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Abstract

THE WORLD WAR I CENSORSHIP OF THE IRISH-AMERICAN PRESS

by Michael Patrick Mulcrone

Chairman of the Supervisory Committee:
Professor Gerald J. Baldasty
School of Communications

During World War I, editions of five Irish-American newspapers were banned from the mails by the United States Post Office. One newspaper and a magazine were forced out of business.

These actions were ostensibly taken in the name of national security. This dissertation suggests, however, that the postal censorships were the culmination of a larger debate about American identity and the limits of pluralism during wartime.

The dissertation examines two aspects of the press: First, how Irish-American newspapers gave voice to immigrant aspirations and helped sustain a sense of identity among the immigrant Irish and their offspring; second, how loyalty to Ireland and anger toward Great Britain produced a backlash against the Irish-American press once the U.S. entered the War.

The first part of the study discusses the role of Irish-American newspapers within the national Irish-American community. The Irish-American press served as an alternative to the mainstream press. Irish-American
newspapers offered an Irish interpretation of events and reinforced Irish identity, the central component of which was hatred of Britain. When the U.S. joined the War as Britain's ally, the unrelenting anglophobia of the Irish-American press came into conflict with mainstream opinion.

The next section discusses role of the mainstream press in fomenting anti-Irish sentiment. The commercial daily press—with the exception of the Hearst papers—looked with suspicion upon Irish-American agitation against England. After the U.S. entered the War, the mainstream press encouraged vigilante activity and gave credence to unsubstantiated rumors of Irish/German plots. Some papers equated Irish-American nationalism with treason to the U.S.

The final section examines the subsequent censorship of the Irish-American press. Postal documents reveal that officials and volunteers at the New York City Post Office were more often motivated by a desire to silence dissent than by a legitimate concern for national security. In the hysteria of the times, criticism of Great Britain and expressions of Irish-American support for national self-determination in Ireland became synonymous with disloyalty to the United States.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Ethnic Press

Sixteen years ago, in an essay which appeared in the inaugural issue of *Journalism History*, James Carey lamented the current state of American journalism history.¹ Carey complained, among other things, that the field was dominated by a single interpretive paradigm which wedded the notion of progress to the idea of history. This whig interpretation of journalism history proclaimed that the evolution of the American press was—apart from a few temporary halts and digressions—essentially a story of success marked by ever-expanding freedoms, knowledge and social responsibility. The reconstructed record of the past became, as a consequence, little more than a cartography of past achievements.

Much has changed in the intervening years. Some scholars are scrutinizing the development of the mainstream commercial press with a more critical eye. Others are reevaluating the contributions of the alternative and dissident presses. The whig paradigm is no longer ascendant: the field, to borrow a phrase from Carey, has
been somewhat ventilated by fresh perspectives and new interpretations.

Yet the task is far from complete. Hanno Hardt has charged in a recent essay that the immigrant press has received little attention. Press historians, Hardt contends, have ignored or undervalued the contributions ethnic newspapers have made to American political and social culture:

By ignoring people, including the working class, which was made up of immigrants and their cultural differences, and by omitting an assessment of the social and political contributions of immigrant cultures and their newspapers as supportive or oppositional forces in society, press historians have made a travesty of journalism history.²

Some scholars dispute the sweeping contention that the immigrant press has been ignored.³ Most early studies of the immigrant press owe a debt to Robert Park's seminal work which concluded that the immigrant press primarily serves a dual role: it either inhibits or accelerates the assimilation of ethnic groups into the mainstream of American life.⁴ A more recent generation of scholars suggest the need for fresh perspectives.⁵

Despite efforts to include the ethnic press, the fact remains that journalism history has focused mainly upon the institutional side of journalism--most often mainstream journalism--or upon the broad economic, technological and social forces which helped give rise to the modern press.⁶
Yet at its essence, journalism is an interactive social process, an extended conversation among people who are attempting to make sense out of the world at particular moments in time. As Carey writes:

"Journalism is essentially a state of consciousness, a way of apprehending, of experiencing . . . When we study the history of journalism we are principally studying a way in which men in the past have grasped reality."

The immigrant or ethnic press was and remains an expression of ethnic consciousness and it provides a window into the process by which an ethnic group defines and sustains itself. The ethnic press also played a central role in the debate over the future course of American civic culture during the early years of the 20th century.

The ethnic press was ubiquitous. A British commentator observed in 1915 that if an Eskimo were to land unexpectedly into New York, the first thing he'd find would be a newspaper written by Eskimos for Eskimos. In 1917—-one of the years encompassed by this study—more than 1400 ethnic newspapers were published in more than 33 different languages. These papers provided vital forums through which ethnic aspirations could be articulated and resolved.

The ethnic press—-in its broad curriculum—was at once an expression of ethnic distinctiveness and a site of struggle against (and at times acquiescence to) acculturation and domination by the mainstream native majority. Some understanding of the ethnic press as a site
of divergent or oppositional visions of America is central to a complete understanding of the formation of contemporary notions of cultural and political pluralism and the role of the mass media role in that process.

This study examines how these concerns were articulated in the Irish-American press during the years 1914-1918—a time of upheaval when issues of loyalty and national identity were in the forefront of national discourse. This case study examines the strategies by which the Irish-American press sought to reconcile both sides of the Irish-American hyphen. It also addresses issues concerning the nature of press freedoms and the limits of cultural and political pluralism during times of national stress.

Specifically, the study explores how the Irish-American press described the experiences, articulated the aspirations and defined the identity of the Irish-American community at a critical point in its evolution. The study also examines the role of the Irish-American press as a forum for oppositional ideas. The study attempts to answer a number of questions:

- How did Irish-American newspapers represent or give voice to insurgent or oppositional ideas?
- What were the limits to such ideas?
- Finally, what were the consequences for the Irish-American press when its persistent expressions of ethnic aspirations and identity brought it into conflict with the
attitudes of the dominant mainstream culture during World War One?

 Immigration and the Debate About American Identity

Urban America teemed with immigrants in the first decades of the 20th century. Outside of the Deep South, most cities held substantial immigrant populations. Four in every ten inhabitants of New York City in 1910 were foreign-born. In San Francisco, one in three was an immigrant. In parts of New England, the percentage of the foreign-born population approached 50 percent. Immigrants and their American-born offspring made up more than 75 percent of the population in major cities across the nation.

Unlike earlier waves of immigrants, most now came from southern or eastern Europe. The flood of newcomers—with their old-world loyalties and their bewildering babble of tongues—chafed at accepted notions of American identity. A resurgent nativism based upon the inherent superiority of Anglo-Saxons was but one response. The rise of racial theories—which asserted the genetic superiority of old stock Anglo-Saxons—paralleled the growing mood of rapprochement with Great Britain and America's burgeoning imperial presence following the Spanish-American War.

The very definition of American was under challenge. Debates raged within intellectual circles—and spilled out into the mainstream media—over the relative merits of
Anglo-conformity versus "melting pot" theories of assimilation.¹⁷

These concerns rose into high relief as the United States moved towards war as an ally of Great Britain. World War One provided a focus to the tensions that seethed within American society. The War shattered the myth of homogeneity on which American society rested.¹⁸ The years 1914–1918 witnessed unprecedented attacks upon marginal groups. Vigilante organizations prowled the country in search of dissenters.¹⁹ Slackers (draft dodgers) and spies were the first targets. Socialists, labor radicals and the foreign-born soon became objects of suspicion. Exhortations in behalf of the Anglo-Saxon character of American identity were quickly subsumed under demands for conformity to "100% Americanism."²⁰

The Espionage, Sedition, and Trading with the Enemy Acts were used to silence many immigrant, socialist, religious and radical publications. Postal authorities wielded broad discretionary powers to stifle dissent by withdrawing—or threatening to withdraw—mailing privileges.

By mid-1918, 75 newspapers as well as scores of magazines, books and pamphlets were interfered with by the United States Post Office.²¹ Yet not a single commercial daily newspaper was directly affected by the postal proscriptions although a few, such as the Hearst papers,
often carried reports similar to those for which immigrant newspapers were suppressed.22

The War was a dark era for the immigrant press. Justice Department officials and civilian volunteers at the U.S. Post Office subjected immigrant newspapers to continuous harassment. The German-language press suffered most. But other ethnic publications—including the Irish—were also affected. Postal authorities barred editions of at least five Irish-American newspapers from the mails during 1918 as well as a number of magazines, books and pamphlets.

Six editions of the New York Irish World and three editions of the New York Advocate were withheld from the mails. The New York Gaelic-American was barred from the mails for more than a year (postal privileges were not restored until three months after armistice). The Freeman's Journal and Catholic Register of New York was forced to suspend publication permanently. The Irish Press of Philadelphia almost went under. Jeremiah O'Leary, publisher of Bull, an anti-British satirical magazine which was forced out of business in 1917, went on the run before being captured on a chicken ranch in Washington state and tried for treason in a case that garnered national attention.

The experience of the socialist, radical, and German-language presses has been documented.23 The experience of the Irish-American press in the years prior to and during
World War One, however, remains largely untold.\textsuperscript{24} The years 1914-1918 provide an appropriate period of study for a number of reasons. The years leading up to World War One marked the convergence of a myriad of political and social forces that led to the suppression of socialist, radical and foreign-language publications. The Irish-American press continued to promote an ethnic agenda at a time of rising xenophobia, when assertions of ethnic distinctiveness attracted increasing suspicion.

This study of the Irish-American press addresses important issues concerning the nature of press freedoms and the limits of political and cultural pluralism in a seminal juncture in American history. It also discusses the role of the immigrant or ethnic press as a site of divergent or oppositional visions of America.

**Dimensions of the Study**

The study has two basic dimensions: 1.) It analyzes the content of a sample of Irish-American newspapers as a manifestation of Irish-American aspirations at a crucial stage in the evolution of the Irish-American community--the years 1914-1918. 2.) It documents the subsequent suppression of the Irish-American press following the United States' entry into World War One. This in turn will have three dimensions: The response of the government, the mainstream press, and the general public to ethnic aspirations as expressed in a sample of Irish-American
newspapers. Irish-American newspapers were suppressed for reasons that went beyond legitimate concerns for national security. The suppressions came, rather, as a consequence of the press' persistent and often strident demands that Irish-American aspirations concerning the colonial status of Ireland be acknowledged.

The study attempts to answer four questions:

- First, what major themes/concerns were articulated in the Irish-American press? Evidence reveals that anglophobia—antipathy toward Great Britain and fear of Anglo-Saxon influence in the United States—was the central dimension of Irish-American identity as articulated by the press. The anglophobic tendency found expression through several recurring themes: obsession with past injustices, concerns about the group image of the Irish in America, attitudes concerning the War and the anti-colonial struggle in Ireland. This dimension of the study also investigates the strategies by which the Irish-American press attempted to reconcile anglophobia with loyalty to the United States at a time of resurgent Anglo/Saxonism and rapprochement with Great Britain.

- Second, what was the nature of the U.S. government's case against the Irish-American press? National security was used as justification for the postal suppressions. Yet postal records concerning Irish-American publications reveal that censors were more often motivated by a spirit of
vigilantism and jingoism than by legitimate concerns for wartime security.

- Third, what role did the mainstream press play in fomenting or encouraging anti-Irish sentiment? Research reveals that many large daily newspapers—especially in New York City—equated Irish-American nationalist aspirations with disloyalty to the United States. Many Irish-Americans and Irish-American newspapers favored Germany over Britain in the early days of the War or advocated American neutrality. Following America's entry into the hostilities, however, even the most stridently anglophobic elements within the Irish-American press supported the war effort. Yet the mainstream press continued to equate criticism of Great Britain and support for national self-determination in Ireland with disloyalty to the United States. Many Irish editors accused mainstream newspapers of anti-Irish sentiment before and during the War. The Leader, the Irish World, the Gaelic-American, the Chicago Citizen and the Western Watchman were vociferous in their attacks upon mainstream newspapers. Mainstream daily newspapers encouraged attacks upon the Irish by giving credence to unsubstantiated British claims of Irish-German collusion in subverting the American war effort.

- Finally, how did Irish-American editors respond to the threat—or the actual imposition—of postal restrictions? The Freeman's Journal of New York and Bull, a
monthly magazine, were forced out of business. The Gaelic-American, which remained defiant, was banned from the mails until well after the end of the War and survived only through donations from supporters. The Irish Press suffered repeated postal bannings. The Irish World used its political influence in an attempt to counter the postal restrictions until continuous harassments forced it to submit.

The Irish-American Press

In 1914, at least 25 newspapers devoted to Irish interests were published in the United States. These papers were English-language weeklies and many enjoyed national and even international circulations.

The Irish-American press provided a vigorous and vocal forum within the Irish-American community. Although the Irish could read English and could turn—unlike most other immigrant groups—to the mainstream press, the Irish supported their own newspapers in most large cities outside of the Deep South. New York alone had as many as five Irish weeklies. Boston supported two.

The Irish-American press warrants study for a number of reasons. The Irish, in the first decades of the 20th century, served as arbitrators between immigrant America and the old guard, mainly Anglo-Saxon establishment. The Irish were a powerful presence in politics, labor, and the church. Yet despite their influence (or perhaps because of it), they
were still denied access to key positions in industry, banking, and academia. With some exceptions, Irish editors were voices in support for cultural and political pluralism. Irish advocacy of self-determination for Ireland also provided a model for other immigrant groups in support of independence for their own homelands.  

The experience of the Irish-American press was in some ways unique. Robert Park placed great emphasis upon foreign-language as a factor in the function and survival of the immigrant press. For immigrants unable to read English, newspapers in their native tongue provided important information as well as reassurance in the alien environment of urban America.

Yet the Irish could read English and could turn to the mainstream press for such information as was necessary make their way in the new world--and they did. Evidence suggests that the Irish were regular readers of mainstream newspapers. The survival of the Irish-American press depended not upon language loyalty--like its foreign-language counterparts--nor upon the need to be "all things to all people," like the commercial daily press.

The Irish-American press existed because it practiced a fundamentally different kind of journalism. It satisfied needs that the mainstream press--in its appeal to the broad middle--was unable or unwilling to meet. Irish editors interpreted events from a distinctly Irish perspective which
often stood at odds with mainstream interpretations. They appealed to their readers not as potential consumers but as members of a far-flung community separated by geography, class, and levels of adjustment but united by commonalities of culture, religion, a set of shared experiences, and an all-encompassing antipathy towards the ancestral enemy—Great Britain.\textsuperscript{31}

Nationalism was the driving force behind the Irish-American press since the foundation of the first distinctly Irish-American weekly, The Shamrock, in 1810. In the 19th century, the press labored to secure a place for the Irish in America by reconciling loyalty to Ireland with loyalty to the United States. To that end, Irish-American newspapers employed one of two conflicting strategies: they appealed to the Catholic identities of their readers or promoted a strident strain of nationalism which called for the violent overthrow of British rule in Ireland.\textsuperscript{32}

These approaches were designed for American ends: good Catholics would make good American citizens; a free Ireland would confer credibility and status upon the Irish in America (the anti-colonial struggle was often framed in the language and mythology of America's own war of independence against Great Britain. The two strategies were largely reconciled by the turn of the century. The Irish-American press had proved a critical influence in transforming the
social identity of the Irish in America. Much of its work in helping the Irish to adjust was complete.33

But adjustment did not confer acceptance by the host society. By 1900 the Irish in America had achieved a degree of economic and political success. Yet they continued to be haunted by nagging suspicions of their own inferiority. America remained in many ways a hostile Anglo-Protestant nation and the Irish attributed their second-class status to the insidious influence of "Perfidious Albion" and her fawning anglophile acolytes. Those few within the Irish community who had scrambled their way into the upper-middle class longed only to abandon these ancestral concerns and disappear into the anonymity of mainstream America. For most, however, nationalism served as a source of tribal identity and provided a means by which legitimacy and acceptance might be won. The Irish looked to their organizations--and to their press--to give shape and voice to these aspirations.

In the 19th century many Irish-American newspapers advocated radical social and economic changes in American society and physical force to free Ireland from Great Britain. By 1914, however, most Irish-American newspapers scorned socialism and espoused instead a moderate domestic agenda which advocated labor peace and upward mobility as proper strategies for securing the position of the Irish in America.34 Yet the Irish-American press maintained its
vehement, if less violent, attacks upon British policies in Ireland and upon perceived Anglo-Saxon influence--both foreign and domestic--in America. 35 Irish-American criticism of Great Britain and Anglo-Saxon influence eventually called down the wrath of postal censors.

Methods/Documentary Sources

The study is grounded upon three categories of primary source material as well as a number of secondary sources. Primary sources will include:

1.) Irish-American newspapers--A sample of five Irish-American newspapers was drawn from the years 1914 through 1918. The sample includes three newspapers--the San Francisco Leader, the Gaelic-American, and the Irish World (both of New York City)--which suffered restrictions at the hands of the representatives of the federal government and two newspapers--the Chicago Citizen and the Western Watchman of St. Louis--which escaped censure.36 These newspapers were all weeklies and enjoyed regional and often national circulations.

The sample is not designed as a completely representative cross section of the entire Irish-American press. It is intended to reflect geographical differences and differences in orientation. One paper was selected from the west coast, two from the east, two from the Midwest.

2.) Mainstream daily newspapers--The sample of newspapers included the New York Times, the New York World,
the Chicago Tribune, the San Francisco Chronicle, and two Hearst newspapers—the San Francisco Examiner and New York American—which were more sympathetic to the Irish. The Literary Digest was also consulted for a cross section of American press opinion.

3.) Postal records and Justice Department records relating to Irish-American activities and the Irish-American press during World War One. These records are held in the National Archives, Washington D.C.

Editions of the five Irish-American newspapers were consulted from the years 1914-1918. A clustered sample was constructed around salient dates including in part the beginning of World War One in 1914, the 1916 Dublin Rising and its aftermath, the April 1917 declaration of war by the United States, the September 1917 warning concerning newspaper content issued by the Post Office, the November 1917 New York mayoral election, the January 1918 withdrawal of mailing privileges, reports of Irish-German plots in 1917 and 1918, etc. The New York Times Index served as an invaluable guide in constructing a chronology of Irish and Irish-American activities during 1914-1918.

Mainstream daily newspapers were examined from the same time period. Attention was given to all relevant newspaper content, including news reports, editorials and letters-to-the-editor. The study does not employ a formal content analysis; it relies instead upon the descriptive-analytical
method that typifies most narrative historical work in this country.

In addition to primary source material, a wide range of secondary sources was consulted in an effort to reconstruct the material conditions and historical consciousness of Irish-Americans prior to and during the War. Events can only be understood in terms of the contexts from which they arise. To fully comprehend the past events it is necessary, as Carey observes, to:

... penetrate beyond mere appearance to the structure of imagination that gives them their significance. ... The objective is not merely to recover articulate ideas ... but rather the entire "structure of feeling" ... to show, in short, how action made sense from the standpoint of the historical actors: how did it feel to live and act in a particular period in human history?[^37]

The Irish-American Newspapers

The *Irish World and American Industrial Liberator*, published in New York City since 1870, was for decades the largest and most successful newspaper of its kind in America. The *Irish World* was edited by founder Patrick Ford until his death in 1913. Born in Ireland, Ford came to the United States in 1844 as a child of seven. His experiences as a young man in Boston during the full fury of Yankee nativism—when signs advising "No Irish Need Apply" were everywhere in evidence—convinced Ford that the Irish were victimized by British tyranny even in America.
Ford broke into the newspaper business at age 15 as a printer's devil on William Lloyd Garrison's abolitionist paper, the *Liberator*, where he absorbed not only the basics of the trade, but also Garrison's passionate concern for social justice. Ford served for a time as editor of the *Boston Tribune*. Following the Civil War he edited the *South Carolina Leader*, which agitated for black rights. After a failed attempt at Irish journalism in South Carolina, he founded the *Irish World*.

The *Irish World* espoused a variety of radical domestic social agendas in the long course of its evolution and supported the anti-colonial struggle in Ireland. In the 1880's, the *Irish World* endorsed labor agitation in the United States and sponsored massive fund raising drives bankroll rent boycotts in Ireland and bombing campaigns in Britain.

By the turn of the century, however, the *Irish World* had embarked upon a more moderate course. Abandoning its radical social agenda, it promoted middle-class values and labor harmony as the proper strategies for achieving respectability and acceptance for the Irish in America. The *Irish World* also turned away from armed struggle in favor of parliamentary methods on behalf of Ireland's campaign for independence from Britain. Following Patrick Ford's death in 1913, his nephew Robert took over as editor until his death in 1920. The Ford family also published the *Freeman's*
Journal and Catholic Register in New York City. The Irish World was the premier Irish newspaper in America. Estimated circulation in 1914 was 60,000.38

The Gaelic-American—also published in New York City—was the nearest rival to the Irish World in influence if not circulation. Edited by John Devoy, who was exiled to the United States in 1871 for revolutionary activities in Ireland, the Gaelic-American was the strident and uncompromising voice of Irish nationalism in America.

Devoy served for a time as foreign-editor at the New York Herald before turning to Irish journalism in the 1880's. He founded the Gaelic-American in 1903 to challenge the Irish World's decision to promote parliamentary methods to resolve the Irish question. The only Irish-born nationalist leader in New York, Devoy was the ideologue of Irish-American nationalism, the "guardian of revolutionary purity" who strove to protect the movement from the contaminations of social radicalism and compromise.39

Devoy was also sensitive to the needs of the Irish in America. He lived most of his life in the United States and the Gaelic-American, like the Irish World and most Irish-American papers of the time, advocated social mobility as a means of achieving acceptance for Irish-Americans. But unlike the Irish World, the Gaelic-American continued to advocate armed struggle to achieve Ireland's independence. Respectability would only be won by the Irish in America,
the Gaelic-American insisted, when Ireland took its place among the independent nations of the earth. Devoys efforts were largely responsible for funding the Easter 1916 Rising in Dublin which set off a chain of events culminating in the establishment of the Irish Free State in 1921.

The Gaelic-American was the unofficial organ of Clann-na-Gael, which represented the violent wing of Irish nationalism in the United States. The chief owner of the paper was New York Supreme Court Justice Daniel Cohalan, who often co-wrote editorials with Devoys. The Gaelic-American was the premier radical-nationalist Irish newspaper in the United States. Estimated circulation in 1914 was 30,000.40

The San Francisco Leader was co-founded in 1902 by Peter Yorke, an Irish-born Catholic priest.41 Although not an official diocesan publication, the Leader represented a kind of nationalist/Catholic hybrid that was common in the Irish-American press.

Yorke served for a time (1894-1898) as editor of the diocesan paper of San Francisco, The Monitor. During his tenure there he led a successful campaign against the American Protective Association, a nativist organization which flourished for a time in California.

As editor of the Leader, Yorke championed the cause of organized labor even as he insisted upon conformity to conservative Catholic values. Yorke was a vocal critic of Britain and of Anglo-Saxon influence in the United States.
His war against real and perceived discrimination against the Irish became something of an obsession—despite the fact that the Irish who settled in San Francisco suffered little of the bigotry and social ostracism their fellow countrymen endured in other parts of the nation. The Leader's estimated circulation in 1914 was 27,000.

The Chicago Citizen, founded by John F. Finerty in 1882, claimed to be "The Only National Secular Newspaper West of New York Devoted to the Unity and Elevation of the Irish People." A one-time member of Congress (on an anti-British platform), Finerty had a career in the mainstream daily press before turning to Irish journalism. Following his death in 1912, the paper had a series of editors including John P. Sutton, W.H. Cahill, and James Conwell.

The Citizen had ties to the Ancient Order of Hibernians (AOH), the largest Irish fraternal organization in the United States. It was also closely allied with the United Irish League, the American branch of the Irish Parliamentary Party led by John Redmond. The Irish Party was the voice of Home Rule in Ireland and it held the balance of power in British Parliament in the late 19th and early 20th century.

The Citizen was virulently anti-socialist and promoted middle-class values. Despite its claims of secularism, the Citizen took a conservative Catholic perspective on such moral issues as sex education, divorce, and censorship of "indecent" literature. The Citizen was distributed in many
cities along the east coast. Estimated circulation in 1914 was 30,000.45

The Western Watchman, established in 1865, was the official newspaper of the Catholic archdiocese of St. Louis. The Watchman’s masthead noted that the paper was "Devoted to the Interests of the Catholic Church in America." Edited by Rev. D.S. Phelan, the Watchman focused mainly upon clerical and church news from around the nation. It also carried a substantial Irish content and regularly chastised mainstream daily newspapers for their editorial stands on Irish issues.

At 20 pages, the Watchman was substantially larger than the other papers which normally ran eight to twelve pages in length. It also carried a larger percentage of advertising than its counterparts.46 The Western Watchman is representative of those Catholic papers which carried substantial Irish content. The church--along with machine politics and the labor movement--was one of the few areas of Irish predominance and Irish clerics--whether American-born or immigrant--often brought an Irish perspective to the Catholic newspapers they edited. Estimated circulation of the Western Watchman in 1914 was 8,000.47

Chapter Organization

Chapter Two--Irish-America Before the War--This chapter discusses the material conditions and status of the Irish in America. The post-Famine emigration of the 1840's and the hostile reception that the Irish received upon landing in
America left an indelible mark upon the folk memory of Irish-Americans. By 1914, the Irish had achieved a measure of economic and political power that enabled them to serve as arbitrators between immigrant groups and the old guard establishment. But a tangle of conflicting aspirations remained, including the need to somehow harmonize loyalty to the old country with loyalty to the United States. Despite their common heritage, however, the Irish of 1914 were a heterogeneous community divided by class, geography and levels of adjustment.

Chapter Three—Anglophobia, Identity, and the Irish-American Press—This chapter discusses the Irish-American press' anglophobic response to the resurgent Anglo-Saxonism in the years leading up to America's entry into World War One. This chapter begins the thematic content analysis of the Irish-American newspapers.

Chapter Four—Irish Nationalism: The American Dilemma—This chapter describes Irish-American press support for Irish independence from Great Britain. The Irish in America saw themselves as a nation in exile, forced to emigrate because of British misrule in Ireland. Prior to 1914, Irish-American papers were divided on tactics concerning the Irish national question. Some papers supported constitutional efforts to achieve limited self-rule for Ireland while others espoused armed struggle as a means of achieving total independence from Britain. Britain's
decision in 1914 to suspend implementation of home rule legislation until after the end of the war eroded the position of the moderates. The summary execution of the leaders of the 1916 Dublin Rising further marginalized the moderates. For both wings, however, self-determination in Ireland was seen as a necessary precondition for achieving legitimacy for the Irish in America. This chapter examines the Irish-American press' position on the question of Ireland's relationship to Great Britain. It also examines the mainstream press' attitudes concerning the Irish national question. The goal of this chapter is to determine how the Irish-American press sought to harmonize its anglophobia with loyalty to the United States as those two imperatives came into conflict.

Chapter Five--The War: Loyalties in Collision--From the beginning of the War, most Irish-American papers advocated American neutrality and were strident in their condemnation of Britain. Some papers openly favored Germany. This chapter examines the ways in which the Irish-American press interpreted the War. As America's entry into the War approached, the Irish-American position became increasingly untenable. Irish papers scrambled for a strategy to reconcile anti-British sentiment with loyalty to America.

Chapter Six--The Treasonous Irish: Vigilantees, Conspiracies and the Mainstream Press--This chapter discusses the national mood of vigilantism that began to
gather strength prior to America's entry into the War. Sanctioned and encouraged by elected officials and powerful sectors of the mainstream press, the national mood of suppression coalesced in the anti-hyphen debate of 1915, the presidential campaign of 1916 and the New York mayoral race of 1917. Chapter six also examines the antipathy of much of the mainstream press towards Irish-American aspirations. Many mainstream newspapers condemned Irish-American support for Irish self-determination and independence from Great Britain. Despite the paucity of evidence, most leading mainstream newspapers gave credence to every rumored German/Irish plot which emanated from British propagandists. With the exception of the Hearst newspapers, the mainstream press equated Irish-American support for the anti-colonial struggle in Ireland with disloyalty to the United States. By the time the United States entered the War, agitation in support of the independence movement in Ireland had become synonymous in public consciousness with disloyalty to America.

Chapters Seven and Eight--The Postal Suppressions. The Suppressions Expand--These chapters discuss the passage and implementation of the Espionage and Trading with the Enemies Acts and the censorship and suppression of Irish-American publications by the U.S. Post Office and the U.S. Justice Department. These chapters detail the scope of the press bannings and discuss the reactions of various Irish-American
newspapers. Postal records reveal that censors employed arbitrary standards which--despite protestations to the contrary--forced two periodicals out of business and resulted in the pre-publication censorship of every edition of the Irish World during the latter months of 1918. These standards went beyond the mandate of the law and far exceeded any legitimate concern for national security during wartime.

Chapter Nine--Conclusions--This chapter summarizes the experience of the Irish-American press during 1914-1918 and discusses its implications. It also offers suggestions for future study.
Notes to Chapter I


3Catherine Cassara, "The Foreign-Language Press in America: A Historiographic Analysis," unpublished paper delivered at the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communications convention, Boston, 1991. Cassara concludes that this perception exists because most research concerning the immigrant press has been published in journals other than those devoted to communications studies. Cassara 26.

4Robert Park, The Immigrant Press and It's Control (New York: Harper and Brothers: 1922). The Park study—which remains the only detailed study of the entire immigrant press—was part of a ten-volume series on immigrants and Americanization conducted by the University of Chicago on a grant from the Carnegie Foundation. The social scientists at Chicago sought to reappraise American attitudes towards the foreign-born following the nativist resurgence during World War One. One of the goals of the Park study was to determine how the foreign-language press could be enlisted to advance the Americanization of immigrant populations. Park also concluded that the foreign-language press was essentially opportunistic. Its first duty is to survive. According to Park's evolutionary model the immigrant press tends over time to move toward the middle of the socio-political spectrum, abandoning advocacy and opinion in favor of objective news and advertising. Park also placed great emphasis on the importance of foreign language as a factor in the function and survival of the immigrant press. He concluded that the foreign-language press provided vital information about the alien American environment for immigrants unable to read English. The very existence of the Irish-American press (which Park ignored) suggests that the immigrant press served other needs. Unlike other immigrant groups the Irish could read English and could, as a consequence, turn to the mainstream press for such information as was needed to order their lives.

Studies of the German-language press employ Park's dual role model to conclude, in agreement with Park, that assimilation was given higher priority by editors than separatism. Carl Witte, who surveyed the entire German-language press, and Carl Knoche, who studies the press in Milwaukee, also agree that partisan publications were short-lived and that commercial papers were more widespread and


5George E. Pozetta, "The Italian Immigrant Press of New York City: The Early Years 1880-1915," Journal of Ethnic Studies (Fall 1973) suggests, in contradiction of Park, that the immigrant press was not always altruistic and sometimes worked against the interests of immigrants.

Jonas Bjork concludes that Park's dual role model is true but inadequate. He suggests that it is too tied to immigration and that scholars since Park have become prisoners of Park's perspective. Ulf Jonas Bjork, "The Swedish-American Press: Three Newspapers and Their Communities," diss., U of Washington, 1987, 18.


Marion Marzolf argues that earlier analyses failed to acknowledge the evolutionary character of the ethnic press. Different obstacles and needs of each group determine the functions of its press at any given time. As the aspirations of a group change, so too does the role of the press. Marzolf suggests: "Descriptions of the ethnic press must take into account the immigrant group's experience and characteristics, the time period, the functions of the press..." Marion Tuttle Marzolf, The Danish Language Press in America, diss., U of Michigan, 1972, (New York: Arno, 1979) 15.

foreign-language press.

7Carey 5.

8The term "ethnicity" is derived from the Greek "ethnos" meaning people or nation. The term "ethnic group" is used here to describe a group with a shared feeling of peoplehood based on nationality, language or place of common origin. The terms "ethnic" and "immigrant" are used interchangeably in reference to the press. This is based on the conclusion that the readership of the immigrant press was comprised not only of immigrants, but also their offspring.


10Emery notes that the number of foreign-language newspapers peaked at 1323 in 1917, the number of dailies peaked at 160 in 1914. Emery 265. The operative definition of ethnic newspapers also includes those which were published in the English language for distinct ethnic groups, including Irish-Americans. The true number of ethnic papers is difficult to assess because newspaper directories from the period--such as N.W. Ayer and Son's--did include English-language newspapers in any of the ethnic categories. The true number was probably well in excess of 1400.


13Horace Kallen, a superintendent of New York City schools and a professor of philosophy at Harvard, observed that English had become like Latin in the Middle Ages: it was the language of the upper and dominant class and served as a kind of lingua franca in the economic life of the masses. Horace Kallen, "Democracy vs. the Melting Pot," Nation (25 Feb. 1915) 217.

14The "new" nativism that began to gather momentum after Haymarket massacre in 1886 was not limited to new immigrants. It had a distinct anti-Catholic character and it looked to England as the source of American cultural and

Josiah Strong, Our Country: Its Possible Future and Its Present Crisis (New York: American Home Ministry Society, 1885) advocated Anglo-Saxon imperialism. Strong, a Congregationalist minister and a pioneering social reformer, criticized Irish political machines for courting the immigrant vote. 176,000 copies of his book were in print by 1916. Charles E. Woodruff, M.D., Expansion of the Races (New York: Rebman, 1909) advocated closer ties between England and America based on their common Aryan superiority. Racial superiority and the idea of the white man's burden were used to justify the United States' incursion into the Phillipines.

The notion Anglo-Saxon dominance in the racial hierarchy was predicated on the assumption that culturally acquired characteristics were genetically transmitted. Fallows 6. Many expressed a fear of "race suicide" as a consequence of immigration. A University of Wisconsin professor of sociology complained: "... we now confront the melancholy spectacle of this pioneer breed being swamped and submerged by the overwhelming tide of latecomers from the old-world hive. ... blood now being injected into the veins of our people is 'sub-common' ... (from) hirsute, low-browed, big-faced persons of obvious low mentality." Edward Alsworth Ross, Ph.D., The Old World in the New (New York: Century, 1914) 299, 282, 285. Another widely-read book was Madison Grant, The Passing of the Great Race (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1916. Grant, a New York descendent of Yankee colonial stock, helped found and direct the New York Zoological Society. The genetic theories did not stand unchallenged in academic circles. Some emphasized
the importance of new blood in the creation of a new
American type. John Higham, "European Immigration in
American European Thought 1885-1925, diss., U of Wisconsin,
1948. See also Franz Boas, The Mind of Primitive Man (New
York: MacMillan, 1916) 120-121. Boas was a German-Jewish
immigrant and a professor of anthropology at Columbia
University.

Fuchs argues that the question of American identity
was in almost continuous debate from 1880-1920. This debate
centered around two conflicting ideas: 1.) the basis of
American identity was based upon diversity bound by a
Jeffersonian commitment to civic culture and democratic
participation rather than cultural, racial, or religious
conformity. 2.) American identity was a condition of
character, birth, or ethnic heritage. Laurence H. Fuchs,
The American Kaleidoscope: Race, Ethnicity and the Civic

The term "melting pot" came from the 1908 play of the
same name produced by Israel Zangwill. Zangwill's play
celebrated the American libertarian mission and the fusion
of all races. The theory of cultural pluralism was first
articulated in the writings of Horace Kallen: Democracy vs.
the Melting Pot," Nation (18, 25 Feb. 1915) Baltzell argues
that that the structural exclusion of ethnics by the
dominant majority and the persistence of ethnic associations
such as newspapers, schools, etc. made for a de facto
structural pluralism long before the theory of cultural
pluralism was articulated. E. Digby Baltzell, Protestant
Establishment Revisited (New Brunswick: Transaction
Publishers, 1991) 221.

Critics of the melting pot theory claimed that the
melting pot did not work. They warned that immigration
threatened the survival of the Anglo-Saxon race and as well
as American civic life and democratic institutions:
"[Immigrants] not possessing the Anglo-Teutonic conception
of law, order, and government . . . [have begun] to corrupt
our civic life." Stanford Professor Edward Cubberly,
founder of the Immigration Restriction League,
quoted in Fuchs 57. "In the city of New York, and elsewhere
in the United States, there is a native American aristocracy
resting upon layer after layer of immigrants of lower races.
. . . the operation of universal suffrage tends toward the
selection of the average man for public office rather than
the man qualified by birth, education, and integrity. . . .
from a racial point of view, it will inevitably increase the
preponderance of the lower types and cause a corresponding
loss of efficiency in the community as a whole. . . . If the
Melting Pot is allowed to boil without control . . . and we
continue to follow our national motto . . . the type of
American of Colonial descent will become as extent as the
Athenian in the age of Pericles." Grant 5, 228. Others made veiled suggestions that the Constitution be changed to prevent that eventuality: "So long as present sociological conditions continue unchanged in the Republic and its political constitution remains unaltered, the nation must in due time be given over to those races who can turn up to heave the greatest number of befouled and stubby noses. The final passage of the American Republic into the control of other race approaches, and with it the Day of the Saxon draws to an end." Homer Lea, The Day of the Saxon (New York: Harper, 1912) 36.

Articles in the mainstream press, often based on scientific studies, helped popularize racial theories and the concern that the Anglo-Saxon character of American identity was endangered by the immigrant masses. See "Does the 'Melting Pot' Melt," Literary Digest 3 March 1917: 544-545. See also "Birth Control and Race Suicide," Literary Digest 3 February 1917: 244-245. John Higham suggests that "fears of an immigrant menace" grew more powerful and widespread after 1910. John Higham, diss., 150.


