

Reporting on the Irish question by *The Times* and *Helsingin Sanomat* 1910–
1919

University of Oulu
Department of History
Master's Thesis
December 2017
Miika Tapaninen

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
1. The Road to Home rule 1910–1914.....	14
1.1. Helsingin Sanomat 1910–1914	15
1.1.1. Parliament Act: removing the road block.....	15
1.1.2. The necessity of Home Rule.....	20
1.1.3. Ulster’s resistance: “Civil war or comedy”	26
1.1.4. Mirroring the Irish and Finnish questions.....	30
1.2. The Times 1910–1914	33
1.2.1. Parliament Act: constitutional crisis	34
1.2.2. The Home Rule Phantom: “unsubstantial and fugitive will-o-the-wisp”	38
1.2.3. Justifying Ulster’s resistance.....	43
2. The changing realities 1914–1919	50
2.1. Helsingin Sanomat 1914–1919: from a principle to practical.....	51
2.1.1. Parliamentarism over extremism	51
2.1.2. Helsingin Sanomat’s alignment with the British government is emphasised ...	59
2.1.3. Changing views: British disappointment leads to shift in alignments.....	66
2.2. The Times 1914–1919: “we would gladly leave it in silence”	78
2.2.1. Irish question ties into the British war effort	79
2.2.2. Irish question: “A national and imperial necessity”	88
2.2.3. The slowly decreasing importance of the Irish question.....	96
Conclusions	105
Bibliography	108
Appendixes.....	111

Introduction

The Irish question was a significant issue in the British politics from early 19th century until the 1920s which revolved around Irish nationalism and calls for self-governance for Ireland. Ireland lost its own Parliament in 1801 by the Act of Union, which united Great Britain (England and Scotland) and Ireland under the name of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland¹. Between 1801 and 1922 the Irish fought (by parliamentary and non-parliamentary means) to regain their own Parliament and autonomy, also known in this case as Home Rule, and eventually they gained more than they originally bargained for. My thesis focuses on how the Irish question was reported in *The Times* and *Helsingin Sanomat* between 1910–1919.

In this post-Brexit² era we are currently living in, another “Irish question” has surfaced: the question of unified Ireland. The solution for the Irish question in 1922 included the partition of Ireland into Irish Free State (known as the Republic of Ireland since 1949) and Northern Ireland but since 1949 there has been a so called ‘soft border’ between Ireland and United Kingdom which has helped the mobility of people from one country to another. The threat that Brexit now brings is that a ‘hard border’ might be imposed between the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland and that would affect the Northern Ireland’s peace process. This border question was one of the reasons Northern Ireland voted for remain in the UK’s European Union membership referendum in 2016. Although the idea of unified Ireland has been bounced around since the referendum, it is highly unlikely that there will be a unified Irish state. The evidence can be found from the 20th century history of the island of Ireland.

Furthermore, the subject of Irish question in 1910–1919 has become highly topical since the year 2012 which started the decade of centenaries in Ireland. Between 2012 and 2022 Ireland will commemorate the most significant events in its modern history which eventually lead to independent Ireland. Therefore, this thesis will come out in a very appropriate time.

¹ “Act of Union”, *Britannica*.

² Brexit = Great Britain’s exit from the European Union.

Historical background

Ireland was officially annexed to the United Kingdom in 1801 by the Act of Union of 1800. Becoming an official part of the United Kingdom meant that Ireland gained representation in Westminster, the Parliament of the United Kingdom. Act of Union also meant that the Irish parliament would be dissolved.³ Despite of the reforms of the new century⁴ the conditions in Ireland were degrading. This all escalated between 1845–1850 when the potato blight swept across the country which caused the vital potato crop to rot in the ground year after year. The blight led to the Great Famine, during which approximately one million died of starvation and related diseases, and one million emigrated across the globe, mostly to the USA.⁵

Deteriorated conditions, the failed relief attempts of the British and general negligence of the Irish situation eventually led to the birth of the Home Rule movement. Home Rule movement strived for self-government for Ireland inside the United Kingdom by parliamentary means. The support of Home Rule was at its highest in the 1870s when 80 % of the Irish Members of Parliament in Westminster and the Liberal Party, led by PM William Gladstone, were for the Irish Home Rule. There were two attempts to pass the Home Rule Bill in 1886 and 1893, but they both failed. On the third attempt in 1912–1914 the Home Rule Bill passed successfully as a law, but due to the outbreak of the First World War in August of 1914, the enactment of the Home Rule was suspended until the end of the war.⁶

The Times

The Times is one of Britain's oldest and most influential newspaper which was founded in 1785 (under the name of The Daily Universal Register) and has been known as *The Times* since 1788. By the mid-19th century *The Times* had already risen to the position where it could influence the public opinion in Britain. In the era of sensationalist journalism, *The Times* maintained its rigorous standards of reporting and writing, and it strove for precise accuracy.

³ Bartlett 2014, 227–234.

⁴ Most notably the abolition of the Penal Laws, which had been established in the early 17th century, that i.e. barred Catholics from holding a public office and purchasing or leasing land; Bartlett 2014, 140–141.

⁵ Bartlett 2014, 227–234.

⁶ Bartlett 2014, 331–336; 340–341; 367; 373–375.

Since its establishment, *The Times* had declared its independence from party politics and its responsibility to the people and not the government. Although independent, in the early 20th century its editorial views became distinctly conservative. In the late 19th century *The Times* had ended up in financial difficulties and it was not until 1908 when sensationalist press lord Alfred Harmsworth (1st Viscount Northcliffe) bought the company, that *The Times* regained its financial security. Although its financial security, the paper's editorial reputation continued to deteriorate until Lord Northcliffe's death in 1922.⁷

Helsingin Sanomat

In the late 19th and early 20th century the Finnish press became more ideological and also more affiliated with different political parties. The main division in the Finnish political movements in the late 19th century was between the Fennoman movement (Finnish-speakers) and the Svecoman movement (Swedish-speakers). In the late 19th century the Fennoman movement split into two political parties: the Old Finnish Party and the radical Young Finnish Party. In 1889, the Young Finnish Party started their own newspaper called *Päivälehti* and Eero Erkko became its editor. In its early years *Päivälehti* was suspended four times for a set period of a time and finally shut down for good in 1904. After few months, the newspaper was established again but this time under a name of *Helsingin Sanomat*. Erkko returned as the editor in 1909 and he remained in the position until 1927 when his son Eljas Erkko assumed the directorship of the paper.⁸

Since its beginning, *Päivälehti* had determined that the paper's party-political stance was down to its core pro-Finland and its agenda's main point would be constitutionalism or as they put it: "supporting and improving our laws and all of our national institutions."⁹ Because of its policies, *Päivälehti* often struggled with preventive censorship that the Russian administration practiced in Finland. Eventually Eero Erkko was exiled from Finland by the order of General-Governor Bobrikov in 1903 because he was deemed by Russians to be "one of the most notable agitators in the secret resistance movement." Erkko managed to return

⁷ "The Times", *Britannica*; Torvinen 1982, 79–84.

⁸ Kortti 2016, 186–187; "Helsingin Sanomat", *Britannica*.

⁹ Henning 2003, 9.

to Finland in 1906 and in 1909 he became the editor, as mentioned, of the already established *Helsingin Sanomat*.¹⁰

It is important in the context of this thesis to note that the second wave of Russification started in Finland in 1908 and it continued until Finland gained its independence from Russia in December 1917. The aim of the Russification was to strip down Finland's autonomy and its national institutions, and bring Finland closer to Russia and the central government. At the same time in Britain, from 1910 onwards, Home Rule for Ireland had surfaced again in the political discussions and *Helsingin Sanomat* was eager to comment on Ireland's situation because Finland and Ireland shared a similar position as a part of a greater Empire. Ireland was seeking autonomy and Finland was trying to retain it, so the comparisons are easy to make in this case.

Research problem and research questions

The main focus of this research is to find out how *The Times* and *Helsingin Sanomat* reported about the Irish question. My research has three primary research questions:

1. What have the newspapers written about the Irish question between 1910–1919 and why?
2. Do the views about the Irish question differ between the newspapers and if so, how?
3. Do the views of the newspapers about the Irish question change in any way during the years?

The secondary research questions are:

- a) What kind of arguments did the newspapers use during those years for and against the events of the Irish question?
- b) What kind of attitudes can be found in the papers against different factions related to the Irish question?
- c) Do the newspapers give special significance for the Irish question?

¹⁰ Henning 2003, 10–16.

I have decided to limit my research to the years between 1910-1919 because, even though the final settlement for the Irish question was not achieved until December 1921¹¹, a similar kind of research has already been done of the years of the Anglo-Irish war 1919–1921. This thesis begins from the general election that were held in January 1910. In those elections, the Liberal Prime Minister Herbert Henry Asquith (1852–1928) made a commitment to introduce a Home Rule Bill for Ireland in the next Parliament¹². In my thesis, I will cover the years between the general election of 1910 until the early months of 1919.

To make this thesis more approachable I will now explain some key concepts important to this research. In order to fully understand 20th century history of the Irish question I will briefly explain the different factions and the most essential events related to the Irish question:

Essentially *Home Rule*, as Encyclopaedia Britannica puts it, means “limited autonomy or self-government granted by a central or regional government to its dependent political units. It has been a common feature of multinational empires or states—most notably, the ancient Roman Empire and the British Empire—which have afforded measured recognition of local ways and measured grants of self-government provided that the local populations should remain politically loyal to the central government.”¹³ It is important to note that home rule did not mean independence in any way, but a very limited autonomy from the central government.

In order to understand the British politics between 1910–1919 it is important to identify the main actors on the political field. The Liberal party had been the ruling party since the general election of 1906 and it maintained its position in the general election of 1910. Liberals had supported the Irish Home Rule since the First Home Rule Bill of 1886 and from 1910 onwards, the Liberal party, led by Prime Minister Asquith, were determined to finally find the solution for the Irish question.

¹¹ See Anglo-Irish Treaty of December 6th, 1921.

¹² Adelman & Pearce 2008, 126.

¹³ “home rule”, *Britannica*.

Another party which was keen to see the Home Rule finally implemented was the Irish Nationalist Party. Nationalist Party was a commonly used term to describe a number of Irish political parties who were supportive of Home Rule for Ireland. The largest of the Irish parties was the Irish Parliamentary party whose leader John Redmond (1856–1918) was usually seen as the leader of all the Irish representatives in the Westminster Parliament.

The main opposition for Home Rule came from the Conservative and Liberal Unionist alliance. In 1886, the First Home Rule Bill was brought down by Liberals who opposed the idea of Home Rule. After the fall of the Bill these Liberal Unionists defected from the Liberal Party and allied themselves with the Conservative Party¹⁴. At this point the ideology of Unionism became the dominant political ideology in the province of Ulster¹⁵. The key point of Unionism is to maintain the political union between Ireland and Great Britain. It is also the counterforce for Irish Nationalism. To sum it all up: in Great Britain, the counterparts were the Liberal Party and the Conservative Party and in Ireland, Irish Nationalists and Ulster Unionists.

It is important to understand the significance of Parliament Act of 1911 in the context of the Irish question. Before the enactment of the Parliament Act in 1911, the House of Lords had an absolute power of veto on legislation, however, “under the act, any bill passed by the House of Commons in three separate sessions without being altered could be presented for the royal assent without the consent of the Lords, providing that two years had elapsed since the bill had been introduced.”¹⁶ Without the Parliament Act it would have been impossible for the Third Home Rule Bill to ever pass the House of Lords because the Conservatives held a significant majority there.

Sinn Féin (‘We Ourselves’ or ‘Ourselves Alone’ in English) is an Irish political party which has for over hundred years advocated Irish “self-determination and self-reliance, which requires separation from England and English influence of any description, political or otherwise”¹⁷ in other words to end the political partition of the island of Ireland. The party’s political ideology

¹⁴ Bartlett 2014, 340–341; “Conservative Party”, *Britannica*.

¹⁵ Ulster: A province of Ireland. Today known as the country of Northern Ireland.

¹⁶ “Parliament Act of 1911”, *Britannica*.

¹⁷ Feeney 2002, 18.

has always been highly nationalist, in this case referred to as republican¹⁸. Sinn Féin was not an important figure in the Irish politics until after the 1916 Easter Rising when its popularity surged and it won 73 of 105 of the Irish seats in the British Parliament in 1918¹⁹. Sinn Féin was not actually involved in the events of the Rising, although, *The Irish Times* was quick to dub the Rising as “Sinn Féin rebellion”²⁰.

Easter Rising of 1916 (from April 24th to 29th) was a small armed rebellion (approximately 1600 rebels) against the British government and their Home Rule policy that was mostly confined to Dublin. It was planned by a few revolutionary Irish Nationalists who were members of the secret society called the Irish Republican Brotherhood. The aim of the Rising was to declare an independent Irish Republic but after five days the rebels were forced to surrender due to the overwhelming numbers of the British troops.²¹

Even though the public opinion in Ireland was against the Rising and the Rising failed in its goal, its legacy made all the difference for Ireland. Fifteen rebel leaders were swiftly and secretly court-martialled and shot before the politicians managed to regain the initiative back from the military command. Also, over 3000 men and women were arrested in suspicion of rebellious activities. The large majority of the rebels were sent to Frongoch internment camp in Wales, which was later dubbed as the “University of Revolution.” The public opinion in Ireland was not originally on the side of the Rising, but now the damage had been done: the brutality of the British military against the Irish rebels caused a wave of revulsion against the British authorities. The executed rebel leaders became martyrs for the independent Ireland.²²

I have divided this thesis into two main chapters. Each of these main chapters are divided into two subchapters, one for each of the newspapers. In the first chapter I will study the writings of the newspapers about the third Home Rule process between 1910 and 1914. In the second

¹⁸ “Sinn Féin”, *Britannica*; Republicanism in Ireland’s context means a demand for a united and independent Irish Republic.

¹⁹ “Sinn Féin”, *Britannica*.

²⁰ Dudley Edwards & Pyle (*Was it for this?*) 1966, 8.

²¹ Adelman & Pearce 2008, 146–147.

²² Bartlett 2014, 393–394.

chapter I will review the effect the first world war had on the reporting of Irish question and also how the newspapers dealt with the Easter Rising. In this chapter I will also focus on how the papers reacted to the rise of nationalism and Sinn Féin in Ireland in the context of the Irish question.

Previous research

The Irish question has been a key subject in Irish studies for decades and therefore there has been a lot of literature published. The Irish question itself has been covered from many different aspects but I have not located any research that uses newspapers as its primary source material. There have been a few master's theses about Irish history published that use newspapers as a primary source, but they do not quite cover the same subject or timeline. However, they might be useful in a methodological way. The following books cover Irish history on a greater scale and do not specifically focus on the issue of the Irish question, except one of them.

Great Britain and the Irish Question 1798–1921 by PAUL ADELMAN and ROBERT PEARCE provides an in-depth analysis on the relationship between Great Britain and Ireland from the Act of Union in 1800 to the Anglo-Irish settlement in 1922. The book contains detailed description of the most important events and persons of the Irish question and is extremely meaningful for my thesis in order to fully understand the different aspects of the Irish question.

ROBERT KEE's *The Green Flag: A History of Irish Nationalism* is an essential reading for those who wish to understand the historical forces that have shaped Ireland during the past decades. Kee's focus is on the Irish nationalism: its birth in the 18th century, different nationalist movements in Ireland and the rise of nationalism in early 20th century et cetera. Kee also pays detailed attention to the events of the Irish question.

Another classic for studying the 20th century Irish history is JOHN JOSEPH LEE's *Ireland 1912–1985: Politics and Society*. Lee approaches the subject of Irish history, both North and South, from a wider perspective and argues that Irish politics must be understood in the broad

context of economic, social, administrative, cultural and intellectual history. Although only the first chapter of Lee's book covers the time period of my thesis, it is still greatly important research literature.

British Politics and the Great War: Coalition and Conflict 1915–1918 by JOHN TURNER is also highly valuable book for this thesis since it discusses how the British war-time coalition governments dealt with different political issues including the Irish question. Turner's research will come especially useful in the second chapter of the thesis which studies how the newspapers reported on the Irish question during the First World War.

Sources and methods

The primary sources for my thesis are two newspapers: *The Times* (English) and *Helsingin Sanomat* (Finnish). I have narrowed my options down to these two papers because both of them are still being published, they have held a significant status in their countries and at the present time they represent opposite views on the liberal-conservative scale (*Helsingin Sanomat*, liberal; *The Times*, conservative). One significant reason for these choices are the similarities in Finland and United Kingdom's political atmosphere in the early 20th century. Finland was struggling to defend its autonomy from Russification process and Ireland was seeking to establish a self-governing Irish Parliament within United Kingdom. I also think that both of these newspapers are worth studying because they hold a similar influential status in their respective countries. Furthermore, *The Times* and *Helsingin Sanomat* come from a different cultural background so comparing their views on the subject might be more interesting than comparing two newspapers of the same background.

For this research I have used the *National Library's Digital Collections* (<http://digi.kansalliskirjasto.fi>), which contains the newspapers and magazines published in Finland before the 1920s, and *The Times Digital Archive 1785–1985*. In order to find the relevant material for this thesis between 1910–1919 I chose specific keywords for my searches. In *Helsingin Sanomat's* case I expected a lot narrower reporting of Ireland in general, so I used *Irlanti* ('Ireland'). For *The Times's* editorials I felt that I had to narrow the search down more so I used 'Ireland' and 'Irish' as my keywords after which I selected the

right editorials that were relevant for this thesis. I have presented the quantity of relevant news articles and editorials published in the papers in Appendix 1 (*Helsingin Sanomat*) and Appendix 2 (*The Times*).

Due to the vast amount of source material some limitations must be made. Because the Irish question was a domestic matter for Britain it is natural that the coverage will be much wider than in *Helsingin Sanomat*. Therefore, I have decided to limit my research of *The Times* to the editorials published in the paper. Editorials also give us a much clearer picture of the paper's own views. In *Helsingin Sanomat* this limitation is not necessary because the coverage is narrower and therefore I will focus in their news articles and letters from their readership, which show the paper's views of the events clearly.

However, I will not be studying how objectively the newspapers cover the events, for objectivity does not mean the same as objective reporting. In his book *Analysing newspapers: an approach from critical discourse analysis*, JOHN E. RICHARDSON has stated that "columns, editorials and other forms of news analysis will never qualify as 'objective reporting': the voice of the journalist is either too loud or too central for them to be objective."²³ He has argued that:

*Distancing oneself from the truth claims of the report is not the same as removing all value judgements from a report. Instead, it requires that the fact and opinion in a news report – that is, the **reported speech**, included in whatever form – needs to be that of the people **other than** the journalist.²⁴*

All in all, newspapers can report truthfully of the events, but they reflect their own values and meanings to them. Of course, there is essentially always need for source criticism when it comes to non-academic writing and the source material must be read in relation to the research literature.