20 Gordon argues: "Anglo-conformity received its fullest expression in the so-called Americanization movement which gripped the nation like a fever during World War One. ... essentially it was a consciously articulated movement to strip the immigrant of his native attachments and make him over into an American along Anglo-Saxon lines." Milton Gordon, Assimilation in American Life (New York: Oxford UP, 1964) 98-99.

21 "It was the little newspapers--the reform or radical publications--along with the foreign-language press, which were suppressed by the government." Peterson and Fite 95.


century press.

Eileen McMahon, "The Irish-American Press," The Ethnic Press in the United States, Sally Miller, ed. (New York: Greenwood, 1987) suggests that immigrant editors of the 19th century sought to ease the process of assimilation and to shape and promote Irish-American nationalist opinion. She concludes that anti-British sentiment was the driving force behind the press.


N.W. Ayer & Son, American Newspaper Annual and Directory (Philadelphia: Ayer & Son, 1914. The actual number could be much greater because, as noted, the Ayer Newspaper Annual did not classify Irish-American periodicals in any consistent ethnic category. Newspapers and magazines devoted to Irish interests were classified according to a number of arbitrary designations including "Irish," Irish-American," "Irish-Catholic," "Catholic," Irish Interests," "Democratic," and "Anti-British." These designations can be a source of confusion. The Irish World, for example, the most successful and influential secular Irish publication in the United States, was labeled "Catholic." N.W. Ayer & Son, 1914 Newspaper Annual 653. Numerous ostensibly Catholic newspapers—most of which were edited by Irish clerics—also devoted substantial attention to Irish and Irish-American issues. Dean Esslinger, "American German and American Irish Attitudes Toward Neutrality, 1914–1917: A Study of Catholic Minorities," Catholic Historical Review 53 (July 1967): 200.

The Irish question was also a popular topic in the contemporary African-American press. See Frederick

27 Park claimed that the existence of the immigrant press was a function of foreign-language. He argued that without non-English speaking readers, the immigrant press had no constituency. Park 9, 326-327.

28 The Hearst newspapers, which were generally sympathetic to Irish causes, enjoyed a wide Irish readership. Two of the Hearst chain's most popular comic strips—"Happy Hooligan" and "Maggie and Jigs"—were based on Irish characters. The Irish of New York were such faithful customers of Joseph Pulitzer's New York *World* that the *Gaelic-American* often called upon its readers to punish the *World* by withholding advertisements from its death notices section (known in common parlance as the "Irish sports page"). See "World's Audacious Impudence," editorial, *Gaelic-American* 21 March 1914: 4.


30 Irish-American newspapers were less dependent on advertising than other weeklies in the United States. Marzolf notes that mainstream commercial weeklies devoted an average of 50 percent of their space to advertisements in the early 20th century. Danish-American weeklies carried an average of 18 to 30 percent ads. Marzolf 211.

Of the Irish-American newspapers analyzed in this study, only the San Francisco *Leader* had an advertising ratio approaching that of the Danish weekly press. The *Leader* promoted itself as an advertising medium and often ran contests to boost circulation. Advertising content of the other Irish-American papers often fell below ten percent.

Patrick Ford, founder of the *Irish World*, believed that Irish weekly newspapers could be supported by circulation alone. He also believed that because the chief function of the Irish press was editorial interpretation, there was no need for an Irish daily press. Joyce 176.

31 Some word needs to be said about the "Scotch-Irish," as Protestants from the northern counties of Ireland came to be known in the United States. Not all Irish immigrants to
the United States were Catholic and not every Irish-American newspaper appealed to the Catholic identity of its readers. Because of historical circumstances, however, Catholicism and Irish nationalism became intimately interwoven. Irish Protestants were a notable presence in the United States particularly before the Irish potato famine of the mid 19th century which sent thousands of destitute Catholic peasants to the eastern seaboard. Moynihan suggests that Irish Protestants, in an attempt to separate themselves from the impoverished horde, actively sought to become absorbed into the native Anglo-Saxon stock that had successfully absorbed the Scots. The strategy was reinforced by the appearance of anti-Catholic/anti-Irish nativism—the Know Nothing movement. Nathan Glazer and Daniel Moynihan, Beyond the Melting Pot (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1970) 239-240.


There was no identifiable Irish-Protestant press in the United States. Irish-Protestants, however, were prominent in the American alternative media: E.L. Godkin served as editor of the Nation during World War One. Another Irish-born Protestant, Shane Leslie, was associate editor of the short-lived newspaper, Ireland, which appeared in 1916 in New York to promote the cause of Irish constitutional nationalism as an alternative to the advocates of armed struggle.


33Joyce 184, 5.

34Following the 1886 Haymarket massacre and its aftermath, many Irish-American leaders, including Patrick Ford of the Irish World, turned away from radical social agendas.
35The success of the Home Rule movement—which promised to achieve a degree of legislative autonomy for Ireland—gave credibility to those nationalists who advocated non-violent, constitutional tactics.

36These publications were chosen from among those generally acknowledged as being the leading Irish-American papers of the period. See Thomas N. Brown, "The Origins and Character of Irish-American Nationalism," Review of Politics, 18 (1956) 201. See also Arthur Link, Wilson and the Struggle for Neutrality 1914–1915 (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1960) 22. The choice of newspapers was also determined in part by their availability on microfilm. Complete runs were available for the Leader, the Gaelic-American, and the Irish World for the years 1914–1918. Editions of the Chicago Citizen were available from January 1914 through May 1914, and February 1917 through December 1918. The Western Watchman was available only for the years 1917 and 1918. Although editions surrounding certain important events—most notably the 1916 Dublin Rising—are missing for the Citizen and the Watchman, complete runs were available for the critical years following the United States' entry into the War.

37Carey 23.

38N.W. Ayer & Son, 1914 Newspaper Annual 653.

39Joyce 164.

40N.W. Ayer & Son, 1914 Newspaper Annual 650.

41T.J. Mellot was co-founder and co-editor of the Leader. Joseph S. Brusher, Consecrated Thunderbolt: Father Yorke of San Francisco (Hawthorne: Wagner, 1973) 70.

42Yorke was forced to resign as editor of the Monitor in 1898 when his anti-nativism became too strident for Archbishop Patrick Riordan.

43N.W. Ayer & Son, 1914 Newspaper Annual 85.

44The Hibernian, the monthly magazine published by the AOH, had a circulation of 175,000 in 1914. N.W. Ayer & Son, 1914 Newspaper Annual 1247.

45Ayer & Son, 1914 Newspaper Annual 177.

46The Watchman devoted up to 40 percent of its space to ads. The Leader sometimes approached 30 percent. The Gaelic-American and the Citizen averaged around ten percent. The Irish World fell somewhere in the Leader and the
Citizen.

CHAPTER II

IRISH-AMERICA BEFORE THE WAR

In 1914, at the eve of World War One, Irish-America was a nation in exile. Irish immigrants and their first generation American-born children numbered 4.5 million, surpassing even the population of Ireland. The Irish constituted the largest immigrant group in the United States other than the Germans. In Chicago and San Francisco, the Irish were the second largest immigrant group. In New York City, the Irish were fourth in numbers.¹

In all, between 15 and 20 million Americans could claim at least partial Irish ancestry. And although the Irish had scattered throughout the United States (mostly in urban areas) sixty per cent of the national Irish community was concentrated in the six states of the northeast where the legacy of anti-Irish nativism remained strongest.²

Immigration continued but the numbers were in decline. By the turn of the century, newcomers from southern and eastern Europe had largely replaced the swarms of Irish at the immigrant gates. The exodus from Ireland to the United States--one of the largest folk migrations in modern history--had fallen from a peak of 219,000 in the post-Famine year of 1851 to less than 50,000 by 1910. The
American-born now outnumbered their immigrant Irish parents two-to-one. The diaspora had begun to abate. Irish-America was coming of age.

The Irish could look to many examples of their rising status. They were a powerful presence in politics, organized labor, and the Catholic church. Their knowledge of English and their skill at organization enabled the Irish to rise to positions of the leadership in the labor movement. Irishmen were elected mayors of major cities. Irish clerics dominated the hierarchy of the Catholic church and edited the vast majority of Catholic newspapers. By the late nineteenth century the Irish had become a strategic ethnic presence in the hub of urban America. . . . a core group about whom laboring immigrant Americans clustered.

The Irish, by seizing control of urban political machines across the nation, became arbitrators between immigrant America and the old guard elite. In New York City--the capital of immigrant America--the Irish would run the Tammany machine, with its rich network of political influence and patronage, as an Irish fiefdom for more than half a century. The flood of newer immigrants after the 1890's--who unlike earlier immigrants were likely to be Democrat and often Catholic--further reinforced Irish political power.

At the national level, Joseph McKenna won appointment as Attorney General during the McKinley administration to
become the first Irish Catholic to hold a cabinet-level position. Another Irish Catholic, Joseph Tumulty, served as personal secretary to President Woodrow Wilson. Irish senators and congressmen represented states from every region of the country outside of the Deep South.

In the economic arena, the Irish had achieved relative occupational parity with native white Americans. The prospect of social mobility—denied in the old country—had awakened a hunger for achievement in the new. A higher proportion of Irish children were attending college than those of WASP parentage. In northern cities, one-fifth of all public school teachers were Irish Catholic. Irish women were prominent in nursing and in the secretarial trade. Irish pugilists would dominate professional boxing from the 1880's until 1937 when Joe Louis knocked out James J. Braddock to win the world heavyweight crown. And although most Irish were still members of the working class at the eve of World War One, they enjoyed—because of their dominance of the American Federation of Labor—a disproportionate share of the best paid union jobs. The achievements of second-generation Irish-Americans were so dramatic that one critic of the Irish was forced to conclude:

... the record of their children proves that there is nothing in their stock that dooms it forever to serve at the tail end of a wheelbarrow.
But not everyone shared in the spoils of economic achievement. Despite advancements, many were left behind by the rising tide of upward mobility. In 1900, one-quarter of Irish-born males and one-seventh of American-born males of Irish descent still labored in low paying, unskilled occupations. Irish females continued to scrub clothes and scour floors in the homes of the urban elite, or labor in the sweat shops of the textile industry.\textsuperscript{10}

As late as 1915, the death rate among the Irish was the highest in New York City and twice that of contemporary Ireland.\textsuperscript{11} The Irish died in such numbers from tuberculosis that it was commonly known as "the Irish disease."\textsuperscript{12} Schizophrenia and the ravages of chronic drinking sent a disproportionate number of Irish immigrants to public mental asylums.\textsuperscript{13}

The level of Irish achievement was determined in part by local conditions. In San Francisco--where the Irish encountered an "almost negligible degree of discrimination, alienation and dislocation," they responded with confidence and quickly rose to positions of authority in all areas of public and private life.\textsuperscript{14}

But San Francisco was unique. As America's first instant city, it provided an "exceptional environment" whose critical feature was

the lack of an established elite capable, by virtue of prior arrival and control of resources, of ascribing an inferior place to subsequent immigrants.\textsuperscript{15}
Chicago, like other cities in the Midwest, represented a kind of hybrid. It offered more tolerance and social mobility than the cities of the east but less than San Francisco. The Irish encountered a hostile environment on the east coast.

On the eastern seaboard, Irish-Americans experienced nativist wrath and discrimination that inhibited economic and social mobility. Consequently the eastern Irish developed a defensive ghetto mentality dominated by an inferiority complex... a siege mentality. ... The Irish of San Francisco and the west inhabited an environment that was characterized by a cosmopolitan ethos, competition and tolerance that engendered an Irish psychology of confidence and pride.

Despite their contrasting experiences, the American Irish were united by a sense of common identity that transcended differences of geography, class, and levels of adjustment. Many who settled in the Midwest and the Far West had migrated there from the eastern seaboard where they had experienced first hand the realities of intolerance and discrimination.

The memory of past deprivations in both Ireland and America was kept alive in folk memory. The Irish-Catholic world view was molded by a pre-industrial, rural way of life which stressed the communal and the non-competitive and devalued individual initiative and responsibility. To the peasant Irish, fate was the product of powerful, implacable forces over which the individual could exercise little control. Emigration was a form of involuntary exile rather
than an opportunity for advancement. Those who sailed on immigrant ships blamed Britain for their leaving, even if objective circumstances proved otherwise.\textsuperscript{20}

This "culture of despair" was articulated throughout the 19th century in the popular press in Ireland, in folk traditions, and even in the very structure of the Irish language.\textsuperscript{21} And it survived in the Irish imagination on both sides of the Atlantic in many forms of popular expression until well into the 20th century.

The emigration experience generated an entire genre of ballads of which thousands survive in the living tradition. Most express anger and a sense of irreconcilable loss at having been forced to leave Ireland. Many--those most popular in the Irish-American press--end with ringing cries for revenge against the foreign tyrant, Britain.\textsuperscript{22}

The Irish language contributed to the mythos of immigration as involuntary exile. There is no word with neutral connotations in the Irish language for "emigrant." The words most commonly associated with emigration invoke images of homelessness, banishment, and exile.\textsuperscript{23} Although the Irish language was in rapid decline by the turn of the century, one in every four immigrants to the United States in the years 1891-1900 came from an Irish-speaking district. An even higher percentage came from areas where the language had only recently fallen into disuse. Thus the symbolic
structure of the language still resonated through the Irish imagination in the new world as well as the old. 24

Another tradition—the "American wake"—evolved in Ireland in connection with the leave-taking of a son or daughter to the new world. 25 Although symbolic in nature, these "American wakes" infused the emigration experience with all the trauma and finality of death. The entire country, complained an Irish newspaper in 1901, was becoming "one vast 'American Wake.' "26 An observer in 1909 lamented, "the Irish immigrant is not the personification of national adventure, but of something that has the appearance of national doom." 27 The practice survived in parts of Ireland until the 1920's.

The mythos of emigration as involuntary exile was galvanized by the Great Famine of 1846-1848—an apocalyptic event which forever altered the character of Irish society and the course of modern Irish history (and in no small way American history). Potatoes were the primary and often sole source of nutrition for the peasant population. When blight destroyed successive harvests, one million people died from starvation and fever. Another 1.7 million fled from hunger and mass evictions to America.

The Famine had all the dimensions of a holocaust. According to one newspaper account:

... horrors of war have seldom equalled and certainly never succeeded those of the Irish famine of 47. The babe suckling at the dead
mother's breast, whole families living on putrid carrion, hundreds dying and dead by the wayside.\textsuperscript{28}

Britain offered little assistance to the starving masses, most of whom were tenants of British absentee landlords. Sir Charles Trevelyan, the British official in charge of relief, blamed Ireland's agony not on the "physical evil of famine," but upon the "moral evil of the selfish, perverse and turbulent character of the people."\textsuperscript{29} In the cosmology of the day, mass starvation was a manifestation of divine will.

Food was exported while hundreds of thousands starved. Those who took flight shared the ocean-side docks with tons of Irish livestock and grain bound for Britain in payment of rents. The \textit{London Times} rejoiced that Irishmen would soon be as "rare on the banks of the Liffey as a red man on the banks of Manhattan."\textsuperscript{30}

That wish was in part fulfilled. Most who left would never return:

The enormity of that catastrophe guaranteed that Irish immigration would be more final than that of any other immigrant people. ... Irish traffic was one way.\textsuperscript{31}

The Famine set in motion a tradition of mass emigration to America that would last until well into the 20th century.\textsuperscript{32} In 1845--just prior to the Famine--the population of Ireland approached nine million. By 1914, it had shrunk to less than 4.5 million.\textsuperscript{33}
Those who survived the ocean crossing in cramped, fever-ridden "coffin ships," were cast exhausted and ill-equipped upon the shores of east coast America. The eastern cities afforded neither sympathy nor assistance to the destitute Irish.\textsuperscript{34} To be poor in America, according to the Darwinian ethic of the time, was evidence of moral inferiority rather than social or economic injustice.\textsuperscript{35} The hostile reception that greeted the Irish exacerbated their confusion and shame. One newspaper observed:

Our country is literally being overrun with the miserable, vicious, and unclean paupers of the old country.\textsuperscript{36}

The Irish were despised because they were poor, foreign, and Roman Catholic. To civic leaders, the hordes of ignorant Irish who swarmed into tenements or spilled out into shantytowns posed a threat to the social order.\textsuperscript{37} One Bostonian complained of

\[ \ldots \text{the ravenous dregs of anarchy and crime,} \]
\[ \text{the tainted swarms of pauperism and vice Europe shakes on our shores from her diseased robes.} \textsuperscript{38} \]

Anti-Irish sentiment was not limited to the Northeast. The Chicago \textit{Tribune} observed in 1855:

The great majority of members of the Roman Catholic Church in this country are Irishmen. \ldots who does not know that the most depraved, debased, worthless and irredeemable drunkards and sots which curse the community are Irish Catholics. Who does not know that five-eighths of the cases brought up every day before the Mayor for drunkenness and consequent crime are Irish Catholic?\textsuperscript{39}

Among even the most liberal Protestant elements, Irish immigrants were deemed less worthy of assistance than
America's slave population. Theodore Parker, abolitionist minister and grandson of a Minuteman commander, recommended that the Catholic Irish be quarantined for 31 years:

... it would take all this time to clean a paddy on the outside. ... to clean him inwardly would be like picking all the sands of the Sahara.41

Nativist attacks lost some of their shrillness after the 1870's.42 By some accounts the Irish were "generally well-regarded" as they pulled themselves out of poverty and became more like native-born Americans in speech and manner.43

But the memory of past indignities and present insecurities nourished a sense of unease. The horror of the "Great Hunger," as the Famine came to be known, and the shame and humiliation of its American aftermath, were seared into folk memory to survive down the generations. In the collective mythos, England "`had crippled the Irish deliberately,' unfitting them for success abroad while obliging their exodus."44

In many ways, Irish immigrants of the mid-19th century constituted America's first "group social problem." As "proletarian pioneers" of the urban ghetto, they were the first to challenge Anglo-Saxon political and cultural hegemony.45

Insult seemed to follow achievement. When an upstart Irishman, Hugh O'Brien, was elected mayor of Boston in 1885, the Yankee-controlled state legislature responded by seizing
control of the city police department. The Boston police force would remain under control of the state legislature until 1962, two years after John F. Kennedy, grandson of another Boston-Irish mayor, was elected president of the United States.

In 1888, the mayor of New York insulted Irish sensibilities by refusing to review the annual St. Patrick's Day Parade. When the Irish of Boston built a grand cathedral a decade later, Yankee city planners showed their contempt by raising an elevated rail trestle a few yards away, casting a perpetual pall of darkness, clamor, and soot upon the city's most visible symbol of Irish achievement and subjecting the Mass and its celebrants to the regular roar of rail traffic.

Irish political successes attracted the ire of Progressive reformers. According to one historian, the civil service reform movement, which sought to restrict political office to the educated elite, was "a nativist, class-bound reaction against the success of the Irish--foreign, Catholic, working class people--in urban politics."

Many urban Progressives were middle-class Protestant professionals. Most were motivated by a desire to return control over urban politics to the native Protestant elite. One contemporary observer complained that Irish political
machines had transformed American cities into "the worst
governed cities in the civilized world:"

... these Irish immigrants had neither the temper
nor the training to make a success of popular
government. They were totally without experience
of the kind Americans had acquired in the working of
democratic institutions.50

Another advocate of Anglo-Saxon superiority concluded that
the Irish record in American politics offered proof of their
inability to govern themselves in a post-colonial Ireland:
"An independent Ireland worked out on the Tammany model is
not a pleasing prospect."51

A few among the Anglo-Saxon elite championed Irish
contributions to the American social fabric.52 Yet the
cumulative weight of insults regarding Irish achievements
coupled with the attacks upon Irish capacities to
participate in American political institutional life bruised
Irish sensibilities and heightened their sense of
insecurity. And the most stinging rebukes were those that
questioned Irish loyalty to the United States.

At the May, 1914, dedication of a memorial to the
Irish-born American Revolutionary War hero, John Barry,
President Woodrow Wilson delivered a reprimand that would
serve as a harbinger of things to come. Before a crowd of
Irish gathered in celebration, the President praised Barry
as an Irishman whose "heart crossed the Atlantic with him,
while castigating those who "... need hyphens in their
names because only part of them has come over."53 The
message was clear—the loyalty of Irish-Americans was suspect.

Thus the conflicting realities of their collective status offered mixed signals to the Irish. Irish-American newspapers and fraternal organizations reinforced the sense of connectedness to a larger national and international Irish community even as increasing numbers of Irish-Americans fought their way into the middle class. None were more aware of their insecurity nor more sensitive to snubs from Anglo-Saxon America than the rising middle class whose "influence in public life increased all out of proportion to their status in public life."\(^{54}\)

The Irish-American press responded to the rising but still insecure status of the Irish and to indignities both real and imagined by sounding the ancestral cry—often to the point of shrillness—and placing blame on the Anglo-Saxon. If some Irish were ill-equipped for life in urban America, it was due to past deprivations under British colonial rule. If they suffered discrimination and slander in some parts of the United States, it was because of Anglo-Saxon influence. Many factors contributed to Irish insecurity, but "most important, WASP non-recognition of Irish-American accomplishments embittered the Irish middle class and kept old inherited wounds fresh."\(^{55}\)

The primary role of the Irish-American press in the first decades of the 20th century was to make sense of the
conflicting aspirations and insecurities of the American
Irish and to devise comprehensible strategies by which
respectability and acceptance might be won. This impulse
found secular expression in Irish-American nationalism.56

But if the press was the primary agent of nationalist
aspirations, it was also a product of those forces which
gave rise to the nationalist impulse. The Irish-American
press mirrored an Irish-Catholic mind shaped by a legacy of
700 years of colonial subjugation and tempered by the
experience of immigration and the adjustment to the
conditions of the new world.

The resurgence near the turn of the century of a
nativism based upon the inherent superiority of the Anglo-
Saxon race kept the old wounds festering. Despite their
achievements, the Irish remained, by the measure of
America's ruling elite, obstacles to all that was proper and
progressive. The Atlantic Monthly warned:

The only hope for the Irish lies in the mingling
of their blood with that of native Americans. Even
those who move up, rise to the level of saloon
keepers. When they enter politics, they leave
honesty behind, perhaps because they have always
thought of governments as oppressors. They pose a
danger of turning the United States away from its
friendly, close ties to the English.57

The American-Irish, in the first decades of the 20th
century, were in a state of transformation.58 As the elite
of immigrant America and role models for more recent
immigrant groups, the burgeoning Irish middle class stood at
the doors of acceptance into American society. But the
doors remained closed. America was still a Protestant nation and the top positions in government, business, and intellectual life—the inner sanctums of true power—remained the domain of the WASP. The Irish in America were stuck in the ambiguous position of being "the group closest to being in while still being out." Some still scrambled for a secure economic foothold. Others had made it. In either case, the pressures to assimilate came into increasing conflict with an urge to cling to a collective Irish identity and past.

By 1914, most of the exiles of the Famine had passed on. But the legacy of the Famine continued, fed by fresh infusions of immigrants, folk memories, and rising rumblings of Anglo-Saxon ascendancy. Although the status of the Irish was much improved, the awareness of past indignities and present insecurities kept feelings of inferiority alive and nourished the ancestral hatred of all things Anglo-Saxon.

At the eve of World War One, Ireland was emerging from its long colonial past. In America, the immigrants and their offspring remained a nation of uneasy exiles in search of a secure definition of themselves. The Irish-American press provided that definition in an American context and served—as war descended upon Europe and rebellion stirred in Ireland—as a lightening rod for their collective discontent.
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CHAPTER III

ANGLOPHOBIA, IDENTITY, AND THE IRISH-AMERICAN PRESS

Introduction

Anglophobia was the cornerstone of the Irish-American experience. A combination of ancestral hatred of Britain that survived from the old country and a fear of Anglo-Saxon influence in the new, anglophobia provided a framework through which attitudes could be defined and events made comprehensible. The anglophobic imperative overwhelmed differences based on class, region, and levels of adjustment. It was the social glue which bound the scattered Irish together in a sense of community and common purpose.

Anglophobia was the product of two historical forces: the pre-migration experience in Ireland, with its long legacy of British colonial domination; and the post-Famine experience in America where an unwelcome reception awaited the immigrant Irish. Antipathy toward the Anglo-Saxon reverberated through all forms of political and cultural expression—from fraternal organizations and political agendas to cultural rituals such as parades and mass gatherings. Anglophobia found its most coherent expression
in a number of recurring themes which resounded across a broad spectrum of the Irish-American press.

Collective Memory and Historical Consciousness

The obsession with all things English was sustained by a collective memory and an oral tradition that nourished a profoundly telescoped sense of historical time. In the Irish psyche, the past held mythic power over the present, informing not only contemporary events and attitudes but also the very core of Irish-American identity. Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, a labor organizer who grew up in New England in the 1890's, recalled:

The awareness of being Irish came to us as small children, through plaintive song and heroic story. ... As children we drew in a burning hatred of British rule with our mother's milk. Until my father died, at over 80, he never said "England" without adding, "God damn her!"

Thomas Flynn bequeathed his hatred of England to his daughter despite the fact that he was born in America and never laid eyes on Ireland. The power of collective memory to obliterate the tempering influence of time prompted British Consul Frederick Leahy to complain of Irish-Americans in 1916: "Their minds hark back to the past, and their mental picture is based upon an Ireland of 75 to 100 years ago."

The press served as a kind of repository for the race memory of the American-Irish. At a time when most Irish and American history was written by Anglo-Saxons and formal
alternative institutions such as the Irish-American Historical Society were in their infancy, serialized features in the Irish-American press offered alternative and oppositional interpretations of the Irish experience—interpretations that both drew upon and helped sustain the collective memory of oral tradition. In the Leader, "Duffy's Irish History" presented a weekly litany of English atrocities against the Irish people over 700 years. Similar features appeared in other Irish-American papers. This attention to the past served two purposes—it reinforced a sense of common identity by depicting the Irish in America as a nation of exiles who were forced to flee Ireland because of British oppression; and it cast suspicion upon present Anglo-Saxon intentions in the United States as well as Ireland.

The notion of the Irish as involuntary exiles was the defining feature of the emigrant experience, according to the press. The Leader complained that because of British misrule, "... the Irish race [had] scattered all over the world." The Irish World argued that the Irish diaspora was a direct consequence of British policy:

Irish exiles did not leave their land of birth of their own free will. They were forced to do so. A vicious economic system backed up by all the power of the British Empire ... rendered it impossible ... to earn a decent livelihood in the land they loved with all the ardor of their Celtic souls. The emigrant ship was their only refuge. ... They who should have enriched the land of their birth ... have contributed to the upbuilding of the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand.
Even the moderate Chicago Citizen subscribed to the exile myth: "The great majority of the Irish race have been compelled to leave their native shores. ..."\(^9\)

The press blamed England for the depopulation of Ireland, the dissolute state of Irish industry, and the impoverishment of the Irish people:

A depopulated Ireland is England's stern accuser. ... Ireland alone, among all the nations of the world, is a land whose population has been more than cut in two: whose industries have been killed; whose cities and towns are dying of dry rot and whose fertile fields have been turned into grazing grounds for bullocks. ... [in the cities] 20,000 families are living in single room tenements in buildings which, in the days of the Irish Parliament, once housed the intellect and wealth of Ireland.\(^10\)

Irish-American newspapers offered a sustained chorus of past British outrages against the Irish people.\(^11\) But no one event garnered more attention than the Great Famine of the 1840's. Famine tales were retold in the language of a shared nightmare:

... an appalling picture springs up from memory. ... ghosts walk the land. ... great giant figures reduced to skeletons by hunger, shake in their clothes. [There are] no graves, but pits are dug. ... those who have managed to escape this dread visitation are flying panic-stricken to the seaports. ... to famine ships and fever.\(^12\)

Disease and the ocean crossing claimed thousands more, leaving an "unbroken chain of graves wherever the tide of emigration extended."\(^13\) The post-Famine emigration was the determining event in the history of the American-Irish—a enduring presence that held such sway over the collective
memory that T.P. O'Connor, a moderate nationalist leader in Ireland, warned the British Parliament:

The Irish in America live in 1846. The things they heard from their mothers or grandmothers of the reactionary policy in Ireland send these Americans of Irish blood back to 1846, and when they get there is no reasoning but the frenzied and justifiable resentment against the treatment to which their forefathers had been subjected. . . . there is only one permanent factor in the minds of men of Irish blood and that is the famine and emigration of 1846.14

The press enlisted the post-Famine experience in America as further evidence of British injustice and as justification for continued Irish resentment.15 And if the Irish press was guardian of the collective memory and rage, the exiled Irish would be agents of its revenge. The legacy of British colonial policies provoked, according to the Chicago Citizen,

. . . a legitimate anger which shall never be calmed until our common enemy shall have made reparations for the sufferings, the extinction and the massacre of the unoffending children of the Gael.16

The "prejudice of centuries" was thus both logical and inevitable—and subject to continual renewal in collective memory through constant reminders in the press.17 "It's hard to forget," the Leader advised. "Is it possible to forgive?"18 For the Gaelic-American, the answer was clear:

The exiles who were driven out everywhere on the lone highways of the world have everywhere risen up like armed avengers to demand an accounting. . . . Empire building does not pay.19
Contending Visions of America

Anglo/conformity—a well-orchestrated movement to advance the Anglo-Saxon dimension of American identity—was a dominant social force in the United States at the turn of the century.\textsuperscript{20} In essence, the movement was a response by established elites to the perceived threat of continuing immigration. The communal nature, persistent old-world loyalties, and alien cultural habits of immigrant groups were viewed as incompatible with American traditions. Edward P. Cubberly, a Stanford professor and a founder of the Immigrant Restriction League, outlined the goals of Anglo-conformity in 1909:

Our task is to break up their groups . . . to assimilate and amalgamate these peoples as a part of the American race, to implant in their children, so far as can be done, Anglo-Saxon conception of righteousness, law, and order.\textsuperscript{21}

The impending prospect of U.S. involvement in World War One as an ally of Great Britain gave further impetus to the push for conformity to an Anglo-Saxon conception of American identity. Advocates of assimilation jettisoned any lingering hopes that the melting pot could forge the divergent immigrant cultures into a new and better American hybrid. In both the heartland and the sanctums of the elite, many began to view immigrant groups as indigestible elements within the American national mix.\textsuperscript{22}

The push for Anglo-conformity became the "Americanization" movement of the war years and persuasion
gave way to coercion.\textsuperscript{23} The Anglo-Saxon dimension of the campaign to Americanize the immigrant was unmistakable.\textsuperscript{24} The rationale in support of Anglo-conformity was based upon the assumption of Anglo-Saxon genetic and cultural superiority and upon the belief that Americans---despite the swelling tide of immigration---were still overwhelmingly of English stock.\textsuperscript{25}

The Irish-American press challenged these assumptions.\textsuperscript{26} The \textit{Gaelic-American} insisted:

\begin{quote}
\text{[the idea] \ldots that the American people are overwhelmingly of English blood will soon have to be dropped. \ldots [it is] \ldots an impudent claim, repeated at every opportunity by Anglomaniacs and echoed by fools who know no better.}\textsuperscript{27}
\end{quote}

Boston Mayor James Curley, in a speech reported in the San Francisco \textit{Leader}, assailed the ascendant position of old-stock Americans and derided the assertion that the descendants of the Mayflower made better citizens:

\begin{quote}
The so-called Anglo-Saxon is a negligible citizen. \ldots He is not a good American. It has not occurred to him that he is not American nor is the dwindling provincial personnel he speaks of the nation. The Puritan has passed; the Anglo-Saxon is a joke. A new and better American is here.\textsuperscript{28}
\end{quote}

Irish newspapers offered alternative definitions of American national identity. The \textit{Leader} suggested that the "Celtic spirit" supplemented that of the Saxon and---with the melting pot simmering for two generations---it was "not improbable" that one-third of all Americans had Irish blood flowing in their veins.\textsuperscript{29} The \textit{Irish World} promoted a more
pluralistic if only slightly less hierarchical conception of American identity:

We are not Anglo-Saxons. Four-fifths of the people of this country do not belong to the Anglo-Saxon race... They are Celts, Teutons, Scandinavians... and other bloods.30

The Chicago Citizen scoffed at assertions that the United States was an Anglo-Saxon country and insisted upon a hybrid conception of America's racial identity:

[The United States] is not Anglo-Saxon, never was, never will be!... The newsboy on the street corner could inform our dons that we are a people of very mixed blood."31

The Anglo-American Conspiracy

The movement in favor of closer ties with Great Britain, which had begun to gather momentum before the turn of the century, was a source of concern to many Americans of immigrant stock. For the insecure Irish, the growing Anglo-American friendship was a threat to their own tenuous status and additional evidence of British influence in America.

Many Irish-American newspapers attributed America's burgeoning imperial program to British influence.32 The Irish World saw American military adventures in Cuba and the Phillipines as part of an Anglo-Saxon campaign against Catholic countries.33 The Chicago Citizen condemned American designs on Mexico as "... tempting bait to our greedy, though not needy, Americans of a certain descent."34 The Gaelic-American made constant attacks upon the British
Empire and rejoiced at every intimation of anti-colonial rebellion.\textsuperscript{35}

Irish commentators heaped derision upon the Anglo-American rapprochement. When Teddy Roosevelt's successful campaign for the Presidency in 1904 was hailed as an Anglo-Saxon triumph, Finley Peter Dunne, the Chicago-born humorist, assailed the resulting profusion of anglophilia. Dunne, who wrote in a mock-Irish dialect and whose "Mr. Dooley" was the single most influential pro-Irish voice in the syndicated mainstream press, depicted Roosevelt's ambassador to Britain, Joseph Choate, as hurrying to the King of England "... as fast as his hands and knees wud [sic] carry him."\textsuperscript{36} The Irish World dismissed the advocates of Anglo-American cooperation as "Anglomaniacs:

These denationalized Americans would have us forget the American revolution and all it accomplished. In their opinion it was a huge mistake ... a blunder committed by Washington and his compatriots.\textsuperscript{37}

The mood of rapprochement pervaded many areas of American thought. An emergent imperial school of history sought to rewrite American history from an Anglo-Saxon perspective. Revisionist historians glorified the role of English Puritans in shaping American ideals while ignoring or undervaluing the contributions of other national groups.\textsuperscript{38} Steel-baron turned philanthropist Andrew Carnegie, himself an immigrant from Scotland, predicted that
the "... reunion of the Anglo-American would dominate the world."^39

Fired by ancestral loyalties and emboldened by their rising if insecure status, Irish-Americans challenged the Anglo-onslaught in every available forum. The Irish constructed a Celtic interpretation of history as a "defensive weapon against anglophile historians."^40 Representative government, trial-by-jury—the trappings of modern democracy—were claimed for ancient Ireland as precursors to American political traditions. The Irish Historical Society, founded in 1897, praised—and often exaggerated—Irish contributions to the United States. The resulting "literature of justification"—a mark of rising respectability and continued insecurity—became a staple of the Irish-American press.^41

The Irish "hated England for the good of the United States."^42 America, by their conception, was but the latest battlefield in the epic conflict between Saxon and Celt. In the legislative arena, Irish lobbyists in the Senate helped defeat three of four arbitration treaties negotiated with Britain between 1897-1911.^43 In 1907 the Ancient Order of Hibernians joined forces with the National German-American Alliance—the largest racial or ethnic organization in the country—to lobby against immigration restrictions and foreign entanglements, both of which were seen as part of the Anglo-conspiracy.^44 Irish-American newspapers condemned
the repeal of free tolls for U.S. shipping through the Panama canal as a capitulation to British interests.\textsuperscript{45} Irish leaders even damned Rhodes scholarships as part of a British plot to reconquer America.\textsuperscript{46} The Chicago Citizen argued that the scholarship program was

\ldots begotten under very corrupt auspices, through the plunder of South Africa, for the purpose of Anglifying this country and eventually absorbing it into the British Empire.\textsuperscript{47}

Evidence of the Anglo-infestation was everywhere. Minor incidents swelled into portents of great alarm. A student performance of the English national anthem at a New York convent school became an act of betrayal: girls of Irish descent were being "\ldots taught to reverence the traditions of the hereditary enemy of their race and religion."\textsuperscript{48} A proposal to reorganize the United States Army in regional regiments like the British Army was ridiculed as an attempt by "Anglomaniac toadies" to anglicize the American armed forces.\textsuperscript{49}

The growing fascination with all things Anglo-Saxon was dismissed as a betrayal of American traditions. A Carnegie-sponsored campaign to commemorate a century of peace with Great Britain inspired particular scorn. The American Truth Society, founded by Jeremiah O'Leary in 1912 to protest the proposed "100 Years of Peace," railed against the threat posed by British sea power to American shipping. O'Leary toured the nation with a satirical stereopticon show entitled, "The Fable of John Bull."\textsuperscript{50} The Irish World
criticized a decision to issue two special U.S. postage stamps to commemorate Anglo-American friendship as tantamount to "... placing our country in the false and humiliating position of being junior partner in the firm of John Bull and Company." The World suggested that the burning of the nation's Capitol in 1812--"an act of wanton and unprompted savagery unparalleled in the annals of modern history"--was an event more worthy of official attention. The Leader was even more dismissive of the "100 Years of Peace:"

Feeble editorials have appeared ... urging their readers to get in line and whoop things up for the dear, old "step-mother" country. ... the celebration will be a failure. Americans are not to be fooled even by Carnegie millions. They recognize Britain as their bitterest enemy and this cant about a general jollification because Britain didn't put herself in the way of getting another walloping during the past 100 years is not fooling them at all. The Leader urged its readers to offer the nation an alternative, non-anglophile form of patriotism:

Fly the flag ... show that on this far-off western shore the spirit of patriotism yet lives, untarnished and undimmed by the Anglomaniacs.