²³ Richardson 2007, 86.

²⁴ Ibid.; Bolded words originally in cursive in the book.

This research is qualitative and comparative in its nature. The main aim of this thesis is to determine why and how the Irish question was portrayed in the newspapers, not what, when and where. I'll be analysing the newspapers from the perspective of critical discourse analysis (CDA), which Richardson discusses in his book *Analysing newspapers: an approach from critical discourse analysis*. CDA is "a theory and a method of analysing the way that individuals and institutions use language." CDA is concerned with social problems, but it is not concerned with "language or language use *per se*, but with the linguistic character of social and cultural processes and structures." Language use can be ideological and to determine this "it is necessary to analyse texts to investigate their interpretation, reception and social effects." During this research, it is important to remember that discourses are historical and they can only be understood in relation to their context.²⁵

²⁵ Richardson 2007, 1; 26–27.

1. The Road to Home rule 1910–1914

After the general election in January 1910 the time had finally come to tackle the Irish question once and for all. However, the election result was an enormous disappointment for the Liberal Party which gained as many seats in the House of Commons as the Conservatives and therefore lost its majority of the House²⁶. With the support of the Irish Nationalists and the Labour Party, Liberals managed to remain as the governing party and Asquith could carry on as the Prime Minister. With the majority of the House behind them, the government could now begin to deal with the House of Lords which was the only obstacle on the road to Irish Home Rule. The Parliament Act of 1911 received the Royal Assent and was enacted in August of 1911. The Parliament Act abolished the absolute veto of the House of Lords over legislation and now Lords could only delay a bill, which was passed by the House of Commons in three successive parliamentary sessions, for two years. The following year the Liberal government introduced the Third Home Rule Bill and finally in September 1914 the Home Rule Bill was placed in the statute book. However, the Bill was never enacted for it was suspended due to the outbreak of the First World War.²⁷

As it can be seen from the graph (Appendix 3) and the tables quantifying the number of articles and editorials published on each year (Appendix 1 & 2) the papers' interest on the Irish question differed significantly early on. *Helsingin Sanomat* showed great interest on the subject in the early months of 1910 during the general election because the paper thought that Ireland's future would be determined in this election and the paper also followed closely the negotiations concerning the Parliament Act. In 1911, after the Parliament Act had passed, there were many months that no news regarding the Irish question was published, however, from 1912 onwards, when the Home Rule Bill was introduced for the first time in the Parliament in April, the number of articles published rose steadily each year as the paper followed the Home Rule process closely. *The Times*, however, published only 2 editorials concerning the Irish question in 1910 but the paper was considerably more active during 1912. That said, the paper's number of editorials declined greatly from 1912 (22 editorials) to

²⁶ House of Commons consists of 670 seats and 336 seats are needed for majority.

²⁷ Adelman & Pearce 2008, 126–127; 145.

1913 (6 editorials) and 1914 (5 editorials)²⁸ which could be because, after the passing of the Parliament Act, *The Times* viewed that the Irish Home Rule was inevitable.

In the first main chapter my aim is to study the period from 1910 general election until September 1914 in the newspapers. I have sorted out three distinctive themes in the Home Rule process for both papers between 1910–1914: The Parliament Act, the Home Rule Bill itself and the Unionist resistance against the Home Rule. I have divided this main chapter in two subchapters, one for each paper, where I will analyse the papers writings of those three themes. Exception to this division is in *Helsingin Sanomat* which has an additional chapter for mirroring the Irish question and the Finnish question.

1.1. *Helsingin Sanomat* 1910–1914

From early on, it can clearly be seen in the writings of *Helsingin Sanomat* that the paper's views on Irish question are very positive and significantly pro-Home Rule for Ireland, but this does not mean that the paper's views are anti-British rather than anti-conservative. It is obvious that *Helsingin Sanomat* used the Irish question to mirror Finland's struggle for maintaining its own autonomy under Russia's rule but that was not the sole reason for the paper's stance on the Irish question. From the writings, it can easily be distinguished that *Helsingin Sanomat* favours the policies of the Liberal Party and supports self-determination of smaller nations. Even though its liberal views, the paper's reporting was not from a narrow perspective, and it regularly included views from both conservative and liberal British newspapers to its own news.

1.1.1. Parliament Act: removing the road block

Helsingin Sanomat began its coverage early in January 1910 when the general election was going on. From January 15th to February 10th²⁹, *Helsingin Sanomat* paid close attention to how many seats the parties were gaining and at the same time provided commentary of the

²⁸ Appendix 2.

²⁹ The whole election process lasted from January 15th to February 10th. In those days elections took far more amount of time than today for understandable reasons.

situation, for example, about what would it mean if a certain party gained majority in the House of Commons. However, *Helsingin Sanomat* showed the most interest on the Liberal Party's electoral success because the party leader Asquith had in last December in his speech at Royal Albert Hall pledged to introduce a Home Rule Bill in the next parliament if the Liberals were re-elected³⁰.

In January 18th *Helsingin Sanomat* published an article analysing the Irish Nationalists and their position in these elections. According to the paper the Irish Nationalists were the only party "in the Great Britain and Ireland that could with full peace of mind await the elections" because they did not have to worry about significantly increasing or decreasing their number of seats in the Parliament. The paper asserted that the influence of the Nationalists in the Parliament depended on the success of the Liberals and the Conservatives because the Home Rule depended on the majority of the Liberal Party. The article also argued, with some foresight, that the most advantageous position for the Nationalists would be if the Liberals' majority would depend only on the Nationalists, which actually was the result of the election.³¹

Sometimes it is challenging to distinguish whose voice can be heard from an article due to the style of writing in *Helsingin Sanomat*. For example, in January 23rd the paper reported on the Nationalist leader John Redmond's comments about the current standings in the election³². There were no direct quotations in this short article, so it is difficult to differentiate between Redmond and the writer's voice. The article ended in a sentence: "No Liberal Party, no matter how strong they are, would deny the Irish their Home Rule." *Helsingin Sanomat* often summarized entire speeches for articles without using quotation marks and therefore there was no clear distinction in the article whether this was Redmond's or the writer's opinion. However, because there was not any corrections or additions to this statement at the end of the article, it is possible to draw a conclusion that the paper stood by this statement.

³⁰ Adelman & Pearce 2008, 126.

³¹ *Helsingin Sanomat* (HS) 18.1.1910.

³² HS 23.1.1910.

Helsingin Sanomat kept a close eye on the elections and how the seats were distributed but the paper was at times jumping to conclusions rather quickly, which speaks for how important the paper saw this election. In the article published in January 25th the paper stated that even though it was still early to talk about the election results, some of the key questions of this election had already been answered. *Helsingin Sanomat* interpreted the relative strengths of the parties at the time that there was no hope for limiting the power of the House of Lords in the upcoming parliamentary term.³³ However five days later in January 30th, it had become clear that the Liberals would reach the majority with the help of the Irish members. *Helsingin Sanomat's* London correspondent noted that the government should be able to pass two significant reforms, the budget and the constitutional reform that would remove House of Lords's absolute veto right.³⁴ This kind of hasty reporting and quick conclusions can be seen more clearly in the papers reporting of Ulster's resistance of Home Rule (Chapter 1.1.3).

After February 10th the result of the election was final. The Liberal Party had maintained its position as the largest party, but its number of seats had significantly been reduced from the previous elections, so they depended on the Irish Nationalists for the majority³⁵. For the next couple of months, budget discussions would dominate *Helsingin Sanomat's* Ireland-related writings. For the Liberals, it was extremely important to pass the budget because the previous budget proposal and its failure was the reason the last Parliament was disbanded in the first place³⁶.

On the following day, February 11th, *Helsingin Sanomat* published an article titled "Which side will the Irish take?³⁷" This question was in the air at the time because naturally Irish Nationalists supported the Liberal Party because they had promised them to implement Home Rule, but on the other hand, the Irish saw that some parts (the Irish detested the idea of an increase in the whiskey duty) of the budget the Liberals were planning to pass would not serve Irish interests³⁸. The article stated that the procedure of the Irish Members of

³³ HS 25.1.1910.

³⁴ HS 30.1.1910.

³⁵ Bartlett 2014, 365–367.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ HS 11.2.1910: "Mille puolelle irlantilaiset asettuvat?"

³⁸ Boyce 1992, 77.

Parliament will depend on more noble principles than whiskey duty³⁹. However, the budget gave the Nationalists leverage against the government and with it they could demand guarantees that the government should prioritise abolishing the veto-right of the House of Lords over passing the budget.

For the next few weeks *Helsingin Sanomat* followed the budget discussions closely. *Helsingin Sanomat* deemed that the two questions about budget and veto-right were “exciting and extremely important”⁴⁰ but the paper also wrote that delaying passing of the budget after dealing with the House of Lords would be questionable⁴¹. These minor differences in the paper’s views could be explained by different writers because altogether *Helsingin Sanomat* clearly hoped to see Home Rule granted for Ireland. That said, *Helsingin Sanomat* showed distinct anticonservative views. The paper argued, in an article published on February 23rd, that if the Nationalists and Labour would not support the government with the budget, it would again lead to disbanding the Parliament and “in worst case scenario” the Conservatives would become the governing party and British politics would turn against the Irish and Labour⁴². There might be minor differences in the views of the different writers of the *Helsingin Sanomat* (although it is impossible to conclude anything of it because the writers were not credited in the articles), but it is safe to say that *Helsingin Sanomat* saw a threat in the Conservative politics.

After weeks of negotiations between the Liberals, Labour and Nationalists, they finally reached an agreement in early March 1910 on the procedure of the House of Commons. The budget was accepted by the Lords in late April and now the focus of the Liberal government, and the newspapers, was on the reform of the Upper House. In May 5th *Helsingin Sanomat* published a long article on the subject where it stated: “But Liberal Party cannot, without severely damaging their moral values, accept any sort of compromise that would make achieving Irish Home Rule soon in some form impossible⁴³.” The paper then continued that breaking of already made promise would not be necessary anyway because the conservative

³⁹ HS 11.2.1910.

⁴⁰ HS 18.2.1910.

⁴¹ HS 23.2.1910.

⁴² HS 23.2.1910.

⁴³ HS 5.5.1910.

opposition against Home Rule was not absolute and neither will the Liberal's Home Rule proposal be so all-round that the negotiations should abate because of the Home Rule question. The paper concluded the article by stating that at current time only small portion of the English was either against or for Home Rule anyway.⁴⁴ Yet again the analysis was incorrect.

The death of King of the United Kingdom Edward VII (1841–1910) threw a wrench in the works and negotiations were halted until the end of May. In May 31st *Helsing Sanomat* published an article about the change of monarch and Upper House question. The paper reported of willingness to compromise amongst the Conservatives due to Edward VII's death and that *The Times* had written that the burden of Edward should not be passed to George V, the next King. But because the monarch is supposed to act upon government's guidance and decisions, *Helsingin Sanomat* wrote that there was no need to change the procedure of the Upper House reform. According to the paper, the ongoing battle on great issues of principle should not be ruined by rushing into things and only the Lords had something to gain by delaying the process further, not democracy.⁴⁵

Democracy and constitutionalism were issues that both *Helsingin Sanomat* and *The Times* brought up at some point during their reporting on the Irish question but they both had a different perspective on them. Both newspapers saw the Upper House reform, and also Home Rule, as a constitutional struggle. In the case of *Helsingin Sanomat* this can most easily be seen in many headlines that were titled for example "Constitutional struggle in England⁴⁶", "England's constitutional question⁴⁷" and "English parliamentary battle⁴⁸" and of course in the content of those articles. *Helsingin Sanomat* saw it necessary to limit House of Lords' veto-right because it was unconstitutional for one institution to be able to veto any law passed to it. By limiting the Lords' veto-right, it would make Home Rule possible and therefore spreading of democracy which would strengthen the status of smaller nations like Ireland and Finland.

⁴⁴ HS 5.5.1910.

⁴⁵ HS 31.5.1910.

⁴⁶ HS 21.6.1910.

⁴⁷ HS 16.11.1910.

⁴⁸ HS 8.8.1910.

Parliament Act 1911 eventually received Royal assent and commencement in August 18th 1911. The process had not been as simple as *Helsingin Sanomat* had predicted because between May 1910 and August 1911 Britain witnessed a failed veto-conference that tried to find a solution for the Upper House question and another general election in December 1910 which yielded nearly same results as the previous one⁴⁹. Finally, House of Lords bowed to Asquith's will, who threatened the Lords that the King would impose new peers and thus the Conservatives could lose their majority in the Upper House, and the Parliamentary Bill was accepted by the Lords. Two days before the Bill received Royal assent, *Helsingin Sanomat* gave a positive prediction for the future of Home Rule Bill. The paper thought it was likely that the government would propose the Home Rule Bill at the beginning of the next parliamentary session and it was possible that the Bill would pass during next term⁵⁰. In the next chapter I will discuss the *Helsingin Sanomat's* reporting on the process of the Home Rule Bill from end of 1911 August to its acceptance and suspension at the outbreak of the First World War.

1.1.2. The necessity of Home Rule

Now that the problem of the Lords had been solved there was seemingly nothing standing in the way of passing of the Home Rule Bill. Without the absolute veto-right, the Lords could only delay the inevitable because the Parliament Act guaranteed that "any bill rejected by the House of Lords could, if passed through the Commons again in two more consecutive sessions, automatically qualify for the royal assent and become law regardless of the Lords⁵¹." It seemed like the Irish Nationalists' support of the government would eventually be rewarded.

Helsingin Sanomat resumed reporting on the Irish question by the end of August 1911. In the article titled "Ireland's Home Rule" *Helsingin Sanomat* stated that now the government did not have any other choice than to take Irish Home Rule under serious consideration⁵². After all Asquith had promised in December 1909 to pass Home Rule if the Liberal Party won the

⁴⁹ Adelman & Pearce 2008, 127.

⁵⁰ HS 16.8.1910.

⁵¹ Kee 1972, 463.

⁵² HS 31.8.1911.

elections and now the final obstacle had been removed from the way of the Bill. Even the Conservatives, according to *Helsingin Sanomat*, could not do anything else but to appeal to their old hostility towards the Irish and to the fear that Home Rule would create Catholic ascendancy in Ireland and the Catholic majority would oppress the Protestant population⁵³. After this article, the reporting on the Irish question died down for a couple of months and the reason for this can be found from the strike of the Irish railroad workers. Asquith's government had to deal with this strike before returning to other business and therefore *Helsingin Sanomat* also paid more attention to these current events than speculating the Home Rule process that had not even started yet.

Helsingin Sanomat picked up the Irish question again in early February and between February and end of April in 1912 the paper published three articles that discussed the Home Rule in further detail. On February 4th *Helsingin Sanomat* published an article where the paper outlined at the time known contents of the Home Rule Bill. More interestingly in April 12th the paper published an article called "Home Rule – the newest victory of nationalism." Right in the beginning *Helsingin Sanomat* declared that the day before had been "a day of victory for small nations" for Asquith had finally introduced the third Home Rule Bill in Parliament⁵⁴. According to the paper:

*An empire, that is the largest in the world by area, without a match in its political significance and ahead of everyone else in democracy, has yesterday for the third time engaged in correcting the most disgraceful part of its great history.*⁵⁵

Helsingin Sanomat argued that during the last century Britain had been a defender of the rights of the small nations and therefore it was most shameful that this kind of oppressive rule had occurred for centuries right next to the center of the empire⁵⁶. However, *Helsingin Sanomat* quickly moved away from criticizing Britain itself and focused yet again on the

⁵³ HS 31.8.1911.

⁵⁴ HS 12.4.1912.

⁵⁵ HS 12.4.1912: "Valtakunta, joka on alueeltaan maailman suurin, valtiolliselta merkitykseltään ehkä vertaansa vailla ja kansainvaltaisuuudessaan samoin edellä muita, kävi eilen kolmannen kerran käsiksi suuren historiansa häpeällisimmän kohdan korjaamiseen."

⁵⁶ Ibid.

Conservative Party. The paper wrote that Britain attempted, as *Helsingin Sanomat* put it, “to remove the stain” in its history for the first time in 1886 and since then the attempts have been thwarted by the Conservatives who the paper called in the article “relentless enemies of Ireland⁵⁷.” *Helsingin Sanomat* then listed reasons for the Conservatives’ opposition of Irish Home Rule and divided the reasons into three categories: economic, religious and state.⁵⁸ This was the first article in *Helsingin Sanomat* that tried to provide proper analysis on why the Conservatives opposed the Irish Home Rule. The article also provided counterarguments for the Conservatives and deemed their arguments weak⁵⁹.

In conclusion *Helsingin Sanomat* wrote that “imperial politics can once again move out of the way of the rights of small nations and amongst other nations rises once again a nationality that has reached its national maturity⁶⁰.” This article summarised perfectly how *Helsingin Sanomat* viewed the question of Irish Home Rule. *Helsingin Sanomat* saw Irish Home Rule, as they clearly stated in the article, as a victory for the small nations everywhere, and what especially made Ireland’s case significant was that it was part of the largest empire in the world. It seems that, by using the Irish question and Britain as an example, *Helsingin Sanomat* attempted to create a scale on which all the other empires and greater states would be measured. In the context of Finland this could be seen as an attempt to criticise the on-going Russification process in a more unprovocative way and provide some kind of guidelines for Russia how to handle its provincial politics. Even though censorship was enforced in Finland at the time due to the second wave of Russification, the Finns were now more eager to resist the process than during the first wave⁶¹ and therefore *Helsingin Sanomat* was more comfortable to criticise Russia’s actions, although the paper did so more indirectly by writing about the Anglo-Irish relations. An example for this could also be found from an article published in May 12th where *Helsingin Sanomat* summarised *Nya Pressen*’s (a Swedish-speaking newspaper published in Helsinki 1906–1914) article and wrote how England was strengthening the bond between England and Ireland by granting Ireland autonomy⁶².

⁵⁷ HS 12.4.1912

⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁵⁹ Ibid.

⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁶¹ Vahtola 2012, 280–281.

⁶² HS 12.5.1912.

Usually the most extensive, and at times the most poignant, reports about the British politics and Irish question came from *Helsingin Sanomat*'s correspondents who wrote under the pen name of Terä and A.C. In April 23rd and June 26th *Helsingin Sanomat* published letters written by Terä where he provided commentary on the political atmosphere in Britain. On April 23rd Terä wrote that due to the national emergency, caused by the sinking of Titanic, the attention of the press and the public had shifted from Home Rule, although, he argued that without Titanic all the attention would be on Irish Home Rule⁶³. However, it seems that for Terä the Irish Home Rule was not the most important on-going political process because in June 26th he wrote that the Home Rule Bill was a minor issue compared to the suffrage reform the government was also pushing⁶⁴. This reform, if passed, would essentially mean universal and equal suffrage on the principle of "one man, one vote", although still excluding women, and Terä also boldly argued that this would mean that the Conservative Party would never again achieve the status of a governing party⁶⁵. So even though Irish Home Rule was considered to be a high-priority issue, at times it can be seen from the writings of *Helsingin Sanomat* that the Conservatives were considered as a threat and the paper depicted distinct antipathies against them.

During August and September in 1912 *Helsingin Sanomat* published a three-part letter by A.C. In these letters A.C discussed Home Rule from different perspectives, for example why Ulster resisted it (this part of the letters I will discuss more in the chapter 1.1.3.) and what it meant to Ireland or the British Empire. In the second (September 14th, 1912) and third (September 15th, 1912) letters A.C pondered the reasons for Ireland's discontent and why the Home Rule was necessary in constitutional and economic sense, and also for integrity of the Empire⁶⁶. In the second letter A.C showed that he has really studied the issue for he sought these reasons from the Anglo-Irish history and in his letters, he provided extensive historical background for the reasons behind Irish Home Rule. The third letter viewed the issue of Home Rule from the perspective of 1912. A.C wrote that the conditions had improved in Ireland but the wounds of centuries of oppression had not yet healed, but A.C commended Asquith's government for

⁶³ HS 23.4.1912.

⁶⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ HS 14.9.1912.

starting the reform work⁶⁷. According to A.C, Home Rule would bring many benefits for Britain: lightening the parliamentary workload of the British Parliament, limiting the Irish influence on purely English affairs, cutting costs on expensive administration and most importantly A.C saw Home Rule as a principle for the integrity of the Empire (A.C based this argument on the fact that at the time there were 28 Parliaments in the British Empire)⁶⁸. The interesting part about these arguments raised by A.C is that *The Times* used very similar arguments, although from different perspective, against Irish Home Rule, but more on that in chapter 1.2.

After this point, the reporting on the Irish question started yet again to die down in *Helsingin Sanomat*. In October 1912, the paper published a two-part letter about Ireland written by Niilo Idman, bachelor of philosophy, who was at the time travelling in Ireland and England. But after Terä's article in November 7th, no major articles concerning Irish Home Rule were published until September 1913. Some smaller news and telegrams that followed the progression of the Home Rule Bill were published but between November 1912 and September 1913 *Helsingin Sanomat* did not publish any larger pieces that would analyse Irish Home Rule further. Two reasons can be found for *Helsingin Sanomat's* decreased interest on the issue. Firstly, the reporting on Ulster's resistance (see chapter 1.1.3.) had started to increase since the beginning of 1912 and from January 1913 onwards, when Ulster Volunteer Force was established, the situation in Ulster began to slowly escalate as the Home Rule Bill progressed further. Secondly, the passing of the third Home Rule Bill was a process that lasted years. It could be argued that there was not much interest on behalf of *Helsingin Sanomat* to follow the process intensively if any major developments did not occur. After all, by the end of 1913, the bill had already passed the Commons and Lords (where it was rejected) twice. At this point the bill only needed to pass the House of Commons once more in order to become a law and because of the Parliament Act it did not matter on the third time whether the Lords would accept or reject, it would receive royal assent anyway.

Helsingin Sanomat picked up the storyline again in September of 1913 but the paper's full focus was on subject from February 1914 onwards when the Parliament returned from its

⁶⁷ HS 15.9.1912.

⁶⁸ Ibid.

break. In his article Terä stated the significance of the beginning session because the future of Ireland would largely be determined in the following months. The government would continue to push the Home Rule Bill forward but on its way were still the Lords, who according to Terä, were engaged in “Don Quixote’s battle for their regressive opinions”, and also the revolutionary Ulster who Terä did not even take seriously.⁶⁹

In March 12th and 22nd *Helsingin Sanomat* reported on the essential part of the Home Rule Bill which was the compromise solution to give Ulster’s counties chance by referendum to opt out from Home Rule for six years. In March 12th’s article *Helsingin Sanomat* did not really react to this suggestion of partition even though the question of partition was essentially acute in the political debate in Britain. Thomas Bartlett has described the situation in the following way:

*The Conservatives under Bonar Law who had wanted to use Ulster to wreck the entire Home Rule project would have to admit defeat, and so too would Carson, for this had been his plan all along. Irish Nationalists naturally would be hostile to the idea of a divided Ireland and for Redmond and the Irish Parliamentary Party, given the volatile public mood outside Ulster, such a concession might prove their undoing in electoral terms.*⁷⁰

This article of *Helsingin Sanomat* did not react to the subject of partition but in March 22nd Terä stated in his article that concessions on Home Rule were a sign of weakness by the government⁷¹.

Home Rule Bill finally passed the House of Commons for the third time in May 1914 and this meant that it would become a law despite of rejection by the Lords. In next September, the Bill was placed in the statute book, but its enactment was immediately suspended due to the outbreak of the First World War⁷². After the Bill had passed the Commons in May, *Helsingin*

⁶⁹ HS 18.2.1914: “Their boasting performance cannot be taken seriously.”

⁷⁰ Bartlett 2014, 373–374.

⁷¹ HS 22.3.1914.

⁷² Bartlett 2014, 374.

Sanomat published an article where it stated that even though the Bill had passed, the Home Rule question was still not settled, and the paper predicted unrest and possibly even bloodshed in Ireland⁷³. This statement was oddly firm considering that since 1911 *Helsingin Sanomat* had gone back and forth in their reporting on the possibility of the outbreak of civil war in Ireland. The next chapter will discuss the reporting on Ulster's resistance of Home Rule.

1.1.3. Ulster's resistance: "Civil war or comedy"

The Irish question also spawned the Ulster question. Ulster resisted the implementation of Home Rule because the large Protestant population of Ulster refused the idea that they would be subjugated under the rule of Catholic majority of the South. For Ulster Unionists, who were dominantly Protestant, the question was of race and religion, and J.J. Lee has even argued that Protestantism became a symbol of racial superiority for Unionists, who could not be told apart from Catholics by skin colour or language⁷⁴. Unionists were also afraid of the growing political influence of the Roman Catholic Church and therefore the phrase "Home Rule is Rome Rule" had entered the political debates during the 19th century⁷⁵.

The first mentions of Ulster's resistance came already in December 1910 after the general election. On December 24th *Helsingin Sanomat* reported that many Conservative and Unionist newspapers were predicting outbreak of the civil war in Ireland if Home Rule was forced upon Ulster, although, *Helsingin Sanomat* deemed that the reports of these right-wing publications were "highly exaggerated to say the least⁷⁶." At this point *Helsingin Sanomat* did not pay much attention to the situation developing in Ulster and by the end of April 1911 the paper wrote that there was only a small Unionist group in Ireland which resisted Home Rule and was currently gathering funds for launching a political resistance campaign against Home Rule⁷⁷.

However, by February 1912, a lot had changed. Winston Churchill was going to give a speech at the Liberal Party's convention in Belfast in early February but Terä wrote on February 1st

⁷³ HS 29.5.1914.

⁷⁴ Lee 1990, 2–3.

⁷⁵ Adelman & Pearce 2008, 123.

⁷⁶ HS 24.12.1910.

⁷⁷ HS 29.4.1911.

that “whole Ulster has gone on a warpath against [Churchill].” In his article Terä wrote that Ulster was “English by nationality, Protestant by religion and regressive by its political opinions.”⁷⁸ That said Terä tremendously simplified the issue of Ulster. Between 1912 and 1914 *Helsingin Sanomat* frequently raised the matter of Ulster’s nationality in its articles⁷⁹. Regardless, it is difficult to consider Ulstermen as distinctly English. The Jacobite plantation of Ulster took place in early decades of 17th century when the lands confiscated from the Irish were settled by the British, who were mostly Scots⁸⁰. Due to this fact, it could be argued that after 300 years Ulstermen were descendants of these British planters, but their nationality was hardly English or Scottish at this point, and even though Ireland was not partitioned into the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland until 1921, Ulstermen could not be called Irish either⁸¹. It might have been easier for *Helsingin Sanomat* to assert that those who resisted Home Rule in Ireland were English, so the resistance could be seen as a “foreign” influence rather than domestic. Furthermore, Unionists were not exclusive to Ulster for there were also Unionists in the southern parts of Ireland also. What comes to the religion part of Terä’s claim, according to the census of Ireland in 1911, Protestants were a majority only in four of nine counties in Ulster⁸², however, the centre of Unionism, Belfast, is located between County Antrim and County Down, which had two of the highest Protestant majorities.

Helsingin Sanomat clearly saw Ulster’s resistance as a rebellion which had no legal basis. *Helsingin Sanomat*’s correspondent A.C asserted in August 1912 that difficulty of the Home Rule question lay in religion because Ireland’s and especially Ulster’s Protestants were “intolerant and blindly religious⁸³”. According to A.C Ulster Protestants feared for their freedom of religion under Home Rule but A.C did not believe that Home Rule would mean Home Rule for Ulster. Furthermore, A.C wrote that Ulster was not even unanimous of Home Rule for there are both Protestants and Catholics in Ulster and of Members of Parliament from Ulster, 16 supported Home Rule and 17 opposed it.⁸⁴ J.J. Lee has argued that Ulster Protestants regarded themselves as “*Herrenvolk*” compared to the Catholic population and

⁷⁸ HS 1.2.1912.

⁷⁹ See for example: HS 10.2.1912; HS 24.9.1912; HS 5.2.1913.

⁸⁰ Adelman & Pearce 2008, 4.

⁸¹ Lee 1990, 2–5.

⁸² Lee 1990, 2.

⁸³ HS 22.8.1912.

⁸⁴ HS 22.8.1912.

how an “Ulsterman was an abstract Protestant ideal untainted by the contamination of Catholic presence⁸⁵.” Concerning this, Lee then poses a question: “Why should a *Herrenvolk* deign to notice numbers? Why should one Protestant be equated with one Catholic?”⁸⁶

On February 5th 1913, *Helsingin Sanomat* presented similar views of Ulster, when the paper described Ulster as “a Protestant base of conqueror and oppressor element” and the paper also argued that the centuries of oppression have brought up all of Ireland, except the Ulster extremist, to see Home Rule as an only way to free Ireland from this feeling of inferiority⁸⁷.

Helsingin Sanomat's another correspondent Terä also gave his opinion of the situation on May 29th 1914. Terä asserted that Ulster rebels, who deemed themselves to be “loyal subjects of King George”, were arming themselves against democracy because their resistance was directed towards representatives of government who have been elected by the electors who had been chosen by the people⁸⁸. Additionally, Terä criticised the parliamentary opposition who had encouraged Ulstermen to take arms. He argued that because English politics is “based on customs and precedents” other groups like workers and suffragettes could defend using non-parliamentary ways by referring to Ulster crisis.⁸⁹ Terä clearly saw Ulster's actions unconstitutional which could prove to be even more harmful on the larger political scale.

On March 23rd 1914 *Helsingin Sanomat* published an article where the paper stated that “it is impossible to predict whether the conflict in Ulster will end in civil war or comedy⁹⁰.” In my opinion this sentence perfectly summarised *Helsingin Sanomat*'s reporting on Ulster's resistance during 1914. Since 1912 *Helsingin Sanomat* had reported that Ulster's resistance would eventually escalate into a civil war and the paper stood by this view until 1914 when the reporting changed into terribly erratic. In January *Helsingin Sanomat* reported that the situation in Ulster had become more and more threatening⁹¹ but on March 13th the paper wrote that the situation had improved significantly⁹² and before end of March the status had

⁸⁵ Lee 1990, 5.

⁸⁶ Ibid.

⁸⁷ HS 5.2.1913.

⁸⁸ HS 29.5.1914.

⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁹⁰ HS 23.3.1914.

⁹¹ HS 16.1.1914.

⁹² HS 13.3.1914.

again shifted twice. In early May *Helsingin Sanomat* was sure that the government and Ulstermen had reached an agreement⁹³ which was rather odd considering that on 24th and 25th of April UVF had managed to smuggle about 25,000 rifles and 5 million rounds of ammunition, purchased from Germany, into Ulster⁹⁴. Bartlett has argued that UVF transformed overnight from “a comic-opera army” into “the best equipped force, apart from the British army, in United Kingdom⁹⁵.” However, according to the paper, a month later the situation was yet again on the brink of war⁹⁶.

It is challenging to draw definite conclusions why *Helsingin Sanomat*'s reporting concerning Ulster became so erratic during 1914. On March 12th 1914 *Helsingin Sanomat* admitted that their reporting on Home Rule had been contradictory and the reason for this could be found from the conservative Russian telegram sources that the paper used⁹⁷. According to *Helsingin Sanomat*, the Russian sources resented Irish Home Rule but in the end, they had to correct their previous biased statements. Also, the paper had in January 1910 criticised St. Petersburg's telegram office's sloppy and inadequate communication which made difficult for the paper to follow the British general election⁹⁸. Anyhow, following and reporting on foreign affairs could not have been easy due to the technology of the time. Additionally, the Ulster question was a heated issue where an agreement that would satisfy all the parties was difficult to find. Even Liberals and Nationalists did not completely agree on every aspect of the Bill and neither did the Conservatives and Ulstermen. Therefore, it is understandable that the situation could change rapidly.

Helsingin Sanomat clearly saw Ireland as an island that housed two separate nations/nationalities: Ulster Protestants and the rest of Ireland. *Helsingin Sanomat* supported Irish Home Rule and did not see any threat in it for Protestant Ulster. Therefore, the paper did not approve Ulster's aspirations to violently resist the implementation of Home Rule and deemed the resistance unconstitutional. Even though Ulster, like Finland, was also Protestant,

⁹³ HS 3.5.1914.

⁹⁴ Bartlett 2014, 371.

⁹⁵ Ibid.

⁹⁶ HS 19.6.1914.

⁹⁷ HS 12.3.1914.

⁹⁸ HS 21.10.1910.

the rights and self-government of small nations clearly outweighed religion in importance for *Helsingin Sanomat*. In the next chapter I will discuss how *Helsingin Sanomat* mirrored the Irish and Finnish question between 1910 and 1914.

1.1.4. Mirroring the Irish and Finnish questions

One of the most interesting themes that can be distinguished from the news of *Helsingin Sanomat* is how the Irish question was compared to the Finnish question. Ireland and Finland are mentioned multiple times in different articles between 1910–1914. These articles often consist of material published in either Russian or English newspapers that has been summarised and translated in Finnish. Even if the material often came from foreign newspapers it is worth to note *Helsingin Sanomat*'s interest and effort in publishing these articles to show how Finland's struggle for autonomy is viewed abroad. Also, by publishing these articles, *Helsingin Sanomat* attempted to tie the Finnish question into the Irish question and therefore provide arguments for maintaining Finland's autonomy under the Russification process.

Most of the articles that I found while studying the source material dealt with Finnish and Russian politics. Those articles did not really have anything to do with the Irish question but, nevertheless, the articles often referenced the Irish question when talking about the political situation in Finland. For example, in February 22nd 1910 *Helsingin Sanomat* published an article about the Finnish Parliament, which was elected in early February, with headline: "New Parliament of Finland and *Novoje Vremja*". This article was a translation of an article published by *Novoje Vremja*, a Russian newspaper which was published between 1868–1917. In the end, the article suggested that the Russian politicians should learn from the example of British provincial politics concerning Irish Home Rule when it came down to dealing with Finland⁹⁹. There are lots of other examples in those articles that I have found that urged Russia to consider how Britain is dealing with Ireland and apply that to Finland, or articles that briefly state that the British way was the proper way to handle the provincial issues in an empire which is actually rather odd to think about because the British government still had a few

⁹⁹ HS 22.2.1910.

months under four years of different kind of obstacles to go through before passing the Home Rule Bill. At this point in early 1910 the Irish Home Rule was not set in stone, but it was an inspiring situation concerning small nations under an empire.

Apparently, the comparisons of Finnish and Irish questions have been a notable issue at the time because even Russia's Prime Minister Pjotr Stolypin gave his opinion on the subject in an interview with a reporter from the *Financial Times*, which was published in *Helsingin Sanomat* in December 11th 1910. Stolypin compared Russia's stance on Finland to the relations of England and Ireland. Stolypin stated that England compelled Ireland to send its representatives to the Parliament of the kingdom which handled all the Irish affairs in a way that benefited the empire, and England even forced Ireland to take part in the taxes of the Empire. Meanwhile, opposite of that, Russia had *tolerated* the existence of one of its provinces (Finland) located right beyond the gates of its capital. A province which among other things has its own Parliament, police, anti-Russian press and tax system. Stolypin stated that Finland has practically been an independent state and then posed a question: should Russia, which at the time was guided by great imperial aspirations, treat Finland lighter than England treated Ireland?¹⁰⁰

To summarise Stolypin's opinions on Finland-Ireland comparisons, he argued that Finland already had better status under Russia than Ireland under the British Empire. Finland did have much better political and legal status under Russian Empire than Ireland did as part of the British Empire. However, *Helsingin Sanomat's* articles had not been about Finland wanting a similar status as Ireland but of Finland not wanting its autonomy in the empire to be diminished. During the summer of 1910, Tsar Nicholas II had ratified a statute passed by the Russian Parliament, also known as the Duma, which defined the realm of imperial legislation¹⁰¹. According to this statute, all the Finnish laws that concerned imperial interests (in practice all the laws concerning Finland), would have to be drafted by the Russian government (Council of Ministers) and accepted by the Duma¹⁰². This meant that Finland

¹⁰⁰ HS 11.12.1910.

¹⁰¹ Jussila 2009, 91–92.

¹⁰² Vahtola 2012, 280.

would lose its legislative autonomy and would have to send representatives to Duma. However, the Parliament of Finland refused to send their representatives.

From the articles of *Helsingin Sanomat* it can be seen that Ireland was not something Finland was trying to be. *Helsingin Sanomat* clearly portrayed Ireland as an example how an empire should treat its provinces. If Britain was planning to give Ireland its long-coveted Home Rule, what right did Russia have to take it away from Finland?