Irish-American newspapers framed their arguments against closer ties with Great Britain in hyper-patriotic terms in attempt to equate Irish anglophobia with American interests. "Anglomaniacs" who advocated Anglo/American friendship were dismissed as the moral descendants of the Tories of the Revolutionary War. The Irish-American press often constructed elaborate and unlikely comparisons in an
attempt to equate Irish and American interests. The Irish World, for example, denounced Irish-American politicians who exhibited insufficient resolve in condemning pro-British tendencies as:

... worse than renegades in Ireland, for not only do they betray Ireland, but the U.S. as well. Judas, who went and hanged himself, was noble in comparison to this rotten crew.\(^5\)

The Gaelic-American stretched even further in its vilification of church leaders in Ireland--those "mitred imperialists"--who failed to denounce British colonial policies:

... those who are taking their stand on the side of the Scarlet Harlet will be placed in the same category as the Tories of the American revolution. ... the stain of national treachery will follow their kindred to the seventh generation.\(^6\)

By this tortured logic, every manifestation of sympathy toward Britain--whether in Ireland or in the United States--constituted an act disloyalty to both countries. Thus Irish devotion to both Ireland and the United States could be perfectly reconciled: if anti-British sentiment was the hallmark of American patriotism then Irish and American interests were one and the same.

**Inferiority and Pride**

The assertive self-confidence of Irish-American anglophobia was tempered by a nagging undercurrent of insecurity. The Irish-American experience, as Thomas Brown observed, was characterized by "a pervasive sense of
in inferiority, an intense longing for acceptance and respect, and an acute sensitivity to criticism." The competing components of Irish-American group consciousness—the tension between post-colonial inferiority and immigrant pride—found voice in the Irish-American press. Irish-American newspapers attacked real and imagined slanders and labored to instill a sense of pride and confidence among the Irish in America.

In the 1880's, the Irish were generally regarded as the most disruptive element in the nation. The mainstream press reinforced and promoted a stereotypical image of the Irish as "socially troublesome and inferior—a lower order of mankind." A New York Times editorial which praised the qualities of German and Scandinavian immigrants, also observed that "a bad Irish-American boy is about as unwholesome a product as was ever reared in any body politic." The negative depiction of the Irish carried strong Anglo-Saxon overtones. A British historian suggested that America's social problems would be solved if "every Irishman [were to] kill a Negro and be hanged for it." Negative portrayals of the Irish were also a regular feature of 19th century graphic humor. The popular stereotype of Irish "Paddy," a drunken, childlike, often truculent oaf, was a creation of early Victorian imagination. "Paddy" made his first appearance in American periodicals after the Civil War and became a staple figure
in *Puck* and *Harper's Weekly* until well after the turn of the century.\(^62\)

The Anglo-Saxon dimension was unmistakable.\(^63\) In many caricatures, "Paddy" is a riotous, reckless fanatic, "eternally hostile to Great Britain."\(^64\) In others, he is a drunken, priest-ridden fool, more content to wallow in squalor and indolence than to embrace the more proper Yankee (i.e. Anglo-Saxon) virtues of sobriety and thrift. An 1884 *Puck* cartoon, for example, depicted St. Patrick, the patron saint of the Irish, as a bearded, simian-faced Catholic bishop with a tangle of snakes at his feet, a crooked miter upon his head, and a jug of whiskey in his fist.\(^65\)

Irish women fared little better. The stereotype Irish-American female was "Queen of the Kitchen," a "funny, disorderly, hardworking but unpredictable servant girl" who squandered her hard-earned wages in support of squalling children, dissolute husbands, and lazy, feckless relatives.\(^66\) Most of the traits attributed to Irish-Americans mirror those which whites ascribed to blacks in 1930's-1960's America.\(^67\)

By the turn of the century, the image of the Irish in graphic humor was in transition. "Paddy," the bomb-wielding fanatic and booze-gorged gorilla, was giving way to less strident portrayals. In the Hearst papers, "Happy Houligan," a whimsical shanty Irishman, began to share the
comic pages with "Jiggs" and "Maggie," an upwardly mobile lace-curtain couple. But an element of condescension remained. Hooligan, along with Mickey Dugan and his gang of Irish street urchins of "Hogan's Alley," stood as prototypical urban slum dwellers. Jiggs and Maggie, who had escaped the slums, were objects of bemused contempt: Jiggs because of his pugnacity, his fondness for drink, and his lingering attachment—despite his wife's objections—to the saloon and his old working-class pals; Maggie for her social pretensions and her relentlessly unsuccessful efforts to ingratiate herself with the native-born elite.

By the eve of World War One, the days of "No Irish Need Apply" had passed. Yet discrimination survived in more subtle ways and Irish-American newspapers railed at its every manifestation. One area of concern—often to the point of hypersensitivity—continued to be the image of the Irish in popular culture. Despite Irish political and economic successes, the stereotypes of the 19th century continued to taunt the Irish well into the 20th.

Many of old stereotypes gained new life in an emerging medium—motion pictures. The *Irish World* condemned motion pictures—a popular form of mass entertainment among immigrants—for distorted portrayals of the Irish. The so-called Hogan movies, which were filled with Irish gangsters, prompted real-life hoodlums to adopt Irish names, according
to the *Irish World*, thereby heaping a double slander upon
the Irish race.\textsuperscript{72} Other movies defamed Irish women by
depicting them as frequenting dances and partaking in other
equally dubious "debaucheries."\textsuperscript{73} The *Irish World* argued:

> We have succeeded in driving the stage Irish from
> the theatres. We should not permit moving picture
> shows to perpetuate the foul anti-Irish calumnies
> the defunct 'stage Irishman' sought to perpetuate.\textsuperscript{74}

The campaign against the "stage Irishman" became at
times a philistine descent into reaction and self-loathing.
When John Millington Synge's "Playboy of the Western World"
first toured America in 1911-1912, the Ancient Order of
Hibernians, the United Irish Societies, and the Irish-
American press orchestrated a national campaign of public
protests and legal injunctions in an attempt to drive the
play from the stage.\textsuperscript{75}

The campaign also targeted the "vile so-called Irish
plays" of Lady Gregory.\textsuperscript{76} Ironically, Synge and Gregory
were two of the guiding lights of the Celtic renaissance, a
sudden flowering of the arts which arose out of Ireland
around the turn of the century to win world-wide critical
acclaim. Synge and Gregory drew upon Irish folk ways and
the lyrical cadences of Irish peasant speech as sources of
inspiration.

For the Irish press, however, theatrical celebrations
of Irish rural life inspired more shame and indignation than
pride. This willingness to engage in symbolic self-
annihilation as a means of securing status gave testament to
the conflicting aspirations and post-colonial insecurities of the American-Irish. When the Playboy of the Western World" returned for a second U.S. tour in 1914, the Chicago Citizen boasted:

Not even the enemy [i.e. Anglo-Saxons], who delighted in our humiliation, can find much pleasure now in looking at a caricature which has had its day.77

Irish-American newspapers also found sources of humiliation much closer to home. Finley Peter Dunne, an Irish-American newspaper columnist who wrote about working-class life in the poor, Bridgeport section of Chicago, was a frequent target. The centerpiece of Dunne's columns was a fictional saloon-keeper named Dooley whose philosophical musings in a rich Irish brogue won national attention and praise. Irish-American newspapers claimed that the Dooley series promoted a negative stereotype of the Irish. The Chicago Citizen often lambasted Dooley. Patrick Ford of the Irish World refused to accept advertisements for a collection of Dooley columns.78

Irish papers also stood the line against anti-Catholic discrimination. The Chicago Citizen called the governor of Florida a "bigoted barbarian" for allegedly barring Catholics from teaching in public schools.79 The Leader charged that a wartime proposal to ration meat on Tuesdays was an attempt to double the sacrifice of Catholics who already refrained from eating meat on Fridays.80
Even as it challenged negative depictions, the Irish-American press labored to instill a sense of racial pride among the American-Irish. Newspapers regularly featured examples of Irish-American success stories and promoted social mobility as a strategy to achieve respectability.\textsuperscript{81} The \textit{Irish World} advocated education and cooperation with other racial groups.\textsuperscript{82} Socio-economic advancement would achieve two goals: it would confer status upon the Irish in America and aid in the effort to free Ireland:

Those Irish out here who forget or want to forget they are Irish or of Irish extraction forget a great deal more, the remembrance of which would ennoble them among their peers. You have nothing to be ashamed of in the history of your country or your race. . . . [carry] yourselves in this land . . . as equals of any and all the various races. . . . Why should the Irish accept a position in society . . . inferior to other peoples?\textsuperscript{83}

The Irish press tried to buttress the self-confidence of its readers by glorifying Irish culture and accomplishments while disparaging those of the English. The press challenged the underlying premise of Britain's imperial mission—that Anglo-Saxon superiority gave Britain a mandate to rule—and civilize—the less-advanced peoples of the earth.

Irish newspapers, much like African-American newspapers of a later period, sought to invert the relationship between colonizer and colonized by insisting that Irish civilization pre-dated that of the English. The Chicago \textit{Citizen} claimed that "1500 years ago" Irish scholars brought religion and
culture to English "cave-men . . . [who] subsisted on wild berries and dwelt under the ground in dug-outs." The Leader also depicted the English as aboriginal hunter-gatherers at a time when poetry and high culture flourished in Ireland. The Irish, according to the Leader, "were a civilized race when the English were digging acorns in the forested wilds." Another strategy was to portray Irish racial characteristics as superior to those of the English. Celtic "spirituality" and "love of justice" stood in contrast to English "hypocrisy" and "blind, stupid materialism." This tactic challenged one of the staple justifications of British colonial rule—that the Irish were unfit to govern themselves. In America, the Progressive campaign against urban political machines carried equally powerful implications of Anglo-Saxon superiority. The Irish press challenged the assumption that old-guard elites were better equipped to run American cities than Irish ward heaters. Attacks upon Anglo-Saxon racial characteristics thus conferred status to the Irish on both sides of the Atlantic.

Irish-American support for racial and social equality, however, did not always translate into support for other subordinate groups. The contradictions articulated in Irish-American press gave testament to the contending insecurities that festered within the Irish-American psyche.
The Chicago *Citizen*, for example, attacked the Guardians of Liberty for refusing to endorse any Irish-Catholics or Jews in a judicial election. Yet the *Citizen* also condemned bolsheviks as anti-Christian Jews who possessed little talent for government. The *Citizen* promoted social mobility for the Irish but expressed alarm when upwardly mobile blacks began to move into white neighborhoods in Chicago.

On the west coast, the *Leader* lambasted anti-Catholic and anti-Irish discrimination often to the point of shrillness. Yet for all its proclaimed belief in tolerance, it lobbied against Chinese and Japanese immigration and decried "the utter uselessness of the Protestant religion." The *Gaelic-American*, which called for the freedom of Egypt and India and condemned the persecution of Jews in other countries, could also insist that "Anglo-Semitic gold" was responsible for pro-British proclivities of the "U.S. Jew-owned press." Ironically, the inconsistencies and vacillations of the Irish-American press on the issue of race gave implicit endorsement to the Anglo-Saxon racial hierarchy it claimed to abhor.

The Irish-American press blamed Britain not only for the despoilation of Ireland and the scattering of her people, but also for the low self-esteem of the Irish or what the press called the "slave mind." If the Irish peasant was lazy and unproductive, it was because of British
policies "which would have destroyed industry among the Dutch or the Chinese." If the Irish were ashamed of their language--the oldest written vernacular north of the Alps--it was because Britain had characterized the Celts as "barbarous and illiterate from the beginning of time." 

The "slave mind," according to the Irish-American press, was a debilitating affliction of the spirit, a vestige of colonialism which robbed the Irish of their self-confidence, dignity, and direction. The Gaelic-American feared that the "slave mind" had destroyed the "moral courage" of the Irish people. Manifestations of the slave mind included Irish doubts about their ability to govern themselves, the lingering desire to be "larded over" by the English, and the belief that Britain was innocent of any special wrong against the Irish people.

The Irish press condemned those who exhibited shame of their heritage or tried to curry favor from apologists of Anglo-Saxonism. The Leader observed:

The most frequently repeated slander about the Irish is their want of unity. The Irish can never agree about anything. They are always fighting between themselves. If you want to roast an Irishman you can always find another Irishman to light the fire. .. This marks the ultimate triumph of the English campaign that Irishmen take themselves at England's valuation. ..

The Leader once assailed a Bostonian named Hogan who tried to change his name because it was "suggestive of Irish origins." The Gaelic-American repeatedly chastised "blatherskites" who displayed "Anglomaniac" tendencies. The
Irish World despaired because the affliction of the spirit lingered in America despite Irish successes:

What then is the source of the racial weakness which torments us. . . . We have retained our physical courage, but long subjugation to foreign rule . . . sapped our moral vitality. . . . Here in this free land the restoration to perfect moral health should have begun earlier and should have progressed further than in Ireland.100

The Irish-American press offered two mutually reinforcing strategies to resolve the crisis of the spirit: social mobility in America and freedom for Ireland through the dissolution of the British Empire. Socio-economic success would confer status upon the Irish in America and enable them to forge coalitions with other nationalities to lobby on Ireland's behalf. The defeat of Great Britain—"the harlot of nations, the modern Babylon"—and Ireland's consequent entry into the community of nations would vindicate the Irish in America. The demise of Britain, the press insisted, would benefit all of mankind. The Irish World promised, the "world will be sweeter when the British Empire is burned up."101 The Leader declared: "Forever blessed be the boot that administers that glorious kick."102

The Mainstream Press

The chief agents of anti-Irish sentiment in the United States, according to the Irish-American press, were mass circulation daily newspapers—-the mainstream press. Despite their other differences, Irish newspapers universally cast themselves in an adversarial role, assailing the alleged
anti-Irish slanders and pro-British tendencies of the "anglomaniac" or "trust" press. The *Gaelic-American* in New York and the *Leader* in San Francisco were the most unrestrained in their attacks, followed by the Chicago *Citizen*. The *Irish World* took a more restrained approach until rising war fever and events in Ireland forced it too into action.

The *Gaelic-American* accused the New York press of plotting to distort the news to Britain's advantage. Joseph Pulitzer's New York *World* was a frequent target. The *World*, according to the *Gaelic-American*, was "the worst enemy of the Irish race in America." When the *World* suggested in a St. Patrick's Day editorial that the Irish should throw their support behind the Panama canal treaty with Britain, the *Gaelic-American* replied:

> The New York *World* is the lowest, dirtiest, most corrupt, dishonest and unprincipled newspaper in the United States. . . . its impudence is unparalleled in the annals of journalism. . . . The men who run the *World* hate all the Irish. . . . Irish citizens will estimate the *World*'s advice at its true value--as they would a harlot preaching chastity in the market place.

The *World*'s most unpardonable sin was its failure to support Ireland's struggle against Britain. *Gaelic-American* editor John Devoy called upon the New York Irish to boycott the *World*, which enjoyed a large Irish readership.

Other New York papers felt the *Gaelic-American*'s lash. The *Gaelic-American* condemned the New York *Evening Post* for depicting the Irish as "happy-go-lucky Celts." Oswald
Garrison Villard, the Anglo-Irish editor of the *Evening Post*, was singled out for committing the most unpardonable of sins for an Irishman--criticizing agitation in support of the Irish national struggle:

[Villard is] . . . an anti-Irish Irishman attacking his own people for the applause of Anglomaniacs. He works himself up into a white heat, froths at the mouth and dips his pen in the froth.¹⁰⁹

The *Gaelic-American* accused the New York *Tribune* of "doing England's dirty work" by printing false reports about the activities of Irish labor radical James Larkin. "The *Tribune,*" the *Gaelic-American* observed, "is run by a man whose sister is married to King George's Chief Stable Boy."¹¹⁰ The *Gaelic-American* charged that the New York *Times* unjustly questioned the loyalty of Irish-Americans and other non-Anglo-Saxon racial groups even before America entered World War One.¹¹¹

The *Gaelic-American* found comfort only in the Hearst papers. "Mr. Hearst," the newspaper observed, "means well to the Irish." The *Gaelic-American* expressed the hope that the Hearst papers would break "the boycott of the New York papers" on news against the campaign to align the U.S. with Britain in war against Germany.¹¹²

In the Midwest, the Chicago *Citizen* echoed the *Gaelic-American's* attacks on the "Anglomaniac" press. The *Citizen* accused the "leading daily newspapers" of being part of an insidious attempt . . . to falsify American history as part of an apparent movement to Anglisisize the United States.¹¹³
The *Citizen* also condemned caricatures in the mainstream press. It characterized a Chicago *Daily News* piece on Irish policemen, which alluded to "Celtic brogues" and "big feet," as a "dirty little spew of venomous bigotry."\(^{114}\) The *Citizen*, however, was not above praising mainstream newspapers when it saw fit. It lauded a report about Ireland in the notoriously anti-British Chicago *Tribune* for its fairness even as it tempered its praise with the observation:

> We are aware that the word has gone forth that the American press must not be as friendly to Ireland as it has been in the past.\(^{115}\)

Farther west, the Catholic *Western Watchman* defended the St. Louis Irish from charges of divided loyalty that appeared in the mainstream press.\(^{116}\) The *Watchman* also condemned press proposals for a long term Anglo-American alliance.\(^{117}\)

In California, the *Leader* exceeded its New York and Chicago counterparts in both the ferocity and the scope of its attacks. The Sacramento *Bee* was a favorite target. The *Leader* attacked the *Bee* and its publisher, Charles McClatchy, for questioning the loyalty of Irish-Americans. The *Bee*, according to the *Leader*,

> ... spoils with printer's ink a certain amount of perfectly good paper that could be used much more profitably for sanitary purposes.

The B is so-called because it is the initial letter of blackmailer, blackguard and blackleg, of brute, beast, bully, blowhard and bigot, of bluster, blab and bilk, of bogus, bore, bughouse and bull ... Chump McClatchy is the original human gas bag.\(^{118}\)
The Leader called the San Francisco Chronicle a "subsidized sheet . . . a tail of the London Times," because of its alleged pro-British tendencies. It accused the Associated Press of stirring up anti-Catholic bigotry by "giving prominence" to a violent attack in Denver upon a man named Spurgeon. Spurgeon, according to the Leader, was

... a low-brow bigot . . . a money-mad wretch . . . [who] openly charged that every priest has concubines among the members of their congregation.

Rather than condemn the beating, however, the Leader inferred that it was deserved.

The Leader accused Scripps' San Francisco Daily News of Anglo-Saxon sympathies because of its portrayal of Irish immigrants. In reaction to a Daily News serial entitled, "Confessions of a Wife," the Leader observed:

This Alexandrine indecency written by some anonymous hack with the mind of a slut and the pen of a pander portrays the Irish servant girl before her high-brow employer as the usual soft, slushy, ignorant, untidy and half-witted slattern of the anti-Irish stage, her impossible brogue of "kape" and "indade," and her blasphemous references to the "blissid son of the holy virgin."

The Leader sometimes exhibited an almost puritanical sensitivity to the portrayal of Irish immigrants in the west coast press. The Leader once chastized the Daily News for characterizing the Irish as "Pats" and called for a boycott of the paper:

[The Daily News] . . . shows its pro John Bull preferences by its sneers at the people of Irish descent. . . . the bigoted sewer-rat weaklings that
turn out the Daily News should be made to answer for this gratuitous insult.\textsuperscript{122}

The \textit{Leader} criticized not only the mainstream daily press, but also Catholic newspapers. For the \textit{Leader}, Catholicism and anglophobia were inseparable components of Irish-American identity. Rev. Peter Yorke, publisher and chief editorialist at the \textit{Leader}, attacked those Catholic newspapers which in his estimation failed to condemn Britain with sufficient ardor or exhort the Irish to greater levels of self-confidence.\textsuperscript{123}

\textbf{Conclusions}

Anglophobia was a central feature of the Irish-American press. A product of collective memory and immigrant adjustment in America, anglophobia gave the Irish a sense of identity and provided an interpretative framework for the Irish-American experience as well as a strategy by which acceptance might be won in America.

Two cataclysmic events, however, would challenge the utility and logic of Irish-American anglophobia. The Easter 1916 Rising in Dublin would inflame anti-British sentiment to new heights; the United States' entry into World War One as Britain's ally would compel the Irish-American press to search for a strategy by which anglophobia could be kept compatible with loyalty to America.
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CHAPTER IV

IRISH NATIONALISM: THE AMERICAN DILEMMA

Introduction

The movement to free Ireland gave focus to the anglophobic instincts of the American-Irish. The nationalist impulse infused all forms of social and cultural expression and gave meaning and purpose to a multitude of national organizations and publications. Irish-American nationalism became the touchstone of tribal loyalty and identity. Its chief instrument was the Irish-American press.¹

Irish-American nationalism was a broad-based movement in support of an end to British colonial rule in Ireland. Yet at another level, it also represented a quest for dignity and self-respect for the Irish in America. The two goals were inseparable. The self-proclaimed purpose of the Irish World, the premier Irish paper in America, was to advance the cause of Ireland and prove that the Irish in America were not "strangers within the gates."

As the likelihood of American involvement in the European war increased in 1915-1917, agitation on behalf of Ireland would bring down accusations of disloyalty to the United States and lead to the censorship of a number of
Irish-American publications. The dilemma in an increasingly hostile climate for the Irish-American press--and the Irish-American community at large--was to somehow reconcile loyalty to Ireland with loyalty to the United States.

The Origins and Character of Irish-American Nationalism

Modern Irish nationalism was forged in the crucible of the American immigrant experience. For the peasant Irish, most of whom had never traveled beyond the narrow confines of their own townlands, the act of immigration gave birth to a sense of national consciousness. Those who thought of themselves only as Mayomen or Kerrymen (or women) were transformed into Irishmen the moment they passed through the immigrant gates. Nationality was an artifact of immigration.

The forced exodus of the Famine years and the harrowing adjustment to America--where contempt rained down upon the indigent Irish--gave rise to a sense of fury and shame that became part of the collective inheritance of the American-Irish. Even as Britain became the focus of Irish rage, mother Ireland became an object of intense and sometimes maudlin adoration.

This obsessive devotion to homeland--seldom rivaled by other immigrant groups--was central to the mythos of Irish-America as a nation in exile. Its most intense expression often arose from those who never set foot upon Irish soil--
first and second generation Irish-Americans, the children of the Irish diaspora.

The immigrant Irish and their offspring outnumbered those left behind in Ireland. The most committed nationalists were often the children of immigrants.\(^5\) In New York City—an international center of Irish nationalist agitation—the majority of nationalist leaders and editors were American-born. Of the major figures, only John Devoy of the Gaelic-American came from Ireland.

For all the blustering exhortations on behalf of Ireland, Irish-American nationalism was largely directed toward American ends.\(^6\) It was the "cement" rather than the purpose of Irish American organization.\(^7\) Irish nationalism satisfied a myriad of needs. It provided a sense of identity, a shield against Anglo-Saxon religious and racial prejudice, and a route to respectability that would serve as a model for other national groups.\(^8\)

The status of the Irish on both sides of the Atlantic was inexorably linked. For immigrants and their offspring, the liberation of Ireland was an essential prerequisite to the vindication of the Irish in America. A free homeland would confer dignity upon the Irish of both shores.\(^9\) An independent, self-governing Ireland would refute the contention that the Irish were incapable of fair and honest governance. Michael Davitt articulated the appeal of Irish-American nationalism in a speech at Cooper Union in 1880:
You want to be honored among the elements that constitute this nation, as a people not coming from a paupered land; and in order that no sneers be cast on you when you stand for any position . . . you want to be regarded with the respect due you. . . . aid us in Ireland to remove the stain of degradation and in America you will get the respect you deserve.¹⁰

Nationalism satisfied another need. Social and economic differences within the Irish-American community often precluded consensus on domestic issues. To a people divided by class, geography, and levels of adjustment, nationalism provided a standard around which all could rally.¹¹ Irish-Americans could unite in their contempt for Britain and in their desire for some form of self-government for Ireland. Irish-American politicians and other so-called "professional" Irishmen were often quick to exploit nationalist sentiments for their own ends. Finley Peter Dunne made this observation in an 1895 newspaper column about the link between Irish nationalism and political opportunism:

Did ye iver see a man that wanted to free Ireland th' day after to-morrah that didn't run f'r alderman soon or late?¹²

The Two Strategies of Nationalism

There existed a long history of Irish-American support for the anti-colonial struggle in Ireland. Irish-American involvement was so pervasive that the London Times concluded in 1885: "The Irish question is mainly an Irish-American question."¹³ The Irish-American press kept the issue alive.
Prime Minister William Gladstone observed in the 1890's: "But for the work the Irish World is doing and the money it is sending across the ocean, there would be no agitation in Ireland."\textsuperscript{14}

Although they might agree on nationalist goals, Irish-Americans quarreled over tactics. Two modes or strategies of nationalism competed for Irish-American support since the 1840's.\textsuperscript{15} Constitutionalists advocated parliamentary reforms to achieve self-government for Ireland. Radicals espoused armed struggle.

Opinions often split along class lines.\textsuperscript{16} Unskilled relative newcomers and members of the working class—the "shanty" Irish of popular imagination—were more likely to embrace radical nationalism. The middle-class and established older immigrants—the "lace-curtain Irish"—were inclined to support the more respectable methods of constitutional nationalism.\textsuperscript{17}

Until the Anglo-American rapprochement of the late 19th century, radical nationalism was often compatible with American interests and the U.S. government sometimes gave tacit approval to Irish schemes against Britain. In 1776, George Washington embraced Irish nationalists in America as fellow patriots. In 1798, Jeffersonian democrats championed the cause of the United Irishmen.\textsuperscript{18} Following the American Civil War, successive administrations used the threat of
Irish-American nationalism as leverage in negotiations with Great Britain.\textsuperscript{19}

In 1866, the Fenian Brotherhood, a self-proclaimed Irish government-in-exile, launched a two-pronged invasion of Canada from New York and Vermont.\textsuperscript{20} The Fenians, in their wildly improbable scheme, hoped to establish an Irish government-in-exile in Canada. President Andrew Johnson knew of the campaign but did little to stop it. Fenian soldiers---most of whom were Civil War veterans---were even allowed to keep their weapons when they returned to the U.S. after their failed assault. After a second unsuccessful invasion attempt in 1870, the Fenians disbanded.\textsuperscript{21}

In the 1870's and 1880's, the \textit{Irish World} supported social agitation in Ireland and bombing campaigns in Britain. Land League collections raised $353,000 to finance rent strikes and agrarian agitation in 1879-1882. The \textit{Irish World} also sponsored an "Emergency Fund" to bankroll dynamite attacks in Britain.\textsuperscript{22}

But a series of episodes began to erode support for violence. The Molly Maguires' affair of 1877 attracted national attention. The Mollies were a secret society of Irish miners in the anthracite regions of Pennsylvania. After a flurry of violent labor incidents, 19 members of the Mollies were tried, convicted, and executed in the biggest mass hanging in American history. The name Molly Maguires
became synonymous with labor radicalism and Irish extremism.  

Explosions rocked London in 1883-1885. Members of Clan-na-Gael, the radical successor to the Fenians, tried to blow up the House of Commons, London Bridge, and a number of other London landmarks in a sustained campaign of "bloodless terrorism" (dynamite had recently been invented).

The attacks, however, fell short of their goal. By the end of 1885, 27 bombers were locked away in British prisons and American revulsion against dynamite terrorism was on the rise.

The romance with dynamite finally ended in 1886 when a bomb exploded at a Chicago labor rally killing six policemen. The Haymarket massacre set off a clamor of nativist reaction that would reverberate well into the 20th century. Although the incident had nothing to do with the Irish question and the identity of the bombers was never firmly established, the British press claimed Irish-American involvement. Bishop McQuaid of Rochester publicly compared the Haymarket bombers to the men of Clan-na-Gael.

After Haymarket, Irish-American leaders and editors distanced themselves from the advocates of violence. The Irish World began to embrace a more moderate agenda. Radical policies on the Irish question became increasingly incompatible with the social objectives of upwardly mobile and well-to-do Irish-Americans. The end came in 1889 when
the battered body of Dr. Patrick Cronin, leader of a Clan-na-Gael faction, was discovered in a Chicago sewer. The victim of a Mafia-style execution, Cronin was murdered in a Clan-na-Gael power struggle. Irish-Americans and native Americans reacted with horror.²⁸

The Clan's failed bombing campaigns and the backlash following Haymarket and the Cronin murder marginalized the advocates of radical nationalism. The emergence of the constitutional Home Rule movement in the late 1880's offered an avenue for nationalist impulses.²⁹ Irish-American nationalism under the guise of Home Rule was more compatible with the search for acceptance in America. Home Rule also served as a bridge between rich and poor: wealthy Irish-Americans could unite with their poorer countrymen under a banner of bourgeois respectability.³⁰

Home Rule

Home Rule was a legislative campaign to grant Ireland limited self-government. Under Home Rule, Ireland would have its own parliament with some control over domestic affairs. But the link with Britain would be maintained.

Home Rule made Irish-American nationalism respectable and political circumstances in Britain made passage of Home Rule appear likely.³¹ A reinvigorated Irish Party under the leadership of John Redmond held the balance of power between Liberals and Conservatives following the 1900 parliamentary election.³² Redmond's critical presence in the Liberal
coalition government in the years leading up to World War One kept the Irish question to the fore. The Irish question would also contribute to the demise of the Liberal Party in Great Britain.33

Home Rule seemed inevitable until the constitutional impasse of February, 1914. The Conservative Party and its loyalist Irish allies threatened to block an annual army bill unless Ulster, the northernmost of the four provinces of Ireland, was excluded from Home Rule legislation.

The loyalist Ulster Volunteers, who were willing to fight to remain part of Britain, began to smuggle guns into Ulster. In an attempted show of force, Liberal Prime Minister Herbert Asquith ordered British troops to take up garrisons in four locations in Ulster, the northernmost province in Ireland. On March 19, 1914, Brigadier-General Hubert Gough and 57 other officers at the Curragh camp in southern Ireland refused to obey the order and resigned.

The incident threw the British government into crisis. The Curragh mutiny marked the first time since 1688 that the King lost the allegiance of his army. In the ensuing stand-off, Prime Minister Asquith backed down and General Gough was reinstated. The Curragh mutiny, according to one scholar, marked "the precise moment of Liberal England's death."34 The impotence of the Liberal Party over Home Rule had been clearly demonstrated. The failure of British resolve when faced with loyalist intransigence established a
pattern that would plague Britain—and Ireland—far into the future.\textsuperscript{35}

Redmond and the Irish Party enjoyed wide support among Irish-Americans. By 1910, the vast majority of Irish-Americans favored Home Rule.\textsuperscript{36} Donations from great fund rising drives led by the United Irish League (U.I.L.), Redmond's organization in America, supported Irish members of Parliament until government salaries were introduced in 1911.\textsuperscript{37} As the forces of constitutional nationalism gathered strength, the advocates of physical force languished in the political wilderness.

For a time, the Irish-American press was generally supportive of Home Rule. The \textit{Irish World} was an early and committed champion.\textsuperscript{38} The Chicago \textit{Citizen} remained loyal to Home Rule and the Irish Party long after all other Irish-American newspapers had abandoned Redmond. The \textit{Leader} ignored Home Rule for the most part, preferring to focus its energies on more domestic concerns such as attacks on British and Anglo-Saxon influence in the United States. Only the \textit{Gaelic-American}, the guardian of ideological purity, stood steadfast and consistent in its dismissal of Home Rule as merely the latest example of British subterfuge.

Home Rule, according to the \textit{Irish World}, would return Ireland to a kind of pre-Famine arcadia. Emigration would
cease, prosperity would return, and dignity and self-confidence would once again be restored to the Irish race.  

Poverty ever brings contempt, amongst nations as among individuals and the increased prosperity of our little island will enable her to hold up her head amongst the nations of the world. Her people, proud of her country and its prosperity, will be on an equal footing with those of other nations.  

The Irish World was ecstatic when the House of Commons voted in favor of Home Rule in May 1914, thus assuring its eventual passage. The pages of the Irish World overflowed with reprints of pro-Home Rule editorials from mainstream daily newspapers and congratulatory letters from politicians, judges, and editors. The World's celebratory mood betrayed an element of self-congratulation. But the hallelujahs of mainstream elites carried a more significant message--the conferral of respect for Irish-American aspirations and recognition of Irish contributions to America:

It is no wonder, then, that . . . Americans rejoice. . . . In prosperity as in adversity, in peace as in war, men of our blood have displayed their devotion to the Republic they have so loyally served from the day of its birth down to the present hour.

The proposed exclusion of Ulster, however, dampened the euphoria surrounding Home Rule. The Irish World warned that Redmond and the Irish Party "would be guilty of treason to Ireland if they voted in favor of the mutilation of the motherland." The Gaelic-American condemned Home Rule as an "atrocious and devilish proposal to dismember Ireland along religious lines." The Gaelic-American, which was
founded in 1903 by John Devoy as an alternative to the Irish World, chastised the Irish World for supporting Redmond and warned that Irish-Americans who aided or abetted the partition of Ireland would be condemned as "traitors." 45

The mainstream daily press generally supported Home Rule. 46 Even the usually hostile New York Times endorsed the plan for limited self-government in Ireland. The New York Times, however, attributed the Ulster impasse to "racial and religious" factors, an attitude that reflected middle-class American biases in favor of Anglo-Saxon racial superiority and Protestantism. 47 A news analysis in the New York Times by British press baron, Lord Northcliffe (who would later become chief of British propaganda in the United States), also reduced the Ulster issue to "racial" differences: "The Southern Irish are easy, charming ... but impractical. The Northerners are shrewd and industrious." 48 Another source cited by the New York Times claimed that Home Rule was an Irish-American plot hatched in Tammany:

If there is ever a government set up in Belfast by Home Rulers, it will be a government with Charles P. Murphy at its head and with Rinky Dink and Bathhouse John forming the cabinet. ... Redmond will be office boy. ... If we could get rid of Irish-Americans and then banish the priests, we'd settle the whole Home Rule question in a day. 49

The Hearst papers, which alone among the major daily newspapers echoed Irish-American press positions, blamed the
Ulster problem on centuries of English sectarian rule rather than Irish racial characteristics.  

Mainstream newspapers favored Home Rule primarily because it offered few fundamental challenges to the status quo. Ireland would not become independent but would remain part of the British Empire and have no control of its own foreign policy. Britain favored Home Rule. And the supporters of Home Rule also represented voices of moderation within the Irish-American community. Implementation of Home Rule would silence troublesome Irish elements by removing the Irish question once and for all from the American public agenda. Resolution of the Irish question would clear away a major stumbling block to closer relations between The United States and Great Britain and it would improve the prospects of "Americanizing" a leading--and wearingly contentious--sector of America's immigrant population.

Irish-America rejoiced when royal assent was given to Home Rule on September 18, 1914. The Irish World observed: "The struggle of more than a century bequeathed from bleeding sire to son is ended." 51 The mood of celebration soon soured, however, when on September 20 Redmond pledged Irish manpower in support of the British war effort. The Irish World warned of "wholesale slaughter" and expressed horror at the thought that "Irish blood shall be poured out like water in defense of the British Empire." The Irish
World feared that the sons of an already depopulated Ireland would be "exterminated on the fields of France like an invading horde of locusts."52

Redmond's pledge of support to Britain caused a wholesale defection of Irish-Americans from the ranks of the moderate nationalism.53 Prominent figures resigned from the pro-Redmond United Irish League. Many turned to the hard-line Clan-na-Gael.54 No longer a solitary voice crying out in the political wilderness, Devoy's Gaelic-American experienced a sudden surge in popularity.

Redmond's commitment to Britain inspired an outpouring of letters to the Irish World. Most spoke of Redmond's action in terms of the exile mythos and in language of shame and betrayal.55

The Irish World soon abandoned Home Rule and the Irish Party in favor of "revolutionary movement."56 Redmond, the one-time beacon of nationalist respectability, was damned for his willingness to barter Irish blood for Irish rights, a policy the Irish World labeled "black treason."57

The Gaelic-American and the Leader also condemned Redmond. The Gaelic-American dismissed Redmond as a paid lackey whose decision to support the British war effort was a "wanton act of treachery" which destroyed Ireland's greatest opportunity for freedom since the American Revolution.58 The Leader was even more derisive. Redmond's capitulation was the work of a "debauched fool" which
brought shame down upon the memory of past struggles.\footnote{59}
Redmond's ultimate crime, according to the Irish-American press, was his subservience to Britain. In the Leader's pantheon of deadly sins, the "slave mentality" was the cardinal offense and Redmond and the Irish Party numbered among the damned:

Treachery to those who trusted them . . .
cowardly to those who betrayed them, the Irish Party goes down the gutters of degradation and decay. . . .\footnote{60}

Irish-American support for moderate nationalism began to fall away. By 1915, the Chicago Citizen stood alone in its support to Redmond.\footnote{61} The U.I.L. declined in influence and popularity. The Irish Party, which once survived on U.I.L. contributions, was forced to send money to America to keep the U.I.L. alive.\footnote{62}

Events would soon conspire to ensure the demise of the U.I.L. The Easter Rising in Dublin in 1916 dramatically altered the nationalist landscape and severely diminished the prospects of moderate nationalism in the United States. By 1918, on the eve of the postal suppressions, the voices of moderation were few. 1918, Arthur Willert, chief New York correspondent for the London Times, advised in a January, 1918 confidential report to the British War Mission in Washington, D.C. that the U.I.L., the bastion of moderate nationalism in America, was "virtually dead."\footnote{63}
Dual Loyalty

The campaign for Ireland's independence, as articulated in the Irish-American press, represented more than the displacement of British colonial control. It was part of a larger restorative process for the Irish on both sides of the Atlantic, a final chapter in the epic battle between Saxon and Celt.

The American-Irish were bound to the old country by ties of blood, sentiment, and responsibility. The attachment to "mother Ireland" was all-consuming and had power to transcend temporal and geographical boundaries. John Devoy claimed that Irish-Americans were often more "Irish" and more loyal to Ireland than the Irish themselves.64 Ireland's plight could evoke a maudlin sense of duty among the American-born who, despite never having seen Ireland, saw themselves as exiles:

Are we, Irishmen in America, are we not going to harken [sic] back to the sweet voice of mother Erin to us her wandering sons, "Come back to Erin, Mavourneen, Mavourneen, Come back aroon to the land of thy birth. . . . we are blessed in this country with privileges and opportunities which are denied to our own at home. . . . we must do what we can to the last effort."65

Irish-American newspapers reflected and inflamed the attachment to Ireland. Support for the struggle was not a matter of "charity," but rather a "duty everyone of Irish blood owes to the land of his inheritance."66 Exhortations in the press ranged from the practical to the wildly implausible. Newspapers regularly solicited money for the
cause. In occasional flights of rhetoric, they called for the exiles return to repopulate Ireland and take part in the final struggle. 67 The Irish in America were all that stood between "liberation and annihilation."68 By aiding Ireland, the exiles would vindicate themselves in America:

Today Ireland is calling. . . . They appeal to us to emancipate them, and by doing so we will emancipate ourselves and take our place in the life of America as children of a free race.69

An Irish Race Convention--the first of its kind in the United States--convened in New York City in March 1916 to marshal support for the independence movement and create a new organization to displace the moribund U.I.L. There were new opportunities to exploit. The postponement of Home Rule until the end of the war, the prospect of mass Irish deaths on the fields of France and the possibility of Irish independence through German intervention prompted renewed interest in the Irish question.70

2300 Irish delegates from across the nation met for two days at Madison Square Garden. The gathering was organized by Devoy and Daniel Cohalan and numerous Irish organizations were represented.

The convention came at a delicate time. The climate of American opinion was shifting in favor of the Allies and the United States was engaged in serious exchanges with Germany regarding that country's submarine warfare. Convention speakers condemned Great Britain, praised Germany and urged
American neutrality in the war. The convention also demanded Ireland's independence at war's end.\textsuperscript{71}

But the primary purpose of the Irish Race Convention was to reconcile support for Ireland with loyalty to the United States. The delegates tried to achieve this by promoting an alternative and distinctly non-Anglo-Saxon definition of American identity.

Speakers hailed Ireland as the "cradle of Americanism." Joseph Smith, a Lowell, Massachusetts newspaper editor, argued that Americanism was a consequence of choice rather than a circumstance of birth.\textsuperscript{72} In his keynote address John Goff, a New York State Supreme Court Justice, cited the American Declaration of Independence as moral justification for Irish armed struggle against Great Britain. Goff warned of "sinister propaganda" in the mainstream press and insisted that Irish-American antipathy toward Great Britain was as natural and inevitable as Irish loyalty to both Ireland and the United States:

\textit{... there is not a single instance of citizens of Irish blood, who because of love \ldots for the old land, failed in the performance of their full duty to America as a soldier, sailor or civilian.}\textsuperscript{73}

The convention issued a formal declaration of loyalty to the United States:

\textit{We solemnly declare that we owe no allegiance and we share no loyalty which in any manner or to any degree lessens our devotion to American ideals or impairs our faith in American institutions.}\textsuperscript{74}
The Irish-American press applauded the Irish Race Convention. The New York daily press condemned it. The *Irish World* declared that the convention demonstrated the strength of Irish-American loyalty to the United States and the legitimacy of anti-English sentiment. The *Leader* emphasized Irish contributions to the American Revolution. It was Irish immigrants, "driven by English tyranny from their native land," who formed the backbone of Washington's army. The *Gaelic-American* insisted that Irishmen, whether "soldier, sailor, or civilian," were constant in their devotion to the United States. The *Gaelic-American* called the convention the "most orderly and best managed gathering ever held in New York City." The convention would open up a "new epoch in American and Irish history." The *Leader* praised the convention as

the most momentous gathering that has ever taken place in the United States. It is not only momentous for the Ireland, but for America and for the world.

The Irish-American community, however, was less than unanimous in its support the Irish Race Convention. Several prominent Irish-Americans declined to attend for fear of attracting accusations of disloyalty. A handful openly criticized the organizers and sponsors of the event. Patrick Egan, former business manager of the *Irish World*, complained that the convention was supported by

... certain pro-German renegade Irish printers and had the affrontery [sic] to adopt what some of its mouthpieces described as "a Declaration of
American rights and Irish independence." 

Ireland, the recently established New York newspaper, suggested that "there ought not to have been such a convention at all." But these critics were few in number.

The mainstream daily press generally ridiculed the Irish Race Convention or questioned the loyalty of its participants. The New York Times condemned the dual loyalty of Irish-Americans and argued that the convention did not represent legitimate Irish-American opinion:

At this time this movement is particularly unfortunate. It has an alien smack... It is the time for every good citizen to be just an American. It is the worst of times for hyphens or the display of old blind resentments.

The New York Tribune was more openly contemptuous:

The clownish performance we have lately witnessed... has been a cause of humiliation to many Irishmen in this country who are not unnaturally pained to see their native land held up to derision and ridicule by an impudent set of upstarts who have no authority whatever to express the sentiments of Irishmen at home.

Only the Hearst papers seemed to offer any support.

The Easter Rising

On Easter 1916 a combined force of Irish Volunteers led by Patrick Pearse and members of the Citizen's Army under the command of James Connolly occupied strategic buildings throughout Dublin. The Easter Proclamation, read outside the General Post Office in the city center, announced the creation of a provisional government and called for support from Ireland's "exiled children in America." The rebels
held out for several days against vastly superior British forces before surrendering on April 30.

Initial reports in the American press were sketchy. American attention had been focused upon diplomatic exchanges between the United States and Germany following the sinking of the Sussex and with rising tensions with Mexico. American opinion generally followed that of the mainstream newspapers. Most condemned the rebellion but were shocked by Britain's summary execution of rebel leaders.\textsuperscript{86} Irish-Americans had mixed reactions at first. The executions, however, galvanized Irish-American opinion and ensured the demise of moderate nationalism.

For several days, mainstream newspapers across the nation devoted banner headlines to the Rising. Early reports dismissed the Rising, one of the first major anti-colonial insurrections of the 20th century, as "riots."\textsuperscript{87} The \textit{New York Times} called the rebellion "an act of madness" and concluded that it was an inevitable consequence of Irish racial characteristics.\textsuperscript{88} Strife, \textit{New York Times} insisted, was endemic in Ireland. The Irish displayed a predisposition toward irrational behavior and lacked the maturity to govern themselves without British oversight:

\begin{quote}
There can be no independence for Ireland. . . .
The story of the Dublin revolt is pathetic, because it is the recital of men who act like forward children, causing untold annoyance to others.\textsuperscript{89}
\end{quote}
The New York World dismissed both the Rising and the notion of Irish independence as folly:

The separatist dream of an independent Ireland is not even good nonsense. . . . A man can be forgiven for being a traitor . . . but he can never be forgiven for being a fool.90

The San Francisco Chronicle called the Rising a "collosal blunder" and the rebels, a "mob."91 The Chronicle conceded that past British ineptitude contributed to the rebellion but concluded that the British government had been "paternally beneficent" towards Ireland "for a full generation."92 An atavistic and irrational hatred of England was alone responsible for the insurrection and the English, beleaguered and frustrated in their efforts to mollify the troublesome Irish, were justified in their response.93 The Rising deserved condemnation, according to the Chronicle, because it threatened the integrity of the British Empire and, more significantly, because it was equivalent of a revolt in Puerto Rico while the U.S. was at war.94 The Chicago Tribune acknowledged the legitimacy of Irish complaints against Britain but questioned the judgment of the rebels.95

Several papers portrayed the rebellion as a pro-German conspiracy hatched in America.96 The New York World accused Irish-American members of Clan-na-Gael of fomenting the revolt.97 The New York Times attacked the Gaelic-American and accused editor John Devoy for making "scurrilous references" about President Woodrow Wilson. Devoy claimed
that Wilson had betraying the Rising by furnishing information to the British. The New York Times reported that Devoy was under investigation by federal authorities for alleged involvement in pro-German "and other alien" conspiracies. Hearst's San Francisco Examiner also reported that Irish-American newspapers were under scrutiny by the Justice Department.  

The Hearst papers--alone among the mainstream daily press--expressed unconditional support for the Rising. The New York American echoed the sentiments of most Irish-American papers in defending Ireland's right to revolt. The American compared Germany's role to that of France during the American Revolution and chastised the New York press for its pro-British sympathies:

If we have not misunderstood the remarks of our morning and evening contemporaries in this town, the majority of them regard Irishmen who have taken up arms against England as ungrateful rebels who deserve to be hanged. . . . British and American Tory publications of that day [the American Revolution] regarded those who had taken up arms against England as ungrateful rebels who deserve to be hanged. . . . The Irish revolution was not made in Germany. Neither was it made in America. The Irish revolution was made in Ireland. And it was made by more than 700 years of harsh misgovernment. . . .

Irish-American newspapers rejoiced at news of the Rising. The Gaelic-American was quick to compare the Rising to the American Revolution. The Gaelic-American also attacked the New York mainstream press for suggesting that plans for the revolt were conceived in Germany and the
United States. Editor John Devoy defended the right of Irish-Americans to provide material assistance to the rebels and scoffed at threats of federal investigation:

... let them prosecute. Irish people here have as good a right to collect money and supply arms to their countrymen in Ireland as J.P. Morgan and the munition manufacturers have to send money... and munitions to England. And they will not be terrorized by the petty czar who is now King George's viceroy in the White House.

The Gaelic-American embraced the Rising as part of a larger restorative process affecting the global community of exiled Irish. The Gaelic-American cast the revolt in terms which contrasted English and Irish racial attributes. The Dublin rebels—dismissed as "children" and "fools" by the New York mainstream press—were portrayed as visionaries:

Materialistic Englishmen cannot understand... Anglomaniacs who control the pro-British press in America are of the same type. But the Irish are a race of idealists, and idealists who challenged British power in Dublin have made an appeal to pride of race.

The Irish World also attributed the Rising to conflicting racial characteristics. The difference between Saxon and Celt was as idealized as it was irreconcilable:

It is blind stupid materialism versus the refined sentiments of a highly intellectual and spiritualized race.

The Irish World enthroned the Dublin rebels as Irish equivalents of the heroes of the American Revolutionary War:

Irish patriots... were fighting for the same principles for which Americans fought at Lexington Bunker Hill... Degenerate indeed would be the American who would not feel stirred to sympathy and admiration by a sight that forcibly reminded him of
the beginnings of a revolution out of which his country emerged as a nation.\textsuperscript{108}

The San Francisco \textit{Leader} interpreted the Rising as a kind of sacramental rite of passage. In the \textit{Leader}'s Catholic world view—a potent mix of morbid fatalism and an obsessive devotion to the past—religion and national identity were inseparable. For the \textit{Leader}, the union of England and Ireland was as unthinkable as "the union of Moloch and the God of Truth." Armed revolt was a prerequisite to a redemptive process, a "resurrection," through which Irish dignity and manhood might be reclaimed. The past lay claim to the present. The Rising was articulated in the language of blood sacrifice in which ancestral duty required an offering in lives:

The procession of pale ghosts, whose mutilated bodies are a witness to Ireland's holy cause, have marched up to our times and demanded that their ranks be augmented by newer victims and newer heroes—there is revolution in the streets of Dublin.\textsuperscript{109}

Support for the Rising, according to the \textit{Leader}, was the essence of true Americanism:

Our first and last allegiance is to America, but we are truest Americans when our sympathy and . . . help goes out to nations rightly struggling to be free.\textsuperscript{110}

The \textit{Leader} rationalized the seeming futility of the Rising by comparing it to early days of the American Revolution and accepted with joyful fatalism the price that the ritual sacrifice of the Rising required:
Ireland laughs; she has taught her young men how to die, and that is the best guarantee of the existence of a nation.\textsuperscript{111} With Easter Week came the first real victory of nationality. . . . it was largely a victory of negation on the physical plane.\textsuperscript{112}

The \textit{Irish World} and the \textit{Gaelic-American} described the Rising in more secular terms although their references to sacrifice and "sacred duty" also carried obvious religious connotations.\textsuperscript{113}

Mass meetings convened in cities across the United States to express support for the Dublin insurgents. Speakers denounced Britain and advocated a brand of "Americanism" that harmonized with Irish-American support for the Rising.\textsuperscript{114}

The rallies also served as forums to demonstrate support for Germany. Many Germans were reported in attendance at an April 30 mass meeting in New York.\textsuperscript{115} Both the German and the American national anthems were played at a subsequent gathering of 3000 at Carnegie Hall.\textsuperscript{116} At a rally at George M. Cohan Theatre, the crowd reportedly cheered at every mention of Germany.\textsuperscript{117} Representatives of a broad cross section of Irish-American organizations compared the Rising to the American Revolution and equated German aid to Ireland with French aid to the American colonies.\textsuperscript{118}

Irish editors and publishers were featured speakers at many mass gatherings. In New York, John Devoy of the \textit{Gaelic-American}, Patrick Ford of the \textit{Irish World} and
Jeremiah O'Leary, publisher of Bull, were acknowledged leaders whose opinions were sought out and quoted by the mainstream daily press as barometers of nationalist sentiment. On the west coast, Peter York of the Leader served the same function.119

Yet despite the seeming consensus, Irish-American support for the Rising was divided. A minority of newspapers and elites initially condemned the Easter insurrection. Ireland, the only constitutionalist Irish paper in New York, called the Rising as a "riot."120 Joseph C. Walsh, editor of Ireland, expressed "regrets" at news of the rebellion.121 Patrick Egan, who resigned as business editor of the Irish World when the paper turned away from constitutional nationalism, called the Rising "criminal insanity . . . a useless and bloody riot."122 Egan accused John Devoy of planning the Rising and financing it with German money.123

The Chicago Tribune claimed that the Chicago Irish were divided over the Dublin revolt. The Tribune quoted five local elites, four of whom condemned the Rising. Charles Ffrench, former president of the elite Fellowship Club, called the insurrection "utter madness." P.T. Barry, editor of the Redondite Chicago Citizen, stated:

It is not a revolution but a bulition [sic] . . . [these] brawlers . . . do not represent the great majority of loyal Irish people.124
Two publishers from opposite ends of the Irish-American nationalist spectrum—Jeremiah O'Leary of Bull and Joseph C. Walsh of Ireland—correctly predicted that the execution of the leaders of the Rising would spark a war of revolution in Ireland. What they failed to predict was that the executions would galvanize opinion in the United States among both Irish-Americans and the mainstream press.

The Executions

Britain treated the Rising as an act of treason. After secret perfunctory military trials, the leaders of the Easter rising were condemned to death by firing squad. The executions—which dragged on over the first two weeks of May—radicalized even the moderates. The conservative Catholic press lost all restraint in its attacks on Great Britain. Even Ireland conceded that the executions would be "interpreted as having been inspired by racial antipathy." The Gaelic-American, the Irish World and the Leader were predictably outraged. Mass meetings were once again held throughout the nation. Resolutions condemning the executions were introduced in both the Senate and the House of Representatives. Irish-American opinion was more closely united on the Irish question than any time since the 1880's.

The mainstream press condemned the executions in a sustained flurry of editorial comment. The New York World labeled the executions a "blunder" and "an
unnecessarily savage reprisal." The New York Times called the initial executions "justified" but "unfortunate." But as the deaths continued, the New York Times condemned the British government as "incredibly stupid."

The San Francisco Chronicle reacted in similar fashion. The Chronicle called the initial executions a "colossal blunder" and criticized Britain for squandering a chance to create good will by showing leniency. Yet the Chronicle also insisted that British rule was beneficial and that Ireland was "less able...to stand alone." But as the death toll mounted, the Chronicle accused Britain of using the war as an excuse to delay Home Rule:

Ireland fighting for freedom arouses a sympathy as world wide as that which was extended to Kosciusko and the Poles.

The reaction of the Hearst papers was indistinguishable from that of the Irish-American press. The San Francisco Examiner called the executions

... the most cruelly stupid blunder committed by a government which has never yet exhibited anything but cruelty or stupidity...in its dealings with Ireland. It will yet be written in the chronicles of times to come that [the rebels] won Ireland's final independence.

The New York American's editorial response--shot through with imagery of blood sacrifice, redemptive transmutation, and allusions to the American Revolution--could have come from the pen of Peter Yorke of the Leader:
The blood that flowed from the gaping wounds of the slain will water and will make to blossom and to fruit the tree of Irish liberty as surely as the blood which flowed at Lexington and Concord from the hearts of our glorious rebel forefathers watered and made to blossom and to fruit the tree of American liberty.\textsuperscript{139}

Attention surrounding the Rising culminated with the execution of Sir Roger Casement on August 3, 1916. Casement had been captured after returning to Ireland aboard a German U-boat to stop the Rising and sacrifice himself for the cause of Irish freedom.\textsuperscript{140} In the U.S., there was widespread revulsion at the prospect of another execution. Even the \textit{New York Times} suggested that Casement's life be spared.\textsuperscript{141} The U.S. Senate urged British government to exercise clemency.\textsuperscript{142}

The Irish-American press quickly anointed Casement as the latest martyr. The \textit{New York World} condemned his hanging.\textsuperscript{143} The \textit{New York Times} expressed regret but observed that Britain had every right to execute Casement as a traitor.\textsuperscript{144} At Casement's death, the Chicago \textit{Tribune} compared the Rising to the American Civil War and insisted, "the right of rebellion is . . . fundamental." The \textit{Tribune}, however, stopped short of supporting Irish independence, and concluded that Ireland's best hope was to become a "contented and self-governed part of the British Empire."\textsuperscript{145}

The San Francisco \textit{Examiner} offered no such qualifications to its support. In a page one editorial prior to Casement's execution, Hearst himself observed:
England has not learned that she cannot treat Ireland with brutal selfishness and injustice, even with stupid race hatred and religious prejudice and expect loyalty there. England can probably never learn the lesson of Ireland until there has been a wholly successful rebellion there.\textsuperscript{146}

Apart from the Hearst papers, the commercial daily press condemned the executions less out of sympathy for the leaders and goals of the Rising than out of the pragmatic realization that the executions would further inflame Irish-America and would place a potentially insurmountable obstacle in the way of closer ties with Great Britain. The United States was moving to a war footing--largely at the urging of the mainstream daily press--and any additional impediments to that process were viewed with alarm. Most of the mainstream press opposed the Rising and the idea of Irish independence. But there was genuine consensus that Britain had "blundered" in its handling of the Dublin revolt. Britain's failure, however, was the result of flawed tactics rather than failed policy. Britain's mistake was not that it put down the rebellion, but that in executing the rebels, it transformed them into martyrs.

The Dublin Rising raised the issue of German involvement. By 1916, American public opinion concerning the war was shifting in favor of Britain and the Allies. Although the United States was a year away from entering the European conflict, sectors of the Irish-American press had already been tarnished by accusations of pro-German conspiracies. The mainstream daily press--particularly the
New York Times—had branded the nation's leading Irish editors as the chief agitators of radical nationalism.147
As America descended toward war, the Irish-American press would scramble for a strategy by which loyalty to the cause of Irish independence might be somehow be kept in harmony with loyalty to the United States.
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CHAPTER V

THE WAR: LOYALTIES IN COLLISION

Introduction

World War One presented an opportunity—and a special problem—to the American advocates of Irish independence. The War offered the best hope in over 100 years of breaking the colonial link with Great Britain. But in the years prior to America’s entry into the War, powerful political leaders—abetted by sectors of the mainstream press—relentlessly challenged the loyalty of Irish-Americans. The anti-hyphen campaign of 1915, the 1916 Presidential race and the neutrality debate had a cumulative effect of casting the Irish as one of the most disloyal elements in America.

When the United States entered the War in April 1917 as Britain’s ally, Irish-American nationalism came into potential conflict with the foreign policy interests of the United States. Insistent voices argued that continued Irish antipathy toward Britain posed a direct threat to U.S. national security.

Prior to the Anglo-American rapprochement of the late 19th century, the American-Irish shared their antagonism toward Britain with a succession of U.S. administrations.\(^1\) If the Irish were not always tolerated, their opposition to
Britain often was. At the eve of World War One, however, old antipathies between London and Washington had largely been reconciled. Woodrow Wilson, the latest in a series of anglophile presidents, resided in the White House and Britain was well entrenched as a friend of the United States.

The Irish-American press faced an intractable dilemma. Irish hostility toward Great Britain was stronger than ever following the failure of Home Rule and the execution of the leaders of the 1916 Easter Rebellion. So too was the need to demonstrate loyalty to the United States that was beyond question or reproach. As the voices clamoring for war gathered in strength and number, pressure to conform to policies favoring Britain would mount. The Irish-American press would soon find itself on a collision course with mainstream American opinion.

At the outbreak of War in 1914, most Americans wanted only to stay out of it. By Spring of 1915, however, the trade issue, British propaganda, and Germany's dogged refusal to abandon submarine warfare would begin to shift American public opinion in favor of the Allies. Even before the U.S. entered the conflict, the debate over what constituted true "Americanism" would be subsumed under demands for conformity to a brand of neutrality which favored the Allies. Support for—or at least acquiescence to—an agenda which favored Britain became, in the words of
President Woodrow Wilson, the "acid test" of "true loyalty and genuine Americanism."²

Irish-Americans overwhelmingly supported the effort to defeat Germany once the U.S. declared war on April 6, 1917. Irish-American opinion prior 1917, however, is more difficult to assess. Some historians suggest that most Irish-Americans backed Germany and saw the War as an opportunity for Ireland to break away from British control.³ Others conclude that opinions divided along class lines with wealthy Irish financiers and industrialists (who profited from the rise in industrial activity fueled by the War) supporting Britain while working-class Irish and more recent arrivals favored Germany.⁴ A few contend that Irish-Americans favored the Allies or were indifferent to the War.⁵

It seems likely, however, that the majority of Irish-Americans longed for the defeat of Great Britain—at least in the early days of the War—and that German-American/Irish-American cooperation to keep the U.S. out of the War was a matter of convenience rather than mutual affection. A New York-based British propaganda officer admitted as much in a secret dispatch to London: "The friendship between them is purely artificial and is based on a common hatred of England."⁶

Most Irish-American newspapers—whether secular or religious—favored Germany at the outset of the War.⁷ John
Redmond complained that the Chicago *Citizen* was the only Irish paper in America that was not pro-German. The War also spurred a flurry of publishing activity. Three new Irish papers appeared during the War years. In New York, the *Gaelic-American* enlarged its format and began to carry more ads.

Some suggest that the Irish-American press was not a reliable barometer of Irish-American opinion. What is certain, however, is that the Irish-American press—regardless of whether it shaped or reflected the opinions of its readers—was not so much pro-German as anti-British. One historian writes: "Not instinctive love for Germany, but all-consuming Anglophobia accounted for the pro-German attitude of the Irish-American press. . . ."

*Ireland's Opportunity*

World War One offered radical nationalists the best chance of securing Ireland's independence since the Napoleonic wars. In centuries past, Gaelic poets had looked to Spain and France for Ireland's deliverance. In 1914, Irish-American editors looked to Germany. "England's prosperity," a 19th-century maxim proclaimed, "is Ireland's misery; England's defeat is Ireland's victory."

The War presented Ireland "the greatest opportunity in her history" of achieving self determination, according to the *Gaelic-American*. The *Gaelic-American* placed a somewhat messianic—and naive—hope in the prospects of a Germany
victory. The triumph of Germany was inevitable, the
Gaelic-American insisted, and the Kaiser (who reportedly
carried in his pocket a sprig of Irish shamrock) supported
the goal of a free and independent Ireland.

The fight for Irish liberty is being fought on the
battlefields of Galicia, and when the kingdom of
Poland is reconstituted ... and a million
victorious German veterans are freed for finishing
up the war in the west, Irishmen will begin to see
their day is close at hand.

The New York Irish World was equally frank in its
desire for a German victory. The interests of Germany and
Ireland were synonymous: "It is treason to our race to hope
for or help in an English victory." The War would rally
Ireland's scattered exiles to the defeat of the "vampire
country," whose prosperity was gained at the expense of
workers around the world. Germany would become the agent of
their revenge:

[the] impending disaster ... will strip the robber
nation of the world of the spoils it has gathered
unto itself after centuries of murder and robbery.

The Irish World reasoned that Irish sympathy for Germany was
a matter of convenience predicated upon the fact that
Germany was the "enemy of Ireland's enemy." The Irish World
went so far as to criticize the New York Staats-Zeitung for
advocating a reconciliation between Germany and Great
Britain:

... if this war [is] ... merely a Teutonic
family row preliminary to closer union, it behooves
Ireland to stand aside. ... aid to Germany would
ultimately be as prejudicial to the case of Ireland
as direct aid to England would be.
Irish-American newspapers also feared that the European War could become the instrument of Ireland's final destruction. By the end of 1915, upwards of 100,000 Irish troops were serving in regiments of the British army. Britain's proposal to extend conscription to Ireland threatened to gather in tens of thousands more. The Irish-American press feared that an entire generation of Irishmen would be slaughtered on the killing fields of Europe, plunging an already depopulated Ireland into a state of irreversible decline. The Irish World feared that the War would Britain with final solution to its centuries old "Irish problem." What famine and forced transportation had failed to accomplish, the War would complete:

They are contemplating making the last remnant of our race food for German powder. The famine of '47 more than decimated Ireland's population; conscription in 1916 will rob her of her young men and seal the fate of our race in its cradle land. . . . We do not use the language of rhetoric. . . . If the decision is carried out, Ireland will enter upon a stage of decrepitude which will be the prelude to her final conquest by England. . . .

Irish-American support was essential, according to the Irish World, not only to the survival of Irish nationality in the old world but also to maintenance of Irish self-esteem in the new:

The last remnant of the old race is threatened with extinction by famine and conscription and you in America can save them. . . . Never were your manhood and pride so deeply at stake as in this hour of trial for your flesh and blood. . . . to fail her now would be the blackest treason.
The *Gaelic-American* shared the *Irish World's* concerns about the effects of the War on Ireland. The *Gaelic-American* charged that Irish soldiers were sacrificed at Mons and Dardanelles in order that English soldiers might be spared. English troops occupied Ireland "as a conquered country" while Irish soldiers fell in France.

The prospect of conscription in Ireland (which would flare up again in the Spring of 1918) inspired an incendiary editorial in the *Gaelic-American* in 1915 which may have contributed to future governmental proscriptions of the newspaper. The editorial attacked a reported decision to sell U.S. riot shrapnel to Britain for use in Ireland. The *Gaelic-American* accused President Woodrow Wilson of "complaisance" in helping the British in their plans to slaughter Irish draft resisters. The *Gaelic-American* advocated possible sabotage of U.S. munitions factories:

...if a law is inhumane it should be broken... if the President does not stop it, then some means will be found. ... When it comes to stopping the murder of ones own kindred, who cares about the law? ... Blowing up of munitions factories will be justified in the sight of god if it stops the wholesale murder of innocent men, women and children--for in 'suppressing mobs' British soldiers always act like butchers.

**The Neutrality Debate**

When war broke out in August 1914 between Germany and Britain, Irish and Germans in America, who enjoyed a tradition of cooperation against the resurgence of Anglo-Saxonism, joined forces to lobby against American
involvement. Public meetings and demonstrations took place in cities throughout the nation. An avalanche of petitions descended upon Washington, D.C., urging Congress to keep the U.S. out of war.

The campaign in support of American neutrality was a broad-based movement involving socialists, pacifists, and radical labor elements in addition to nationality groups. Many Irish/German public rallies expressed open support for Germany. 6,000 Irish and Germans met in San Francisco in December 1914 to express hope for Irish independence through a German victory. An August 1914 rally of 3,000 in New York's Celtic Park paraded the German flag and issued a pro-German resolution. Jeremiah O'Leary, publisher of Bull and co-founder (with Alphonse Koebel of the German-American Alliance) of the American Truth Society, toured the country condemning Great Britain and pleading Germany's case.

President Woodrow Wilson's desire to keep the U.S. out of the European conflict was sincere and his administration professed a policy of strict neutrality. But there was a perception early on that Wilson's brand of neutrality was less than evenhanded. The San Francisco Examiner observed in November 1914:

There is a growing feeling that the neutrality of this administration is more a matter of sound than substance.

Not every Irish-American organization supported Germany—and the New York Times gave prominent coverage to
those who did not, specifically the all-but-defunct United Irish League. But the bulk of organized Irish-American opinion—at least that which was most vocal—supported Germany at least in the early days of the War.

**The Propaganda War**

German and Irish newspapers in the U.S. followed much the same propaganda line. They warned against British control of the seas, lobbied against U.S. financial support of the Allies, and decried munitions sales. The United States, according to the Irish-American press, was a victim of British intrigues.

The *Irish World* argued against war loans and complained that Britain's blockade of neutral shipping harmed American commerce. Keeping America out of war, the *Irish World* advised, was the "duty of every patriotic American."

Solidarity between Irish and Germans was the essence of true Americanism. As the elites of immigrant America, the Germans and Irish had a duty to lead the fight in support of American neutrality:

> Americans of German and Irish descent should be especially conspicuous in combating English intrigues. . . . Unity between German-Americans and Irish-Americans would paralyze every effort of England to array the United States on her side against Germany.

Irish-American newspapers sometimes went to imaginative lengths to counter British war propaganda. After news of alleged German atrocities in Belgium swept across the U.S.,
the San Francisco Leader devoted all of page one to photographs of sites of British atrocities in Ireland dating back hundreds of years.\textsuperscript{35} The Leader occasionally reprinted translations of reports from German-language papers.\textsuperscript{36} The Gaelic-American urged its readers to read German-American papers "to understand our German-American fellow citizens."\textsuperscript{37}

Irish counter measures proved futile, however, against what an historian has described as "one of the major propaganda efforts in history."\textsuperscript{38} From the early days of the War, Britain enjoyed a cable monopoly on news emanating from Europe.\textsuperscript{39} British propagandists supplied free press releases to 360 newspapers in the U.S. In addition, the British maintained a mailing list of 260,000 American elites who they kept supplied with war information.\textsuperscript{40} The British, unlike the Germans, were subtle and often covert in their massive campaign to sway American public opinion.\textsuperscript{41} One historian has concluded:

Americans were led to believe they were making up their own minds when they were really being directed gently toward a pre-determined set of opinions in favor of the allies.\textsuperscript{42}

British efforts proved so successful that Sir Gilbert Parker, the chief of the British propaganda mission in the U.S., could boast in August 1916, "We have swept German news out of American papers."\textsuperscript{43} Parker resigned in February 1917 (reportedly due to ill health) when it became apparent that the U.S. would enter the War. He was replaced by Lord
Northcliffe, founder of the Daily Mail and the Daily Mirror and owner of the London Times. Northcliffe established the British Information Bureau. Headquartered in New York City, the British Information Bureau had at its height 500 officials with 10,000 assistants working in the U.S.\textsuperscript{44}

The Irish-American press began to warn of pro-British bias in the mainstream media soon after the first shots were fired in Europe. The Leader complained that Germany was being victimized by a "bigoted and unscrupulous press."\textsuperscript{45} The Irish World called for a German/Irish alliance to counter British propaganda. "English influence," the paper warned, "has made itself felt in certain newspaper offices."\textsuperscript{46} The Gaelic-American decried the "campaign of calumny" being waged by the "Anglomaniac press:"

\begin{quote}
The English are doing to the Germans what they have for centuries being doing to the Irish—filling the world with lies about them.\textsuperscript{47}
\end{quote}

There was a measure of truth about Irish complaints concerning the New York mainstream press. The New York Times became so partisan that Sir Gilbert Parker warned that British government against accepting it as a reliable barometer of American public opinion.\textsuperscript{48}

The Hearst papers, alone among the commercial daily press, offered solace to the Irish. Like the Irish-American newspapers, the Hearst papers advocated American neutrality and warned of Anglo-Saxon influence. The Leader often reprinted editorials from the San Francisco Examiner; the
Irish World occasionally borrowed political cartoons from the New York American.

Irish editors embraced Hearst as an ally. When Britain banned Hearst's International New Service from the trans-Atlantic cable in October 1916, the Irish World rushed to Hearst's defense:

It is gratifying to find that one American newspaper publisher—William Randolph Hearst—cannot be bought, bribed, or frightened... In his stand against the arrogance of the British ministry he should have the support of every American citizen.⁴⁹

From the beginning, the New York Times regarded the pro-German sympathies of the American-Irish as evidence of disloyalty to the United States. A page-one Times account of a German/Irish meeting chaired by Jeremiah O'Leary reported, for example, that the American national anthem was not played and that the crowd "did not cheer when the Stars and Stripes... were mentioned."⁵⁰ The Gaelic-American disputed that Times' version of events and accused the Times and other New York papers of conspiring to print deliberate falsehoods in order to provoke hostility against Irish and German-Americans.

There is a hyphen in the term Anglo-Saxon, yet these unnaturalized Anglo-Saxons like Mr. Ochs of the Times, who is not an American, are ever referring to Irish and German citizens as hyphenated Americans... yet some of the men in charge of Mr. Pulitzer's chief departments are Englishmen who have not yet taken out their naturalization papers and probably never will.⁵¹
The issue of loyalty—as it would be played out in public discourse and through the press—would be defined in part along racial lines.

The Anti-Hyphen Campaign

The coercive side of the neutrality debate surfaced in the anti-hyphen campaign of 1915. In 1915 and 1916, most Americans were "slowly making their minds up" about the War. The anti-hyphen campaign, which was ostensibly directed against those nationality groups which exhibited dual loyalties, in fact promoted a form of Anglo-conformity which sought to enforce a conception of American patriotism that was sympathetic to Great Britain in the War.

The campaign arose out of a fear that the process of immigrant assimilation had broken down and that the same old-world animosities that were rending Europe would shatter the American body politic. George Creel, future head of the Committee on Public Information, wrote that "seditious attacks" upon the government by "hyphenated societies and a foreign-language press" offered clear evidence that the melting pot was not working:

The bland assumption that we are one country and one people has been given a rude shock. . . . a domestic peril . . . threatens the permanence of American institutions as gravely as any menace of foreign foe.

The campaign against the hyphen was also part of a larger and more diffuse debate about the limits of pluralism and the nature of American identity. Its most ardent
advocates claimed to condemn hyphenates of every kind, but their true targets were those Irish-Americans and German-Americans who lobbied against support for Britain.

The use of the term "hyphen" as a derogatory reference to nationality groups was introduced by Teddy Roosevelt in an 1894 journal article. Roosevelt wrote, "Some Americans need hyphens in their names because only part of them has come over." He argued that divided loyalty was incompatible with true "Americanism." The targets of Roosevelt's attack were those nationality groups which sought to derail the Anglo-American rapprochement—Irish-Americans and German-Americans.

Although Teddy Roosevelt coined the phrase, "hyphenated American," President Woodrow Wilson did much to popularize it. President Wilson scorned dual loyalty other than the Anglo-Saxon variety. He cherished the English roots of American traditions and argued in his academic writings that race was the determining factor in the destiny of the nation.

Wilson and most of the senior members of his administration were anglophile by ancestry or inclination. The President, who sprang from Ulster Protestant stock, had an "unconcealed distaste" for non-British immigrants and blamed them for the decline of American democracy.

In May 1914, Wilson appropriated a Roosevelt phrase to chastise those Irish immigrants who needed "hyphens in the
names because only part of them has crossed over." The word "hyphen" soon became synonymous with questionable loyalty and with Americans of German and Irish ancestry.

Wilson breathed new life into the anti-hyphen campaign with a Philadelphia speech a few days after the sinking of the Lusitania. Before an audience of 15,000 recently nationalized citizens, Wilson attacked hyphenated Americans and insisted that the continued existence of national groupings was anathema to the interests of the United States. His words were clearly aimed at Germans and Irish:

America does not consist of groups. A man who thinks of himself as belonging to a particular national group in America has not yet become an American.

The hyphen hysteria intensified in the autumn of 1915. On Oct. 1, Wilson chose a gathering of the (overwhelmingly WASP) Daughters of the American Revolution (DAR) to observe:

Very large numbers of our fellow citizens, born in other lands, have not entertained with sufficient affection and intensity the American ideal.

Roosevelt took Wilson's message a step further in a speech to the Knights of Columbus eleven days later. The former President condemned dual loyalty and demanded more emphasis on duty, and less emphasis on rights:

There is no room in this country for hyphenated Americans. . . . For an American citizen to vote as a German-American, an Irish-American or an English-American is to be a traitor to American institutions, and those hyphenated Americans who terrorize American politicians by threats of the foreign vote are engaged in treason to the American republic.
The mainstream press fed the anti-hyphen fever through the latter months of 1915. As one historian described it, "cartoonist and columnist united in a campaign against the hyphen."\textsuperscript{64} The \textit{Literary Digest} declared hyphenism the most important issue of the day.\textsuperscript{65} The \textit{New York World} and the \textit{New York Times} enthusiastically endorsed the Wilson and Roosevelt speeches.\textsuperscript{66} The \textit{Times} recommended "hazing" of hyphenates as "a cure for the dangerous un-American habit... Life," the paper advised, "is hardly worth living under continual hazing."\textsuperscript{67} The \textit{Times}'s indirect call for vigilante activity would be answered in 1917 and 1918 with chilling consequences.