It was clearly important for *Helsingin Sanomat* to attempt to show the historical and political similarities between Finland and Ireland. It was also a way for the paper to comment the Duma's politics on Finland. In August 25th 1910 *Helsingin Sanomat* published a letter, by pen name Terä, titled "Finland and Ireland – a few thoughts about Ireland's ancient House of Parliament" which received lots of space in the paper. Terä began his letter:

*No foreigner approaches Ireland's old House of Parliament without a sort of interest. And while thinking the fate of his own country, a Finn feels much deeper anxiety than anyone else when he sees before him the degradation of a small and hard-working nation – a megalomaniac destructive work of imperialism.*¹⁰³

Terä then proceeded to compare the way how Ireland lost its self-governance in the beginning of 19th century and how Russia was trying to constrict Finland's constitutional rights. Behind both of these developmenst Terä saw "unlimited imperialism" which aimed to destroy small nations and nationalities but according to Terä Finland and Ireland's cases were different. The Irish chose democratically to disband the Parliament, but Finland's population would never let that happen in Finland. Even though the English Parliament was the one who proposed the Act of Union in 1799, it still required the acceptance of the Irish Parliament and therefore Terä saw England, even over 100 years ago, more constitutional than Russia in 1910.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰³ HS 25.8.1910: "Ei suinkaan ilman määrättyä mielenkiintoa kukaan ulkomaalainen lähesty Irlannin iäkästä parlamenttitaloa. Ja ajatellessa oman maansa kohtaloa tuntee suomalainen paljon syvempää ahdistusta kuin moni muu, kun hän edessään näkee pienen ja ahkeran kansakunnan alennuksen – imperialismin turmiollisen suuruudenhullun työn."

¹⁰⁴ HS 25.8.1910.

An article by *Helsingin Sanomat*'s London correspondent (pen name A.C) was published in September 14th 1912. In this article, the correspondent considered reasons for Ireland's dissatisfaction and why Home Rule for Ireland was necessary in constitutional and economic means and even for the integrity of the United Kingdom. The writer provided an overview of Ireland's history under English rule. He described how the lands of the Irish farmers were taken from them and given to the English, how the Catholics were oppressed because of their faith¹⁰⁵ and how the population started to decrease due to the oppressive regime of England. In the context of this chapter, what struck out most from the correspondent's article was a tiny notion which he made of the English way of governing Ireland. The writer stated that this oppressive rule resembled more of a "eastern tyrannical government" than an English government.¹⁰⁶

Judging by the articles of Terä and A.C it seems that *Helsingin Sanomat* tried to create sort of a bond between the Finnish and the Irish. Finland and Ireland were both "small and hard-working nations" that had been struggling under oppressive foreign rule for centuries. This would explain how closely *Helsingin Sanomat* in general followed the events of the Irish question during 1910–1914. Ireland was in sort of a similar situation as Finland: Ireland had a chance to gain its self-governance and Finland strived to maintain its own. Both were small nations fighting for existence of their nation and nationality during a time period when great nations and empires were trying to strengthen their positions on the political map of Europe. Therefore, Ireland provided a perfect comparison for *Helsingin Sanomat* to also promote the Finnish question.

1.2. *The Times* 1910–1914

It is only natural that *The Times* delved into the Irish question in more detail than *Helsingin Sanomat* because Irish question was an important domestic issue for it concerned the integrity of the British Empire and the United Kingdom. *The Times* did not try to hide its dislike for Irish Home Rule or Asquith's Liberal Government and in its editorials *The Times* gave more

¹⁰⁵ See Penal Laws (Ireland from the 17th until the 19th century)

¹⁰⁶ HS 14.9.1912.

space for the views of Conservative politicians and often the paper even ridiculed Liberal and Nationalist politicians for petty reasons. Like *Helsingin Sanomat*, *The Times* raised themes of constitutionalism and democracy concerning the Irish question, but *The Times's* manner of an approach was completely opposite.

1.2.1. Parliament Act: constitutional crisis

The Times opened its discussion of Irish question on January 5th 1910, before the elections, when the paper stated that Home Rule had not been a live issue in the 1906 elections and the Liberal leaders “had eagerly disclaimed any intention to carry the Home Rule Bill” until early 1910 when their Nationalists allies forced them to admit importance of the Home Rule¹⁰⁷. Early on *The Times* tried to imply that the issue of Home Rule was not that significant for the Liberal Party because it was not brought up during the last parliamentary term. However, PATRICIA JALLAND has argued that Home Rule was “the logical consequence of a long-standing commitment” for the Liberals who had supported the principle of Home Rule since Gladstone’s last ministry¹⁰⁸, so it was not a great surprise that Asquith pledged to pass Home Rule for Ireland after the Parliament Act.

What really stands out from the reporting of *The Times* is the paper’s continuous efforts to present the Irish people hostile towards Empire. For example, on January 5th the paper wrote that many people did not share Winston Churchill’s view that Home Rule would effectively bring Ireland closer to Empire and *The Times* also added that Unionists view “the Celtic peoples hostile to the Empire”.¹⁰⁹ On February 8th *The Times* also wrote that it had no doubts that the Nationalist majority would abuse its powers in Ireland under Home Rule¹¹⁰. Although it is rather simple to come to this conclusion, especially concerning the political violence the Irish practiced against the British during 19th century, the argument did not have such a strong basis in the context of 1910. Irish public opinion was for Home Rule and it was seen as a meaningful achievement until the Easter Rising of 1916 which turned the Irish opinion against

¹⁰⁷ *The Times* 5.1.1910.

¹⁰⁸ Adelman & Pearce 2008, 127: Adelman and Pearce cite Patricia Jalland.

¹⁰⁹ *The Times* 5.1.1910.

¹¹⁰ *The Times* 8.2.1910.

the British. However, *The Times's* view of the Irish seemed to have changed in a year. On February 16th 1911 *The Times* argued that the Nationalists did not represent the Irish people and “it is only by system of intimidation and moral pressure that they maintain the appearance of representing Catholic Ireland¹¹¹.” *The Times* also added that the Nationalists had no pretensions to represent Protestant Ireland at all.

The Times was also quick to bring up the arguments concerning the Imperial security and integrity. On February 8th 1910 the paper cited the Conservative leader Arthur Balfour who stated that Ireland was a matter of imperial and national security due to its geographical location next to Britain and according to Balfour Home Rule would mean “total separation of Ireland”¹¹². Therefore, Ireland could not be granted any sort of self-governance or colonial government. *The Times* backed up this statement by mentioning an Irish Major John Macbride who had stated that he would welcome the Germans if they would attempt to attack Britain through Ireland.¹¹³ As for the opinions expressed by Balfour, it is understandable that Ireland was seen strategically important due to its location, a sort of a backdoor to Britain but even though the details of the Home Rule bill would not be known for a few more years it was still absurd to state that it would mean “total separation of Ireland” for that was never the case with Home Rule but it was necessary to portray Home Rule as something that would shake the foundations of the United Kingdom. Additionally, *The Times's* mentioning of Major Macbride was just another attempt to portray the Irish as enemies of Empire. Macbride was an extremist and a member of the Irish Republican Brotherhood, the secret society behind the 1916 Rising¹¹⁴, and it is safe to say that he did not represent the general public opinion in Ireland in 1910.

Even though *Helsingin Sanomat's* style of reporting was at *The Times* quite sharp-tempered, the world-famous *The Times* also lowered itself to make personal remarks of Liberal and Nationalist politicians. On February 11th 1911 *The Times* wrote that Asquith and Redmond had commented a Conservative MP Ian Malcolm's speech in Parliament and according to *The*

¹¹¹ *The Times* 16.2.1911.

¹¹² *The Times* 8.2.1910.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁴ Kee 1972, 440–443.

Times, Asquith and Redmond had found the speech to be “too well fortified with quotations to be at all agreeable to either of these gentlemen” and Redmond had also commented that “quotations made the speech dull and stale.” *The Times* then added that Redmond filled his own speech with similar material.¹¹⁵ This seemed rather petty for a respectable newspaper that according to TAIMI TORVINEN, was known for “shaking governments and opposing statesmen¹¹⁶.”

The Times’s tendency to criticize Asquith and his government for vagueness considering Home Rule Bill presented itself clearly in the editorial of February 16th¹¹⁷. Ironically however, *The Times* could also be blamed for vague reporting from time to time. For example, on February 16th *The Times* wrote that Ian Malcolm had brought up the “shifty nature of Nationalist policy, which asks for a Home Rule Bill on the ground that it is only a little one, but with full knowledge that it would be – and would be used as – a lever to get what would scare the British people if they were allowed to see it as a whole¹¹⁸.” *The Times* did not clarify what this was though, but it can be seen as a scare tactic meant to influence the British people to rise up and resist the government’s Home Rule policy. As the most prominent British newspaper *The Times* had the need to influence its readership and the paper also often demanded, like the Conservatives, that a referendum should be held concerning Home Rule because the British people had not gotten a chance to express its opinion because according to *The Times*, the people did not really know what they were voting about¹¹⁹.

By April of 1911 the Parliament Bill had reached the Committee stage. In their editorial on April 25th *The Times* decided to raise a comment made in the Committee by Mr. Lonsdale (Conservative MP) who protested behalf of Unionist Ireland “against leaving the destinies of the country to be decided by Separatist faction while the constitution is in abeyance¹²⁰.” In this editorial, *The Times*’s argued that the Parliament Bill Asquith’s government was pushing was by its nature unconstitutional. *The Times* saw the Bill as government’s attempt to

¹¹⁵ *The Times* 16.2.1911.

¹¹⁶ Torvinen 1982, 78.

¹¹⁷ *TheTimes* 16.2.1911.

¹¹⁸ *TheTimes* 16.2.1911.

¹¹⁹ Ibid.

¹²⁰ *The Times* 25.4.1911.

dismantle the constitutional safeguards in order to “force through one of the very gravest of measures that any country could contemplate”, the Home Rule. Once again, the paper asserted that the government was going to carry a measure “for the disruption of the United Kingdom without allowing the country a word upon the matter.”¹²¹ *The Times* was keen to promote, in their opinion, the undemocratic and unconstitutional actions of the government which would lead to the disintegration of the United Kingdom. The paper saw that the government was mocking representative democracy by attempting to “make the Lords more representative” without consulting the people. Also, the April 25th's editorial raised yet another argument concerning the Irish Nationalists. *The Times* argued that the Liberal government and therefore the majority of the House of Commons was under the dictatorship of Nationalist leader Redmond¹²². “The country may think what it pleases, and say what it pleases, but it will have no power over the majority now ruling the House of Commons under Mr. Redmond’s direction¹²³” wrote *The Times* emphasising the point that the on-going process of Parliament Bill and the following Irish Home Rule would not be results of democratic and constitutional policies, but a policy dictated by the enemies of the Empire, the Irish Nationalists. After the Parliament Act had been enacted *The Times* wrote that the Act was in the eyes of the Irish Parliamentary Party “an instrument for carrying Home Rule without taking the judgment of the constituencies upon it” and next the Irish would coerce the Liberal Government to use it for what it was made for¹²⁴.

Now that the Parliament Bill had been passed *The Times* focused more attention to the Home Rule Bill that would be introduced next year. In October 1911, *The Times* continued to criticize the Government for being vague on what the Home Rule Bill would really entail. “We are to ‘wait and see’ until the Bill severing the United Kingdom is produced” wrote *The Times* referring to Asquith’s response when he was asked about the details of the Home Rule Bill earlier in 1911¹²⁵. But because of the enacted Parliament Act, the Lords could not prevent the Home Rule Bill anymore and at this point there can be seen a shift in the style of *The Times*’s argumentation. Heavier arguments were needed and from the Autumn of 1911 forwards *The*

¹²¹ *The Times* 25.4.1911.

¹²² *Ibid.*

¹²³ *Ibid.*

¹²⁴ *The Times* 11.10.1911.

¹²⁵ *The Times* 11.10.1911; *The Times* 16.2.1911.

Times gave more and more attention to the economical side of Home Rule and on October 11th the paper even stated that “finance is one of the supreme difficulties in the way of Home Rule¹²⁶.”

1.2.2. The Home Rule Phantom: “unsubstantial and fugitive will-o-the-wisp”

Before the enactment of the Parliament Act in August 1911, *The Times’s* editorials had concerned more or less the dangers and difficulties what the Home Rule would bring to Britain and its people but after August *The Times* also attempted to appeal to the Irish. On October 11th *The Times* wrote that financially Ireland had been doing “marvellously” during the last 20 years so why would they allow Home Rule to be implemented upon them because according to *The Times* Home Rule would automatically bring risks and dangers with it, although *The Times* did not specify what those risks and dangers might be¹²⁷. However, *The Times* did provide calculations done by economist Edgar Crammond that under Home Rule Ireland’s expenditure would exceed its revenue by £4,200,000 a year and it would lead to significantly higher taxes for the Irish, although, *The Times* had spent a lot of time arguing that the details of Home Rule are unknown to all but government which made it rather odd that there would be financial analysis done already. As *The Times* wrote on November 2nd, Home Rule “remains unsubstantial and fugitive will-o-the-wisp” because the politicians were focused on figuring out what it would eventually mean¹²⁸.

The Times also attempted to use history in order to provide arguments why Home Rule should not be enacted in Ireland. Unlike *Helsingin Sanomat* which provided historical background of Ireland under the British rule, *The Times* used history to find reasons for why Home Rule would not work. One of *The Times’s* correspondents had found a precedent for Ireland from the case of uniting Upper and Lower Canada into a single colony in the 19th century¹²⁹. Canada was granted self-government after the rebellion of 1837 and according to *The Times* uniting Upper and Lower Canada was a mistake which was rectified in 1867 when they were

¹²⁶ *The Times* 11.10.1911.

¹²⁷ *The Times* 11.10.1911.

¹²⁸ *The Times* 2.11.1911.

¹²⁹ *The Times* 2.11.1911.

separated into Ontario and Quebec. “Merged in the larger unity of the Dominion of Canada, Ontario and Quebec get on excellently; merged in the larger unity of the present United Kingdom, Ulster and the rest of Ireland are also at peace” explained *The Times*.¹³⁰ Canada must have been an important dominion for Britain because in August 12th *The Times* appealed to Canada behalf of Ulster to join them in opposing Irish Home Rule¹³¹.

A couple of days later *The Times* tried to briefly explain the divided nature of Ireland through “tragic course of Irish history.” Ireland, according to the paper, had been “separated by the memories of centuries of strife” and it had been “a feud that draws its bitterness from rivalries of race and class and religion.”¹³² In this editorial on November 7th *The Times* wrote that “impartial study of the past enables a few on either side to understand much, and where much is understood much can be forgiven; but from masses of very slightly educated people we cannot fairly expect the charity of history.” *The Times* seemed to deliberately overlook the role of the British in creating this division in Ireland in the first place. Furthermore, it seemed like *The Times* implied that the Irish were uneducated who did not properly understand the political situation in Ireland which further proved *The Times*’s clear dislike for the Irish.

The Times evidently promoted uncertainty concerning the Irish Home Rule. On February 3rd, *The Times* wrote that “in a month or six weeks a new draft Constitution is to be promulgated for the United Kingdom, or the fragments which the United Kingdom is to be severed¹³³.” It was typical for *The Times* to argue that Home Rule would cause disintegration of the United Kingdom. The paper tried to argue that the future of Ireland under Home Rule was unclear: would Ireland be totally separated from the United Kingdom as a self-governing colony or would the Constitution of the United Kingdom as a whole be placed on a federal basis¹³⁴? The confusion about the possibilities of federalism was understandable since both newspapers had reported of federalist talks but concerning the separation of Ireland from the United Kingdom, none of the previous Home Rule Bills meant to separate Ireland from the United Kingdom. *The Times* attempted to portray Home Rule as something “secret”: the paper did

¹³⁰ *The Times* 2.11.1911.

¹³¹ *The Times* 12.8.1912.

¹³² *The Times* 7.11.1911.

¹³³ *The Times* 3.2.1912.

¹³⁴ *The Times* 3.2.1912.

not know anything, the people did not know anything, the Parliament did not know anything. Only the government had some sort of an idea what the Home Rule would contain. Overall, if *The Times* is compared to *Helsingin Sanomat*, the “Home Rule Secret” seems like a deliberate attempt by *The Times* to portray the bill as something unknown. In comparison, *Helsingin Sanomat* did not emphasise what is unknown but what is known of the bill at the time.

After the Home Rule Bill had been introduced in the House of Commons in April 1912 *The Times* wrote an editorial where it clearly strived to undermine the bill’s contents. The paper posed a question “is the Irish Parliament to be no more than a mere *Conseil Général*” by which it referred to how the local government was organised in France.¹³⁵ The efforts, at the same time, to show Home Rule as a threat to integrity of the United Kingdom and as an underwhelming form of regional government seemed contradictory. The third Home Rule Bill was supposed to be fundamentally the same as Gladstone’s bill of 1893, but even more limited, and Adelman and Pearce have described it as a very moderate measure which provided Ireland limited self-government and the imperial government would hold supreme authority over all persons, matters and things in Ireland¹³⁶.

Despite of *The Times*’s attempts to include the British people into the political process, it did not apparently have the desired effect. On February 3rd 1912 *The Times* wrote that the public opinion had stopped from demanding details on the bill¹³⁷ and on June 10th *The Times* stated that “the country is showing a strange indifference to the impending revolution or a certain eagerness to forget it¹³⁸.” *The Times* had already stated in October 1911 that “we have entered upon the preliminary skirmishes of the campaign which is designed to carry out the second half of the ‘Revolution’” on which Asquith with his colleagues had embarked¹³⁹. The view of Home Rule as a revolution stemmed from the Conservatives’ stance that Irish Home Rule was being steamrolled into the statute book with the help of the Parliament Act. This according to Bartlett, “appeared improper, or in the eyes of some, even illegal” and therefore

¹³⁵ *The Times* 16.4.1912.

¹³⁶ Adelman & Pearce 2008, 128.

¹³⁷ *The Times* 3.2.1912.

¹³⁸ *The Times* 10.6.1912.

¹³⁹ *The Times* 11.10.1911.

anti-homerulers could “defend their threats with reference to the allegedly unconstitutional way by which Home Rule was being driven into law¹⁴⁰.” However, despite of *The Times*’s best efforts to scare the public with the “monster of Home Rule” there was no referendum on Irish Home Rule. By July 1913 *The Times*’s voice had softened a bit regarding to the referendum on Home Rule Bill. The paper admitted “the bill would not be any better” after referendum but “the moral position of the government would be entirely different, for they would then have the mandate of the nation behind Bill”, a mandate which the other parties would have to accept¹⁴¹.