The defining moment of the anti-hyphen campaign came in President Wilson's state of the union address on Dec. 7, 1915. The President, in an obvious reference to German and Irish immigrants, stated:

There are citizens of the United States... born under other flags, but welcomed under our generous naturalization laws to full freedom and opportunity of America, who have poured the poison of disloyalty into the very arteries of our national life.\textsuperscript{68}

The Irish-American press rose to the defense of hyphenated Americans and challenged the restrictive definition of Americanism. The \textit{Gaelic-American} called Wilson a "demagogue" and a pawn of England.\textsuperscript{69} The \textit{Gaelic-American} defended the loyalty of hyphenates and blamed the mainstream press for orchestrating the campaign against them.
The press of New York stands for and exploits a policy of Toryism, toadyism and tawdryism, and the "hyphenated-Americans" insist upon a policy of strict neutrality. That is the essential difference between the Americanism as handed down by the Fathers of the Republic and the modern Americanism as defined by the subsidized press of New York. 70

The Gaelic-American complained that the press unfairly labeled as un-American or "hyphenated" anyone who dared criticize England:

American, in the Tribune's dictionary, means Anglo-American and no foreign-born citizen is properly "assimilated" unless he declares himself an Anglomaniac. . . . That is the new brand of Americanism. 71

The Irish World accused the anti-hyphenates of hypocrisy, noting that the divided loyalties of "double hyphens," such as Scotch-Irish and Anglo-Saxon Americans, escaped scrutiny and condemnation. 72 The Irish World complained of rising anti-Catholic bigotry. Both the World and the Leader warned that the anti-hyphen campaign represented a modern form of knownothingism. 73 The Leader predicted that President Wilson would adopt "the new knownothingism" as a rallying point in the 1916 election. 74 The Western Watchman advocated a more expanded definition of American identity and insisted that immigrants and their offspring strengthened rather than weakened the American social fabric:

When will our evil-minded fanatics come to learn that hyphenated Americanism, properly understood, is a virtue and only becomes vice by being misapplied. For the hyphen, as has been well said, of its very nature tends to unite, not to separate. 75
Although it was punctuated by speeches by President Wilson and ex-President Roosevelt, the anti-hyphen campaign was not orchestrated from on high. A groundswell of public sentiment drove the campaign against the hyphen as the nation—swayed by British propaganda, German blunders, and simmering racial antipathies—made its mind up about the War. One historian concludes:

It is hardly appropriate to attribute the wave of intolerance that inundated the U.S. in the fall of 1915 to the rhetoric of Teddy Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson. These men merely rode its crest and sanctioned it with their moral authority.\textsuperscript{76}

The mainstream press aggravated the situation with its attacks on hyphenated Americans and with its countless unsubstantiated reports of German plots and conspiracies during the latter months of 1915.\textsuperscript{77}

By the end of the year, coercive elements began to coalesce into organized groups. An "America First" campaign was launched with the goal, among others, of imposing a "uniform interpretation of the meaning of American citizenship."\textsuperscript{78} The "Loyal America League" described itself as a "movement to eliminate the hyphen and the dual loyalty for which it stands."\textsuperscript{79} The New York Times call for the hazing of hyphenates would soon be answered.

\textbf{The Lusitania}

The turning point in the neutrality debate came on 7 May 1915 when German submarines on patrol in the North Atlantic torpedoed and sank the British steamship Lusitania,
killing 128 American civilians. The mainstream press quickly condemned Germany. According to a Literary Digest poll of 365 mainstream editors at the beginning of the War, 66 per cent supported neutrality, 29 per cent favored Britain, and five per cent favored Germany. After the Lusitania, however, most editors called for Germany's defeat. Public support for Germany withered.

Despite the jingoist firestorm, Irish-American newspapers rushed to Germany's defense. The Gaelic-American insisted that Germany had every right to sink the Lusitania. Under rules of war, the Gaelic-American argued, Britain was guilty of carrying munitions aboard a civilian transport ship and President Wilson and Secretary of State Bryan were negligent for ignoring German warnings. The "Anglomaniac" press, according to the Gaelic-American, distorting the incident in Britain's behalf.

When the subsidized yelping of England's hell-hounds in the New York press has subsided . . . it will be found that [the] incident was the deliberate work of the British government.

The Leader, in a page-one translation of an Illinois Staats-Zeitung editorial, claimed that the Lusitania had been warned and precautions taken to prevent the loss of life. The Irish World charged that the ship was a "floating arsenal" and predicted that "mercenary,
unscrupulous, and unpatriotic newspapers" would use the incident as an excuse for American involvement. 86

The war of words grew shriller in the aftermath of the Lusitania. The Irish World accused U.S. arms manufacturers of war profiteering, insisted that Britain was the real enemy of the U.S., and argued that the Wilson administration had "no right" to threaten Germany with war if it refused to end its submarine warfare. 87

When Secretary of State William Jennings Bryan resigned in protest of Wilson's ultimatum to Germany, the Gaelic-American complained of the "moral cowardice" of America's leaders.

What was wanted was a man of courage to rally real Americans . . . and save the country from being dragged into . . . war to serve the purpose of a few millionaires who have already amassed great fortunes supplying the Allies with munitions. 88

The Leader accused the White House of wholesale capitulation to Great Britain.

Under the present supine and anglo-maniacal Administration, Old Glory can be trailed in the mud without bringing more than a feeble protest. 89

Sectors of the mainstream press increasingly questioned Irish loyalty. The New York Times--quoting a London press report--concluded, a "very large portion of German-American success must be ascribed to Irish-American cooperation." 90

The Literary Digest speculated about the depth of Irish loyalty to the U.S. Its survey of Irish-American newspapers found "plenty of anti-English and some pro-German
declared. \textsuperscript{91} Irish-American newspapers were forced on the defensive. The \textit{Leader} observed:

\begin{quote}
We are not more German than the Germans, nor are we more British than many native-born Irish who are ashamed of their nativity. . . . We are Americans and as such loath, suspect, and despise the one nation that has ever been our enemy . . . perfidious England. \textsuperscript{92}
\end{quote}

Hearst's San Francisco \textit{Examiner}, an advocate of neutrality and a vocal critic of Britain, made a similar declaration:

"This newspaper is not pro-German or pro-allies. It is pro-American morning, noon, and night." \textsuperscript{93}

Irish newspapers stepped up their attacks upon the mainstream press. The \textit{Gaelic-American} labeled mainstream reports from the front a "disgrace to journalism." \textsuperscript{94} A page-one editorial cartoon in \textit{Irish World} depicted the "Anglo-American press" as a beguiling temptress trying to seduce Uncle Sam into war. \textsuperscript{95} The \textit{Irish World} chastised New York newspapers for truckling to British interests:

\begin{quote}
The craven, lying New York press tries to convince Americans that Germany is the enemy of the United States because, so they say, she seeks to dominate the world. In England's domination they gladly acquiesce. When will America once more declare her independence? \textsuperscript{96}
\end{quote}

The \textit{Leader} accused the daily press of "debauched flunkyism" for subordinating the interests of America to those of Britain.

\begin{quote}
. . . our press, with a few notable exceptions, is proud of American slavery and lauds the hand that whips us. \textsuperscript{97}
\end{quote}
Despite the efforts to preserve American neutrality, events pushed the nation ever closer to War. The sinking of the Arabic in August 1915 and the Sussex in March 1916 further eroded German/American relations. The Irish insisted that they hated England for the good of the U.S. and that anglophobia was a logical expression of Americanism. But the argument that England, rather than Germany, was the enemy of the United States became increasingly untenable. When Germany announced the resumption of unrestricted submarine warfare in January 1917, the Senate quickly voted to sever diplomatic relations.\textsuperscript{98} War seemed inevitable.

The \textit{Irish World} responded to the latest crisis in calm and measured tones. It praised President Wilson's "pacific attitude" and urged him not to take the "fatal leap" into war.\textsuperscript{99} Although the paper continued to criticize Britain, it advised that the "honor and the interests of America with all true Americans take precedent [sic] over all other considerations."\textsuperscript{100}

The \textit{Western Watchman} also kept up its attacks on England and her allies in America. The \textit{Watchman} dismissed as "Un-American" a pro-war speech by an Episcopal bishop:

\begin{quote}
If, as the Bishop says, America is on God's side, then she can't be with England. History reveals John Bull too often playing the devil's part to allow us to believe that he is now on the side of God's cause. . . . [England] is teaching the world today such lessons as men need--the dear bought lessons of the extent to which pride, avarice, ambition, jealousy and envy can go.\textsuperscript{101}
\end{quote}
The *Gaelic-American* called the break with Germany a "victory for English propaganda in America." 102 The Chicago *Citizen* was more conciliatory. The *Citizen* proclaimed the willingness of Irish-Americans to stand behind the United States: "Their first duty is the flag of their country, and that flag is the stars and stripes." 103 Yet the *Citizen* also recommended sympathy for the "awkward position" of German-Americans. 104

The *Leader* reluctantly accepted the likelihood of war and warned, "It is not a time for jingoism nor for recrimination." 105 Within months, however, the *Leader* would run with the jingoistic pack.

The point of no return came in March 1917 when British agents intercepted a secret German communiqué. The so-called Zimmerman note proposed a German/Mexican alliance in the event of America's entry into the War. Unable to explain away the implications of the Zimmerman note, most Irish-American newspapers ignored it. A few questioned its authenticity. The *Leader* dismissed the note as a creation of British propaganda. 106 The *Leader*, as it accepted the inevitability of war, articulated the conflicting sentiments of many Irish-Americans:

... if this country should go to war, the vast majority of our citizens will be behind the flag.
... Our interests and our honor, or whatever we regard as our interests and our honor, may lead us to fight with Germany, but common decency, the memory of our dead fathers and the hope of our posterity should prevent us from allying ourselves with ... England. 107
The 1916 Presidential Campaign

The discord stirred up by the anti-hyphen campaign of 1915 spilled over into the 1916 Presidential race. President Wilson ran on his record of having kept America out of war. But a major issue in the campaign was hyphenism.

Wilson set the tone early in the campaign. In his Flag Day speech, Wilson attacked those who advocated voting blocks organized around racial or nationality groups. In a clear reference to Americans of Irish and German ancestry, the President observed:

There is disloyalty active in the United States, and it must be absolutely crushed. . . . a very small minority . . . are trying to levy a species of political blackmail, saying "do what we wish or we will wreak our vengeance at the polls."108

The Gaelic-American accused Wilson of deliberately stirring up racial strife to attract votes.109 The San Francisco Examiner charged the "President's two personal newspaper organs in New York"--a veiled reference to the World and the Times--with "moral treason" for

... attempting to excite hatred between American citizens of different ancestry in these times of peculiar danger. . . . reprehensible as has been much of the pro-German propaganda, none of it has begun to equal in bitterness, abusiveness and persistency the pro-British . . . propaganda.110

Wilson raised the issue again in his acceptance speech at the Democratic national convention.

I am a candidate of a party but I am above all things an American citizen. I neither seek the favor nor fear the displeasure of that small alien
element which puts loyalty to any foreign power before loyalty to the United States.\textsuperscript{111}

The Hearst papers denounced the attacks on hyphenates as divisive and one-sided:

There are more kinds of hyphenates than one in this country. . . . We stand firmly for common sense Americanism that is neither pro-Teuton nor pro Allies. . . .\textsuperscript{112}

The hyphen issue culminated in a widely-publicized exchange between President Wilson and Jeremiah O'Leary at the end of September. The occasion was the landslide victory in the New Jersey primary election of incumbent Senator James E. Martine over John W. Wescott, Wilson's candidate. In a telegram to the President, O'Leary commented:

Senator Martine won because New Jersey voters do not want any truckling to the British Empire. . . . Anglomaniacs and British interests may control the newspapers but they don't control votes. . . . Every vote for Martine was a vote against you.\textsuperscript{113}

Wilson called a press conference to deliver a stinging retort to O'Leary:

I would feel deeply mortified to have you or anyone like you vote for me. Since you have access to so many disloyal Americans and I have not, I will ask you to convey this message to them.\textsuperscript{114}

The Wilson/O'Leary brawl inspired a firestorm of editorial commentary—most of it directed against O'Leary—and thrust the hyphen issue to the center of the Presidential campaign.\textsuperscript{115} The press demonized O'Leary as a
paragon of disloyalty and the Wilson campaign shifted into high gear. A Democratic national committeeman observed:

We are going to make the hyphen issue the big talking point of this campaign. There isn't any other issue. The President's telegram to O'Leary has nailed Mr. Hughes' effort to win the German vote to a flagpole . . . so the whole country can see it.

O'Leary and his supporters tried mount a counter attack. 12,000 gathered at an ATS rally in New York to protest Wilson's retort. And in a second telegram to Wilson, O'Leary argued:

It has remained for you to break new ground as a President and to seek to divide your countrymen into racial and religious groups. The word "hyphenate" was never heard in American public life until you coined it to insult your hosts, real Americans of Irish blood, at the dedication of the Commodore Barry monument in Washington.

O'Leary's rebuttal, however, received much less attention in the press than his first telegram and Wilson came out much better after their confrontation. O'Leary accused the daily press of pro-British bias:

The applause it [Wilson's telegram] received from some newspapers, particularly those that are owned by Lord Northcliffe, newspapers like the *New York Times*, proves the existence . . . [of] Knownothingism.

Of the major mainstream newspapers, only the Hearst papers were willing to speak on O'Leary's behalf. The San Francisco * Examiner* defended O'Leary's right to lobby against Great Britain and to criticize the policies of an incumbent President:
If an American citizen who strenuously objects to the welfare of England being put above the rights and dignity and sovereignty of the United States is disloyal... then the majority of us Americans are disloyal. If it is disloyal... to oppose the policies of an American President and to seek to defeat him at the polls... then every one of us is a traitor... this particular case ceases to be an individual case of Jeremiah O'Leary and becomes the public concern of all you citizens.\textsuperscript{121}

In the final days of the Presidential campaign, Republicans and Democrats accused each other of courting the hyphen vote.\textsuperscript{122} A \textit{New York Times} editorial accused Hughes of consorting with O'Leary, the "arch-hyphenate... one of the most strident and persistent un-Americans."\textsuperscript{123} Hughes was compelled to publicly spurn the hyphen vote to counter charges that his managers had secretly met with O'Leary and Daniel Cohalan.\textsuperscript{124} O'Leary had became an emblem of disloyalty for both political parties.

On the eve of the election, the San Francisco \textit{Examiner} called for an end to hyphen-baiting and a for a more pluralistic vision of the American body politic:

\textbf{Mr. Wilson and Mr. Hughes should cease making themselves ridiculous and cease affronting the spirit of true Americanism... by reflecting upon any worthy class of citizens through the pretense of not wanting their votes.... What are the men of Irish descent and German descent that any President should not try to get their votes.... They are an essential part of our citizenship.... all of us in this country who are not Indians came from somewhere else; and all of us who are descended from ancestors of foreign origin have some sympathetic interest of the land from which our people came.}\textsuperscript{125}

Some Irish-American editors gave lukewarm endorsements to Hughes, more out of antipathy toward Wilson than
affection for his Republican challenger. The Irish World conducted a low-key campaign in opposition to Wilson's re-election. The Gaelic-American and the Leader, by contrast, leveled bitter and continuous attacks against the President. Following the Wilson/O'Leary exchange, the Gaelic-American called the President a "moral coward" and an anti-Irish bigot:

Wilson hates the Irish with the implacable hatred of Ulster Orangemen—the stock he comes of ... his abuse is studied and always veiled. ... [he has] never missed an opportunity of repeating his false accusations of disloyalty against the race that proved its loyalties on the bloody battlefields of the Civil War, fighting for the Union while ... his father was desecrating a Christian pulpit by ranting in favor of human slavery.126

The Leader condemned Wilson in even more acerbic terms. The Leader called Wilson a "sourfaced knownothing," the "most anti-Irish President America has ever had" and concluded that the Republicans could elect "a sick cat" over the incumbent President.127 Three days before the election, the Leader issued its harshest attack:

We want no sniveling preaching in Washington ... We do not want a snuffling schoolmaster, canting about the rights of the people of the world, while he neglects and condemns the rights of the people he is supposed to represent. ... We do not want a canting hypocrite who preaches neutrality, but whose every act is anti-neutral. ... We want a President who is an American, not a degenerate mental hyphenate who splashes his own filth across the faces of the American people. ... We want a big man. We want an honest man. We want any man but Wilson.128
Wilson won the election by the narrowest of margins. Irish-American voters apparently did not follow the advice of their editors en masse.\textsuperscript{129} There is little evidence of any wholesale defection of Irish voters from the Democratic party in 1916. But Wilson's accusations of disloyalty had some effect. Except for California, Wilson failed to carry a single state that had a large Irish-American population. In predominantly Irish districts, the Democratic margin was down from previous and subsequent elections.\textsuperscript{130}

The \textit{Gaelic-American} insisted that Wilson had won a "pyrrhic victory."\textsuperscript{131} But the hyphen issue, the public exchange between Jeremiah O'Leary and President Wilson, and the relentless campaign of calumny conducted by the mainstream press during the election left an enduring scar upon the public image of the Irish.\textsuperscript{132} By the end of 1916, Irish-Americans—at least those who continued to condemn Britain and insist upon strict American neutrality—were clearly branded as one of the most disloyal elements in the United States.

\textbf{War Declared}

The Irish-American press was thrown into turmoil when the United States declared war on Germany on April 6, 1917. Catholic newspapers in the East and in the Midwest scrambled to demonstrate their patriotism while the major secular papers went to torturous lengths to reconcile their conflicting sentiments.\textsuperscript{133} The \textit{Irish World} initially
condemned the vote for war as a capitulation to "Anglo-Saxon capitalism" and insisted that ordinary Americans had "every reason for wishing the English may not win."\textsuperscript{134} Within a week, however, the \textit{Irish World} proclaimed its grudging support of the war effort—even as it continued to condemn Britain: "To America and America alone is our allegiance."\textsuperscript{135}

The \textit{Gaelic-American} followed a similar path. The \textit{Gaelic-American} called the declaration of war "the first disgrace" since the birth of the republic and insisted that history would vindicate those who had opposed it.\textsuperscript{136} The \textit{Gaelic-American} soon conceded that war against Germany was the "law of the land" and that every Irish-American would support it. But the paper also cautioned:

[the] Irish in America . . . will not consent to have Irish or American blood poured out to help England to hold Ireland down.\textsuperscript{137}

The \textit{Leader} stepped up its attacks upon Britain and tried to enlist the declaration of war as justification for armed revolt in Ireland.\textsuperscript{138} The \textit{Leader} launched a bitter denunciation of President Wilson—-an action that attracted the attention of the U.S. Department of Justice. A page-one editorial in the early editions of the April 7 issue of the \textit{Leader} observed:

Mr. Wilson's action in steering us into this wicked and wanton war is the worst blow the true interests of America have received since the flag was fired on at Fort Sumter—an action then applauded by Mr. Wilson's party and by Mr. Wilson's ally England even more vigorously than they are applauding his fatal
policy today. . . . Having obtained re-election under false pretenses, Mr. Wilson renewed his efforts to embroil us with Germany. He succeeded. . . . the season marked by the betrayal of Our Lord . . . [is] consummated by the betrayal of the nation. 139

The editorial, which gone to press before the vote in Congress, also stated that the Leader would support the War once it became official. Nevertheless, U.S. District Attorney John W. Preston pressured publisher Peter Yorke to remove the offending editorial. Yorke complied and the attack on Wilson did not appear in later editions. 140 Preston's action was a prelude to the governmental campaign of censorship that would affect Irish, foreign language, and other non-mainstream newspapers in the months ahead.

For the remainder of 1917, the Leader, the Gaelic-American, and the Irish World continued to question the war effort and criticize Great Britain. The three papers argued that American blood should not be shed in support of Britain. They complained that American troops would be sacrificed at the front while English troops sheltered behind the lines in relative safety. 141

The Irish World charged that the "privileged classes," which it claimed had started the War, would conspire to provoke racial and religious divisions among American workers. 142 The Leader warned of the rising threat of anti-Catholicism, demanded taxation of war profiteers and, in a final convulsion of defiance, challenged U.S. District Attorney Preston who had suppressed the Leader's April 7
editorial and who threatened to prosecute Irish activists on the west coast:

The Irish in San Francisco are not going to be cowed by a whippersnapper nor John Bullied into suffering the continued existence in public office of the mean slanderer of their race and faith.143

The Western Watchman, which for the most part avoided controversy regarding the War, attacked Britain, "the apotheosized hypocrite of nations," and defended her American critics.144 When Teddy Roosevelt recommended that "any man who hates England more than he loves the U.S. should be thrown out of the country," the Watchman advised: "There wouldn't be enough fighting men left in the country to whip Bulgaria, not to speak of the Germans."145 The Watchman insisted that the U.S., despite its declaration of war, had "entered into no alliance with Great Britain. There has been no 'wedding of two nations.'" The Watchman argued that the Tories who ruled Ireland were descendants of those who oppressed the American colonies before the Revolution.146 Even the conservative Chicago Citizen continued to criticize British policies in Ireland and Anglo-Saxon influence in the U.S.147

But the Gaelic-American alone continued to call for Britain's defeat. The Irish question would be the "rock upon which the British empire would be split" and Ireland's exiles were gathering "in every country of the world" to hasten its dissolution.148 Editor Devoy's obsessive devotion to Britain's demise--nourished over five decades--
overwhelmed the need to develop a less incendiary and more pragmatic strategy on Ireland's behalf. Months after the U.S. declared war, the recalcitrant old Fenian continued to express the full fury to his hatred of America's formal ally:

Hypocrisy, unctuous and unblushing, has always been the outstanding characteristic of the English. Wherever they have gone . . . massacre, assassination and every conceivable form of torture have accompanied them, and while they have exercised all these to the utmost cruelty, they . . . trumpeted to the world that they were solely interested in the advancement of Christianity . . . [and] the blessings and benefits of civilization to unhappy natives. Cromwell drenched Ireland with blood, massacred its men, disemboweled its women . . . for the glory of God and the cause of humanity. . . . Every Englishman since Cromwell's time . . . has carried out a similar policy in every land where the English have gone. Hindus were blown from the cannon's mouth . . . Boers were starved . . . Egyptians butchered . . . in the interests of English civilization. . . . England is not fighting unarmed men now. . . . it will be but justice, and justice too long delayed, if she has inflicted upon her a part of what . . . she inflicted upon so many.149

The Loyalty Issue

As war fever swept the nation, Irish newspapers stepped up their declarations of loyalty and "true Americanism." Press accounts regaled the past contributions of Irish soldiers in the American Revolutionary and Civil Wars and claimed that 30 percent of the present U.S. fighting force was of Irish descent.150 Irish newspapers urged their readers to support the war effort and to
purchase Liberty Bonds. The Leader became active in the Catholic War Drive in San Francisco.

Irish newspapers scrambled to demonstrate the patriotism of their readers. The Leader became chauvinistic in its support of the War. The Chicago Citizen boasted that the Stars and Stripes were a "prouder ensign for Irish-Americans . . . than even the 'Wearing of the Green.'"\textsuperscript{151} The Citizen insisted that Irish-Americans--"Sinn Feiner and non-Sinn Feiner"--stood united in their support of the President.\textsuperscript{152} In St. Louis, the Western Watchman suggested that immigrants and their offspring were more willing to join the armed forces than even the children of native-born Americans.\textsuperscript{153}

The effusive outpouring of patriotic sentiment was designed to shield the Irish from accusations of disloyalty. Sectors of the Irish-American press struggled to distance themselves from the more unrepentant elements of the nationalist movement and yet somehow maintain an anti-British posture. The Western Watchman observed:

Some Irishmen in America are under accusation of too close an affiliation with Germany. Perhaps the charges have a basis in fact, but that does not justify the fear that there is any doubt about loyalty to that vast body of Americans who are of Irish lineage. . . . they are not pro-German, but by the same token they are not pro-British; and they are unwilling to see our proud flag entwined more closely than is necessary with the English banner.\textsuperscript{154}

The cleavage between the Chicago Citizen and the Sinn Fein wing of the nationalist movement grew wider when
America entered the War. The moderate Irish Party, which the Citizen continued to support, advocated active Irish support of Great Britain in order to win a hearing for Ireland at the post-war peace conference. The Citizen also feared that the strident campaign on behalf of Ireland's independence threatened the tenuous status of the Irish in America. The Citizen warned that the actions of "certain professional 'Irish' patriots" could bring disrepute upon American citizens of Irish birth and ancestry.\textsuperscript{155} The Citizen charged that the anti-British sentiments of a visiting F.O.I.F. (Friends of Irish Freedom) speaker bordered on treason:

> He has no right to come here to Chicago or any other center of population to dictate to Irish-American citizens what their duty is in this crucial situation.\textsuperscript{156}

The Citizen offered an analysis strikingly similar to that which would be used to silence Irish-American publications in the months ahead:

> Sowing distrust of an ally of the United States must . . . create discontent, prove embarrassing to the government, give comfort to the enemy and . . . prolong the war.\textsuperscript{157}

At the opposite extreme, the Gaelic-American continued to insist that its advocacy of an independent Ireland was consonant with American values. The Gaelic-American presented a defiantly anti-British brand of patriotism that chastised its critics in the "Anglo-maniac" press:

> The Gaelic-American is more truly loyal to the United States than Pulitzer, Reid, Rathom or any
other of the journalistic prostitutes who are working for England and flinging charges of "treason" or "disloyalty" against every man who stands for the independence of Ireland and insists that President Wilson should make good his solemn words.158

The Gaelic-American escaped proscription—for the moment.

Conclusions

The U.S. declaration of war shattered the possibility of securing Ireland's liberation through England's defeat at the hands of Germany. Irish hopes now lay with President Wilson and the prospect of including Irish independence an American war goal.

But the Irish-American press found itself in an increasingly hostile environment where the acceptable parameters of public discourse grew ever more constricted. The Irish-American press had lost the propaganda war and come out on the wrong side of the neutrality debate. Great Britain, intractable enemy of the American-Irish, was now America's ally.

The Irish loudly proclaimed their loyalty. But the anti-hyphen campaign, the 1916 Presidential election and their previous advocacy of Germany had tarred the Irish with the taint of disloyalty. The cumulative effects of British propaganda and unrelenting attacks in the mainstream press also exacted a toll.

By the end of 1917, it had become increasingly risky to question the conduct or goals of the War, criticize Great
Britain, or give vocal support to the campaign for Irish independence. The Leader had been forced to kill an editorial which criticized President Wilson. Vigilantes in New York—urged on by the New York Times—had begun to disrupt Irish street rallies. More serious proscriptions lay ahead.
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CHAPTER VI

THE TREASONOUS IRISH: VIGILANTES, CONSPIRACIES
AND THE MAINSTREAM PRESS

Introduction

Following America's entry into the War, the character of public discourse concerning anti-British agitation shifted from criticism to confrontation and finally, to coercion. The anti-hyphen campaign of 1915 and the presidential election of 1916 had branded the Irish as one of the most potentially disloyal elements in the nation. Demands for conformity to a crabbed conception of American patriotism escalated. So too did public suspicion of those Irish-Americans who refused to abandon their advocacy of Ireland's independence. The mainstream press fed upon and inflamed a national mood of suspicion by giving credence to rumors of pro-German plots and by equating anti-British exhortations with treason to the United States.

In the latter months of 1917—and well into 1918—the mainstream press gave prominent coverage to a series of alleged conspiracies involving Irish-Americans. Even the Hearst papers—normally wary of British intrigue—gave uncritical coverage to the wildest of reports emanating from London. The New York Times cheered on a vigilante campaign which drove Irish soap-box orators from the streets of
Manhattan. In the New York mayoral race, mainstream papers made the names of certain Irish editors and nationalist leaders synonymous with sedition.

The mainstream press endorsed vigilantism, disseminated British propaganda, and typecast Irish-Americans as purveyors of treason despite the absence of convincing evidence. Powerful daily newspapers thus contributed to a national climate of coercion that set the stage for and legitimized the suppression of the Irish-American press.

Vigilantism and Spy Hysteria

In early 1917, as the United States moved inexorably towards war with Germany, scores of local and regional vigilante organizations stirred into action from Honolulu to Hartford. Often sanctioned though seldom supervised by government agencies, groups like the Guardians of Liberty, the Anti-Yellow Dog League, the Knights of Liberty, the Boy Spies of America, the Sedition Slammers and the American Protective League, to name but a few, scoured the nation for signs of sedition and sabotage.¹ Draft dodgers and supposed spies were the initial targets, but socialists, labor radicals and the foreign-born were soon swept into the web of the self-proclaimed protectors of the American way.²

The American Protective League (APL) quickly rose above the pack to become the largest corps of sleuths in the nation's history--a kind of citizen's auxiliary to the Department of Justice. The APL soon established units in
cities with large foreign-born populations. By the time Congress declared war in April, the APL had 100 branches. Within a month, nearly 1,000,000 citizens had applied for membership in the APL. By November 1917, the APL had 1200 branches with upwards of 260,000 undercover agents in cities, towns and hamlets across America.\(^3\)

Vigilante groups such as the APL reserved a special rancor for the foreign-born. The chief APL inspector in Minnesota, for example, urged that foreigners be kept from "colonizing" large cities. He proposed a kind of ethnic cleansing, suggesting that municipalities emulate villages that had banished foreigners and remained "American."\(^4\)

The Justice Department made several half-hearted attempts to restrict the APL to purely war-related activities.\(^5\) But internal dissension at the federal level and public support for "excesses in the name of patriotism" overwhelmed efforts at restraint.\(^6\) John Lord O'Brien, who headed the Justice Department's War Emergency Division, spoke of

... immense pressure brought to bear throughout the war upon the Department of Justice in all parts of the country for indiscriminate prosecution demanded in behalf of a policy of wholesale repression and restraint of public opinion.\(^7\)

The Justice Department was forced to compete with state defense councils, other federal departments and a myriad of vigilante organizations.\(^8\) In the public consciousness, spies and saboteurs were abroad in the land and the foreign-
born were prime suspects. War fever had resurrected and unleashed a virulent form of nativism. O'Brian recalled:

No other one cause contributed so much to the oppression of innocent men as the systematic and indiscriminate agitation against what was claimed to be an all pervasive system of German espionage.\(^9\)

The vigilante groups which monitored Irish-American activities often wielded considerable influence. In 1917, the American Defense Society (A.D.S.)--an organization founded by Teddy Roosevelt--disrupted street meetings in Boston and New York City organized by Irish-Americans in support of the anti-colonial struggle in Ireland. ADS agitation forced the New York City Board of Magistrates to outlaw such public meetings for the duration of the war.\(^10\)

Vigilante activity against the Irish was not limited to the East Coast. In June 1917, vigilantes and police attacked an Irish anti-war parade in Butte, Montana.\(^11\)

**Vigilantism and the Mainstream Press**

The mainstream daily press did little to temper the rising public paranoia. Instead of serving as voices of reason and restraint, newspapers across the nation encouraged vigilantism and spy hysteria. The *Providence Journal* specialized in stories about spies and conspiracies. These reports gained wide currency and were often reprinted in the *New York Times* despite the fact that most were "pure and unadulterated fabrications," as Attorney General Thomas Gregory later recalled.\(^12\) The *New York Times Index* for 1917
and 1918 contains page after page of reports devoted to sedition, spies and conspiracies. Yet not a single spy was convicted in the U.S. after mid-1917.\(^{13}\)

Press coverage of the lynching of Frank Little in August 1917, was emblematic of the press' willingness to excuse if not sanction mob violence. Little, an anti-war agitator and organizer for the Industrial Workers of the World, was castrated and hanged from a railroad trestle outside Butte, Montana, by local vigilantes. A Literary Digest survey of newspaper accounts reported widespread editorial support for the lynching as a means of combating disloyalty.\(^{14}\) The Boston Transcript observed:

\[
\ldots \text{millions of people who, while sternly reprehending such proceedings as the lynching of members of that antipatriotic society, will nevertheless be glad, in their hearts, that Montana did it in the case of Little.}^{15}\]
\]

The Chicago Tribune stated: "The howls of Industrial Workers of the World over the lynching of Little will find no echo in any reasonable heart."\(^{16}\) Literary Digest noted that although many newspapers condemned the hanging, others were willing to forgive the lynchers' "excess patriotism." Some papers in effect blamed the victim for the crime by attributing the lynching to the government's unwillingness to suppress dissent.\(^{17}\)

The press continued to rail against sedition throughout the remainder of 1917. Teddy Roosevelt's "unhung traitors" were widely denounced in press accounts. Editors condemned
the "quasi-sedition" of certain German-American and Irish-American newspapers.

Rumor and innuendo fed the vigilante fever. Important public figures sanctioned it with their moral authority. Former Secretary of State Elihu Root, upon his return from a trip to Russia, was widely quoted as saying that there were men walking the streets of America "... who ought to be taken out at sunrise and shot for treason."18 In a speech before 8,000 in San Francisco, former ambassador to Britain, James W. Gerard, made this observation regarding the loyalty of Wisconsin Senator Robert LaFollette, one of six U.S. senators who voted against the War:

I do not agree with what my friend Teddy Roosevelt says about [LaFollette] ... that if he lived in Germany he would be sent to digging a trench. My friend Teddy is wrong. If this gentleman lived in Germany he would not be digging a trench. He would be filling one.19

One rumor proved so tenacious that the White House was forced to issue a statement denying reports that Joseph Tumulty, President Wilson's personal secretary and an Irish-American, had been arrested and sent to Fort Leavenworth for being a German spy.20

The New York Times, commenting just after the new year on the lack of executions, called for stronger laws to allow summary execution of "unpunished spies."21 A few weeks later the Times observed that "a few prompt hangings" would
"silence all individuals and organizations that raise their voices against the war."\textsuperscript{22}

The anti-sedition hysteria intensified in the spring of 1918. A San Francisco judge urged vigilantism to stifle seditious talk.\textsuperscript{23} Complaints of disloyalty flooded into state councils of defense. Mobs of vigilantes prowled the countryside burning books, forcing the foreign-born to kiss the flag, and splashing yellow paint—the mark of the coward—upon the homes of those suspected of "disloyalty."\textsuperscript{24} Scores of men and women were tarred and feathered in Colorado, Michigan, Oklahoma and Missouri.\textsuperscript{25}

The press fueled the flames of intolerance and violence. At the end of February the \textit{Literary Digest} reported:

> The extremely low mortality among German spies in America is considered very encouraging, by our observant editors, to their continued activity. No other country in the world, it is maintained, is so healthful and salubrious for persons of an occupation which in some lands is thought a bit hazardous or risky.\textsuperscript{26}

The \textit{Digest's} weekly survey of opinion noted that editors continued to call for executions. The \textit{Syracuse Herald} suggested that various stone and brick walls stood idle and available for use in the early morning hours, presumably for firing squads. The New York \textit{Evening Post} observed:

> A dead spy or two might act as a deterrent. An interned or incarcerated spy is a joke, and more than one is a national calamity.\textsuperscript{27}
The call for retribution was soon answered. Within days, a mob lynched a German-American coal miner in Collinsville, Illinois. Frederick Praeger, a socialist accused of treason for refusing to purchase a Liberty Bond, was dragged from his jail cell, forced to kiss the American flag, and strung up in an incident that garnered national attention. While most newspapers condemned the lynching, they united—as they did following Little's murder—in blaming Congress for failing to pass stronger laws against disloyalty.

There were no similar demands for stronger laws to punish those responsible for mob violence. The press, in fact, became a willing ally to factions within the executive branch of the federal government who used Praeger's murder to implement stronger anti-disloyalty legislation. A Literary Digest survey revealed that editors attributed mob violence to a lack of sufficient laws and weak courts, forcing citizens to take the law into their own hands. Two days after the lynching, the New York World quoted Postmaster General Burleson:

If Congress will not pass the necessary laws, then the American people will take matters into their own hands. I am not at all surprised at the fate which befell Praeger.

It would be wrong to conclude that all mainstream newspapers fanned the hysteria with equal vigor. Following the Praeger murder, for example, the New York World attempted to refute some of the wildest rumors of sedition
and sabotage. The San Francisco Examiner, for its part, gave prominent coverage to efforts to curtail the activities of a local vigilante group, the Knights of Liberty. What is certain, however, is that much of the mainstream press contributed to a national mood of suspicion that also reverberated through press coverage of Irish-American support for the independence struggle in Ireland.

The Irish and the Mainstream Press

Prior to America's entry into the war, most Irish-Americans favored Germany over Great Britain or remained neutral. Once America declared war, however, the overwhelming majority of Irish-Americans and Irish-American editors endorsed the war effort. That many if not most Irish-Americans continued to support Irish independence even as they proclaimed their loyalty to the United States was a fact not easily digested by the mainstream press.

President Wilson's rhetorical flights about liberty and self-determination as U.S. war objectives emboldened Irish-American lobbyists to demand a place for Ireland on the agenda. Petition drives and rallies, which had begun before America's entry into the War, gathered momentum throughout 1917 and 1918.

The New York Times was contemptuous of all talk of Irish independence. It labelled those who advocated the same--whether in Ireland or America--as Sinn Feiners and repeatedly dismissed the 1916 Easter Rebellion as "Sinn Fein
riots."\(^{37}\) For the *Times*, Ireland would always remain an inseparable part of the British Empire. To suggest otherwise was tantamount to treason:

> It is preposterous for Sinn Feiners to talk about a separate and wholly independent government. . . . only the wildest radicals think they want absolute independence.\(^{38}\)

A glance at the map is enough to show that Great Britain can never consent, unless she becomes impotent and ruined, to an independent Ireland.\(^{39}\)

Although less vociferous, the Chicago *Tribune* echoed those sentiments. The *Tribune* supported limited self-government for Ireland but dismissed independence as a "wild and visionary scheme" that was "no less reactionary" than the "designs of British Tories."\(^{40}\)

> There is no desire in America that England should in any way lay herself open to treachery at the hands of misguided and fanatical impossibilists in Ireland. . . . There is very little patience here, and this emphatically includes responsible Irish-Americans, for Sinn Fein extremists. . . .\(^{41}\)

Alone among the nation's mainstream dailies, the Hearst papers were early and stalwart advocates of Irish independence. When the United States entered the War, Hearst suggested that Irish freedom should be one of America's war aims—a position which mirrored that of the Irish-American press.\(^{42}\)

The *New York Times* often included reports of Irish-American rallies and conventions in stories about the arrest of alien enemies and German spies.\(^{43}\) Editorial commentary regularly spilled over into news reports about Irish
meetings. A May 1918 news report characterized a meeting of the I.P.L. as a

... strange kind of gathering held at a time when Fifth Avenue was full of marching soldiers and when the whole city was celebrating the success of the Liberty Loan drive.44

The same report suggested that one of the speeches delivered at the I.P.L. gathering was "... very near crossing the line that divides sedition from loyalty."45

The Times attacked members of Congress who supported Irish independence. In January 1918, for example, Congresswoman Jeanette Rankin of Montana, who had voted against war, introduced a resolution endorsing Irish independence. The resolution requested that Ireland be included among those nations "for whose freedom we are fighting." In response, The Times called Rankin, the lone woman in Congress, "a pitiless [sic] example of emancipation:

Miss Rankin is ready to play the game of our enemies, foreign and domestic ... to insult our loyal democratic comrades in the war, to act in harmony with German propagandists, the Sinn Feiners ... Here and in Ireland, Sinn Fein is our foe ... [Sinn Fein is] a contemptible organ of sedition.46

The New York World was more evenhanded in its coverage of Irish-American activities. The World more often refrained from editorializing in its news reports about Irish-American activities. While the World questioned the loyalty of "a small number of persons who seek to make trouble for an ally of the U.S.," it also acknowledged
American sympathy for Ireland and noted Prime Minister Lloyd George's desire to produce good will among the American public by settling the Irish question. 47

The World blamed the ongoing crisis in Ireland on Britain's unwillingness to grant Home Rule. 48 To the New York Times, however, the failure of Home Rule was a direct consequence of the inability of the Irish to get along with each other. 49 The Times was so protective of British public opinion and so convinced of the pro-British sympathies of the American public that it once chastised the Washington correspondent of the London Times for reporting that many Americans would be upset if Britain failed to apply Wilson's principles of self-determination to Ireland. The New York Times complained that such reports painted a false picture of American public opinion. "Were the censors asleep?" the paper asked. 50

The New York Anti-Street Speech Campaign

By summer of 1917, New York City had become the center of an Friends of Irish Freedom (F.O.I.F.) campaign to keep the Irish issue before the public. The F.O.I.F. led a series of mass gatherings and street rallies at which protestations of devotion to the U.S. were matched in fervor only by exclamations of antipathy toward Great Britain. At a Terrace Garden meeting, John Moore, secretary of F.O.I.F., proclaimed, "We love America as much as we hate England, and it is impossible to love America more than that." 51 The New
York Times interpreted such sentiments as evidence of disloyalty to the U.S. The Times condemned F.O.I.F. members as pro-German polemists

... whose not unprofitable profession is to keep alive the ancient grievances of Ireland and to manufacture new ones.\(^{52}\)

Agitation peaked in August as F.O.I.F. sympathizers gathered almost nightly along Broadway to lambaste Britain and demand a hearing for Irish national aspirations. The street rallies soon captured the attention of the American Defense Society (A.D.S.). The New York Times turned its attention to the street rallies when a prominent A.D.S. member, writer Cleveland Moffett, was arrested (and later released) for heckling an F.O.I.F. speaker who compared Sir Roger Casement, the executed Irish leader, with George Washington and Benjamin Franklin.\(^{53}\)

The incident quickly evolved into a confrontation between supporters of free speech and those who argued that criticism of Britain should be silenced. The ADS demanded that street rallies in New York and other cities be outlawed.\(^{54}\) In a letter to the New York Times, Teddy Roosevelt suggested that anyone who attacked an ally of the U.S. was a traitor. He also advocated government suppression of newspapers that criticized Britain.\(^{55}\)

For nearly two weeks, the New York Times gave prominent coverage to the controversy. The Times charged that German money financed the rallies and that the anti-British
rhetoric of the F.O.I.F. amounted to treason. The *Times* argued that public speech was not free but was subject to standards and limits imposed by the will of the majority:

... people of America are free to say what they please, but it is only on condition that they do not please to say what too seriously offends the ears of their neighbors.\(^{57}\)

The paper urged that stern measures be taken against Irish street orators: "If Great Britain cannot or will not repress her traitors, we shall repress ours."\(^{58}\) The New York *American*, by contrast, argued that free discussion was the cornerstone of the American democratic traditions:

The very essence of Americanism is the free right to differ in opinion, to speak freely. ... full recognition of every citizen's sovereign right to a share in public discussion ... is the fundamental basis of all our liberties. ...\(^{59}\)

The New York *World* joined in condemning the street demonstrations. The *World* also leveled unsubstantiated charges of German involvement and accused both the F.O.I.F. and unnamed Irish-American newspapers of treason:

These organizations and newspapers are frankly disloyal to the United States. They preach sedition. They oppose the war policies of the Government. ... They are morally, if not legally, guilty of treason. We have no doubt that much of this propaganda has been bought in the open market with German money.

The *World*, however, did not suggest suppression as a solution. Instead, it advocated counter-demonstrations:

"It is as easy for patriots as for traitors to organize public meetings."\(^{60}\)
Hearst's New York *American* initially ignored the controversy surrounding soap-box orators. While the *Times* and the *World* were busy condemning Irish street speakers as traitors, the *American* was championing the New York 69th Regiment—the "Fighting Irish"—as symbols of patriotism.⁶¹

Demands for an end to street rallies soon had an effect. The Board of City Magistrates issued a directive curtailing public demonstrations and Mayor Mitchell ordered the police to act.⁶² On August 29, a force of 100 policemen supported by members of the A.D.S. broke up a crowd of 10,000 F.O.I.F. supporters in what the *New York Times* described as "... one of the wildest scenes that Broadway ever witnessed."⁶³

The F.O.I.F. tried to rally its forces on Broadway the following week. But no sooner had the Star Spangled Banner been played and the Declaration of Independence read than the police moved in and scattered the crowd of 4000.⁶⁴

That incident marked the end of F.O.I.F. street rallies. But it did not mark the end of campaign against street corner free speech. A New York judge advised the Grand Jury to indict those Irish speakers who spoke "contemptuously" of the President and Congress. The New York *American* labeled the judge's action "utterly abominable."⁶⁵

The *New York Times* complained that Irish political power in New York was weakening the enforcement of anti-soap
box provisions. The Times called upon the governor to "...crush the heads of the serpents of sedition before they have become too numerous." The A.D.S., for its part, announced a national campaign against soap-box orators and demanded even stronger laws in New York to require licensing and prior review in advance of any public speech—the A.D.S. complained that the New York policy punished public speakers only after the fact.

Irish Conspiracies

Reports of alleged German-Irish plots appeared regularly in the mainstream press throughout 1917 and 1918. These reports were often heavy with innuendo and thin on evidence.

In September, 1917, the so-called Bernstorff and von Igel revelations charged, among other things, that certain Irish-American leaders, including John Devoy, editor of the Gaelic-American, Jeremiah O'Leary, publisher of Bull, and Daniel Cohalan, New York Supreme Court justice and part owner of the Gaelic-American, sought German assistance in support of the 1916 Easter Rising. The revelations received page-one coverage in newspapers across the nation.

Few newspapers commented on the fact that the von Igel revelations dealt with events that took place well before America's entry into the War. And most were prepared to believe the worst. The San Francisco Chronicle concluded that Cohalan was a "pro-Kaiser conspirator." The New York
Times noted that Viereck's Weekly, a prominent German-American newspaper, had supported Cohalan as a candidate for the U.S. Senate. The Literary Digest ran a summary of reports concerning the revelations under the headline "America Infested With German Spies." The Boston Transcript commented:

The time has come for the Irish societies to say under which flag they stand—whether with the country of their people's refuge... or whether with the Cohalans, Devoys, and O'Learys... the plotters against America's integrity and welfare.

Despite the absence of corroborating evidence, several New York newspapers called for Cohalan's removal from office. The New York Times observed:

The thing needs no proof... It makes no difference that some of the men who are engaged in this movement may be merely foolish or deluded and not in receipt of money from Wilhelmstrasse. There are others who are, and these dupes are merely their tools.

The alleged conspirators denied the charges. Justice Cohalan denied knowing von Igel and claimed he was the victim of a plot to sabotage the Irish cause. O'Leary also denied knowledge of or involvement in any sabotage plans. Devoy called the accusations a "mixture of invention, suggestion and falsehood."

The release of the documents was timed to ensure maximum impact. The Justice Department had possession of the von Igel documents some 16 months before their release. The revelations—which dealt exclusively with events prior to America's entry into the War—were designed to discredit
the most vocal Irish-American critics of Great Britain at a
time of increasing agitation in support of Irish
independence.\textsuperscript{78}

There is no doubt that certain Irish leaders had
contacts with representatives of the German government prior
to the U.S. declaration of war. Cohalan and Devoy were
clearly implicated in the von Igel papers. There is also
little evidence that any U.S. laws were violated. The mere
suggestion of German-Irish intrigue, however, was enough to
tarnish Irish activists and editors with the taint of
treason. The Chicago \textit{Citizen} felt compelled to parade its
loyalty, insisting that not even the activities of "a few
politicians of our own race can injure it."\textsuperscript{79}

The von Igel revelations had another effect.
Postmaster General Albert S. Burleson soon announced that
the Post Office would take action against "treasonable"
newspapers that questioned the truth of the revelations or
"circulated matter for the purpose of arousing prejudice
against ... the nations now cooperating with us."\textsuperscript{80}

The \textit{New York Times} gave prominent coverage to alleged
Irish-American plots throughout the remainder of 1917.
Based in part upon allegations made by Lloyd George in
Britain, the \textit{Times} claimed in October that plans for another
German-inspired uprising--a second "Dublin riot"--had been
uncovered in the U.S. and that the Secret Service was about
to swoop down upon Sinn Fein conspirators.\textsuperscript{81} Reports
claimed that Secret Service documents—none of which were produced—contained proof of Sinn Fein collusion with Germany. The *New York Times* reported that Devoy and the Gaelic-American were under federal investigation.\textsuperscript{82} Devoy denied the existence of a plot, but the *Times* concluded that the unsubstantiated reports provided sufficient proof of treason:

As friends of Germany and enemies of England, Sinn Fein in Ireland and its abettors in the United States are necessarily enemies of the United States. They are doing all in their power to beat the United States whose cause cannot be separated from any of her associates in the war. . . . Sinn Fein is seeking and helping to make war on the United States. . . . [the] gravity of the crime calls for severe punishment.\textsuperscript{83}

The *New York World*, the *New York American*, the Chicago Tribune and the San Francisco Chronicle also devoted substantial coverage to the October plot and to the rumors of impending arrests.\textsuperscript{84} These papers, however, did not draw the same editorial conclusions as the *New York Times*.

Two Irish nationalists, Dr. Daniel McCartan and Liam Mellowes, were arrested in the U.S. during the height of the October revelations while enroute to Ireland. Press reports insinuated that the two were involved in German conspiracies. The charges proved groundless, however, and the two were soon released. The importance of the episode, according to Alden Jamison, lay in the fact that

. . . for several days the mainstream press carried stories of the arrests which, with no basis in fact whatsoever, linked Sinn Fein to German conspiracy. The American public was not so well informed about
the thinness of the evidence upon which the arrests were made. 85

In May 1918, another alleged conspiracy captured national attention when the British arrested 500 leaders of Sinn Fein in a sudden sweep across Ireland. The 500 were held without formal charges. But reports emanating from the British Press Bureau and reprinted in the New York Times, the Tribune, the Chronicle, the Examiner, the American and the called attention to yet another German plot.

The story, which came at the height of the conscription crisis in Ireland, received page one-coverage in each of the papers for several days. 86 It also came in the midst of a two-day F.O.I.F. convention in at the Central Opera House in New York City and quickly eclipsed F.O.I.F. efforts to petition Congress and the President on behalf of Ireland. 87

Reports charged that Sinn Fein members in the United States and Ireland had conspired with German agents to foment another rebellion. In exchange for German aid, the rebels would provide Germany with a submarine base in Ireland. Arrests of Irish leaders in the United States were reported to be imminent. 88 These reports coincided with allegations emanating from Washington, D.C., that Sinn Feiners and German agents had also attempted to stir up Finns, Negroes and Lithuanians in the U.S. but had succeeded only with Irish-Americans. The Chicago Tribune spoke of "conclusive evidence" and stated that conspirators in Chicago, Boston and New York would soon be arrested and
tried for treason. British authorities claimed to have irrefutable evidence to support their allegations and suggested that the details of the May conspiracy had been provided by the American Secret Service.

No evidence was ever released, however, and the May conspiracy appears to have been a creation of British imagination. This tactic was a regular part of British propaganda efforts in the United States. Alluding to past British activities, Colonel Edward House offered the following advice to President Wilson concerning the May plot:

... the British government wish this government to pretend that we have found some of the treasonable matter concerning Ireland. If I were you I would caution [Secretary of State] Lansing about this, the British have made several attempts in this direction before, as you will remember.

Ever sensitive to American public opinion, the British hoped to discredit Irish nationalism by making it appear that a German-Irish conspiracy had been uncovered by the American government. The U.S. State Department, however, decided not to take part in the subterfuge.

The British effort to cast suspicion upon Irish nationalism proved successful. Even the Hearst papers—normally suspicious of British subterfuge—were seduced into giving credence to the conspiracy tale. In its survey of press reports about the story, the Literary Digest concluded:

American sympathy for Ireland received a shock ... [when it learned of the] ... treasonable
conspiracy with German agents against Great Britain, on evidence unearthed by our government agents here.\textsuperscript{92}

The U.S. government publicly neither confirmed nor denied the British version of events. The \textit{New York Times} characterized the attitude in Washington as one of "profound reticence." The Chicago \textit{Tribune} reasoned that London withheld its evidence because of security considerations.\textsuperscript{93}

Despite the absence of evidence, many newspapers gave credence to the reports. The \textit{Tribune} concluded that Sinn Fein was guilty of treason toward America and Great Britain even if the allegations of German conspiracy proved untrue: "Sinn Fein \textit{[is]} \ldots \text{striking a blow not only at Great Britain but at our American soldiers on the firing line.}\textsuperscript{94}

The \textit{New York World} observed:

\begin{quote}
Although the proofs of Sinn Fein plotting with Germany are less definite and immediate than preliminary reports had foreshadowed, they have placed the criminality of Sinn Feinism beyond doubt.\textsuperscript{95}
\end{quote}

The San Francisco \textit{Chronicle}, while it castigated Sinn Fein, refrained from condemning all advocates of Irish independence:

\begin{quote}
Ireland may have her domestic grievances against England, but Ireland has no grievance against America or any other of the allies fighting against Kaiserism.\textsuperscript{96}
\end{quote}

The cumulative weight of rumors and unsubstantiated reports of conspiracies raised questions about the patriotism of those Irish-American editors who continued to advocate Irish independence or criticize Great Britain.
The 1917 New York Mayoral Election

Loyalty was the primary issue in 1917 New York City mayoral election. The four-man race pitted Tammany Democratic candidate Judge John Hylan, Republican William M. Bennett, and Socialist Morris Hillquit against incumbent Mayor John Purroy Mitchell. William Randolph Hearst had considered running for mayor but instead supported Hylan. Jeremiah O'Leary flirted with the idea of entering the race on a "free speech" platform.

Both the New York Times and the World were adamant in their support of Mitchell—who ran on a platform of "straight Americanism"—and in their condemnation of the challengers. Hearst's American backed Hylan, and Hearst's endorsement of Hylan became an issue. The names of certain Irish-American leaders also figured prominently in the campaign.

Mitchell himself often raised the names of O'Leary and Cohalan to demonstrate that Hylan had the support of "every seditious, every traitorous, every disloyal element to be found in this city." In announcing his candidacy, Mitchell stated:

I will . . . fight against Hearst, Hylan and the Hollenzollerns; against Murphy, Cohalan, O'Leary and all the Tammany crowd . . . and against the seditionists.

On the eve of the election, Mitchell accused Hylan of being "publicly allied with men whose loyalty has been
officially denounced by the U.S. government—Cohalan, Devoy and O'Leary."\(^{101}\)

The *New York Times* praised Mitchell for his "flaming Americanism" and warned the election would constitute a

... direct public weighing of the forces of loyalty and the forces of disloyalty, of Americanism and Germanism, in this town. ... Is New York American or German?\(^{102}\)

The *Times* concluded that "Irish Revolutionists ... the forces of disloyalty" had divided their support between the two "Hohenzollern" candidates—O'Leary and Cohalan for Hylan; the Irish Progressive League for Hillquit.\(^{103}\) The attacks upon Hylan became so strident that O'Leary's brother-in-law, Grover Whelan, who later became Hylan's secretary, was forced to publicly disavow any connection—beyond marriage—to O'Leary.\(^{104}\)

The *World* also attempted to link Hylan to O'Leary. The election of Hylan, according to the *World*, would lead to chaos. The *World* condemned Hylan as "an unscrupulous blatherskite and demagogue" who was "inflaming class hatred and capitalizing on the ignorance of the great alien populations of New York City." Hylan, the *World* predicted, would lead the ignorant masses in a "heedless rule of idleness, ignorance, violence and confiscation."\(^{105}\) The Hearst's were the only mainstream papers which supported Hylan. The *American* openly courted the immigrant vote, dismissing Mitchell as "the little brother to the rich, the
ally of greedy corporations and the benefactor of syndicates speculating in city property."\textsuperscript{106}

The New York mayoral race attracted the attention of Irish newspapers far outside of New York. In St. Louis, the \textit{Western Watchman} derided Mitchells's divisive campaign theme and warned that the great daily newspapers of New York--with the exception of the Hearst papers--were "active partners" in a "giant confidence game."\textsuperscript{107}

The New York mayoral race was the only major wartime election in which President Wilson declined to take sides. Mitchell, who had been elected in 1913 on a Fusion (or reform) platform with strong administration support, had alienated Wilson by endorsing Hughes in the 1916 Presidential election. Wilson may also have been warned off by a Tammany threat to oppose the war program should Wilson interfere.\textsuperscript{108}

New Yorkers--nearly half of whom were foreign-born--paid little heed to the apocalyptic warnings of the \textit{New York Times} and the \textit{New York World}. Hylan won the election by a plurality. Hearst celebrated Mitchell's defeat as a personal triumph over the forces of repression:

\begin{quote}
No longer can every little aspirant for office wrap himself in the American flag and denounce as traitors all who do not believe him fit... The crushing defeat of Mr. Mitchell at the polls yesterday was the fourth rebuke administered by the American people to the shameless attempts to prostitute patriotism to selfish ends... [the people] have fully vindicated their patriotism.\textsuperscript{109}
\end{quote}
Despite the outcome, the New York mayoral election left a mark upon the reputation of the Irish. What was significant about the 1917 New York mayoral election was the readiness of the Times and the World to raise the names of Devoy, Cohalan and O'Leary as ultimate examples of disloyalty in a campaign in which loyalty was by far the dominant issue.  

Conscription

In April 1918, Prime Minister David Lloyd George decided to impose conscription upon Ireland. Massive losses in the battle of Picardy had left the British army short of manpower and Lloyd George felt compelled to act despite the certainty that his decision would provoke fierce resistance in Ireland. Lloyd George was also concerned that forced conscription could alienate American public opinion.

These concerns were discussed in the British press. Many British papers suggested that the policy would require more manpower to enforce than it would produce. The London Daily Chronicle, for example, labelled the move a "blunder and a catastrophe." The Irish-American press reacted to the news with outrage, fearing that forced conscription would dangerously deplete the population of Ireland. Irish editors also questioned the justice of forcing Irishmen to fight in France while British soldiers remained garrisoned in Ireland. On May 4, 15,000 New York
Irish gathered at Madison Square Garden to denounce conscription.\textsuperscript{114}

The conscription question garnered much attention in the \textit{New York Times}, the \textit{World}, the \textit{American}, the \textit{Tribune} the \textit{Chronicle} and the \textit{ Examiner}. The \textit{Tribune}, the \textit{Chronicle}, the \textit{American} and the \textit{ Examiner} gave prominent coverage to criticism in Ireland and England of the conscription plan.\textsuperscript{115} Of these latter papers, only the \textit{Tribune} took an editorial position on the issue.\textsuperscript{116}

In the two New York papers, however, the conscription provoked more editorial comment than any other Irish issue in 1918. Both the \textit{Times} and the \textit{World} supported conscription, but although the \textit{World} expressed certain reservations, the \textit{Times} was adamant in its advocacy.

The \textit{World} acknowledged opposition to conscription in Ireland and Britain. The \textit{World} accused Britain of having "broken faith with Ireland" and suggested that Home Rule would have to be implemented if conscription were to succeed.\textsuperscript{117} The \textit{World}, which had a large Irish-American readership, also began to carry news accounts regaling the European exploits of the predominantly Irish-American 69th Regiment of the U.S. Army. But in the end, the \textit{World} came down firmly in favor of conscription:

\begin{quote}
\textit{[there is] . . . full recognition here of every oppression and every blunder of the British government for generations past. . . . but only one view prevails as to the present situation. Neither Home Rule nor party and race prejudice nor personal}\end{quote}
animosity can be pleaded in justification of resistance to war.\textsuperscript{118}

The \textit{New York Times} reasoned that conscription was necessary for the "preservation of Irish liberty" and labeled anti-conscription demonstrations in the U.S. as "pro-German and anti-American."\textsuperscript{119} The \textit{Times} denied that Ireland had any legitimate grievances against Britain and concluded that the failure of Home Rule was the fault of the Irish themselves.\textsuperscript{120} The Irish, the \textit{Times} concluded, were ungrateful recipients of British beneficence:

Ireland runs over with prosperity. Her farmers fattened by British legislation, have been rushing about in automobiles to Sinn Fein meetings. . . . Irishmen eat of the fat and drink of the sweet while England lives narrowly and is partly rationed. . . . The world has heard somewhat too much about 'the wrongs of Ireland.' . . . For a generation, the English democracy has sought to confer benefits upon Ireland.\textsuperscript{121}

The \textit{World} presented a different view of conditions in Ireland. Four months earlier, an English correspondent for the \textit{World} filed this report:

It is said that Ireland is now prosperous. . . . I do not call that country prosperous in which the common winter spectacle . . . is barefoot children.\textsuperscript{122}

Realizing the plan was untenable, Lloyd George finally abandoned conscription in June 1918. The \textit{Times} condemned his decision as "abject surrender" to Irish intransigence and the "arrogance" of the Roman Catholic hierarchy.\textsuperscript{123} Throughout the controversy, however, neither the \textit{Times} nor the \textit{World} addressed the fact that 200,000 Irish men were
serving with the British forces in Europe. The papers also failed to note that 150,000 British troops were garrisoned in Ireland as an army of occupation. After June 1918, coverage of the Irish question declined in both the Times and the World for the remainder of the War.

**Conclusions**

Mainstream press coverage of Irish-American activities and of events in Ireland during 1917 and 1918 was marked by suspicion, hysteria and a ready willingness to believe the worst. In news reports and editorial columns, leading newspapers excoriated the anti-British activities of the American-Irish and attacked their loyalty. The press' attitude toward Irish anglophobia both reflected and inflamed the climate of vigilantism and resurgent nativism that afflicted much of the nation.

The views expressed in *New York Times*, the New York World, the Chicago Tribune, the San Francisco Chronicle, and the newspapers surveyed by the Literary Digest do not comprise a completely representative a cross section of American press attitudes. They did, however, constitute a chorus of powerful voices that joined in condemnation of Irish-American support for the independence movement in Ireland. Even Hearst's New York American and San Francisco Examiner—which supported Irish aspirations—carried reports of German/Irish conspiracies. Irish-American nationalism
had become synonymous in much of the mainstream press with disloyalty—and even treason—towards the United States.\textsuperscript{126} Many Irish-Americans openly supported Germany or advocated American neutrality in the early days of the War. The Department of Justice kept extensive files on various Irish-American organizations and Justice agents regularly monitored the speeches and activities of Irish-American leaders.\textsuperscript{127} Yet there is little evidence of disloyalty or sedition among even the most strident sectors of the Irish-American community following America's entry into the War. For all its vigilance, the Department of Justice turned up sufficient evidence for only a handful of indictments against Irish-Americans during the War.\textsuperscript{128}

Large daily newspapers gave credence to every imagined plot brought forth by the British government. Yet they neglected to give equal attention to the paucity of evidence.\textsuperscript{129} In the 1917 New York mayoral race, Irish nationalist leaders and editors were held up by the mainstream press as paragons of pro-German sympathy. In such an environment, no proof was needed. Even the Hearst papers—notorious adversaries of the British—succumbed to British propaganda efforts.\textsuperscript{130}

The British waged a sophisticated campaign to discredit Irish nationalists in the U.S. Irish activities were under constant surveillance. British operatives monitored Catholic opinion and sent detailed analyses to British
Foreign Office and the British Department of Information.\textsuperscript{131} The cumulative weight of negative news reports and commentary concerning the Irish in America—whether inspired by British propaganda of not—had two pronounced effects: In the public consciousness, Irish-American nationalism became the equivalent of treason to the United States; moderate Irish-Americans—their loyalty questioned, their status threatened—distanced themselves ever further from their more radical countrymen.\textsuperscript{132} Stories about pro-German plots and conspiracies and Ireland’s rejection of conscription prompted many Americans to revert to the nativist passions of the 19th century.\textsuperscript{133}

At least part of the mainstream press’ willingness to believe the worst about the Irish must be attributed to the success of British propaganda. Sir William Wiseman, a special emissary and unofficial head of British intelligence in the U.S., was well aware of the benefits of using the American press to promote British interests. His efforts may have played a role during the conscription crisis. In a cabled message to a British cabinet member in April 1918, Wiseman advised:

\begin{quote}
I consider that America’s view would depend largely on how the case is presented through the [American] press, and I do not believe the possibility of bad effects here should influence your decision.\textsuperscript{134}
\end{quote}

Wiseman’s confidence was well grounded. Prior to sending the cable he had consulted with an adviser to President Wilson and with Frank Cobb, editor of the New York World.\textsuperscript{135}
U.S. Post Office subsequently barred three April issues of the *Irish World* containing editorials against the conscription bill before British Parliament.

The British maintained a huge propaganda apparatus in the U.S. At its height, the British Information Bureau with headquarters in New York had 500 officials with 10,000 assistants working in the United States in what one scholar characterized as "... one of the major propaganda efforts in history." The *New York Times* had a number of pro-British editors on staff and at least one British citizen.\(^{136}\) Irish-American editors were convinced that Lord Northcliffe, owner of the *Times* and the *Daily Mail* of London and who for a time headed the British Information Bureau, dictated editorial policy at the *New York Times* regarding Irish issues.

Only the Hearst papers gave a hearing to Irish concerns. The *New York World*, the San Francisco *Chronicle* and the Chicago *Tribune* made some attempts to be evenhanded in their coverage of Irish-American issues. But the cumulative weight of their reports called into question the loyalty of those who advocated American support for Irish independence. Of the three newspapers, the *Tribune* was most willing to equate pro-Ireland agitation with sedition.

The *New York Times*, however, embraced an imperial view of the world that was at times more jingoist than even that of the British Tory press. The *Times* saw the Irish question
as a kind of Manichean struggle between the forces of darkness and light: Irish-American support for Irish independence, in that context, constituted treason to the United States.

The Times abandoned all restraints in its attacks upon the loyalty of certain Irish-American editors and it regularly accused Irish newspapers of sowing discontent within the Irish-American community.\textsuperscript{137} Ironically, the issues of the Gaelic-American, the Irish World and the Freeman's Journal that were barred from the mails by the U.S. Post Office in April 1918 carried reports on conscription similar to those quoted from London in the mainstream press.

It is impossible to determine what direct role—if any—newspapers like the New York Times and the World played in encouraging the postal suppression of the Irish-American newspapers, books, pamphlets and magazines. At the very least, they contributed to a public mood of suspicion by casting aspersions upon the loyalty of Irish activists and polemists. The negative coverage of Irish-American issues also served to endorse the policies of those faceless men at the U.S. Post Office who censored and suppressed the Irish-American press.

By the end of 1917, the most ardent voices of Irish-American nationalism were being marginalized or silenced. The F.O.I.F. called off the Irish Race Convention scheduled
for the autumn of 1917. The Ancient Order of Hibernians put
off plans for its 1918 convention and temporarily suspended
publication of Hibernian, the organization's official monthly
mouthpiece.\footnote{138 Bull, an anti-British monthly, was
suppressed by the Justice Department and its publisher,
Jeremiah O'Leary, indicted on charges of conspiracy to
obstruct the war effort. The Irish World and the Leader,
under financial strain and political pressure, appealed to
readers to support their advertisers.\footnote{139 At the height of
October press reports about Sinn Fein plots—and a month
after its editor, Laurence De Lacey was convicted of
conspiracy to free a former German consul from internment—
the Leader observed:}
The Leader has enemies as well as friends . . . we
expect our enemies to strike back at us and we
expect that our friends will aid us . . . by giving
recognition to our countless other friends who use
our advertising columns.\footnote{140}
The Gaelic-American, which began to lose ground after the
U.S. entered the War, maintained a defiant posture even as
it acknowledged the effects of the relentlessly hostile
environment in which it struggled to survive.\footnote{141 In a
November 1917 editorial, a few weeks before the imposition
of postal proscriptions, editor John Devoy advised:}
We are not asking for immunity or special favors but
standing on our rights and demanding only justice.
We make no promises and will continue to insist on
Ireland's right to independence. . . . If this paper
is to go down, it will be with its colors nailed to
the mast, confident the Irish cause will eventually
triumph whether the paper lives or dies.\footnote{142}
Events would soon confirm Devoy's worst fears.
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CHAPTER VII

THE POSTAL SUPPRESSIONS

Introduction

The campaign to discredit Irish nationalist agitation culminated in the postal suppressions of 1918. On January 18, 1918, the Irish World, the largest and most influential Irish newspaper in America, received word that its New York and Chicago editions for that week had been withheld from the mails. In a terse written statement to publisher Robert Ford, Postmaster Thomas G. Patten advised: "The question whether these issues are mailable under the Espionage Law . . . has been submitted to the Solicitor for the Post Office Department."¹ Two of New York's other Irish-American weeklies--the Gaelic-American and the Freeman's Journal and Catholic Register--received similar notifications.²

Each newspaper carried an account of an interview granted by President Wilson to Mrs. Hanna Skeffington, an Irish pacifist whose husband had been gunned down by a deranged British officer during the 1916 Easter Rising. Mrs. Skeffington had presented a petition to the President calling for recognition of Ireland's right to self-determination under Wilson's Fourteen Points peace plan.
The newspapers also reported the introduction of a pro-Irish resolution to Congress by Jeanette Rankin of Montana.³

The Hearst papers carried similar reports but escaped censure.⁴ The implication was clear—criticism of British policies in Ireland would no longer be tolerated in the Irish-American press.

Although relatively immune prior to 1918, the Irish-American press was no stranger to intimidation. In 1915, the short-lived Irish Voice of Chicago suspended operations after being raided by federal agents for possible violation of U.S. neutrality laws.⁵ In April 1917, a federal district attorney forced the San Francisco Leader to remove an editorial which criticized President Wilson for leading the U.S. into war. In November 1917, John Devoy of the Gaelic-American was investigated by a federal grand jury for alleged pro-German activities.⁶

The postal proscriptions of January 1918, however, marked a new departure. The postal bans set in motion a sustained campaign of de facto censorship and suppression that would last until the end of the War, and in some cases, beyond. In the coming months, six Irish-American papers as well as a number of magazines, books and pamphlets would suffer postal exclusions. For some newspapers, only occasional issues would be declared non-mailable. For others, the penalties were more severe, the consequences, more damaging.⁷
The Gaelic-American and the Freeman's Journal of New York and the Irish Press of Philadelphia suffered complete loss of mailing privileges by Spring of 1918. The Gaelic-American would be denied access to the mails until nearly three months after Armistice. Because these weekly newspapers depended upon the mails to reach their readers, the loss of mailing privileges was devastating.

Distribution became a logistical nightmare. The Post Office had broad discretionary power to withdraw second-class mailing privileges—subject to its own interpretation of the Espionage Act—from any paper in the country. The Trading-with-the-Enemies Act of October 1917 also made it illegal to distribute proscribed publications by other means. Thus the loss of mailing privileges meant financial ruin. One newspaper—the Freeman's Journal—and a monthly magazine, Bull, were forced out of business. The Gaelic-American survived only through donations from supporters. The Irish Press of Philadelphia was subjected to almost continuous bannings in 1918. The Advocate, another New York Irish newspaper, had three issues withheld.

The New York Irish World, the flagship Irish newspaper in America, suffered less at the hands of the postal watchdogs and survived the War intact. In all, only five editions of the Irish World were banned from the mails. But the seemingly insignificant number of postal exclusions renders a distorted picture of the ordeal endured by the
Irish World during 1918. Post Office and Justice Department documents from the period reveal a continuing policy of scrutiny and harassment that culminated in the pre-publication censorship of virtually every issue of the Irish World from August 1918 until the end of the War.  

Postal records trace the texture and contours of the government's campaign of suppression against the Irish-American press. Letters and internal memoranda disclose a lack of coherent guidelines among those whose duty it was to monitor Irish publications. News and editorial content were judged according to arbitrary and capricious standards. Records also reveal that officials at the press-monitoring division of the New York Post Office and attorneys with the Justice Department were often motivated by a spirit of vigilantism, nativism, and a desire to stifle public discourse regarding the Irish question.

The Irish World was the largest and most influential of the Irish publications affected by postal proscriptions during World War One. The Irish World supported the American war effort after April 1917 and advocated upward mobility and middle-class values as proper strategies for securing the status of the Irish in America. Publisher Robert Ford was also able to enlist the support of influential friends to intercede on behalf of the Irish World. Yet despite its prestige, its protestations of loyalty, and its mainstream, middle-class orientation, the
Irish World's calls for inclusion of the Irish issue at the post-war peace conference and its criticism of British imperialism and Anglo-Saxon influence in the U.S. were sufficient to call down the wrath of the U.S. government. The Hearst newspapers, by contrast, expressed many of the same sentiments but escaped government censure.¹¹

The story of the Irish-American press suggests that the government and large sectors of the public equated Irish national aspirations with anti-American sentiment. The experience of the Irish-American press during 1918 also raises important questions concerning the nature of political and cultural pluralism and the limits of legitimate public discourse during wartime.

Censorship Laws and Official Policy

The Espionage Act, which became law on June 15 1917, established what came to be the first official U.S. policy of prior restraint upon the press in the 20th century.¹² Obscene material and sexually provocative material had been banned from the mails since 1873 but the Espionage Act marked an unprecedented extension of postal powers.¹³ With a maximum possible fine of $10,000 and 20 years imprisonment, the law made it a crime to

willfully cause or attempt to cause insubordination, disloyalty . . . or refusal of duty in the military or naval forces . . . or willfully obstruct the recruiting or enlistment service of the United States.¹⁴
The Espionage Act also empowered the Post Office to declare nonmailable photographic, written or printed materials which violated any provision of the Act. The Post Office could also revoke second-class mailing privileges from offending periodicals. A weekly publication was entitled to a hearing within four days of notification that an issue had been withheld. The decision to bar a publication from the mail could be challenged in court. But there was little chance of success. There is no evidence that even a single postal banning was overturned by the courts. There was little comment in the mainstream press when the Espionage Act became law. Fiorello LaGuardia, U.S. congressman from New York, warned Daniel Cohalan that sections of the law were aimed directly at Irish activists.

The Post Office soon issued a set of policy guidelines called the "Rules of Procedure for Illegal Publications from the Mails Under the Espionage Act." Among the nine points listed, two were significant in light of later actions against the Irish press:

No publication shall be excluded on account of the general tone of either its editorial or news columns. Exclusion from the mails, shall be based only upon specific articles which may be violative of the Act.