Imperial arguments were also prominent in *The Times*’s writing. On an editorial titled “Home Rule and False Imperialism” *The Times* wrote that the government kept on assuring that there was “not merely a domestic, but an imperial purpose in the government of Ireland Bill” for Parliament could focus more on the imperial issues instead of local affairs¹⁴². *The Times* saw that the bill had no imperial purpose and it would only negatively affect for example free trade, defence and the postal system (because the rest of the Empire enjoyed a single postal service and Home Rule would give Ireland its own). All in all, the paper considered imperial arguments for Home Rule to be sloppy.¹⁴³ However, *The Times* did find plenty of imperial arguments against Home Rule as I have previously shown in this thesis. But did *The Times* portray Home Rule as a domestic or imperial issue? On January 18th 1912 *The Times* wrote that Home Rule was not “a question of the ordinary political type” in which one side wins and other accepts defeat and moves on¹⁴⁴.

The Times perceived Home Rule to affect the integrity of the Empire and United Kingdom (although at least during Gladstone’s premiership his critics used the terms ‘Empire’ and ‘United Kingdom’ interchangeably¹⁴⁵) but it seems that the paper considered the issue to be of a domestic nature. However, in May 1914 when the passing of the Home Rule seemed imminent, *The Times* wrote that Home Rule was “no longer a political issue” and “also no

¹⁴⁰ Bartlett 2014, 367.

¹⁴¹ *The Times* 16.7.1913.

¹⁴² *The Times* 16.10.1912.

¹⁴³ *The Times* 16.10.1912.

¹⁴⁴ *The Times* 18.1.1912.

¹⁴⁵ Kenny 2004, 18.

longer a merely domestic affair” because of the outbreak of a civil war in Britain, centre of the Empire, would be felt through the British dominions¹⁴⁶. Also, a month later, in an editorial titled “The Realities of Home Rule”, *The Times* declared that “the issue of Home Rule has been transferred from the Council Chamber at Westminster to the camps in Ireland”, referring to the paramilitary groups that existed at the time in Ireland¹⁴⁷. Home Rule started as a domestic issue for *The Times* but due to its extraordinary nature it eventually became an imperial issue due to the glooming civil war in Ireland. Although, *The Times* had already in October 1912 appealed to Canada to oppose Home Rule, so the Home Rule question must have been an imperial issue for *The Times* much earlier than the summer of 1914.

The Times gave its greatest contribution to the Home Rule debate during 1912 but from January 1913 onwards the number of editorials published concerning Home Rule decreased significantly. In 1912, the paper published multiple editorials per month but after January 1913 only five editorials, which had ‘Home Rule’ in their title, were published. Reason for the paper’s activity in 1912 was obviously the third Home Rule Bill which was introduced to the House of Commons in April 1912 and passed the Commons for the first time in January 1913. Since the bill could not be altered, due to the measures in the Parliament Act, without starting the whole process all over again *The Times* could not report on any changes in the bill itself. It could also be concluded that since the bill was bound to end up in the statute book because the Lords were unable to veto it anymore was there really a point for *The Times* to report on it in such a detail it had done in 1912.

The next chapter focuses on how *The Times*’s reported on the resistance of Ulster against Home Rule. Unlike *Helsingin Sanomat* who scrambled back and forth in their stance whether there will be civil war in Ireland, *The Times* saw the situation more realistically. While *Helsingin Sanomat* saw Ulster’s activities rebellious and illegal, *The Times* was more sympathetic of their cause.

¹⁴⁶ *The Times* 16.5.1914.

¹⁴⁷ *The Times* 15.6.1914.

1.2.3. Justifying Ulster's resistance

The Times wrote about Ulster's resistance of Home Rule even before the general election in January 1910. In early January, the paper wrote that "Ulster shows the way" for it would not accept Home Rule¹⁴⁸. Ulster was portrayed as an example in the resistance against Home Rule before it was even sure which party would gain the majority in the Commons. Also, this shows that *The Times* actually saw the case of Ulster more realistically than the Liberal government or even *Helsingin Sanomat*. Adelman and Pearce have argued that between 1910 and 1914 "there was little real discussion of the Ulster problem, whether in Cabinet, the House of Commons or even in the columns of the Liberal press" and furthermore "many Liberals had convinced themselves that Unionist opposition was somehow 'artificial'¹⁴⁹." *The Times* did not have these kinds of false notions about Ulster and between 1910 and 1914 its views of Ulster did not change.

The Times strived to fight the views that there was no Ulster question which according to the paper itself was "acute and insoluble¹⁵⁰." *The Times* wanted to provide reasons for the larger public why Ulster resisted Home Rule and to show that the issue was not one-dimensional. How valid these reasons were is however another thing. On February 16th 1911 *The Times* wrote that "Ulster objects much more than just political unfairness" because it also objected placing its business and material interests under the mercy of people who lack the skills and knowledge which have made "north of Ireland what it is¹⁵¹." This statement clarified how the paper viewed Ireland: there existed two separate Irish nations¹⁵². The North, Ulster, was "the minority" which had industrialised already during the last century and was now afraid for its political and economic situation. Meanwhile, "the majority" of the South was striving to overtake Ulster's wealth and oppress them. However, this argument had no historical precedents because "the minority" of Ulster had for a long time enjoyed their privileged position in comparison to the southern Ireland.

¹⁴⁸ *The Times* 5.1.1910.

¹⁴⁹ Adelman & Pearce 2008, 128.

¹⁵⁰ *The Times* 16.2.1911.

¹⁵¹ Ibid.

¹⁵² *The Times* has also expressed its idea of two Irish nations more directly for example in *The Times* 12.4.1912.

On November 7th 1911 *The Times* reported on the formal opening of the resistance campaign against Home Rule in Great Britain. In this editorial, the paper pleaded that “in the present unhappy revival of Home Rule controversy we all earnestly desire to see appeals to religious bitterness rigorously excluded¹⁵³.” It is possible that *The Times* was also concerned about the peace and security of the United Kingdom but in this context, it seems more of an attempt to divert the attention of people away from the obvious religious aspects of the Ulster question, which were the reason for the whole crisis anyway, and provide more justifiable reasons why Ulster would resist Home Rule. The religious reasons were no secret. Ulster Unionist leader Edward Carson had even declared at a monster meeting held in Craigavon (County Armagh) in September 1911 that “we must be prepared the morning Home Rule passes, ourselves to become responsible for the government of the Protestant Province of Ulster¹⁵⁴.” In the November 7th's editorial *The Times* admitted though that centuries of strife had separated these two camps and it was a feud that “draws bitterness from rivalries of race and class and religion” and the paper wrote that time must be “given for old wounds to heal¹⁵⁵.” *The Times* seemed to ignore the role the British had in creating this strife. Also by saying that these old wounds needed time to heal it seemed like *The Times* was accusing the government for the Ulster crisis because the government was the one pushing the Home Rule for Ireland.

Like *Helsingin Sanomat*, *The Times* also noted the Ulster Unionists' attempts to prevent Churchill from speaking in Belfast in February 1912. *The Times* wrote in January that “we cannot pretend to rejoice in the decision of the standing committee of the Ulster Unionist council to take steps to prevent the holding of the meeting in the Ulster hall” and “as a matter of political ethics the action is hard to justify” because according to the paper it limited the right of free speech¹⁵⁶. However, the paper continued that “the Englishman's prejudice in favour of freedom of speech will be exploited, as can already be seen, by the enemies of the Union for all, or more, than it is worth¹⁵⁷.” Even though *The Times* seemed to state they did not condone the methods of Ulster Unionists it comes across like the paper accepted them because Home Rule was “not a question of the ordinary political type” in a sense where one

¹⁵³ *The Times* 7.11.1911.

¹⁵⁴ Lee 1990, 6: There was a plan to setup a provisional government of Ireland in Ulster.

¹⁵⁵ *The Times* 7.11.1911.

¹⁵⁶ *The Times* 18.1.1912.

¹⁵⁷ *The Times* 18.1.1912.

side prevailed and the other accepted defeat and moved on. At this time, the paper claimed that the situation in Ulster was becoming dangerously explosive and now the government was lighting the match. At no point did *The Times* put the responsibility of the escalating crisis on Ulster Unionists because, in the eyes of *The Times*, the government was to blame. *The Times* still considered Ulstermen as loyal subjects of the Crown even though they were preparing to forcefully resist the will of the imperial Parliament. It could be concluded that because *The Times* had repeatedly written of the unconstitutional actions of the government therefore the paper could justify the means of the Ulstermen in resisting those unconstitutional actions.

The Times continued to emphasise the government's role as the guilty party in Ulster question. *The Times* published editorials in which the paper blamed the government for provoking disorder in Ulster and the paper even stated that unless the government was "really bent upon civil war, they will begin to remember that they have no English mandate for Home Rule" and that their authority came from "avowed enemies of this country¹⁵⁸." The Irish Nationalists had forced the Home Rule question upon the government and now the government was attempting to coerce Ulster into accepting it. On several cases *The Times* underlined their opinion that the people had not voted on Home Rule, so the government did not have the right to push it forward¹⁵⁹.

In 1913 Ireland witnessed the formation of two paramilitary organisations: Ulster Volunteer Force (UVF) in January and Irish Volunteers in November. UVF consisted of Ulstermen who had sworn to resist enactment of Home Rule in Ulster and the Irish Volunteers were founded to support the passing of the Home Rule. The situation in Ireland in 1913 became more and more critical as the both sides were training troops and running guns. Both were in a sense illegal, or at least the gun-running was, but the difference was that the other was resisting the government and the other supported it.¹⁶⁰

¹⁵⁸ *The Times* 23.1.1912.

¹⁵⁹ *The Times* 11.4.1912.

¹⁶⁰ Bartlett 2014, 371–372.

One of the most notable events concerning these paramilitaries and the British army was the Curragh incident, also known as the Curragh mutiny, which occurred in March 1914. A large part of the British troops, on whom the government would have to depend on to enforce the law in Ulster if necessary, were stationed in the Curragh camp in County Kildare. On March 20th orders were given in precaution to prepare for the Ulster threat and move troops in certain key points. Instead, 60 British officers declared that they would rather resign than act against UVF.

However, no one was disciplined by the government.¹⁶¹ Apparently, there had been rumours circling about similar plans of British officers if the Home Rule would come to pass already in July 1913. On July 14th, *The Times* wrote that “for our own part, we deprecate most earnestly such premature talk, and we should deprecate premature action even more¹⁶².” *The Times* then added that “the solidarity of our corps of officers is a priceless national possession, which is not to be jeopardized without the gravest and most insistent cause¹⁶³.” Although *The Times* was supportive of Ulster’s cause it did not wish to shake national institutions, except the government, and integrity of the United Kingdom for it. Resisting the Liberal government, which in the eyes of *The Times* was chipping away the British constitution and Empire, was one thing but this just shows how important national integrity was for *The Times*.

By June 1913 the Home Rule Bill had been reintroduced to the Parliament. *The Times* continued its attempts to appeal to the British people that bloodshed would be unavoidable if Home Rule would be coerced on Ulster. *The Times* wrote on June 10th that “the British people shrink with horror from the idea of civil bloodshed” and they would not force Home Rule on their armed fellow citizens¹⁶⁴. *The Times* expanded this idea by arguing that the British people “will not allow any party to turn a million of their loyal and contended fellow subjects into rebels¹⁶⁵.” This was the first time *The Times* used the term ‘rebels’ of Ulstermen, albeit in a hypothetical context, or anything that would have implied the illegality of their actions. A month later *The Times* wrote that “a free community cannot justly, or even constitutionally,

¹⁶¹ Kee 1972, 487–489.

¹⁶² *The Times* 14.7.1913.

¹⁶³ *The Times* 14.7.1913.

¹⁶⁴ *The Times* 10.6.1913.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

be deprived of its privileges or its position in the realm” by any measure that is not approved by “a great body of electors” and “any attempt so to deprive them is a fraud upon their fundamental rights, which they are justified in resisting as an act of violence by any means in their power¹⁶⁶”. To summarize *The Times’s* argument, Ulster had every right to resist the will of the government because it could be seen as an act of violence due to its unconstitutional nature. Ulster was acting within its rights to oppose the unjust government which was aiming to limit Ulster’s rights and liberties, and the paper tried to emphasise that Ulster’s actions were only a justified reaction to the government’s plans. So, *The Times* did not directly approve the planned resistance but saw it as a proper reaction against the government that attempted to coerce Home Rule on Ulster who did not want it.

The Times compares Finland and Ulster

As it became apparent in the Chapter 1.1.4. *Helsingin Sanomat* found a comparison for Finland’s struggles from the Home Rule aspirations of Ireland and in August of 1913 *The Times’s* also ended up comparing Ulster’s situation of the time to Finland. Between 1910–1914 *The Times* published two editorials concerning Finland. The first one was published in March 21st 1910 and it concerned with Finland’s juridical status under Russia and a statement made of it by experts of international law¹⁶⁷. The second one was published in August 9th 1913 and like the first one it was also titled “Russia and Finland” but the editorial itself was not purely about Russo-Finnish relations like the first one. This editorial attempted to draw comparison between Finland’s struggle for its autonomy and Ulster’s struggle against Home Rule.¹⁶⁸ This editorial came out at the time when Ulster Volunteer Force (UVF) had already been founded in January 1913 and Ulster was seriously preparing to resist the implementation of the Home Rule Bill. *The Times* began its editorial followingly:

¹⁶⁶ *The Times* 14.7.1913.

¹⁶⁷ *The Times* 21.3.1910.

¹⁶⁸ *The Times* 9.8.1913.

*When governments try to impose upon a minority a policy which it keenly resents, it does not, apparently, matter very much whether they claim to act on democratic or on autocratic principles; their methods are apt to be very similar.*¹⁶⁹

The Times then continued that both the British and the Russian government have closed their ears from Finland and Ulster's desires and fears, and according to *The Times*, Russian Nationalists and Irish Nationalists shared the view that "it is only right and proper for the minorities to suffer." Although *The Times* admitted that the political terminology was not the same in the cases of Finland and Ulster, it still stated that there was a fairly close analogy to be found. People of Ulster feared that under the Home Rule their interests and traditions would be subordinated to those of the Nationalist majority of Ireland. Finland on the other hand, saw "in the abrogation of their constitutional privileges the end of all liberties" which Finland had enjoyed for the last hundred years under the rule of Russian Tsars. The editorial concluded that all Ulster and Finland asked was that no unilateral changes should be made to their status which they held to be constitutionally guaranteed to them.¹⁷⁰

It is easy to see how *The Times* ended up comparing Ulster's case to Finland: majority of the population in both provinces were Protestants and both were a part of a larger empire. However, the similarities ended there. The Protestant Ulster had not during its history been on the side of the oppressed like Finland. By 1700 Ulster had become mainly a Presbyterian and Anglican province and the Irish landowners, who were Catholics, had been evicted from their lands and those lands were settled by the British.¹⁷¹ Therefore since 17th and 18th century Ulster had enjoyed privileged position compared to the other provinces (Leinster, Munster and Connacht) of Ireland. Furthermore, the penal laws that were implemented against the Irish Catholics after 1689 barred them from voting, holding a public office and also their right to purchase or inherit land was limited, amongst other things, which led to a Protestant ascendancy in Ireland, where the "Anglican social élite dominated Irish politics, society and economics¹⁷²."

¹⁶⁹ *The Times* 9.8.1913.

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁷¹ Adelman & Pearce 2008, 4.

¹⁷² Adelman & Pearce 2008, 15–16.

Obviously, *The Times's* editorial eventually reached *Helsingin Sanomat* and in August 13th 1913 the paper published an article in response to it. Although *Helsingin Sanomat* saw *The Times's* view on Russo-Finnish relations meaningful, the writer still felt the need to correct *The Times's* comparison between Finland and Ulster. According to *Helsingin Sanomat* *The Times* had "allowed itself to be led astray by its enthusiasm of domestic policy in order to attack the government". *Helsingin Sanomat* then stated that "a struggle of small demographic group ("ryhmäkunta") on the side of regression cannot be compared to the liberation of an entire nation."¹⁷³ So *Helsingin Sanomat* did not see eye to eye with *The Times's* comparison and the paper rather perceived Ulster to represent the attempt to preserve the old and outdated regime, unlike Finland who struggled for its constitutional rights.

¹⁷³ HS 13.8.1913.

2. The changing realities 1914–1919

After nearly four years of struggle since the 1910 general election, the third Home Rule Act was finally placed into the statute books, however, its enactment was simultaneously suspended due to the outbreak of the First World War. During the first few years of the war it quickly became evident that the Act would not survive in its current form until the end of the war. The aftermath of the 1916 Easter Rising caused a wave of nationalism that swept over Ireland and shifted the Irish public opinion against the Home Rule and the British rule. The left-wing republican party Sinn Féin's, which was falsely accused of organizing the Rising, popularity surged after the Rising and in 1918 general elections the party managed to gain the majority of the Irish seats in the Westminster Parliament on the expense of the moderate Irish Parliamentary Party which was dethroned as the largest party in Ireland¹⁷⁴.

The passing of the Home Rule Act and the outbreak of the war turned the paper's away from the Irish question. During 1915 *Helsingin Sanomat* published only 7 articles concerning the Irish question, which was the lowest number of articles published per year between 1910–1919, while *The Times* did not publish any editorials during that year¹⁷⁵. However, in 1916 the quantity of writing was at an all-time high for both of the papers¹⁷⁶ because of the re-emergence of the Irish question which was caused by the Easter Rising that took place in Dublin in April 1916. More notably the re-emergence of the Irish question could be seen in *The Times's* publishing for during the next three years the paper published more editorials concerning Ireland that it had in 1910–1915. Reasons for this can be found from *The Times's* need to safeguard the national unity and thus the British war effort by attempting to prevent the domestic situation from aggravating any further.

This main chapter will cover the newspapers between the outbreak of First World War in August 1914 and the establishment of the First *Dáil Éireann* (translated as “Assembly of Ireland”) in January 21st 1919 which also marked the first shots of the Irish War of Independence. The chapter will follow the same structure as the first one, but the

¹⁷⁴ Bartlett 2014, 399: Sinn Féin gained 73 of 105 Irish seats while Irish Parliamentary Party only won 6 seats.

¹⁷⁵ Appendix 1 & 2.

¹⁷⁶ Appendix 3.

subchapters of the newspapers will not be as thematically parallel to each other as in the previous chapter. This is due to the fact that the papers focused on different aspects of the Irish question after the 1916 Rising and approached the issue from different perspectives.

This chapter of the thesis will focus on the newspapers' writings of the Easter Rising, the status of the Irish question post-Rising, the Irish Convention and the rise of Sinn Féin. *Helsingin Sanomat* largely remained as the advocate for moderate parliamentary nationalism and the rights of small nationalities, however, nearing the end of year 1918 these views started to alter. However, the larger shift in views can be seen in the writings of *The Times* even though the motives of the paper were not quite as sincere as *Helsingin Sanomat's*. This shift can be pinpointed on the Easter Rising which became a transformative event in the Irish national history.