These directives were violated in spirit and in form almost as soon as the ink was dry upon the page.
A more expansive interpretation of the statute circulated secretly within the Post Office. The day after the Espionage Act became law, Postmaster General Albert Sydney Burleson issued a confidential memorandum directing postmasters around the country to

... keep a close watch on unsealed matter, newspapers, etc., which is calculated to ... cause ... disloyalty ... or otherwise to embarrass or hamper the Government in conducting the war.\(^{20}\)

The memorandum advised postmasters to withhold questionable matter and submit samples to Solicitor of the Post Office William H. Lamar for review.\(^{21}\) Burleson neglected to mention that excluded material must be willfully obstructive. Nor did he define what constituted "disloyalty." His order to include "embarrassing" material exceeded his authority under the law.\(^{22}\) In August--around the time Irish F.O.I.F. were being hounded from the streets of New York by ADL vigilantes--the Post Office announced that "tactless attacks" on America's allies would be banned from the mails.\(^{23}\) Burleson refused to answer congressional inquiries concerning his instructions to postal workers. Such disclosure, he insisted, would be "incompatible with the public interest."\(^{24}\)

Postmasters from across the country soon flooded the national office with publications they believed were unmailable. Within a month, the Post Office had banned fifteen major publications, most of them socialist.\(^{25}\) As one observer noted, the Espionage Act soon became "the chief
weapon leveled by the federal government against dissenters, who gradually replaced spies and aliens as the major enemy."^{26}

Passage of the Trading-With-the-Enemies Act on 6 October 1917—in the midst of reports in the press concerning alleged Irish/German plots—dramatically broadened the powers of the Post Office.^{27} The law required foreign-language publications to submit translations to the Post Office prior to publication or obtain special permits from the President.^{28} The law also extended the Post Office's control over English-language newspapers by making it unlawful to "transport, carry, or otherwise distribute any matter which is non-mailable."^{29}

The Translation Bureau at the New York City Post Office assumed responsibility for reviewing the Irish-American papers published in the city—the Irish World, the Freeman's Journal, the Gaelic-American and the Advocate—even though the newspapers were published in English and presumably did not require translation.^{30}

Two District Court decisions in the autumn of 1917 gave a stamp of judicial legitimacy to the campaign of postal suppression. The Masses ruling supported the revocation of second-class or bulk-rate mailing privileges.^{31} In this case, Burleson had withheld an August 1917 edition of Masses from the mails. President Wilson interceded on behalf of the publishers of Masses. The President asked Burleson to
ease up, arguing that the men who ran the *Masses* were "well-intentioned." But when Burleson threatened to resign, the President backed down.32

Burleson then employed a rather byzantine rationale to justify subsequent bannings: since *Masses* had missed an issue—the one that Burleson had banned—it was no longer a bona fide periodical and thus no longer eligible for a second-class mailing permit.33 The *Masses* decision affirmed the Postmaster General's right to drive a publication out of business after only one offense.34

The *Spirit of 1776* decision in November 1917 upheld the suppression of a motion picture which disparaged England's conduct during the American Revolutionary War. The film by the same name presented graphic depictions of an incident known as the "Wyoming Valley Massacre," which showed British soldiers impaling infants upon bayonets, shooting innocent women and dragging off young girls. Thomas Bledsoe, a judge on the Southern District Court of California, concluded that the film, despite its historical accuracy, tended to inspire animosity towards Great Britain:

That which in ordinary times might be clearly permissible, or even commendable, in this hour of national emergency . . . may be as clearly treasonable. . . . The constitutional guaranty of "free speech" carries with it no right to subvert the purposes and destiny of the nation.35

The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals upheld the ruling and Robert Goldstein, producer of the film, was sentenced to ten years in penitentiary.36 The ruling, in the judgment of
Zachariah Chafee Jr., "made the maintenance of a real freedom of speech impracticable." The Post Office later used the *Spirit of 1776* decision to publicly justify its suppression of the *Irish World* and other Irish-American newspapers.

Flushed by these court victories, postal officials began to scrutinize the Irish-American press with a renewed sense of purpose. William H. Lamar, Solicitor for the U.S. Post Office, took an unusual interest in the *Irish World*. Lamar, perhaps in response to a letter from the editor of an Ohio newspaper, directed Postmaster Patten in New York City to send him two copies of each issue of the *Irish World* "until further notice," as well as past issues dating back to the implementation of the Espionage Act.

Lamar publicly defended his press-monitoring policies in the February 1918 edition of *Forum* magazine. In what was billed as "the first official interpretation" of the Post Office Department ruling with regard to the Espionage and Trading With the Enemy Acts, Lamar stated: "There is no such thing as suppression of a publication, as such, under our system."

Lamar dismissed critics who argued that the postal restrictions violated constitutional protections of freedom of speech and freedom of the press. He insisted that the use of the mails was simply...

... a business arrangement by which a special privilege is granted upon compliance with conditions
imposed by certain laws. . . . For us to permit an exaggerated sentimentality, a misapplied reverence for legal axioms . . . would be criminal not only to our soldiers, sailors and ourselves, but to posterity!41

Lamar departed from Burleson's stated policy which forbade punishing publications for the "general tone" of their news or editorial columns. Criticism, Lamar advised, would only be permitted from those who were "loyal to the nation." For Lamar, the only practical way to cut through the ambiguities of questionable language was by "... application of that old adage of reading between the lines."42 Lamar issued a stern warning to those who—in defense of their rights of free expression—harkened back to the signers of the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution (a pervasive theme in the Irish-American press):

They are good rhetoricians but sorry historians . . . . It may be reasoned from history that had they pursued their present tactics then, instead of being mildly denied the use of the mails, they would have adorned the limbs of trees.43

Lamar's thinly-veiled evocation of colonial lynching was an attempt to feed upon public sentiment. At the time, vigilantism was rampant throughout the nation. Gangs regularly disrupted public meetings, tar-and-featherings were endemic, lynchings, not uncommon.44 Lamar's pronouncements represented a clear attempt to enlist popular support for less draconian measures. By his logic, press
censorship was preferable to public lynching. The goal was to give free rein to government censors.\textsuperscript{45}

\textbf{Initial Reactions}

The Post Office devoted most of its early attention to socialist and radical publications and to the increasingly suspect foreign-language press.\textsuperscript{46} Irish-American newspapers, however, scorned socialism and were published in the English language. As a consequence they avoided problems with the Post Office—at least in the beginning.

Despite its early immunity, the \textit{Irish World} condemned the harassment of foreign-language newspapers. The \textit{Irish World} attributed the postal banning of an Italian-language paper and a Slovak-language paper to an insidious Anglo-Saxon campaign to control American public opinion:

\begin{quote}
[The] aim is to completely Anglicize this country in language, thought and feeling so that it may more easily and completely be brought under the domination of England.\textsuperscript{47}
\end{quote}

The first sign of serious trouble came when the New York Post Office barred the July, August and September 1917 issues of \textit{Bull} from the mails.\textsuperscript{48} Although not an Irish-American publication per se, \textit{Bull} was singleminded in its anglophobia and publisher Jeremiah O'Leary was a nationally-known Irish agitator. His highly publicized exchange with Woodrow Wilson during the 1916 presidential election had also marked O'Leary as the most notorious hyphenate in the nation.
The banning of Bull sent shock waves through the editorial offices of Irish-American newspapers. The Leader was incredulous:

Bull is not a Socialist publication! It is American through and through and its editor Mr. Bedford has 260 years of American ancestry.

The Gaelic-American defined the issue in terms of freedom of the press and accused the New York mainstream press of encouraging the censorship:

England's subsidized papers of New York are howling for the suppression of every newspaper that refuses to laud England or to swallow without wincing the hypocritical pretense that the arch foe of human liberty is fighting for the freedom of small nations. . . . We have a right say no American troops should be sent to France. . . . We have a right to print this and send it through the mails . . . no Postmaster, President or Congress has the right to stop us.

Not all Irish-American newspapers opposed censorship. The Western Watchman suggested that freedom of speech and of the press were limited rights and that "preventative measures" were necessary. The Watchman, the official newspaper of the St. Louis diocese, argued that censorship of the press was consistent with Church attitudes regarding the suppression of "immoral" literature. "Rigid censorship," the paper advised, "is necessary for the public good."

The Chicago Citizen gave vague and muted support to the governmental campaign to silence dissent:

[The] government is entitled to the benefit of every doubt . . . as long as it is not clearly in error, it ought to be supported. . . . [The] effort federal
authorities are making for the suppression of treason have had their effect. The old theory that it is better to allow men to express themselves has happily not been followed.53

The decision to suppress Bull was quickly upheld in U.S. District Court.54 In October, O'Leary announced that Bull would suspend publication until the constitutionality of the postal ban was resolved.55 A month later, O'Leary and two Bull employees, business manager Adolf Stern and managing editor Luther S. Bedford, were indicted under the Espionage Act on charges of conspiring to obstruct recruitment in the armed forces.56 Irish-America's most acerbic anti-British voice was silenced.57 The suppression of Bull and the indictment of O'Leary were harbingers of things to come. Soon after the indictment, Solicitor Lamar began to personally monitor the Irish World.58

January 1918 Bannings


... not been saying complimentary things about England. But we have demonstrated our loyalty to the government of the United States at all times.59

The broader Irish community reacted to the press bannings with a contradictory mixture of outrage and shame.
The United Irish Societies of New York expressed "astonishment" at the postal proscriptions and sent off an angry resolution to Attorney General Gregory. A spokesman for the group articulated the recurring refrain—that criticism of England and support for Ireland did not constitute disloyalty to the U.S.\textsuperscript{60} In contrast, the Citizen expressed guarded regret at the banning of the Irish World (it failed to mention the other two papers) but was more concerned about the possible effects upon the public image of the Irish:

\textit{... it is unfortunate that anything should occur to give the enemies of the Irish race an opportunity to question the loyalty of our people in America to the flag and the government of this country.}\textsuperscript{61}

Lamar based his decision to withhold the Jan. 19 issue of the Irish World upon reports filed by L.J. Vance, a civilian volunteer at the Translation Bureau of the New York Post Office, and M.H. Bigelow, assistant district attorney with the Justice Department. Vance and Bigelow objected to articles about an Irish women's petition to President Wilson on behalf of Ireland. Ford learned through "unofficial channels" that the reports about the petition had inspired a "storm of protest in certain quarters."\textsuperscript{62}

Vance called attention to "two deliberate misstatements of fact." The first concerned a reference to Countess de Markievicz who, the newspaper stated, had been condemned to
death "for her share in the struggle for Irish freedom."

Vance advised:

The truth of the matter is that she was condemned to death quite justly for her part in inciting the Sinn Fein rebellion which resulted in a bloody massacre in the streets of Dublin.

The second alleged misstatement was in an editorial about Hanna Sheehy-Skeffington whose husband, the paper noted, had been "brutally murdered by an English officer" during the Easter Rising. Vance conceded that Skeffington had indeed been shot and killed by a British officer but he attributed the Irish World's characterization of the incident to German intrigue. Vance, in effect, blamed the victim for the crime:

... it is also true and subsequently proven that the officer responsible for his execution had been insane by the horrors of the massacre brought about by the Irish revolutionaries. ... Both these instances are plain and brazen illustrations of the way the Irish-American press is being utilized by German interests for the dissemination of Prussian propaganda in this country. 63

Bigelow agreed with Vance's assessment:

This paper makes the Irish cause a mere instrument for casting aspersions on all the allies and their war aims. 64

Vance—along with William H. Maxwell, the ex-newspaperman who volunteered to oversee the press-monitoring division of the New York post office—would become an unbending advocate of harsher controls on the Irish-American press in the coming months. On more than one occasion, Vance forwarded information gleaned from the Irish World concerning public
meetings to Military Intelligence and to the Bureau of Information, forerunner of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.\(^{65}\)

The press monitors, however, did not always see eye to eye. Assistant district attorneys with the Justice Department often disagreed with the assessments of the civilian volunteers who examined Irish newspapers for the Post Office.\(^{66}\) The civilians at the Translation Bureau were not ordinary postal employees but were private citizens who volunteered to translate foreign-language newspapers for the Post Office.\(^{67}\) Nationwide, there were perhaps several hundred. Many, if not most, were college and university professors. In New York these translators expanded their mandate to include English-language papers.\(^{68}\)

Assistant U.S. district attorneys often tried to rein in their civilian counterparts. An assistant district attorney identified only as J.A.H. ridiculed, for example, a report by Robert A. Bowen concerning the Jan. 26, 1918 issue of the *Freeman's Journal*.\(^{69}\) J.A.H. concluded that nothing in a report about English losses to German submarines—reprinted from the *London Herald* and judged by Bowen to be offensive—was in violation of the Espionage Act. J.A.H. noted that the story had already appeared in "practically all the American papers." He concluded that a report about British efforts to control news from the Western front had been discussed in British and American papers and in British
Parliament. Concerning Bowen's assessment that another report was against conscription in the United States, J.A.H. advised: "The charge is so silly that it may be passed over."\textsuperscript{70} He recommended that the Jan. 26 issue be released for distribution.

Bowen argued that the use of previously published material by the \textit{Freeman's Journal} was no defense: "That it attains its ends often by use of articles and speeches elsewhere given cannot disguise its purpose."\textsuperscript{71} Bowen's judgment prevailed and the Jan. 26 issue was withheld pending the removal of the offensive material.

Following their banishment from the mails, the three New York Irish papers engaged the services of a Judge Rooney of New York. Rooney, accompanied by Robert Ford of the \textit{Irish World} and James K. McGuire, former mayor of Syracuse, met with Lamar to discuss the problem.\textsuperscript{72} McGuire also met separately with Postmaster General Burleson, a personal acquaintance.

By all accounts, the meetings were conciliatory and Ford was eager to comply with government regulations. Lamar permitted the newspapers to withdraw the Jan. 19 and Jan. 26 issues, remove the offending material and resubmit revised editions for inspection:

\begin{quote}
I am satisfied, from the thorough understanding which has been had, that no further action will be necessary and that the publications will continue without interruption.\textsuperscript{73}
\end{quote}
Ford began to probe the postal barriers in search of weak points. First, he requested permission to re-mail the original copies of the Jan. 19 and Jan. 26 issues with the offending material cut out. Lamar refused. Such alteration, Lamar, would result in the revocation of second-class mailing privileges. Ford also tried unsuccessfully to mail unaltered original copies at first-class rates.

A pattern was established. Offending issues would have to be revised, reprinted and submitted for re-examination. Throughout the negotiations about procedures, Lamar and Burleson continued to insist that the Post Office was not engaging in censorship of the Irish press:

The Postmaster General takes the position that neither this Department nor postmasters should assume the position of censors; that is, suggest what should be put in or left out of any publication. . . .

The revised editions of the *Irish World* displayed a dramatic shift in content which would continue through the remainder of 1918. Page one of both the January 19 and January 26 revised issues were devoted to a mawkish patriotic serial entitled, "A Study of Lincoln's Life." The inside pages substituted gossip and family-oriented features for the usual editorials and news about the War.

**February/March 1918**

The *Irish World* escaped proscription in February and March despite recommendations that several issues be banned. The *Freeman's Journal* was less fortunate. Postal censors
declared one issue of the *Freeman's Journal* nonmailable in the month of February and virtually every issue for the month of March. The *Gaelic-American* also suffered repeated postal bannings.

Lamar withheld the February 16 and March 2 issues of the *Freeman's Journal* because of an article that had no direct connection to the Irish question. Authored by Amos Pinchot, the piece complained that the rich were not paying their fair share in taxes to support the war effort (the article appeared in both issues). Vance, J.A.H., and another censor, William Wadsworth, concluded that the article tended to incite class hatred. The Post Office banned other March issues for, among other things, quoting Victor Berger, Socialist candidate for U.S. Senate from Wisconsin, and for reprinting an anti-war speech delivered on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives on Feb. 7, 1917, by Congressman William E. Mason of Illinois.

Commentary on the Irish question attracted the usual condemnation. A page-one article by English author Hilaire Belloc was judged offensive by Assistant U.S. District Attorney H. Tweed because it advocated self-determination for Ireland after the War. "Its direct result," Tweed concluded, "is to dissuade Irish-Americans from enlisting and encourage them to evade the draft." The March 30 issue of *Freeman's Journal* was banned because of a full-page photo layout entitled, "Second Anniversary of Ireland's
Glorious Easter Week—How the Irish Republic Was Established

"Mid Shot And Shell." Two of the photos depicted property
damage done by the British bombardment of Dublin during the
1916 Easter Rising. Vance observed:

The fact that an Irish Republic has not been
established has nothing to do with the case, nor
is there any reason for printing these pictures
except to incite antagonism to Great Britain . . .
this stupid and virulent anti-British newspaper
should not be permitted to pass through the mails.81

Attorneys J.A.H. and William Whalen supported Vance's
analysis:

It may be reasonably believed that these pictures
will tend to stimulate in the hearts of some, if not
all, of the Irish race, who receive this paper,
hatred of England, and England, being an ally of the
United States in this war, it is submitted they come
within the scope of the Espionage law.82

The Gaelic-American was subjected to constant
harassment throughout February and March of 1918. As the
most radical and unrepentant Irish newspaper in America, the
Gaelic-American was a prime target for both the Justice
Department and the Post Office. Editor John Devoy had been
deeply implicated by the von Igel revelations of October
1917. Largely due to mainstream press reports, Devoy's
name—along with that Jeremiah O'Leary's (who by this point
was under federal indictment)—was synonymous in public
consciousness with disloyalty.

Postal records concerning the Gaelic-American are few
and fragmentary. It is difficult to determine which issues
were declared unmailable. What is certain, however, is that
distribution of the Gaelic-American was disrupted on a weekly basis by the Post Office. On Feb. 2, for example, the newspaper complained of a "comparatively heavy financial loss" but insisted that, if suppressed, it would go down with its colors flying—"the Stars and Stripes and the Green, White and Orange Tricolor of the Irish Republic." The Gaelic-American again complained of harassment:

... pleading for Ireland's freedom and asking American sympathy for the Irish cause is no violation of American law.... It is absurd and unfair to suppress an Irish paper for publishing in full reports of speeches, the chief points of which have been already printed in all the daily papers of New York.... No newspaper dependent on subscriptions can continue to exist under such circumstances, and it looks as if somebody wants to put the paper out of business.

The Gaelic-American issued a call for support from its friends and readers.

The Irish World was also subjected to weekly scrutiny, although none of its February or March issues were barred. The Post Office received complaints about the Irish World from vigilante groups as far away as Hawaii.

Vance complained of the "offensive tone" of editorials in the Irish World. He also complained that articles were "... deliberately calculated to wean away the loyalty of English subjects of Irish birth, or who are sentimentally attached to Ireland."

But the most feverish condemnations of the Irish World arose from W. H. Maxwell, the most committed of the
volunteer watchdogs at the Translation Bureau of the New York City Post Office. The focus of Maxwell's March ire was a letter which had originally appeared in the New York Evening Post and was reprinted in the Gaelic-American and the March 9 issue of the Irish World. That issue also contained a half-page feature announcing the "Great Catholic War Drive Is On." The article urged Catholics "to help the government win the war."

The offending letter, written by Irish poet and novelist, Padraic Colum, told of an incident in Cork City in the south of Ireland in which a girl was found naked and drugged, allegedly after having ingested American-made candies. The letter suggested that Allied troops—including American sailors—should be withdrawn from Ireland. Maxwell demanded that the papers be charged with criminal libel:

... even if the innuendo on the American sailors are of substantial foundation in fact. ... Such publication should, in short, not be permitted under any circumstances as it tends to discourage enlistment.

On this occasion, however, Lamar declined to follow Maxwell's advice. Maxwell refused to let the matter rest. The following week he sent an indignant memo to Lamar which betrayed the extent of his eagerness to harass the press:

The function of this office, as you have repeatedly advised me, is to produce evidence out of the papers on which corrective legal action can be sustained. We have shown that there seems to be a purpose animating papers like the New York Evening Post and the Irish papers. ... We have for a long time been very willing to shut out of the mails a lot of the miserable little hounds who print the foreign
language papers but we have never been willing to proceed against publications like the New York Evening Post [and the Irish papers]. . . . I am willing to devote my nights and my days to assisting the Department of Justice in bringing the publishers of the New York Evening Post and the Irish papers to justice. 90

In the months that followed, Maxwell would get his chance.

The Post Office also barred distribution in March of a pamphlet entitled, "Irish Men and Women Awake." The one-page manifesto, copies of which had been withheld from the mails by inspectors in Oakland, Boston, Jersey City, and Paterson, New Jersey, called upon Irish-Americans to lobby their senators and congressmen on Ireland's behalf. The pamphlet demanded that Ireland be included with Belgium, Poland and Servia as one of the small nations whose independence would be restored after the War. George A. Leonard, Chief Inspector at the Boston Post Office, dismissed the arguments supporting Irish independence and convinced Lamar to ban the pamphlet:

Ireland is not now and never could be considered as one of the small oppressed countries. . . . Ireland can under no condition of circumstances [sic] be classed with Belgium, Poland or Servia because these countries are separate [sic] and distinct nationalities, who operate under their distinctive Governments . . . while Ireland is now and has been for generations part of the English government . . . it would be unwise and impolitic in this crisis . . . to antagonize England with a matter that is strictly local. . . . the persons who are interested in this scheme and who distribute these leaflets are as German as if they were German born. 91
April 1918: The Conscription Controversy

In April, the Post Office again withheld issues of the Irish World, the Gaelic-American and the Freeman's Journal from the mails. And once again, through the intercession of powerful friends and a personal visit to Solicitor Lamar, Robert Ford won permission to file amended editions of the Irish World.

Most of the offending material concerned controversy surrounding a bill before British Parliament to impose military conscription in Ireland. The issue attracted a great deal of attention in both the mainstream and the Irish-American press.

Irish-American editors recoiled at the prospect of Irishmen being forced to fight in France beneath a British flag while thousands of British troops remained garrisoned in Ireland. Many Irish regarded British soldiers in Ireland as an alien army of occupation. Many also feared that forced conscription would accelerate the already severe depopulation of Ireland. Much of the mainstream press, however, equated opposition to conscription in Ireland as evidence of disloyalty and even treason to the United States.

Postal censors argued that negative commentary on the bill was contrary to American interests. L.J. Vance objected to discussion of conscription in virtually every issue of the Freeman's Journal and most issues of the Irish
World. Vance, for example, objected to two articles in the April 20 issue of the Irish World:

They both more or less openly counsel resistance to British rule and threaten the internal peace of the British Empire. 93

Vance, in a memo concerning the April 27 issue of the Irish World, argued that the anti-colonial struggle in Ireland could jeopardize the American war effort:

Ireland irrespective of the claims of its political leaders is a part of the British Empire, and it is subject to the laws enacted by the British Parliament. If it is wrong to apply conscription to Ireland, it is wrong to apply conscription to any part of the British Empire, and by direct inference it is also wrong to apply conscription to the people of the United States. 94

Assistant District Attorney William Wadsworth concluded that passage of a conscription bill for Ireland would have a salutary effect on the Allied war effort by enabling the U.S. government to force Irish aliens in America—who were exempt from the U.S. draft—to enlist in the British army:

The editorial regarding the conscription Act I believe to be illegal . . . . I submit this opinion, having in mind the Solicitor's injunction that the infractions of the Irish World must be more than a mere reiteration or expression of the innate antagonism of the Irish World for the English. 95

James K. McGuire, the influential ally who had proved helpful to Ford in January, interceded once again on behalf of the Irish World. McGuire met with Lamar. And in a "private" letter to Burleson, he drew attention to his own patriotic credentials by noting that he would have written sooner had he not been actively engaged in promoting the
sale of Liberty bonds within the Irish-American community. McGuire informed Burleson that reports similar to those in the Irish World had appeared in the mainstream press:

It looks absurd to many of your friends that these two issues [of the Irish World] so absolutely harmless should be barred from the mails while the American daily press is filled with the bitterest attacks on the English occupation or government in Ireland.96

At least one censor shared McGuire's reasoning. Assistant U.S. Attorney William Whalen disagreed with Vance and Wadsworth about the need to withhold the Irish World for reports about conscription. He warned that banning such material could set a dangerous precedent for the mainstream press:

To concur in their decision is to admit that the printing in the American Press, from time to time of what has been said in the British Parliament about the effect conscription will have in Ireland, comes within the purview of the Espionage Act, and therefore these American papers should be denied the use of the mails.97

Whalen also disagreed with Vance's and Bigelow's objection to an April 20 editorial in the Freeman's Journal

... it merely states what Ireland's attitude is towards conscription, an attitude somewhat similarly expressed by other metropolitan newspapers and based upon... the expressed opposition by the different parties in Ireland to the proposed conscription bill.98

Whalen, however, was overruled on both occasions. There is no record of any subsequent effort by McGuire to intercede on behalf of the Irish World.
The postal proscriptions had begun to take their toll. The *Freeman's Journal*, after weeks of almost continuous bannings, was under severe financial strain. The *Gaelic-American* was warned that it would be permanently barred from the mails if it continued to attack Great Britain. The *Gaelic-American* complained that the press bannings were part of a larger campaign to destroy the cause of Irish independence by silencing legitimate public discourse on the issue. The paper blamed British propaganda and a compliant mainstream press. 

It is quite evident that the intention is to put the three Irish papers out of business for the benefit... of the British Oligarchy, even at the cost of serious injury to the United States. The action of Congress in placing this arbitrary power in the hands of one man enables that man... to destroy such small papers, while some of the great dailies, which he fears, boldly attack the government... The action is that of a bully who smashes the small and helpless and cowards before the strong.

April was the last month, according to postal records, that issues of the *Irish World* were barred from the mails. But the campaign of control continued and issues were delayed on a weekly basis. In an April editorial, the *Irish World* insisted that support of Irish independence was compatible with loyalty to the United States:

The enemies of the Irish in the United States... [insist that] justice for Ireland at the present time is detrimental to the interests of America—that those in America who are true to Ireland are disloyal to the United States. Loyalty to Ireland has for 100 years been a guarantee of loyalty to the United States... Because they ask that Ireland be entitled to self determination is no reason for
supposing that they are disloyal to the country that has espoused the cause of small nations.\textsuperscript{101}

On the west coast, the San Francisco \textit{Leader} had obstacles of its own to overcome. At the end of April, the paper issued a plea for support from its readers:

\begin{quote}
We are being accused of a lack of patriotism and failure to support the United States... just because we have been making a fair fight for Irish liberty.\textsuperscript{102}
\end{quote}

The \textit{Leader}, in response to its critics, would become increasingly shrill--and jingoistic--in its support of the American war effort in the coming months.
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Memorandum, Whalen, 23 April 1918, file number 50357, Records of the Post Office, box 126.


CHAPTER VIII

THE SUPPRESSIONS EXPAND

Introduction

The campaign against the Irish press intensified in the Spring of 1918 as more papers fell under the scrutiny of postal censors. Activity at the Post Office reflected a rising national mood of hysteria about the War in which the even the slightest intimations of dissent were taken as evidence of disloyalty.

The situation became worse after passage in May 1918 of the Sedition Act. An amendment to the Espionage Act of 1917, the new provision came in response to a dramatic upsurge in vigilante activity and to widespread public complaints that existing laws had failed to control dissent. The Sedition Act made it illegal to

. . . willfully utter, print, write, or publish any disloyal, profane, scurrilous, or abusive language about the form of government of the United States, or the military . . . or the flag. . . .

The Sedition Act also empowered the Postmaster General---"upon evidence satisfactory to him"---to order mail returned to the sender if he thought it violated the Espionage Act. Such mail would be marked "Undeliverable Under Espionage Act." The mainstream press contributed to the national mood of suspicion. John Lord O'Brian, Assistant to the
Attorney General in charge of administration of the Espionage Act, recalled:

The general publicity given the statute through the newspapers . . . fanned animosities into flame, vastly increasing the amount of suspicion and complaints throughout the country.⁴

It was in this environment that the censorship of the Irish-American press entered its next phase. At the height of widespread and unsubstantiated press reports in May 1918 about yet another German-Irish plot to foment rebellion in Ireland, postal monitors began to withhold issues of two other Irish papers, the Advocate of New York City and the Irish Press, a Philadelphia weekly that had first appeared in February.⁵ The Post Office also banned a book entitled, Ireland's Case, an anti-English history of Ireland by Notre Dame professor Seamus MacManus.⁶ By year's end, the Freeman's Journal would forced out of business. The Gaelic-American would survive on donations from its supporters. The Irish World, harried and harassed, would voluntarily submit to weekly pre-publication censorship of its galley proofs.

The Advocate

The Advocate, a small, moderate New York weekly devoted to Irish interests, first attracted the censors' attention because of an article about British politics by English author, H.G. Wells. In the May 11 issue, Wells praised the British Labor Party and criticized the Conservatives. The
issue was banned because a quote attributed to Wells: "Down with Kaiserism and Carsonism! They are two sides of the same evil thing." Sir Edward Carson was head of Ireland's Unionist Party, which sought to maintain the link with Great Britain. Censors at the Translation Bureau monitored subsequent issues of the Advocate and recommended that a number of issues be barred but only two other issues—18 July and 27 July—were declared unmailable.

A memo concerning the July 6 issue provides a window into the attitudes that prevailed among at least some members of the Translation Bureau. It also offers evidence of a racially charged atmosphere where ignorance of and antipathy toward the language and cultural practices of those groups other than Anglo-Saxon were commonplace. A press monitor identified only as L.H. advised an unnamed assistant district attorney:

I am sending you the ADVOCATE for July 6th. As I do not usually read the Irish papers, I am amazed to find how very Irish this one is. I should not call it Irish-American. It is filled with advertisements of dancing classes and dances and so on, with the names of various Irish counties and towns joined to them. The paper is full of curious words like "Cumann, nan and mBan" [sic]. Apparently the Irish are just as devoted to parts at least, of their language, as any Germans can be to theirs. I do not see how any German can be much less American... In an article... which I have blue pencilled, we find the resolution to enjoy ourselves "despite the sorrow attached to our exile". [sic] This, I think, is very enlightening... THE ADVOCATE strikes me as being anything but unpatriotic [sic] American paper.
Advertisements for Irish dances and the use of Irish words and place names evidenced a lack of patriotism to the United States. The same censor observed a month later:

The whole tone of the ADVOCATE is un-American though I would not call it particularly pro-German. It is addressed to people who seem to be in this country but not of it.9

The Irish Press

The Irish Press of Philadelphia faced its first press banning on May 18, the date of its eighth issue.10 The newspaper, which never achieved much circulation, had not yet applied for second-class mailing privileges.11

Throughout the Summer and Autumn, postal censors objected to articles about conscription and to the usual expressions of anti-British sentiment. Irish Press editor Patrick McCartan, who had been arrested in 1917 but not tried for attempting to travel to Ireland using a false U.S. passport, had also attracted the attention of Military Intelligence.12

Banner headlines in the September 14 issue of the Irish Press announced, "Irish Republic To Register Its Citizens." The campaign to enroll so-called Irish citizens was designed to give credibility to assertions that Ireland had proclaimed its independence and to counter British army efforts to recruit British citizens living in the U.S. The effort attracted the attention of the Philadelphia U.S.
draft board, Military Intelligence, the Justice Department and the Post Office.

There was some disagreement over how to deal with the problem. The postmaster at Philadelphia withheld successive issues of the Irish Press in the latter months of the War pending further decision. Attorneys J.A.H. and Whalen at the New York Post Office recommended banning the Irish Press. The U.S. Attorney for Philadelphia argued that McCartan's activities did not warrant prosecution. And he offered an uncharacteristic endorsement of free discussion of the Irish question:

It would be far better certainly to have this registration of citizens of the Irish Republic go off as a joke rather than treat it seriously ... our desire [is] not to martyrise [sic] these individuals, or interfere with the free discussion of what Ireland is entitled to politically. ...

The Post Office continued to withhold issues of the Irish Press weeks after the War. U.S. Attorney Francis Caffey, who brought indictments against Jeremiah O'Leary, monitored McCartan's activities until at least as late as April 1919.

The Gaelic-American

By early 1918, the Gaelic-American had been effectively marginalized. Nearly every issue was being banned from the mails. Publisher John Devoy, along with Jeremiah O'Leary, was firmly established in public consciousness as the most intransigent of Irish nationalists in America.
Implicated by the von Igel revelations in the 1916 Easter Rising, Devoy was under regular scrutiny by the Justice Department.

The Gaelic-American responded to the postal bannings with a defiant lack of repentance. The paper insisted upon the inviolability of its Americanism and contrasted itself with the "disloyal" socialist and radical labor newspapers. The Gaelic-American implied that they rather than it deserved suppression.¹⁸

By early Summer, Devoy was under investigation at the highest levels of the Justice Department for his activities as editor and publisher. Despite the postal bannings, the Gaelic-American had been mailing the first page of each issue to city officials, members of Congress newspapers, university professors and others. Alfred Bettman, Special Assistant to the Attorney General, personally examined the June and May 25 issues and concluded that only one—that of June 22—was in violation of the Espionage Act.

Bettman's interpretation of the law was far different than that employed by the Post Office. Bettman concluded that the issues he examined were in compliance with the law because they did not "... expressly or impliedly [sic] suggest to the Irish-Americans to withhold their participation in the war."¹⁹ Those same issues, however, were withheld by the Post Office.
John Lord O'Brien recommended that Devoy be charged
with contempt of court for criticizing in the June 22 issue
of the Gaelic-American the prosecution of Jeremiah O'Leary
and O'Leary's brother, John. U.S. Attorney Francis G.
Caffey, however, decided not to prosecute Devoy:

I felt that Devoy was actually doing no harm to
the business the Government has in hand ... the
contempt proceeding, whether successful or
unsuccessful, might play into his hands.

Caffey said that he was gathering evidence for a "more
serious charge" against Devoy but there is no evidence that
Devoy was ever charged or prosecuted.

The Gaelic-American blamed its plight on British
intrigue and anglophiles within the federal government and
the New York mainstream press:

You are doing more harm to America in this war,
Mr. Barnes, Mr. Ochs, Mr. Reid, Mr. Pulitzer,
Mr. Burleson and Mr. Gregory by your persecution
and your misrepresentation ... than ... German
spies could do in 100 years. ... [You are] making
a mockery of President Wilson's Declaration that
all peoples have a right to self-government and
self-determination ... and you are doing it to
help England hold Ireland down, not to serve
America.

The Gaelic-American, in an editorial quoted by the New York
Times, called William Lamar, Solicitor of the Post Office,
"a knownothing and a bigot" and accused an unnamed assistant
to Attorney General Gregory (a veiled reference to John Lord
O'Brian) as being "the Irish scoundrel" it all.

The pressure on the Gaelic-American continued to mount.
In mid July, the paper issued an urgent appeal for $10,000
to stay alive. Requests for donations to the Gaelic-American Defense Fund would be made every week until the end of the War.

The Post Office refused to relent. Second-class mailing privileges were withdrawn in September. "The Americanism of the paper," complained Bowen, "is very Gaelic." On the eve of Armistice, the Gaelic-American issued a weary and, for Devoy, conciliatory editorial which asked President Wilson to "Call Off the Dogs:"

We are persecuted and our loyalty to America is impeached by Mr. Wilson's subordinates at the very time that our race, in larger numbers than ever before, is fighting magnificently for America on the battlefields of France. . . . [the] persecution is certainly not carried on without Mr. Wilson's knowledge, but it is not a question of fixing responsibility, but of putting an end to the state of things which works evil for the country. . . . Devoy's gesture at conciliation was not answered. The postal proscriptions against the Gaelic-American remained in place long after the end of the War.

The Freeman's Journal

The Freeman's Journal faced continuous proscriptions throughout May. Postal censors barred issues for discussing conscription, the postal censorship, and the prospects of Ireland's post-war independence. Vance complained that the Freeman's Journal refused to stop criticizing the Allies for their decision not to include the Pope at the Peace Conference. He also condemned the paper for repeatedly
reprinting an editorial about racial inequality and the War from the Brooklyn Times, an African-American newspaper.28

Finally, after the thirteenth issue of the newspaper was withheld from the mail by the U.S. Post Office, publisher A. Brendhan Ford gave up the struggle and shut down the Freeman's Journal in its 78th year of publication. In a farewell editorial, Ford wrote that he had been "made to realize" that he could not speak "regarding self-determination of Ireland" or "in defense of the Vicar of the Prince of Peace."29 The demise of the Freeman's Journal came just as Solicitor Lamar started the procedure to revoke the newspaper's second-class mailing privilege.30

The Irish World

Conscription and criticism of Great Britain remained the central concerns of those who monitored the Irish World. But the civilian volunteers and assistant district attorneys at the New York City post office began to include marginal and often frivolous material on their lists of objectionable material.

One censor, identified only as C.P., complained of the "general tone" of the July 6 issue of the Irish World. He objected specifically to a short discussion on Esperanto, which was interpreted as an attack upon the English language, and to a page-one cartoon depicting Irish signers of the American Declaration of Independence, which he condemned as a "suggestive plea for Irish independence."31
Another censor, H.C. Smith, recommended withholding the June 8 issue of the *Irish World* because, among other things, it complained of "English-made lies" in the American daily press and carried an advertisement for the sale of "Irish Republican Flags." ³²

The attacks at times became personal. In a May 25 memo, Assistant District Attorney Wadsworth suggested that a group of prominent advocates of Irish independence who were quoted in the *Irish World*—among them New York Supreme Court Justice John Goff—were "not men of great intellectual weight." ³³

The most severe condemnations came from the pen of W.H. Maxwell, who turned his enmity toward even the most temperate statements of support for Irish freedom. Maxwell's antipathy toward Irish independence was unequaled at the Post Office. His reaction to a letter which appeared in the August 3 issue of the *Irish World* illustrates the degree of his disapproval.

Written by Mrs. William McWhorter, National President of the Ladies Auxiliary of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, the letter appeared under the heading, "Plea to President by Irish Mothers." It argued that Irishmen had fought nobly for America since the Revolutionary War and that the Irish hoped for an American victory in the present conflict. The letter also noted that the Irish had sought Home Rule for 30 years without success and that the issue of conscription
should be submitted to the Irish people for determination. Mrs. McWhorter complained that the American press distorted the Irish position and she called upon the President to speak for Ireland at the peace conference.  