2.1. *Helsingin Sanomat* 1914–1919: from a principle to practical

Between 1914 and 1919 *Helsingin Sanomat's* views of the Irish question did not significantly differ from their views before the war. The paper continued as an advocate for the rights of small nationalities like before and supported the parliamentary process over resorting to non-parliamentary means in securing those rights. A sudden shift in the paper's views could be seen in its writing in December 1917, after Finland had declared its independence from Russia, when *Helsingin Sanomat* wrote that the revolutionary movement in Western Europe would begin from Ireland¹⁷⁷. That said, the revolutionary rhetoric did not really take ground in the paper's writings after December 1917. However, after July 1918 there was a distinct change in the paper's views of the future of the Irish question.

2.1.1. Parliamentarism over extremism

After the war broke out and the Home Rule Act was placed on the Statute Book, news of Irish Question disappeared from *Helsingin Sanomat* almost entirely until the Easter week of 1916. This of course was not a surprise considering the ongoing war and the fact that the Irish

¹⁷⁷ HS 23.12.1917.

question was thought to have been solved by passing the Home Rule Act. Most of the Irish news published in *Helsingin Sanomat* between September 1914 and April 1916 were about recruitment of Irish soldiers, war incidents on the Irish sea or the planned Military Service Act that would extend the conscription to Ireland (which proved to be extremely difficult task for the British Government). However, in December 1914 *Helsingin Sanomat* published an article titled "Ireland and Germany" where the paper reported on a former diplomat of British Foreign Office Sir Roger Casement (Irish by birth) who had spoken of the Irish question in Berlin which of course was peculiar since Germany was in war against Britain. *Helsingin Sanomat* quickly pointed out that Casement had never been a responsible part of the Irish independence movement (HS: *vapausliike*) and he also supported "ultrafenian" ideology, as the paper put it, which was advocated by a negligible and implacable party group that had lost all its influence in Ireland¹⁷⁸, also known as Sinn Féin though the paper did not mention the party by its name. What should be noted though is that *Helsingin Sanomat* was able to differentiate radical Fenians and moderate Nationalists from each other, which could not be said of *The Times* which from time to time grouped up the two groups under single banner.

Easter Rising began on Monday 24th of April 1916 but because of the interruptions in the communications *Helsingin Sanomat* did not report on it until the 27th of April when the paper wrote that "rebellion-like disorders" had broken out in Dublin¹⁷⁹. The paper was quick to point out the needlessness of the rebel activities:

*It is difficult for outsiders to understand on what hopes of success have the organizers of the rebellion relied on when firmly organized Irish Parliamentary Party has constantly supported the government in the current war and due to their efforts couple hundred thousand [Irish] volunteers have been recruited.*¹⁸⁰

¹⁷⁸ HS 29.11.1914.

¹⁷⁹ HS 27.4.1916.

¹⁸⁰ Ibid: "On vaikea sivullisten käsittää mihin menestyksen toiveisiin kapinan järjestäjät ovat luottaneet, kun lujasti järjestäytynyt Irlannin kansallinen puolue on kaiken aikaa kannattanut hallitusta nykyisessä sodassa ja sen agitatsioonin nojalla on parisataatuhatta vapaaehtoista sodassa."

Thus, *Helsingin Sanomat* concluded that therefore the rebel forces enjoyed marginal support in Ireland and a rebel movement from such an isolated position seemed poorly justifiable¹⁸¹. However, the paper wrote that it would follow the development of the events with interest and that is what *Helsingin Sanomat* did. The paper really did pay close attention to the events unfolding in Ireland. Between April 27th and May 2nd, when the paper reported that the rebel forces had surrendered¹⁸², *Helsingin Sanomat* published around 20 articles and telegraphs concerning the Rising and even more articles was published until the end of June 1916 about the aftermath of the Rising.

Helsingin Sanomat during the Rising

On the April 27th, when *Helsingin Sanomat* reported on the Rising for the first time, the paper made clear that the rebel forces were not part of the Nationalist party but a small discontent group of Irishmen¹⁸³. The paper wrote that Irish Nationalists, “whose loyalties cannot be doubted”, had condemned the rebel actions and that the “extremities of the few” had not gained any support in Ireland¹⁸⁴. On the first day of reporting *Helsingin Sanomat* did not put much weight on the seriousness of the Rising and it believed that the Rising would soon be quelled. However, on the next day, April 28th, the paper reported that a civil war was about to be broken out because amongst the British forces sent to suppress the Rising were also Irish Volunteers who were on a leave from the continent¹⁸⁵. This prediction of civil war in Ireland sounds a lot like *Helsingin Sanomat*’s reporting on the Ulster Unionists between 1910 and 1914 when the paper predicted a civil war between the Nationalists and Unionists in every other issue. On April 27th the paper had already stated that the Rising did not have the support of the Irish public opinion and it was a rebellion of a marginal group, therefore, it is hard to imagine that a civil war would break out due to the Irish participants on the both sides of the conflict. After the issue of April 28th *Helsingin Sanomat* did not mention a chance of

¹⁸¹ *Helsingin Sanomat* compared the situation to the previous similar rebel activities in ia. Egypt, Persia and Morocco.

¹⁸² The rebels surrendered on April 29th but the news of it reached the paper few days later.

¹⁸³ HS 27.4.1916.

¹⁸⁴ Ibid.

¹⁸⁵ HS 28.4.1916.

civil war again in relation to the Rising so the whole mention of civil war cannot have been more than a ploy to sell more papers.

Even though *Helsingin Sanomat* paid considerable attention to the events of the Rising the paper did not see any chance for the Rising to succeed in its goals. On the 28th *Helsingin Sanomat* had also reported on the Russian newspaper *Děň's* (*Helsingin Sanomat* spelled the name as *Denj*) take on the Irish events. *Děň'* mentioned that the Irish rural population had been known to possess a revolutionary mentality even long before the Rising and *Děň'* continued that these people were known to disturb the social order by political murders, acts of terror and rebellions.¹⁸⁶ By publishing *Děň's* article *Helsingin Sanomat* strengthened their moderate nationalist stance even further and yet again denounced revolutionary/extraparliamentary means in achieving the rights of self-government for the small nations. Violence had no part in the political process and after all, Ireland had already gained its Home Rule or at least the recognition for its right of self-government.

Although, the Rising was still on-going, and wartime censorship had been enforced in Ireland by the British government, the newspapers from around the world were looking for who to blame for the rebellion. By April 29th there had already been several mentions in *Helsingin Sanomat* of Germany's involvement in the Rising, but who the rebel forces were, was still unclear and the censorship did not stop different newspapers from speculating. On the April 29th news of the Rising appeared for the first time on the 'War'-spread of the paper and the events in Ireland were the main headline¹⁸⁷. The fact that the news of the Rising appeared on the 'War'-spread tells us that *Helsingin Sanomat* saw the Rising as part of the events of the First World War or at least deeply linked to them. After all, Germany had already been connected to the Rising on some level¹⁸⁸. On the paper of April 29th *Helsingin Sanomat* offered a rebuttal for the conservative British newspapers who were blaming Irish administration, and more importantly Augustine Birrell (Lib.) who acted as the Chief Secretary for Ireland, for the outbreak of the Rising. *Helsingin Sanomat* in turn rolled the blame on "Ulster's General", as the paper titled him, Edward Carson, who according to the paper had made the more

¹⁸⁶ HS 28.4.1916.

¹⁸⁷ HS 29.4.1916.

¹⁸⁸ Bartlett 2014, 384–385.

radical part of Irish population resentful and embittered by agitating Ulster Protestants against the Government and Catholics before the war¹⁸⁹. The paper asserted also that by smuggling arms from Germany, the Protestants had indirectly taught the other Irish factions to do the same.

Without any actual knowledge of the Irish actors of the rebellion, the press, including *Helsingin Sanomat* and especially *The Times*, emphasised the role of Germany in planning and executing the Rising. Before the news of the surrenders had reached the paper on first days of May and the censorship was lifted, *Helsingin Sanomat* focused on describing the current events in Dublin and reporting on what the English newspapers were writing of Germany. Involvement of Germany was generally considered to be significant and *Helsingin Sanomat* even published *Děň's* article where the paper had written about France's actions in Ireland in the late 18th century and *Děň'* also considered this historical example to be a warning to Germany when planning invasion of Ireland¹⁹⁰. Despite of the German involvement *Helsingin Sanomat* did not see it realistic for the Rising to spread further and thus the paper concluded that:

*Discontent towards the government may give birth to disorder and even bloody conflicts. But only discontent against the laws can cause a true people's rebellion. Thus we can assume that the disorders in Dublin are only local expressions of discontent which have no qualifications to escalate to people's rebellion.*¹⁹¹

The paper considered the majority of the Irish to be content with the British government at the time and that they did not have any need to separate themselves from Britain. *Helsingin Sanomat* saw that without full-on rebellion Ireland would be of no strategic use to Germany.

¹⁸⁹ Bartlett 2014, 384–385.

¹⁹⁰ HS 29.4.1916.

¹⁹¹ HS 29.4.1916: "Tyytymättömyydestä hallitukseen voi syntyä levottomuuksia, vieläpä verisiäkin yhteentörmäyksiä. Mutta ainoastaan tyytymättömyys lakeihin voi aiheuttaa todellisen kansankapinan. Näin ollen voimme otaksua, että Dublinin levottomuudet ovat ainoastaan paikallisia tyytymättömyyden ilmauksia, joilla ei ole edellytyksiä laajeta kansankapinaksi."

The Aftermath

On May 2nd *Helsingin Sanomat* reported that the uprising in Dublin had been suppressed and the rebels had surrendered to the British troops. Much of the initial information that the paper reported was false (i.e. the names of the leaders, number of rebel troops) but this can be explained by the fact that the events in Dublin had seized just a couple of days earlier and no official investigations or proper declarations by officials had been made yet. Also, an obvious reason for the lack of information and misinformation was that the British government had already in the beginning of the Rising extended the military censorship to Ireland¹⁹². As the days went by the picture of the events would eventually shape up but one thing was generally held as the truth by the press: the republican Sinn Féin party was behind the Rising and it had colluded with Germany. However, this has been deemed false by academics¹⁹³.

During May 1916 the official, although somewhat incorrect, story of the Rising started forming. The British began to execute the rebel leaders in early May and hundreds were sent to internment camp in Frongoch, Wales. Although *Helsingin Sanomat* briefly mentioned in one article that “the saddest part of the Irish rebellion is yet to come”¹⁹⁴, referring to the executions and imprisonment, the paper did not really express any proper opinion of the situation. However, in Ireland the executions, unwarranted arrests and poor treatment of the prisoners were soon to turn the Irish public opinion against the British rule.

Helsingin Sanomat did not have anything new to say about the Rising after May 7th when it continued express those same old views about the necessity and chances of the Rising. The paper once again stated that “the Irish rebellion was doomed to fail from early on” and thus “ended the bloody story of the Irish Republic¹⁹⁵.” The paper then continued:

¹⁹² *The Times* 27.5.1916.

¹⁹³ Bartlett 2014, 379–396; Ferriter 2015, 151–157; Feeney 2002, 56–57.

¹⁹⁴ HS 7.5.1916.

¹⁹⁵ *Ibid.*

*The Irish rebellion, which ended miserably, now joins those other desperate attempts that other nationalities of isolated position have attempted during the world war in order to achieve a change in their political status.*¹⁹⁶

The previous sentence appears rather unsympathetic against small nationalities, although it reinforced *Helsingin Sanomat*'s political stance: parliamentary democracy over revolutionary means. Even though *Helsingin Sanomat* had been sympathetic for the cause of Irish Home Rule it harshly condemned extraparliamentary means as the way to achieve it.

Easter Rising resurrected the Irish question which was generally thought to be solved by the passing of the Home Rule Act in 1914. Although the rebellion failed to establish the Irish Republic, the ideas behind the Rising would gain more and more ground in the upcoming years. Of course, this significant effect of the Rising was not yet to be seen in the few following months after the Rising and at best *Helsingin Sanomat* saw the Rising as a proper warning for Ulster Unionists of the dangers of extremism and where it would lead them¹⁹⁷.

On May 30th 1916 *Helsingin Sanomat* published the first article dedicated fully to Irish Home Rule since the beginning of the war¹⁹⁸. Despite of the Rising, its unfortunate aftermath and the reappearance of the Irish question the paper's tone remained all-in-all positive towards Ireland's situation. In this article, the paper wrote that "the question of re-establishment of the Irish self-governance has entered into a new and presumably its final phase." The paper then continued:

¹⁹⁶ HS 7.5.1916: "Irlannin kapina liittyy siis näin surkeasti päättyneenä niihin toisiin epätoivoisiin yrityksiin, joita eräät muut eristetyssä asemassa olevat kansat ovat maailmansodan aikana tehneet saadakseen valtiollisessa asemassaa käännöstä aikaan."

¹⁹⁷ HS 21.5.1916.

¹⁹⁸ HS 30.5.1916.

*Even at this stage, the subject is worth all of the attention, for much more important than its practical outcome, is the principle, that hides at the bottom of this question. Once more we are going to get the final proof that the principle of tolerance is the only solution that will provide permanent satisfying results to the problems of national self-governance.*¹⁹⁹

To summarize the paper's view: the principle of self-government and the ways it should be achieved with were much more important than the form the self-government would eventually be enacted. In the same article *Helsingin Sanomat* also managed to poke at the Conservatives who the paper claimed "planted the seeds in the Irish soil" which would eventually sprout as the Irish Home Rule. The paper also asserted that the Irish minority, who attempted to "speed up the improvement of Ireland's national status", ultimately used the same methods which the Ulster Unionists had seen just before.²⁰⁰ Although the previous statement could be interpreted that *Helsingin Sanomat* condoned the actions of the rebels, the statement must be seen in the larger context. *Helsingin Sanomat* had always seen conservatism as the greater evil and in this case, it was no different. The paper did not condone the Rising and did not try to justify the rebel actions at any point afterwards. However, *Helsingin Sanomat* did yet again present the Conservatives as the root of all evil and the reason behind the unrest in Ireland, after all, the paper had previously regarded the Conservatives as a danger to peace in Europe²⁰¹.

At the beginning of June 1916 *Helsingin Sanomat* had moved away from reporting concerning the Rising and the focus shifted again on the newly surfaced Irish question. The paper maintained a positive attitude towards the upcoming parliamentary process and appeared hopeful that a solution would be found quickly. In the next chapter I will focus on *Helsingin Sanomat*'s reporting on the Irish question between the summer of 1916 and convening of the Irish Convention in July 1917.

¹⁹⁹ HS 30.5.1916: "Jo tällä asteella on asia kaiken huomion arvoinen, sillä paljoakin tärkeämpi kuin itse käytännöllinen tulos, on se periaate, joka piilee kysymyksen pohjalla. Vielä kerran nimittäin saadaan selvä todistus siitä, että kansallisten itsehallintopulmien ratkaisussa on suvaitsevaisuuden periaate ainoa, joka kykenee johtamaan pysyväisesti tyydyttäviin tuloksiin"

²⁰⁰ HS 30.5.1916.

²⁰¹ HS 12.11.1912.

2.1.2. *Helsingin Sanomat's* alignment with the British government is emphasised

By end of June 1916 the reporting on the Rising had died down almost completely, notwithstanding handful of news concerning Roger Casement's trial or the investigations of the Irish administration in relation to the Rising. The Irish question had once again risen amongst the hottest political topics and the Rising and the executions of the rebel leaders, as Kee has asserted, gave "the demand for Home Rule a new and desperate urgency²⁰²." The Battle of the Somme began on the 1st of July so there was a desire to settle the Irish question for good, so it would not hamper the war effort any more. Between June 1916 and July 1917, most of the *Helsingin Sanomat's* reporting concerning the Irish question happened in 1916 because the negotiations for the settlement of the Irish question had started again from June onwards²⁰³. After the turn of the year the paper did not publish anything concerning the Irish question for a while, but reporting resumed by the end of February. This nearly two months gap could be explained by the fact that in December 1916 the acting Secretary of State for War David Lloyd George, whom Asquith had put in charge of solving the Irish question after the Easter Rising, became the Prime Minister of Great Britain and he had to form a new Coalition Cabinet before they could return to running the country.

Helsingin Sanomat picked up the story of Irish question again by the end of June 1916. On June 28th, the paper reported that the Irish question had yet again risen amongst the major topics in British politics²⁰⁴. The paper wrote that Lloyd George had already proposed a temporary settlement of Irish question to the Nationalists, who according to the paper were "the actual Irish", and Protestant Englishmen of Ulster. *Helsingin Sanomat* divided Ireland again into two different nations and this time the paper really emphasised that the Nationalists were the actual Irishmen. This distinction itself by the paper was not particularly odd concerning that *Helsingin Sanomat* had referred to the two Irish nations often during the years. More interesting is the fact that this so called "two nations theory", at least at the time, was considered to be predominantly a Unionist theory²⁰⁵. Unionists had always emphasised

²⁰² Kee 1972, 591.

²⁰³ This is also why this chapter will have an emphasis on the year 1916.

²⁰⁴ HS 28.6.1916.

²⁰⁵ Lee 1990, 14–15.

their distinctiveness from the rest of Ireland, if not as a separate nation then as “a community that enjoyed a contractual relationship with the British crown²⁰⁶”, and even members of the Liberal Party (for example David Lloyd George²⁰⁷) had denoted the existence of two Irish nations at some point. However, the Irish Nationalists rejected the “two nations theory” and their leader John Redmond went as far as to denounce the theory as “an abomination and a blasphemy²⁰⁸”.

Essentially what can be concluded from this is that even though *Helsingin Sanomat* supported the self-governing rights of small nationalities, the paper’s political ideology was closer to the British Liberals than Irish Nationalists. On the other hand, it could just mean that different ideas and theories of British Isles had not fully reached Finland yet and the “two nations theory” seemed mainstream enough for *Helsingin Sanomat* to get on board with it. However, the paper saw the theory in a different context than the Unionists and by referring Ulster as a separate nation from rest of the Ireland *Helsingin Sanomat* could, as I mentioned in the chapter 1.1.3., portray Ulster’s resistance of Home Rule as a “foreign” influence. Therefore, the paper’s stance on two Irish nations could be seen more as strengthening their own narrative and rhetoric than disagreeing with the Nationalist policy.

On June 30th *Helsingin Sanomat* reported that according to *Děň’* the Irish question had finally been settled but the government had not yet published the results of the negotiations²⁰⁹. According to *Helsingin Sanomat*’s previous information, the basis of the settlement was that Home Rule would not be extended to north-eastern counties of Ulster during the war, but the paper also reported that the Unionists disagreed with the settlement because of its temporary nature and Unionists preferred that Ulster counties would be excluded. However, *Helsingin Sanomat* wrote that “Lloyd George’s proposal is not as dangerous as Unionists make it to be” because the interim government period would extend considerably because after the war the interim system of government would be submitted to Imperial conference in order to find the permanent settlement to Irish question. That said, *Helsingin Sanomat* stated

²⁰⁶ Lee 1990, 14.

²⁰⁷ HS 23.7.1919.

²⁰⁸ Lee 1990, 14–15.

²⁰⁹ HS 30.6.1916.

that exclusion from Home Rule would not be beneficial for Ulster and Ulster might eventually, although bitterly, ask to join the Home Rule Ireland. To back its claim, *Helsingin Sanomat* gave economic arguments which the paper had not done before. This sort of more in-depth approach had been more common with *The Times*, which had frequently analysed the hypothetical political and economic consequences of Irish Home Rule. According to *Helsingin Sanomat* Ulster's exclusion from Home Rule would affect negatively to its economy. The paper argued that Ulster's counties were economically dependent of the southern and western parts of Ireland because Ireland was generally an agricultural economy, but Ulster had already industrialised and thus, at least according to *Helsingin Sanomat*, there was a higher demand for Ulster commodities in the rest of Ireland. The paper also argued, by referencing an article written by *Daily Chronicle*, that Irish peasants used Ulster's banks for their savings, banks which had established a network of branch offices all over Ireland and who financed Ulster's factories.²¹⁰

Helsingin Sanomat concluded that Home Rule Ireland would definitely have a need to establish its own industry and banking thus directing the Irish money to Home Rule Ireland and directly hurting Ulster's economy²¹¹. In the British Isles economic arguments for and against Home Rule were of course more common but it is interesting that *Helsingin Sanomat*, even amidst the war, delved even deeper into the Irish question. It is difficult to say, due to the vast source material, how *Helsingin Sanomat* reported on the other similar foreign political issues but in the case of Ireland the paper showed great belief and hope in the Irish self-governance. Its speculations might have been too optimistic, but it is impossible to say for sure since the Government of Ireland Act of 1914 was never enacted.

July 1916 seemed somewhat contradictory in *Helsingin Sanomat*'s reporting which was not really anything new considering the paper's track record of previous years. Irish question seemed to be in a flux as its status changed couple of times during July. On July 1st, the paper reported that the political situation in Britain had once again become more critical due to the Irish question and that the question threatened to disband the coalition government²¹². In

²¹⁰ HS 30.6.1916.

²¹¹ Ibid.

²¹² HS 1.7.1916.

the same breath, the paper managed to mention that the question seemed to have also caused division in the ranks of the Conservatives and although the paper expressed this in a neutral tone, it is possible to interpret that *Helsingin Sanomat* was clearly pleased with the troubles among the Conservative party. However, after a little over a week *Helsingin Sanomat* stated that according to reliable political sources, Lloyd George's new proposal for settlement of the Irish question could be regarded as approved²¹³.

Helsingin Sanomat's contradictory reporting in July could be explained Lloyd George's negotiation methods in June. In my bachelor's thesis²¹⁴, I studied the Irish question according to Lloyd George's *War Memoirs*, and in my thesis, I concluded that without Lloyd George's 'shuttle diplomacy'²¹⁵ there would have been no initial agreement whatsoever in these negotiations. John Turner explains 'shuttle diplomacy': "without bringing the two parties together in one room, he [Lloyd George] produced a draft settlement which both sides could agree to recommend to their followers²¹⁶." Kee has also asserted that "taking care to keep Carson and Redmond apart, but conferring each individually and giving favourable reports of his discussions with each to the other, he [Lloyd George] succeeded in obtaining an initial agreement between the two which looked like early success²¹⁷." In the light of this it is easy to see why *Helsingin Sanomat* and undoubtedly other media outlets might have been contradictory in their reporting during the summer of 1916.

But as the weeks went on it became clear that the question was far from being settled. By the end of July, the Irish Nationalists were prepared to vote against the Lloyd George's proposal if the new Home Rule Act would not meet all the terms that all of the Irish parties had agreed to in the negotiations²¹⁸. What is noteworthy in this process is that *Helsingin Sanomat* did not side with the Nationalists but instead the paper tried to emphasise the effort and dedication that the British government had put into finding a solution to the Home Rule

²¹³ HS 9.7.1916.

²¹⁴ Tapaninen 2015: *Irlanti ensimmäisessä maailmansodassa David Lloyd Georgen mukaan*.

²¹⁵ 'Shuttle diplomacy': John Turner uses this term in his book *British Politics and the Great War: Coalition and Conflict 1915–1918*.

²¹⁶ Turner 1992, 92.

²¹⁷ Kee 1972, 582.

²¹⁸ HS 27.7.1916.

question²¹⁹. This further shows that the paper's ideology was more pro-Home Rule than aligned with the Irish Nationalists. While *Helsingin Sanomat's* sympathies were on the Nationalist side, the paper did not see eye to eye with the Nationalists of what the Home Rule should entail.

Before the end of July 1916, the negotiations between the Irish parties and British government had collapsed. *Helsingin Sanomat* saw this as a pivotal moment in the history of the Irish question because the failure to reach a settlement meant that the Nationalists now threatened to turn against Asquith's government they had supported since 1910²²⁰. On June 27th, the paper broke the news of the collapse of the negotiations but *Helsingin Sanomat* retained a hopeful attitude that Asquith would still find a settlement that would appease both sides²²¹. That said, one could argue that the paper was out of touch with the political reality of Ireland because it did not take into account what the British government was basically offering for Ireland was a return to the pre-war situation and that the Irish public opinion was slowly shifting away from Home Rule²²².

After the collapse of the negotiations there was not much for *Helsingin Sanomat* to report on for the last months of 1916 concerning the Irish question. The Irish question was superseded by the campaign of Somme which lasted until the middle of November, formation of the new Coalition government lead by the new Prime minister Lloyd George and the rising question of extending the conscription to Ireland in order to combat the increasing need of man-power (Military Service Act would eventually become entwined with the Irish question). Although one brief noteworthy comment by the paper could be found in its speculations of the new Coalition government in early December. The paper wrote that the Labour Party and Irish Nationalists, who formed the "extreme left" ('*äärimäinen vasemmisto*'), would not by any means be part of a government led by Conservatives²²³, which was at the time a possibility. At no point during the time period of this study had *Helsingin Sanomat* sympathised with the Labour movement so grouping the Labour Party and the Nationalists together under the

²¹⁹ HS 27.7.1916.

²²⁰ HS 21.7.1916.

²²¹ HS 27.7.1916.

²²² Kee 1972, 591–592.

²²³ HS 8.12.1916.

banner of extreme left, again raises questions of how the paper saw the Irish Nationalists. I wrote above how the paper seemed to side more with the British government than the Irish Nationalists, so I believe it is fair to raise a question: was the aspiration of Irish self-governance the only common denominator between *Helsingin Sanomat* and Irish Nationalists and how the paper would have viewed the Irish party without its Home Rule policy or would *Helsingin Sanomat* have regarded the Nationalist party similarly as they did the Labour Party?

The Irish question made its return in *Helsingin Sanomat* in early March 1917. The paper wrote on March 8th that the government would give its final proposal for the settlement of Irish question during the same week²²⁴. However, two days later the paper published an article where it stated that the nature of question had changed because the initiative had come from the Nationalist Members of Parliament who had demanded immediate solution to the Irish question²²⁵. This proposal was rejected by Lloyd George which seemed to put *Helsingin Sanomat* in an uncomfortable spot for in the same article the paper continued to analyse the current situation further. The paper wrote that Lloyd George was defending Ulster because according to his opinion Ulster should be excluded from Home Rule and left under governance of Westminster Parliament and the government. *Helsingin Sanomat* added that the exclusion of Ulster was the term that caused the negotiations collapse last summer and now Lloyd George seemed to accept Ulster's position, "at least in practice if not in principle." The paper then posed a question: is Lloyd George more afraid of the danger posed by Ulster than the rest of the Ireland when their discontent will set the whole island a blaze?²²⁶ Apparently the paper referred to the worsening atmosphere in Ireland where the public opinion was gradually shifting away from Home Rule for the advantage of Sinn Féin. *Helsingin Sanomat* attempted to provide a possible explanation by asserting that Lloyd George most likely trusted the "cold rationality and loyalty" of the Irish people more than Ulstermen. However, the paper concluded that "in reality Lloyd George's current position must be explained to be caused by formal reasons and not because of principled or practical reasons" and that his hands were tied because of the Unionist affluence in the Coalition government.²²⁷ *Helsingin*

²²⁴ HS 8.3.1917.

²²⁵ HS 10.3.1917.

²²⁶ Ibid.

²²⁷ HS 10.3.1917.

Sanomat was correct in stating that Unionists had significant influence in the government and Turner has even described Lloyd George's government as "unusual and obtrusively Unionist"²²⁸. The paper also speculated that Lloyd George must have given the Unionists some sort of commitments concerning the Irish question²²⁹.

The position that had formed in Britain during March 1917 seemed a little uncomfortable for *Helsingin Sanomat*. On one hand, the paper supported the Nationalists' aspiration of Home Rule, although the paper seemed to prefer the Liberal led government to be in charge of the process. On the other hand, now that Lloyd George had sided with Ulster against the proposal of the Nationalists, the paper clearly had the need to explain Lloyd George's actions more than usually. During the years *Helsingin Sanomat* had always portrayed Lloyd George as a brilliant politician but now it seemed that this portrayal needed a bit more effort than before. Although in Ireland's case, it is questionable if Lloyd George actually deserved any praise whatsoever, after all, the Irish question had not been a primary issue in British politics since the outbreak of the war and as Turner put it:

*The government's stability in early 1917 depended on its ability to deflect political problems which were not directly about the war, and of these the most malignant, traditionally, was the Irish question.*²³⁰

This would prove to be more prominent course of action for the Lloyd George government during the following years.

After March 1917 *Helsingin Sanomat* did not offer any proper commentary on the Irish question before May. In May it was announced that a convention consisting of representatives from all of the Irish parties would be established in order to create a constitutional framework for Home Rule. In the next chapter, I will study *Helsingin Sanomat's* reporting on this Irish Convention's proceedings which lasted from July 1917 to April 1918.

²²⁸ Turner 1992, 153.

²²⁹ HS 10.3.1917.

²³⁰ Turner 1992, 176.

Additionally, I will focus on how the paper reported about Sinn Féin and its rising popularity in Ireland from summer of 1917 to the early months of 1919.

2.1.3. Changing views: British disappointment leads to shift in alignments

In February 1917 Germany had started its unrestricted submarine warfare which eventually became a significant victory for the Allied forces because finally in April 1917 the United States joined the war against Germany. After the declaration of war, the British government sent a delegate, led by foreign secretary Arthur Balfour (Conservative), to the United States “to arrange full co-operation with Britain’s new ally²³¹.” Once there, Balfour reported that the Irish question was “apparently the only difficulty we have to face here and its settlement would no doubt greatly facilitate vigorous and lasting co-operation of United States Government in the war” but in a secret annexe of his report Balfour stated that “the majority of American Irish groups would in fact accept partition²³², although they would not welcome it in public.²³³” Therefore, there was an obvious need for the British government to achieve a settlement in the Irish question. Even *Helsingin Sanomat* reported on this on April 29th when the paper wrote that “to appease the strong demand of the public opinion in the United States the [British] government will give an official pledge to settle the Irish question as quickly as possible²³⁴.” Due to the establishment of the Irish Convention, the government was able to turn to the more pressing problems of the war: German submarines, the forthcoming offensive in Flanders, and the parliamentary row over Winston Churchill’s return to the ministry. However, as Turner has asserted, “this was the beginning of the end for an agreed settlement of the Irish question.²³⁵”

In this subchapter of the thesis I will study the *Helsingin Sanomat*’s reporting on the Irish question between May 1917 and February 1919. Due to the overlapping of some of the

²³¹ Turner 1992, 183. Bartlett 2014, 291: There was a considerable Irish-American minority in the United States due to the emigration of the Irish between 1850–1920. Nearly half of the 5 million Irish emigrants went to the United States; Mikkonen 1983, 11; 38–41; 123–124: Mikkonen has asserted that the Irish emigrants and their descendants in the United States considered Britain as Ireland’s oppressor and they did not want the United States to join the war.

²³² Concerning partition of Ireland into two self-governing territories.

²³³ Turner 1992, 183.

²³⁴ HS 29.4.1917.

²³⁵ Turner 1992, 185.

themes and a rather long period of time I have decided to divide this subchapter into three parts. First, I will study the paper's reporting on the Irish convention that convened between July 1917 and April 1918. Second, I will study the period of time from May 1917 until July 1918, excluding nearly all the paper's writings of the Irish convention and focusing on other things such as the paper's representation of the Sinn Féin party and the conscription in Ireland. Lastly, I will focus on the period between July 1918 and February 1919 when a visible shift in *Helsingin Sanomat's* views was starting to happen.

The neglected Irish Convention

Irish Convention began on late July 1917 but for the first time *Helsingin Sanomat* brought up the Convention in May. On May 19th, the paper reported that a convention of Irishmen was to be called in order to create a Constitution for Home Rule Ireland and yet again, without any reservations, *Helsingin Sanomat* stated in the article's title that a settlement of the Irish question was close.²³⁶ However, from May onwards until the beginning of the Convention in July 25th, the paper did publish articles concerning the Convention but did not really give any commentary on how the paper actually viewed the idea of the Convention and remained neutral about it.

What really stood out from the *Helsingin Sanomat's* reporting on the Irish Convention during its proceedings was the fact that the paper hardly mentioned the Convention after June 1917. Between June 1917 and April 1918 *Helsingin Sanomat* did not publish any articles dedicated to the Convention and barely mentioned it briefly in other Irish news. The paper wrote the most about the Convention in an article published on December 23rd but I will discuss this article further later on. Also, between January 25th of 1918 and April 19th there was nearly a gap of three months with no news concerning Ireland and by April 19th the Convention had already disbanded so *Helsingin Sanomat* did not even report on the Convention's results, although failed ones.

²³⁶ HS 19.5.1917.

Just before the Finnish civil war broke out on January 27th 1918 *Helsingin Sanomat* published its last article concerning Ireland until next April. The article was written by a Norwegian *Aftenposten's* London correspondent and it ended up being the last piece of news about the Irish convention published in *Helsingin Sanomat*. The article briefly explained that the convention could finish its work fairly soon, but apparently different sources had told that the convention had not yet achieved an agreement on any of the important questions²³⁷. The article did not delve any further into the proceedings of the convention, but it concluded that if the Irish were not able to come to an agreement then the “English government must decisively cut that Gordian’s knot and solve the Irish question on the principles of justice and self-government²³⁸.” This conclusion seemed far from the previous article where the paper promoted revolution in Ireland (more of this in the next chapter) but it did seem a lot like *Helsingin Sanomat's* previous views of the Irish question. Furthermore, what should be noted from this article is that it mentioned that delays in the settlement of the Irish question were affecting England and United States’ war effort²³⁹. This had not been a common theme in *Helsingin Sanomat's* writing, however, it had been more common of *The Times* to write about the effects of Irish question on the war effort. Although the article was not written by *Helsingin Sanomat*, the paper still decided on its own what it would publish. Even though *Helsingin Sanomat* cited opposing views in a fair and balanced way, they never published whole articles written by another paper if it would not align with their own policies. Thus, by publishing an article the paper took the article’s opinion under its own name.

The most likely reason for the lack of reporting on the Irish question during the period between July 1917 and April 1918 can be explained at least partly with Finland’s political situation at the time. *Helsingin Sanomat* was not printed between August 14th and 15th due to a general strike declared by Helsinki’s municipal chapter of the Social Democratic Party. In October, the Bolsheviks led by Vladimir Lenin overthrew the Tsarist autocracy in Russia which led to Finland declaring independence from Russia on December 6th, 1917. What followed

²³⁷ HS 25.1.1918.

²³⁸ HS 25.1.1918.

²³⁹ Ibid.

was a civil war in Finland, due to which *Helsingin Sanomat* was shut down for three months between January 28th 1917 and April 12th 1918.²⁴⁰

Despite the obvious reasons which affected publishing *Helsingin Sanomat* during late 1917 and early 1918, it still strikes rather odd how little the paper discussed the Irish Convention. It would seem like that Irish Convention was exactly the kind of institution that *Helsingin Sanomat* would have thought to be ideal: an assembly of political representatives of a small nation who were attempting to create a constitutional framework for their own country. An epitome of parliamentary democracy which clearly was the driving ideology behind *Helsingin Sanomat*. And even though Sinn Féin had decided to boycott the convention²⁴¹ I do not think that it would have affected *Helsingin Sanomat's*, who did not yet see Sinn Féin amongst the important actors in Ireland, opinion on the significance of the convention. The Irish convention convened from July 1917 until April 1918 during which *Helsingin Sanomat* hardly reported on it and although the first couple of months of 1918 have a reasonable explanation because the paper was not printed, it seems out of character for the paper that it did not properly report on the convention between July and December 1917.

Shifting attitudes of *Helsingin Sanomat*

It seemed that by June 1917 *Helsingin Sanomat's* image of Sinn Féin had slowly began to change. By June 1917 Sinn Féin had already won two by-elections and gained two seats in the Westminster Parliament²⁴² and more by-election victories would follow during 1917. Since the Rising *Helsingin Sanomat* had usually referred to Sinn Féin as a movement, not as a political party²⁴³, and still on March 10th 1917 the paper asserted that Sinn Féin was a revolutionary movement, “opposite to the constitutional movement of the Nationalists²⁴⁴.” However, on June 6th 1917, *Helsingin Sanomat* published an article where it titled Sinn Féin as an Irish independence party (*‘Irlannin riippumattomuuspuolue’*)²⁴⁵. Of course, the paper

²⁴⁰ Henning 2003, 19.

²⁴¹ Lee 1990, 39: “Sinn Féin boycotted the convention, which therefore became a largely academic exercise.”

²⁴² One of the new Sinn Féin Members of Parliament, Joseph McGuinness, had been imprisoned since the Rising.

²⁴³ With few exceptions: See *HS* 3.5.1916 & *HS* 5.5.1916.

²⁴⁴ *HS* 10.3.1917.