Assistant District Attorney Whalen found nothing offensive in the letter and expressed some sympathy for the sentiments expressed:

> There are no threats, express or implied . . . neither does it contain criticism nor resentment of anything this country has done with reference to the Irish question. It is a sympathetic plea to the President to consider Ireland's cause both from the standpoint of the aid Ireland has rendered this country in the past and what the sons of those, who came to our shores long ago, are doing now. . . . The allusions to England, when considered in the light of what really has happened in the British Empire and as reported in our daily press, are, in the opinion of the reader, harmless.  

Maxwell dismissed the letter as a "cleverly designed attempt" to create discord between the United States and Great Britain for the benefit of Germany and he called upon Lamar to suppress the issue of the Irish World. He also expressed contempt for the suggestion of Irish independence:

> . . . any Irishmen with a grain of sense will readily see that if Ireland were politically and in every way separated from Great Britain it would not be long before she would be in trouble.  

Lamar accepted Maxwell's conclusions over those of Whalen. And he reluctantly agreed to permit the August 3 issue to be mailed only after the direct intercession of Robert Ford, publisher of the Irish World, who assured Lamar that no more such material would be permitted in his
paper. Maxwell's condemnations of Irish-American nationalism apparently won favor with Lamar. Maxwell would play an ever more active role in censoring the Irish World in the coming months. There is no record of any subsequent involvement by Whalen in monitoring the Irish World.

Pre-Publication Censorship of the Irish World

By August 6, Maxwell was complaining of articles in the Irish World that were "... not altogether illegal in word but ... thoroughly disloyal in intent and effect." Ford had had enough. He could no longer endure the weekly ordeal of delays and uncertainties over what was permissible. Ford presented Lamar with an unusual request: he wanted permission for postal censors to examine the galley sheets of the Irish World before the paper went to print.

Under normal procedure, postal censors examined the paper only when it had been dropped off at the post office for distribution. Civilian readers at the Translation Bureau then made recommendations about the fate of each issue to assistant district attorneys. The attorneys offered recommendations of their own and forwarded both to Solicitor Lamar for final determination. If an issue was found to contain objectionable material, it could be barred from the mails or, if permission was granted, the paper could be withdrawn, the offending content removed and the
entire press run reprinted at great cost to the publisher and resubmitted for examination.

The new arrangement short-circuited that process. It also invested direct and unsupervised powers of pre-publication censorship with the civilian volunteers. The new procedure by-passed both the assistant district attorneys, who often offered more temperate analyses than the postal volunteers, and Lamar.

Lamar granted Ford what amounted to a special favor. He explained his reasons in a letter to Postmaster Patten:

I am writing you at this time more in a personal than in an official capacity. ... The postal service is in no sense a censorship, but Mr. Ford, who is here, is very anxious to submit informally ... advance sheets of his paper so that everything may be eliminated which should not be published ... I am willing that it be done in an informal way until Mr. Ford is able to locate the people on his paper who are responsible for letting this class of matter through and he says he will discharge them as fast as he locates them; and I thoroughly believe that he is sincere. ... 39

The new arrangement, however, did not go into effect for several weeks. The August 17 edition, for example, was withheld until a paragraph which called for a negotiated peace was withdrawn and the entire run reprinted. Maxwell suggested that the author of the offending paragraph, a Mr. Johnson, be placed in an internment camp with the "rest of his German friends." 40

Maxwell was reluctant to assume the task of censoring the Irish World's galley sheets. He complained to Lamar
that the Post Office did not have sufficient manpower to "proof-read" the Irish World. 41 Lamar replied:

. . . my object in making this arrangement was to bring some one in touch with Mr. Ford who could, for a few weeks, point out the character of the objectionable matter that somebody connected with his paper seems to be putting over on him. Mr. Ford protested so strongly a desire to do what is right that I felt moved to request the Postmaster to help him for a while in order that he might get on the straight road. 42

Although Maxwell questioned the efficacy of the proposed arrangement, he agreed to try it:

I personally take very little stock in his [Ford's] claim that he don't know what's right and what's wrong. However, if you want us to do it, we will do it. 43

Robert Bowen, another official at the Translation Bureau, soon began to complain along with Maxwell that Ford, despite the special favor afforded him, seemed unwilling to learn from his mistakes:

. . . only by a comparing of the succession of galleys could you learn how little the editor of the Irish World seems disposed to benefit by the censoring. . . . the Irish World accepts deletion very fully--even blindly--so blindly, indeed, that it repeats each week the offenses of the preceding week. 44

Bowen and Maxwell wrote to Lamar on a weekly basis throughout September and October to list Ford's offenses. Ford, for his part, continued to assure Lamar of his eagerness to comply with the law. Bowen made note of the paper's "docile amenability" in excising questionable
material. But he also advised Lamar of the papers unwillingness to learn from its mistakes:

... we have reason to conclude that but for this weekly censoring there would always be objectionable if not actually illegal matter in the published sheet.\(^45\)

Bowen's patience began to evaporate upon receipt of the first galleys of the Oct. 12 issue. He complained to Lamar of "tiresome lists" of arrests and searches of suspects in Ireland, information, he concluded, that could have no interest to the readers of the *Irish World*. He expressed doubt that the paper's editorial direction would ever change:

I fear our effort to make the *Irish World* mailable is much like the attempt to mop up the Atlantic Ocean with mop and pail.\(^46\)

Bowen wrote to Lamar four days later when he received the remaining galleys of the Oct. 12 edition. An offending article, written by a Rev. John Talbot Smith, contained a long and florid defense of the Pope's call for an end to the War. Bowen was vehement:

It was with a feeling of resentment and indignation toward Mr. Ford that I read this very disloyal article. His action in accepting it and submitting it for the censorship that you have been considerate in according him appears to me to place him beyond the pale... alike personally and as a publisher. I believe you will agree with Mr. Maxwell and myself... There is no genuine Americanism on the right side of his Irish hyphen... I have lost the last glimmer of faith in Mr. Ford's assurances that he does not mean to offend and has to be shown in what his offenses consist.\(^47\)
Lamar forwarded Bowen's letters to Ford and suggested that closer scrutiny of prospective articles could spare future embarrassment. Ford replied that Dr. Smith, in addition to being president of the Catholic Actors' Guild of America, was arguably the foremost Catholic writer in the country. Smith's Americanism, Ford insisted, was above reproach:

Passing over Mr. Maxwell's and Mr. Bowen's strictures upon myself personally I am astonished that they have placed such an extraordinary construction upon Dr. Smith's article.

**Armistice**

Lamar ended the pre-publication censorship of the *Irish World* soon after armistice. Lamar advised Maxwell to inform Ford that he should no longer submit galley proofs for examination. Lamar also informed Maxwell that copy expunged from the upcoming Nov. 20 issue of the *Irish World* did not violate the Espionage Act and should be permitted.

The offending material suggested that Ireland's claims should be placed on an equal footing with the claims of other subject nations at the impending peace conference. Lamar also advised Maxwell to inform Ford that it would be up to him to observe the requirements of the Espionage law:

Some such statement seems to be necessary for otherwise he might think that all restraint had been removed and I do not wish him to get any such idea in his head.

Maxwell's reply to Lamar, co-signed by Bowen, offers clear evidence of their eagerness to employ arbitrary standards in their censorship of the *Irish World*, standards
well beyond any legitimate concern for wartime security. It also demonstrates their willingness to transcend the law in the execution of their duties at the Translation Bureau. The War was over. So too, presumably, was the need to impose pre-publication censorship upon the Irish World in the interests of national security. Yet Maxwell was reluctant to relinquish his censor's quill:

I should be sorry to have you feel that in the blue-pencilling of the proof hitherto I was under the impression that the material so indicated was contrary to the Espionage Act. I felt, however since we were guiding the Irish World, that we might as well get some benefit to ourselves out of the process. Indeed, the Irish World acted upon interrogation marks as obediently as upon deletion.51

Robert A. Bowen continued to monitor the Irish World at the Translation Bureau until at least as late as April, 1919, five months after the end of the War.52 Self-appointed patriotic organizations and vigilantes continued to complain to the Justice Department about the Irish World and other Irish-American newspapers as late as August, 1921, nearly three years after the last shot was fired in the European War.53

President Wilson ordered an end to postal censorship on 27 Nov. 1918 and Postmaster General Burleson promised to comply. There is no evidence that Burleson directed postmasters to end the censorship before the summer of 1919.54
There is evidence, however, that competing intelligence agencies promoted conflicting analyses about the danger of Irish activities even after the War. The dispute carried all the hallmarks of an inter-agency turf war. Francis Caffey, federal attorney in charge of prosecuting Irish activists, warned: "I am convinced that the situation is becoming quite serious." Charles DeWoody of the Bureau of Investigations minimized the threat:

We have maintained confidential operatives among the inner group of radicals and the Department has been fully advised by reports of the exact status of the situation... I see no necessity for any action by the Department other than to continue to maintain a close watch over the situation.

John Lord O'Brian finally concluded in January, 1919, that investigation of Irish activities had become "a routine matter to be attended to by the New York Office of the Bureau of Investigation." J.A.H., attorney at the New York Post Office, also concluded that the need to withhold the Irish newspapers ended with the War:

... now that the crisis has been passed the writer fails to perceive wherein the Espionage Act is violated in publishing the matter upholding the cause of Ireland to establish a republic.

But the suppression of Irish publications continued. Although Lamar released the Irish World from weekly scrutiny, the postal restrictions remained in place for other Irish periodicals and publications. The Irish Press and Gaelic-American were still banned from the mails. The
Gaelic-American complained that it was being withheld without cause:

The war is over and Creel has announced the end of censorship but the post office, at the demand of the Department of Justice, which is a nest pestiforous knownothings, keeps it in full blast in the case of the Gaelic-American.  

On Jan. 14, 1919, the Post Office banned a pamphlet entitled, "How Ireland Has Prospered Under English Rule and the Slave Mind, by Arthur Griffith." Finally, in February 1919, the Gaelic-American was once again permitted to circulate through the mails. The World War One censorship of the Irish-American press had lifted.

**Irish Press Reactions to the Postal Censorship**

Irish-American newspapers—those that suffered postal exclusions and those that escaped the War unscathed—reacted in different ways to the governmental campaign to control opinion. No newspaper was immune. The Gaelic-American, uncompromising and rebellious, never wavered in its contempt for British presence in Ireland and British influence in the U.S. The Gaelic-American's refusal to conform to the demands of its critics proved nearly fatal. Support for Ireland's independence, the paper and insisted, was no crime. The Freeman's Journal and Catholic Register, which also declined to temper its attacks upon Britain, was forced out of business.

The Irish World chose a more conciliatory and pragmatic path. Following the initial postal bannings, the Irish
World enlisted the aid of powerful intermediaries and sought conciliation through negotiation. When that effort failed, the paper endeavored to cooperate with its censors.

Although it faced no postal exclusions during 1918, the San Francisco Leader was profoundly affected by the campaign to control opinion. The Leader, which like most Irish-American papers had initially opposed the War, became strident in its support of the American war effort. The Leader's efforts to demonstrate its loyalty to the United States became, in the end, a headlong descent into jingoism. The paper attacked every real and imagined manifestation of German influence with a rancor formerly reserved for "Anglomaniacs." Shortly before the end of the War, in an editorial against a proposal to establish an appointed school board, the Leader observed:

> It is engineered by the huckster bigots, profiteers, uplifters, sex hygienists and birth controllers who pose as intellectuals in San Francisco. It is fathered by a department--the Bureau of Education--which has always been suspected of being completely controlled by German thought. It is a barefaced . . . attempt to Prussianize our schools. 62

The Leader flaunted its loyalty and "Americanism" in hopes of enlisting mainstream American support for Ireland at the post-war peace conference. But in doing so it succumbed to the same spirit of vigilantism and bigotry it had once so passionately decried.

Other Irish-American newspapers tried to distance themselves from the more radical elements in the nationalist
community while at the same time insisting upon the legitimacy of Irish national aspirations. The Western Watchman, for example, condemned Jeremiah O'Leary as a hothead but argued that his indictment on federal charges should be not be allowed to impede the effort on behalf of Ireland's independence:

Americans of Irish descent and extraction should see to it that no band of English loan sharks be allowed to prejudice American opinion.63

The Watchman also objected to a U.S. government publicity bulletin which it said reduced the Irish question to one of enemy propaganda.

We find no fault with the bulletin for asserting that German propagandists have taken advantage of the Irish question. . . . But we vigorously protest against an official publication virtually proclaiming that there is no Irish question.64

To the Watchman—and to much of America—Catholicism was an inseparable part of Irish identity. Efforts to link Irish nationalist aspirations to pro-Germanism, according to the Watchman, smacked of anti-Catholic bigotry.65

The most complex response to the postal proscriptions of 1918 came from the conservative Chicago Citizen. The Citizen, which continued to promote constitutional nationalism long after that strategy had been discarded by other Irish newspapers and by the Irish-American community at large, went to torturous lengths in its attempts to protect the reputation and tenuous status of the American-Irish.
The Citizen tried to accomplish this in two ways: by distancing itself as far as possible from the more uncompromising activists within the nationalist movement who, the paper insisted, brought down shame and disrepute upon the Irish; and by insisting that loyalty to America demanded that Irish-Americans suspend—at least for the duration of the War—their ancestral hatred of Great Britain.

The Citizen expressed guarded dismay at news of the initial banning of the Irish World in January 1918. But it failed to mention the Gaelic-American or the Freeman's Journal which were withheld the same day. The Citizen also condemned Jeremiah O'Leary, publisher of Bull, in terms that could have easily come from the columns of the New York Times:

... such individuals do not speak for the Irish race and can never represent them. The Irish race are law-abiding: they are not socialists, they are not 'again the government' here in America. ... We shall not and cannot be misrepresented by these snakes in the grass.  

The Chicago Citizen concluded—like the postal censors—that condemnation of Great Britain and support for the campaign to achieve the independence of Ireland were incompatible with loyalty to the United States: "We hold that American citizens cannot support the Sinn Fein cause without disloyalty to this country."  

Yet for all its efforts to maintain respectability in the eyes of mainstream America, the Citizen could not shake
free of its own antipathy towards Anglo-Saxon influence. The Citizen struggled to reconcile what it saw as its wartime responsibility to support Britain with its duty to stand behind Ireland and to challenge Anglo-Saxon attacks upon the reputation and position of the Irish in America.

The Citizen employed a convoluted logic to its analysis of mainstream press accounts about opposition in Ireland to conscription. The Citizen argued that reports of opposition to forced conscription slandered the reputation of the Irish on both sides of the Atlantic. The Citizen aimed its attacks not at Britain—which proposed conscription—but at the American press which reported it. The Citizen absolved Britain of all responsibility. The Citizen praised England even as it reviled the Anglo-Saxon presence in America:

The common enemy of the Irish race is not in England. The rattlesnake of bigotry was scotched ... long ago in England by the great democracy which has shown itself so nobly in every effort for fair play in its sister democracy in Ireland. ... The common enemy of the Irish race went abroad upon the face of the earth ... [it is] ... a snake that deposited its eggs upon the "fruitful" rock of Plymouth Rock. ... 68

Ironically, a number of Irish-American papers were condemned by postal censors for printing reports about conscription similar to those which the Citizen condemned in the mainstream press.

The paper accused the mainstream press of a "conspiracy of silence" regarding Irish contributions to the American war effort.69 The Citizen also condemned the mainstream
press for printing unsubstantiated reports of German-Irish plots. Above all else, protecting the image of the Irish in America was the primary concern of the Chicago Citizen.

Conclusions

The postal censorship campaign of 1917 and 1918 had a profound effect upon the Irish-American press. Two publications—Jeremiah O'Leary's Bull and the Freeman's Journal and Catholic Register—were forced out of business. The Gaelic-American and the Irish Press barely survived the War.

Irish newspapers responded in contrasting ways to the campaign to control opinion. If nothing else, the postal censorship shattered the tenuous solidarity that existed among most Irish newspapers. The Gaelic-American defied—with a nearly suicidal resolve—government efforts to dictate the acceptable limits of expression. At the other extreme, the Leader warded off charges of disloyalty by embracing a slavish jingoism. The Citizen traveled even further beyond the pale by condemning wartime agitation in support of Irish independence and sanctioning the postal censorship.

The Irish World, more pragmatic, chose conciliation over confrontation in its search for a response to the postal suppressions. In a desperate attempt to end the costly and time-consuming weekly negotiations with its postal overseers, the Irish World became an active agent in
its own control by requesting pre-publication censorship of its galley proofs.

The efforts of the press watchdogs at the New York post office also had a dramatic impact upon the editorial content of the Irish World, the Leader and the Gaelic-American during 1918. The number of editorials in the Irish World and the Gaelic-American plunged by over forty percent compared to the previous four years. The number of editorials containing anti-British or anglophobic sentiments fell in each of the three papers. The Irish World and the Gaelic-American dealt with the War during 1918 by avoiding comment on it, although both newspapers regularly carried ads promoting the sale of war bonds. At the same time, expressions of loyalty to the United States rose dramatically in the Irish World, the Leader and the Gaelic-American.\textsuperscript{71}

It is more difficult to assess the effects of the postal censorship upon the broader body of Irish-American opinion. Some suggest that most Irish-Americans supported the government's campaign to suppress dissent.\textsuperscript{72} Many Irish elites and those most assimilated disassociated themselves from the anti-colonial struggle the moment the U.S. entered the War as an ally of Great Britain.

Yet the evidence is far from clear. The more extreme elements of the nationalist movement were either silenced or were forced to moderate their activities. The Ancient Order
of Hibernians went into hibernation and the Friends of Irish Freedom retreated to the shadows.

But other organizations arose to carry the banner. The Irish Progressive League came into being and remained active throughout 1918. At the height of the May suppressions, 2500 delegates gathered at the Irish Race Convention in New York City to proclaim Irish loyalty to America and to insist upon inclusion of the Irish question at the post-war peace conference. The so-called Mother's Mission also collected 600,000 signatures in the Spring and Summer of 1918 on a petition presented to President Wilson condemning British misrule in Ireland.73 And at least one new newspaper--the Irish Press--came into being.

Despite the pressures of the war years, Irish-American hostility toward Great Britain remained undiminished. As soon as the guns fell silent in Europe, Irish-America mobilized to demand a hearing for Ireland at the peace conference. 25,000 gathered on Dec. 10 at Madison Square Gardens to celebrate Self-Determination Week and to demonstrate their support of Irish independence.74 Following the Versailles conference (which failed to address the Irish question), Irish-Americans organized in great numbers to help defeat President Wilson's proposal for a League of Nations.75

This contradictory evidence suggests that Irish-Americans during the War were torn between their devotion to
Ireland and their need to demonstrate unquestionable loyalty to the United States. Some endorsed the suppression of Irish-American publications. At War's end, others no doubt longed only to forget that, when tempers were high, their loyalty to the United States had been challenged.

Shortly after armistice, the Citizen observed:

> Whether the censorship was or was not too strict during war times will remain a debatable question. . . . A mistake has occurred and there is no remedy for it. The less said the better.

Postal censors wielded vast powers in the name of wartime security. Yet there is no evidence that even a single issue of an Irish-American newspaper was withheld for endangering the war effort by discussions of troop movements, ship schedules or battlefield strategies, or through blatant attempts to obstruct military enlistment. The Irish press was suppressed rather for its criticism of Great Britain, its advocacy of self-determination for Ireland, and for its unrelenting complaints about Anglo-Saxon influence in America. In the hysteria of the times, such expressions were taken as evidence of disloyalty to the United States.

Irish-American newspapers, like many other sectors of American society, had lobbied loudly on behalf of American neutrality and had joined forces with German-Americans to keep the U.S. out of war. Many Irish-American newspapers hoped for Britain's defeat and some gave vocal support to Germany in the early days of the conflict. Prominent
nationalist leaders also attracted suspicion because of their activities. John Devoy of the Gaelic-American and Jeremiah O'Leary of Bull had been implicated along with German agents in planning the 1916 Easter Rebellion.

But the evidence demonstrates that the Irish-American press and the vast majority of Irish-American nationalist leaders supported—or at least did not obstruct—the war effort following the U.S. entry into the conflict. Nevertheless, the Gaelic-American remained barred from the mails long after the end of the War. As late as April 1919, five months after the cessation of hostilities, employees at the Translation Bureau continued to monitor the Irish World. The censors at the U.S. Post Office had an agenda—however vague and unfocused—that transcended legitimate concern for wartime security. Perhaps the most remarkable aspect of the postal censorship campaign of World War One was Postmaster Burleson's insistence that it was benign. In his report for the year 1919, Burleson observed:

A policy of great liberality was adopted as to criticism and the free expression of opinion not directed against the national welfare.

The disruptions of the war years reverberated through the next phase of American history. The wartime suppressions legitimized the wholesale control of dissent and set the stage for the coercive response to the Red Scare of the early 1920's.Suspicion of the foreign-born carried over from the war years and led to the immigration
restriction laws of 1920 and 1924, thus ending the largest sustained folk migration in modern human history.
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CHAPTER IX

CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

America, in the second decade of the 20th century, was an unfinished society. Transformed by mass immigration, challenged by marginal groups which clamored for inclusion, the nation searched for a definition of itself. The years surrounding World War One witnessed an abandonment of faith in America's capacity to weld its divergent elements into a coherent whole. The war years marked a period when, as John Bodnar observed, the dominant "vision of national unity and solidarity excluded notions of ethnic diversity and tolerance."1

Ideas about cultural and political pluralism were forced into retreat. Vast sectors of the public, led by a governing elite and a compliant mainstream press, demanded conformity to a crabbed conception of American identity and adherence to an increasingly narrow range of attitudes and opinions. Dual loyalty was suspect. Hyphenism—other than the Anglo-Saxon variety—was condemned.

The Irish-American press of 1914-1918 contended against powerful forces in hostile environment to assert Irish identity and to win a hearing for Irish aspirations. In the
absence of a sympathetic or comprehending mainstream press—only the Hearst papers offered understanding—Irish newspapers articulated Irish concerns and battled against a resurgence of Anglo-Saxonism in a struggle to secure a place for the Irish in America. Most of all, the Irish press gave a hearing to issues that were ignored or misrepresented by the commercial daily press.

Irish newspapers practiced an adversarial brand of journalism. The commercial daily press, in its search for the broad middle, dismissed the concerns of marginal groups such as the Irish and, more often than not, defined the national interest in terms of the status quo. Irish newspapers, by contrast, were journals of advocacy and complaint. Irish papers gave voice to immigrant concerns that were ignored by mainstream press and offered alternative and oppositional interpretations of the news.

Irish newspapers were integral parts of the communities they served. Editors and writers were bound to their readers by ties of blood, culture and a shared historical experience. Irish newspapers provided critical forums through which the passions, insecurities and longings of the immigrant Irish and their offspring could be articulated and reconciled. In one sense, individual newspapers appealed to different constituencies within the heterogeneous Irish community in support of competing agendas. In another, they were but separate voices in a collective cry for acceptance.
For all their differences, Irish newspapers were united in their devotion to the Irish-in-exile, their disdain for British dominion over the old country, and their distrust of Anglo-Saxon influence in the new.

Irish-American consciousness was shaped by and reflected in the Irish-American press. Anglophobia was the central expression of Irish-American identity as articulated by the press. A well-spring of historical consciousness, anglophobia provided an ever renewable source of solidarity. It bound the Irish together in a sense of community that overwhelmed barriers of class, geography and generational differences.

However faulty and fraught with contradictions, anglophobia offered simple solutions to complex concerns. It explained the second-class status of the Irish; it served as a weapon against perceived misrepresentations in the mainstream press; and it provided an answer to demands for conformity to an Anglo-Saxon conception of American identity. Most of all, it soothed feelings of inferiority. Anglophobia was at once an assertion of Irish distinctiveness and a demand for understanding.

Anglophobia found its most coherent and sustained expression in Irish-American support for an end to Britain's colonial rule over Ireland. Irish nationalism was tolerated as long as the United States and Great Britain remained at odds. In a sudden convergence of events, the Irish national
struggle entered its final revolutionary stage even as Anglo-Saxonism began to surge forth and gather new strength in the U.S. The mainstream press and America's Anglo-Saxon elite condemned Irish-American support of the 1916 Easter Rising and castigated Irish efforts to keep America out of World War One.

America's entry into the War as an ally of Great Britain forced the issue to crisis. Irish-American attitudes about the War were inexorably entangled with the Irish national question and the Irish-American press struggled to reconcile Irish loyalty to the United States with Irish devotion to the old country. Attacks by the mainstream press increased. Irish agitators were driven from the streets of New York City and Boston. Irish nationalist organizations retreated to the shadows. Some Irish papers fell silent. Others continued to lobby loudly on Ireland's behalf even when such exhortations were taken as evidence of disloyalty.

The Irish issue became a site of ideological struggle. In its battle to be heard, the Irish press accused mainstream newspapers of pro-British bias. Irish newspapers insisted that advocacy on Ireland's behalf was consistent with American political traditions and pointed to President Wilson's proclaimed support for self-determination for small nations as an American war goal. Irish nationalism, they argued, stood not in opposition to American nationalism, but
was, rather, an extension of it. The mainstream press, for its part, condemned Irish nationalism as an aberrant, alien force which threatened America's close ties with Great Britain and undermined the American war effort.

In a larger sense, the debate about the Irish question which played out in Irish and in mainstream newspapers—and in the subsequent postal censorship—was part of a broader discourse about the nature and future course of American society. Was America to be based upon a shared commitment to civic culture where divergent groups come together in democratic participation? Or was American identity a consequence of cultural, racial or religious conformity where previous identities and ethnic loyalties are erased?

The 1918 postal censorship of the Irish-American press was an extension of the climate of suppression that infected the nation. Irish newspapers were often proscribed for their "general tone." Postal censors assumed broad, draconian powers and declared open season on the Irish press in the name of national security. Yet Irish newspapers were banned for discussions of issues that were similar to those that had already appeared in the mainstream press.

While it is easy to document the postal censorship and measure its effects, it is more difficult to determine why the loose cannons at the Post Office exercised their duties with such vigor and with such little protest from either their superiors or from the public.
William H. Maxwell and his coterie of civilian volunteers at the Translation Bureau of the New York City Post Office followed an agenda that went beyond the mandate of law. Solicitor Lamar, in the early months of censorship, personally supervised their activities regarding Irish newspapers. Certain assistant U.S. district attorneys also made some attempts to restrain Maxwell and his minions. But by the middle of 1918, the civilian volunteers, unpaid and largely unmonitored, had free rein to censor and suppress Irish publications for arbitrary and often frivolous reasons.

Public statements from officials at the highest level of government contributed to the climate of suspicion and vigilantism regarding the Irish. President Woodrow Wilson contempt for the nationalist aspirations of the American-Irish was well established and widely known long before the U.S. entered the War. His anti-hyphen speech in 1914 at the unveiling of the Barry monument, his participation in the anti-hyphen campaign of 1915, and his public exchanges with Jeremiah O'Leary during the 1916 election helped brand the Irish as one of the most disloyal elements in America.

Much of the blame for the World War One postal suppressions must be placed at the feet of Woodrow Wilson. Despite pleas from the Department of Justice for a public statement during the worst months of vigilante activity, Wilson remained silent. When he did respond, it was too
little and too late. Wilson's most serious shortcoming was his failure to oversee Postmaster General Burleson's implementation of the Espionage Act. The lack of oversight and concern for civil liberties filtered down through the ranks of the Post Office and, with some exceptions, the Department of Justice.

British propaganda also played an important part in fomenting anti-Irish sentiment. Britain maintained a powerful public relations machine in the U.S. The pro-British posture of the mainstream press ensured that British efforts to shape public opinion fell upon fertile ground.

The most decisive factor in creating a climate which led to the suppression of the Irish-American press was the willingness of large sectors of the mainstream press to give credence to unsubstantiated rumors of German/Irish plots and to equate Irish nationalist aspirations with disloyalty to America. Even the Hearst newspapers--no friends to the British--became unwitting participants. Powerful mainstream newspapers--most notably the New York Times--stirred up public hysteria against the Irish and helped create a national climate in which advocacy on Ireland's behalf became evidence of disloyalty--and even treason--to the U.S. Ironically, at the very moment that Irish papers were being banned in New York, two New York Irishmen, as Daniel Patrick Moynihan has pointed out, were being enshrined in American popular culture as symbols of American patriotism--"Wild
Bill" Donovan for leading the gallant troops of the "Fighting 69th" in the Argonne; George M. Cohan for popularizing the American anthem of World War One, "I'm a Yankee Doodle Dandy."²

A number of unanswered questions remain concerning the World War One censorship of the Irish-American press. This study—like any study—is limited by the documentary evidence upon which it depends. The evidence falls into three major categories: Irish-American newspapers; mainstream newspapers; and records of the U.S. Post Office and the Department of Justice. Each of these categories suffers its own shortcomings.

The Irish-American Press

The sample of Irish-American newspapers was chosen in attempt to assemble a representative cross-section of the Irish-American press, subject to what was available on microfilm. Yet the five newspapers in this study represent but a small portion of the vast curriculum of the Irish-American newspapers in 1914-1918. More attention needs to be focused on the smaller, marginal Irish papers, particularly those that were published in the Midwest and the Rocky Mountain states.

Class issues also need to be addressed. The Irish papers in this sample were avowedly middle-class in orientation. Each, in fact, proclaimed its Americanism by distancing itself from socialist and radical labor
newspapers. Yet this was a time when Irish were active in both the labor and socialist movements. An effort needs to made to uncover the newspapers and periodicals that presumably gave voice to Irish involvement in working class movements. Some scholars suggest that Irish nationalism gave focus to working class complaints that produced political radicalism in other groups. That assumption warrants further attention.

One of the goals of the study was to recover, to the degree that such an effort is possible, the contours of Irish-American thought during 1914-1918. The Irish-American press provides a rich and varied source of information. But it is far from complete. The records of the myriad of local and national Irish-American organizations provide a potentially rich source of information. Also, Irish organizations flooded Congress and the executive branch with a flurry of petitions during the years surrounding World War One. These petitions offer a largely unmined body of data concerning Irish-American aspirations and strategies.

A fuller explication of the role of the press in both local and national Irish-American communities is also needed. This study generally restricts its attention to the editors and content of their newspapers. Other dimensions of the Irish-American press deserve scrutiny. How did ordinary people use the Irish press? What role did it play in their lives? Who were the journalists who worked on
these papers? What was their role and status in their respective communities?

The relationship between the Irish press and the presses of other marginal groups need to be more fully explored. Irish and German papers, for example, cooperated to combat Anglo-Saxonism before the War. During the neutrality debate they often reprinted each others' editorials. Cross-cultural cooperation between Irish and other immigrant newspapers in advancing an alternative pluralistic vision of America is warrants further attention. Also, despite the support that some Irish papers gave to other anti-colonial struggles and to black rights, there is evidence that the vision of cultural and political pluralism advocated by the Irish press was less than totally inclusive. This question demands attention.

Finally, what was the interrelationship between the Irish press of America and the nationalist newspapers of Ireland. Irish-American papers often reprinted editorials from Irish papers. Britain banned Irish-American papers from Ireland during and after the war years so they were presumably seen as both influential and threatening. The relationship between Irish papers in the old country and the new needs further study.

The Mainstream Press

The sample of mainstream daily newspapers is burdened by many of the same deficiencies that affects the sample of
Irish-American newspapers. An attempt was made to include mainstream newspapers from the same geographical locales as the Irish papers in order to reconstruct the discourse that took place concerning Irish issues. The Literary Digest was also consulted to get some sense of the national commentary that was devoted to Irish concerns.

A larger, more inclusive sample of mainstream papers would enhance the study. The present sample is skewed towards papers from large metropolitan areas because that was where Irish papers were published and presumably where mainstream papers devoted more attention to Irish matters. This assumption needs to be investigated.

One of the major conclusions of this study is that the mainstream daily press—with the exception of the Hearst papers—supported the status quo regarding the Irish question and sanctioned the suppression of alternative or oppositional interpretations. This tendency should be explored in other contexts.

Finally, the relationship between the mainstream press and the Irish-American press (and the newspapers of other nationality groups) needs to be more fully explored. The immigrant press can only be fully understood in that context. The Irish-American press of 1914-1918 stood not as an immigrant supplement to the mainstream press, but as its adversary. A war of ideas was being waged. Is the relationship between the immigrant press and the mainstream
press adversarial by definition? To what extent do the attitudes and ideas articulated in the immigrant press percolate into the mainstream media? These questions need to be examined in other time periods and in other contexts.

Postal and Justice Department Activities

Postal records at the National Archives relating to the World War One censorship of the Irish-American press are poorly organized and often fragmentary. Records concerning the Gaelic-American are either missing or misfiled. A complete examination of the 400-plus boxes of postal records should be undertaken.

The available records detail the day-to-day activities of those who monitored and controlled the Irish-American press. But a number of questions remain to be answered. Who were the civilian volunteers and the assistant district attorneys who censored Irish publications? Were they motivated by an agenda beyond that which can be deduced from the documents they produced? Finally, the censorship of the Irish-American press needs to be explored in the larger context. How did the treatment accorded Irish publications compare to that of other immigrant and dissident groups?

Implications of the Study

Nearly one hundred years before the onset of World War One, French philosopher Alexis de Tocqueville toured America to discover the secret of its burgeoning experiment in
democracy. De Tocqueville marveled at the number and diversity of newspapers. He remarked that public discourse and debate flourished in every corner of the nation. And he warned of the potential tyranny of the majority.

The events surrounding World War One confirmed de Tocqueville's worst fears. The nation entered a convulsive period in which freedom of speech and of the press came under severe pressure.

The meaning of the First Amendment, like American society, was largely unformed. It was out of the cauldron of the war years that modern interpretations of the First Amendment began to emerge.3

During World War One, the suppression of free expression reached its highest level in the nation's history. Due process was abandoned. Vigilantes scoured cities, towns and villages across American in search of "sedition." Civilian volunteers at the U.S. Post Office assumed summary powers of censorship. Dissent was proscribed. The nation fell under the rule of men and not of law.

Perhaps the most disturbing aspect of the World War One repressions was the role of the mainstream press. Powerful daily newspapers supported the agenda of America's governing elite who defined the nation's interests in its owns terms. The mainstream press encouraged vigilantism by failing to condemn it. It attributed the harassments, the
tar and featherings, the lynchings to the federal
government's failure to control dissent. The mainstream
daily press whipped up public hysteria and railed loudly
against the expression of alternative or oppositional
opinion. When the postal censorships began, the silence of
mainstream press was deafening.

In the end, it was the small and defenseless papers--
the foreign-language, the radical-labor, the pacifist, and
the Irish--that were silenced. Free speech became the
province of the powerful; suppression, the fate of the
weak.\textsuperscript{4}

The experience of World War One carries an important
warning concerning the status of free expression. Simply
put, alternative or oppositional viewpoints that might
otherwise be tolerated come under severe attack during times
of national stress such as wartime. It is during such
pathological periods that free expression is most
vulnerable.

The experience of World War One also carries important
lessons about the character and function of the mainstream
and alternative presses and their relationship to each
other. Mainstream and alternative presses practice
fundamentally different kinds of journalism and appeal to
different audiences.

Commercial daily newspapers are first and foremost
businesses. Their goal, in the pursuit of profit, is to
deliver a heterogeneous mass audience to advertisers. Economic imperatives require commercial newspapers to be omnibus publications, to be all things to all people. As a consequence, they avoid controversy and gravitate toward the middle of the ideological landscape in pursuit of consensus, especially in times of national stress.5

The mainstream press is often privy to the corridors of power and enjoys a special relationship with the governing elite. That relationship is symbiotic: mainstream newspapers depend upon official sources and serve as forums for the expression of dominant viewpoints. Power pays homage to power—the commercial press has a vested interest in maintaining the status quo because it benefits from it.

The alternative press, by contrast, is often more dependent upon subscriptions than advertising revenue. It appeals not to a mass audience of potential consumers, but to a small audience of potential activists. The primary goal of the alternative press is not profit—although profit is essential to survival—but social, political or economic change.6

Alternative newspapers do not avoid controversy, but embrace it. They are journals of advocacy whose guiding mission is to transform the status quo rather than maintain it. The alternative press exists because the mainstream press fails to address the needs and concerns of marginal groups in society, be they social, racial or political.
There is also an intimacy between alternative newspapers and their readers that is not possible in other large urban publications. Editors and journalists are often members of the communities they serve. In the case of the ethnic press, they are bound together by common ties of blood, culture, and shared historical experience.

The alternative press, by definition, challenges accepted orthodoxies and offers interpretations of events and issues that are at odds with the norm. Such deviance is tolerated in times of relative calm. But in times of societal stress, when the differences between mainstream and alternative viewpoints become amplified, self-proclaimed guardians of moral or ideological purity arise to demand conformity to a narrow conception of acceptable opinion. Public discourse becomes distorted. In the absence of strong protections, censorship is the inevitable result—its victims are always the weak, the marginal, the disenfranchised.

The marketplace of ideas, if it is to have any meaning, requires a commitment to the protection of adversarial and offensive expression and to the existence of a vibrant alternative press. Truth can never emerge from discourse when part of the conversation is silenced.
Notes to Chapter IX

1 Bodnar 80.

2 Moynihan and Glazer 244-245.


4 Size and influence provided immunity from censorship. The Hearst newspapers expressed many of the same sentiments as Irish-American newspapers but escaped censorship. As Peterson and Fite observed: "Hearst could criticize President Wilson, he could say the war was an economic struggle, that Ireland ought to be free, and that England could do no right--he could say these things and not be prosecuted." Peterson and Fite 94.


6 It many ways the Irish-American press of 1914-1918 more closely resembled the Party Press of the early 19th century. Irish papers promoted coherent political agendas and often depended upon subscriptions, patronage and at times donations to survive.
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