²⁴⁵ *HS* 6.6.1917.

still considered Sinn Féin to be more revolutionary than other Irish Nationalists but calling Sinn Féin an Irish independence party could be interpreted as the paper finally giving political legitimacy for Sinn Féin, instead of considering them as criminals. Also in the same article, *Helsingin Sanomat* at last properly noted the shift in Irish public opinion which according to the paper was tired of Irish Parliamentary Party's "conciliatory and careful tactics"²⁴⁶." However, the paper did not yet hop in the Sinn Féin's bandwagon, but it was sure that Irish Nationalists would continue to push even stronger for extending Home Rule for all of Ireland.

During the summer of 1917 *Helsingin Sanomat* published only two articles concerning Ireland, one of which was about pardoning the imprisoned rebels of the Easter Rising²⁴⁷. However, the paper abstained from commenting the subject any further. These two articles published on the latter half of June 1917 were to be the last articles published concerning Ireland during the summer of 1917, and it was not until late October that *Helsingin Sanomat* picked up the story again. The three articles published in October did not bode well for the Irish question and according to the paper the situation in Ireland was escalating once again, at least partly thanks to actions of Sinn Féin since the party had in its *Ard Fheis* (party conference) declared that its aim was to secure international recognition of Ireland as an independent Irish republic²⁴⁸. *Helsingin Sanomat* did not directly offer its opinion on the subject but it did write about that a 'democratic' ('*kansanvaltainen*') newspaper had referred to Sinn Féin's actions being a combination of "the darkest despair and unlimited desires"²⁴⁹."

The scarce reporting that had begun from July 1917 onwards continued towards the end of the year and during November and December the paper published only three articles regarding Ireland. The quantity of the reporting is most likely explained with the Irish convention that was still ongoing and therefore there was not that much, at least in the eyes of *Helsingin Sanomat*, to report on. The two articles published on November aimed to briefly explain the current situation in Ireland, however, disregarding the convention. In early November *Helsingin Sanomat* predicted that new conflicts in Ireland were possible due to the

²⁴⁶ HS 6.6.1917.

²⁴⁷ HS 16.6.1917.

²⁴⁸ HS 31.10.1917.

²⁴⁹ Ibid.

Sinn Féin's recent declaration²⁵⁰ but in late November situation seemed to have changed for the paper reported that there had been a shift in the public opinion and Sinn Féin extremists, "who had always been in the minority", were losing supporters²⁵¹. However, from these three articles, the one from December was definitely the most interesting because it was completely out of character for *Helsingin Sanomat*. Even though the article itself was written by a Russian newspaper called *Novaâ žizn'*²⁵² (*Helsingin Sanomat* spelled the name *Novoje Shijnj*) and *Helsingin Sanomat* only published it, the article's content is completely contrary to *Helsingin Sanomat's* ideology of parliamentary democracy.

The article by *Novaâ žizn'* was published in *Helsingin Sanomat* on December 23rd 1917 so it has to be read in the proper historical context, which is that Finland had declared independence from Soviet Russia on December 6th but the Soviet Russian Government had not yet recognized Finland's independence²⁵³. What separates this article from the other articles published in *Helsingin Sanomat* is its revolutionary rhetoric. In the very beginning the article stated that "clouds are gathering over the green island once again" and there were open talks of a new rebellion, which was to be "fatal and inevitable²⁵⁴." The article viewed the Irish convention, which convened behind closed doors, as artificially created by the British government. The article also criticised heavily the half-hearted news coverage of the convention which was due to the ban on the media to report on the proceedings of the convention. Lastly and most importantly the article issued a declaration that "the revolutionary movement in Western Europe begins from Ireland.²⁵⁵" The views of the Irish question expressed in this article clearly correspond with V.I. Lenin's views, who believed that "the end of British rule in Ireland would accordingly bring about the breakdown of British 'capitalist' society" and "since England was the 'bulwark' of European capitalism', then revolution in England would be decisive step forward in the history of World Revolution²⁵⁶."

²⁵⁰ HS 4.11.1917.

²⁵¹ HS 24.11.1917.

²⁵² A socialist newspaper which was published in St. Petersburg in 1917 and 1918.

²⁵³ Vahtola 2012, 289: Soviet Russian government recognized Finland's independence on December 31st 1917 and it was approved on January 4th 1918.

²⁵⁴ HS 23.12.1917.

²⁵⁵ HS 23.12.1917.

²⁵⁶ Mansergh 1978, 127–129.

Helsingin Sanomat had never promoted revolutionary means as a way to achieve rights for small nations. Even though the article was not written by *Helsingin Sanomat* itself, there must have been a distinct reason for the paper to publish such a large article (spreading on three columns) which contradicted their own policy. Soviet Russia not yet recognising Finland's independence would be a strong enough a reason for the paper to try and appeal to the socialist Russian government. This is also supported by the fact that the article published on December 23rd remained the paper's last article containing any hints of revolutionary rhetoric (regarding Ireland at least) moving forward. After the Finnish civil war was over and *Helsingin Sanomat* began printing again in April 1918, the paper's political alignment was back to what it had been before.

The Irish convention gave its final report in early April 1918, but this apparently was old news for *Helsingin Sanomat*, which resumed printing again in April 12th, and the paper never revisited the subject or tried to analyse the events that lead to the convention disbanding. However, Ireland soon returned on the map of global awareness. As a result of Germany's March offensive, the British armies in France had suffered disastrous casualties and therefore the need for manpower arose. Due to the manpower crisis, the British government had decided to extend the conscription, which had existed in Britain since January 1916, to Ireland hand-in-hand with a simultaneous Home Rule which Kee has described followingly:

*Now the British Government, having rejected that case, when the Irish were enlisting voluntarily, was prepared to concede it in order to purchase their agreement to compulsion.*²⁵⁷

The conscription united all sections of nationalist opinion (including Sinn Féin) against it in Ireland and on April 16th when the new Conscription Bill passed through Parliament, the Irish Nationalist Party left the House of Commons as a protest and returned to Ireland²⁵⁸. On April 21st *Helsingin Sanomat* published an article titled "The Irish do not want to fight for England"²⁵⁹ which already sounded biased against the Irish. During the whole Conscription

²⁵⁷ Kee 1972, 618.

²⁵⁸ Kee 1972, 619.

²⁵⁹ HS 21.4.1918: "Irlantilaiset eivät tahdo taistella Englannin puolesta"

Crisis in 1918 *Helsingin Sanomat* seemed to forget to mention that the Irish had already volunteered to fight since the beginning of the war. When the Home Rule Act was placed in the statute books in September 1914 the Irish had something to fight for and all-in-all over 200 000 Irishmen (including both Nationalists and Unionists) fought in the war²⁶⁰. If the Home Rule Act of 1914 would have been enacted immediately after its passing the situation might have been very different in 1918. Now that Home Rule had disappeared and the British government, as Kee put it, was prepared to concede Home Rule for Ireland in order to purchase their agreement to compulsory conscription²⁶¹. These were the facts *Helsingin Sanomat* was neglecting at the time while writing about the Irish and their resistance.

The situation in Ireland was according to *Helsingin Sanomat* clearly becoming worse and worse during April 1918. The catholic clergy was holding meetings to oppose the conscription²⁶², strikes were held everywhere in Ireland except for Ulster²⁶³ and the revolutionary movement seemed to be on the rise²⁶⁴. Also, the possibility of civil war in Ireland was once again looming when the paper reported that Sinn Féin was preparing to resist the conscription with arms and Ulster was also preparing to resist Home Rule with same means²⁶⁵ and by no surprise at all, *Helsingin Sanomat* hinted that Ulster would be the side to fire the first shots. However, nothing of the sort happened as the conscription in Ireland was suspended for a couple of weeks²⁶⁶.

Then came the so called “German Plot” which led to the arrests of 73 prominent Sinn Féin members in late May 1918²⁶⁷. The arrests were made because the British officials claimed to have discovered a conspiracy between Sinn Féin and Germany, however, no proper evidence was ever produced against Sinn Féin so the whole “German Plot” has been widely seen as the British government’s attempt to soothe the situation in Ireland by arresting Sinn Féin leaders who were a powerful force in the anti-conscription movement²⁶⁸.

²⁶⁰ Bartlett 2014, 382.

²⁶¹ Kee 1972, 618.

²⁶² HS 24.4.1918.

²⁶³ HS 26.4.1918.

²⁶⁴ HS 30.4.1918.

²⁶⁵ HS 3.5.1918.

²⁶⁶ HS 4.5.1918.

²⁶⁷ Ferriter 2015, 177.

²⁶⁸ Kee 1972, 620–621.

For the next couple of months *Helsingin Sanomat*'s Irish news revolved around the "German Plot." At first the paper reported the "official" version of the story but already before the end of May, the paper published an article where it wrote that liberal English newspapers were demanding evidence of the plot²⁶⁹. The evidence was published by the government in early June which *Helsingin Sanomat* did not comment any further but by July it had become evident that there had been something suspicious in the government's actions. On July 1st the paper wrote of Lord Wimborne's, who had been Lord Lieutenant of Ireland since February 1915, comments in the House of Lords²⁷⁰. Wimborne criticised the government heavily and stated that he had no information of this Irish-German conspiracy, and he was altogether suspicious of the government's claims. *Helsingin Sanomat* wrote that "if Wimborne's declaration is true, it proves that the English government has adopted a policy which follows the Russian police system's most miserable principles²⁷¹." The paper concluded that "an obvious result of all this honourless scheming is that in Ireland there has risen even more bitter hostility towards the English than never before the conquer of Ireland²⁷²."

"The German Plot" could be seen as a watershed moment in *Helsingin Sanomat*'s reporting concerning the Irish question. After the unravelling of the government's scheming and abandonment of Irish Home Rule yet again, the paper started distinctly shifting from the policies of the British government, which it had supported during all these years, to more pro-Irish point of view. These pro-Irish sympathies of *Helsingin Sanomat* would definitely peak like never before during the first few months of 1919.

Death of Home Rule, birth of Ireland

On July 7th 1918 *Helsingin Sanomat* published an article titled "Irish question – Home Rule law buried for good²⁷³" and this article spread over three columns so it seemed that the paper wanted to give the subject a proper emphasis. This article clearly portrayed *Helsingin Sanomat*'s new point of view to the Irish question. After the outbreak of the war in 1914

²⁶⁹ HS 26.5.1918.

²⁷⁰ HS 1.7.1918.

²⁷¹ Ibid.

²⁷² Ibid.

²⁷³ HS 7.7.1918.

Home Rule had faced many setbacks but *Helsingin Sanomat* had always managed to see the light at end of the tunnel and maintained its positive attitude and expectations towards Ireland. However, now those days were behind them and in the article of July 7th the paper wrote that “the question of Irish Home Rule has abated for an uncertain period of time²⁷⁴.” The paper did not hold back on its words while criticizing the government for the fall of Home Rule:

*The matter is as clear as day. The English government has proved to be incapable to see the Irish question to a happy and just settlement, by giving Irish their self-governance, what would be the only way to appease this nation which has faced great suffering.*²⁷⁵

There was clearly no sympathy left for the British government which the paper had now deemed totally incapable to find a solution to the Irish question. *Helsingin Sanomat* continued by briefly writing of the notable events of the Irish question that had occurred after September 1914 like the Easter Rising and the Irish convention. Lastly on this list the paper mentioned the final attempt of Lloyd George to enact Home Rule in Ireland while simultaneously extending military conscription to Ireland. Three months before on April 21st it seemed that *Helsingin Sanomat* was guiltig the Irish who did not want to fight for England but now the paper stated that “Lloyd George’s government had decided, without asking the Irish opinion, to extend the conscription to Ireland and setting it as a condition for the Home Rule” and that “Lloyd George now took back from the Irish what the Liberals and he himself had given for the Irish²⁷⁶.”

Thus, according to the *Helsingin Sanomat* the anger and unanimous resistance of the Irish was highly understandable which had definitely not been the paper’s opinion during the previous years. At the end of the article there was a brief mention of the rumours that the British government was planning to convert all of Britain into a federation where all of its

²⁷⁴ HS 7.7.1918.

²⁷⁵ HS 7.7.1918: ”Asia on siis aivan selvä. Englannin hallitus on osoittautunut kykenemättömäksi saattamaan Irlannin kysymystä onnelliseen ja oikeudenmukaiseen ratkaisuun, antamalla irlantilaisille itsehallinto, mikä olisi ainoa keino tämän kovia kokeneen kansan rauhoittamiseksi.”

²⁷⁶ HS 7.7.1918.

parts would receive autonomy. However, the paper saw that this rumour was released just to appease the Irish and stated that it would mean nothing for the Irish because the process of federation building would take years or even dozens. Furthermore, the paper stated that the oppressed Ireland needed quicker solutions since their current situation was unbearable.²⁷⁷ There had been years since *Helsingin Sanomat* had previously referred to the oppression of the Irish which had been during the immediate aftermath of the Rising²⁷⁸ and even then, the paper had referred to the Gladstonian times. The narrative of oppression had been much more present pre-world war when the third Home Rule Act had not yet been placed into the statute books but now that the paper did not sympathise with the British government and it was getting closer of the Irish opinion, it was time to bring back the old narratives. This was embodied in the conclusion of the article: "if England really wants to be seen as a liberator of small nations then first of all it has to think of Ireland²⁷⁹."

The shift in *Helsingin Sanomat*'s attitudes was obvious. The next article concerning Ireland was actually a letter by an Irishman named Russel and it had been published in another newspaper. The letter had been titled "England's policy of violence in Ireland" and it dealt with the history of the oppression and violence in Ireland²⁸⁰. There were also headlines like "Aspirations of independence in Ireland²⁸¹" and "Persecution of the Irish²⁸²" which clearly took a heavier stance on the Irish question than even before the war. From the former article it was apparent that the Home Rule movement had come to its end and Sinn Féin had gained its final victory in Ireland.

"The German Plot" had been the watershed moment for *Helsingin Sanomat* but most clearly the change in paper's attitudes came to be seen in early 1919. The war had come to its conclusion in November 1918 and in the general election of December 1918 Sinn Féin had won 73 seats which meant it now held the majority of the Irish seats in the House of Commons, however, Sinn Féin chose to abstain from the British parliament²⁸³. Sinn Féin's

²⁷⁷ HS 7.7.1918.

²⁷⁸ HS 30.5.1918

²⁷⁹ HS 7.7.1918.

²⁸⁰ HS 1.8.1918.

²⁸¹ HS 31.8.1918.

²⁸² HS 29.9.1918.

²⁸³ Bartlett 2014, 398–399.

victory also meant the disappearance of the moderate Irish Parliamentary Party which only won six seats. The general election marked the final burial of the Home Rule movement and the first steps towards Irish independence.

Helsingin Sanomat kept a close eye on the Irish affairs and Sinn Féin from early January 1919 onwards, although, the most important news did not come until January 23rd for it was then that the paper published an article declaring that there had been an immensely important political action in Ireland: Sinn Féin Members of Parliament had declared Ireland as an independent republic and the *Dáil* had been constituted in Dublin.²⁸⁴ For years and years *Helsingin Sanomat* had promoted Irish autonomy, achieved through parliamentary democracy, under the British rule but now that Sinn Féin had declared Irish independence the paper saw it to represent the majority opinion of the Irish population and the paper also stated that the Paris Peace Conference was sure to have a another question on their table²⁸⁵. It could be argued that the Irish independence came through parliamentary means since Sinn Féin had won the majority of the Irish seats in the election but on the other hand Sinn Féin had no authority under the British rule to establish an Irish parliament. This clearly shows how *Helsingin Sanomat's* views of Sinn Féin had evolved from Easter Rising, when the paper considered them nothing but criminals, until January 1919.

However, the Sinn Féin delegation was not accepted into the Peace Conference²⁸⁶ and apparently *Helsingin Sanomat* was not so joyful of the newly declared Irish independence after all because on the next day the paper published an article where it stated that “practically this decision will most likely to remain as a protest” because England would not accept it²⁸⁷. Although, the paper did think that the declaration of independence would hurry the settlement of the Irish question and give the people of the “emerald isle” a broad Home Rule²⁸⁸. The paper’s return to the ideals of Home Rule would be understandable if it was not for the article from February 18th 1919. This article, originally written by a Swedish newspaper *Aftonbladet* but nonetheless relevant concerning *Helsingin Sanomat's* views, was about Sinn

²⁸⁴ HS 23.1.1919.

²⁸⁵ HS 23.1.1919.

²⁸⁶ Kee 1972, 629–630.

²⁸⁷ HS 24.1.1919.

²⁸⁸ HS 24.1.1919.

Féin and their political programme²⁸⁹. The article covered about a one third of a page plus three columns on the next one, so the paper definitely showed interest on Sinn Féin. In the beginning of the article there were instructions on how to pronounce the Sinn Féin name and what the name meant. Furthermore, the article seemed to romanticize Sinn Féin for it wrote about Irish language, culture, sports and economics. However, most importantly regarding to the paper's views of Home Rule, article stated that "what good is it for the people of Ireland to have a Home Rule that is forced into such tight limits" and the article continued that the Home Rule passed on 1914 was so modest that how could any Irishman settle for that and therefore Sinn Féin sought to dismantle the English supremacy over Ireland.²⁹⁰ This article seemed to totally contradict the one published less than a month ago.

At this point in February 1919 *Helsingin Sanomat's* views concerning the Irish question were clearly in a flux. The support for moderate nationalism and parliamentary democracy in the Home Rule process had continued from 1910 onwards until July 1918 when the paper's alignment began to change due to the disappointing scheming of the British government in relation to "the German plot". This watershed moment brought back the old narratives of the Irish oppression that were more typical for the paper in the pre-war period and pre-Home Rule Act of 1914 because after the passing of the Home Rule Act the paper's views had aligned more with the Liberal led British government than the Irish Nationalists. After "the German plot" *Helsingin Sanomat* was getting closer to Sinn Féin and by February 1919 there was a distinct confusion whether the paper supported Home Rule or full independence for Ireland since it appeared to write from both of these viewpoints. However, it was clear that unlike back in May 1916, now the practical outcome of self-governance was becoming more important than the principle for *Helsingin Sanomat*.

2.2. *The Times* 1914–1919: "we would gladly leave it in silence"

Before September 1914 and the outbreak of the war *The Times's* views of the Irish question had been truly unambiguous and there was no doubt that the paper would have resisted the

²⁸⁹ HS 18.2.1919.

²⁹⁰ HS 18.2.1917.

implementation of Irish Home Rule until the very end. Nonetheless, the Home Rule Act reached the statute books and it seemed that the Irish question had been settled. The settlement of course would be only temporary because the Easter Rising in April 1916 would raise the Irish question back on the table. However, from April 1916 onwards there appeared to be couple of shifts in the paper's attitudes towards the Irish question.

In the context of the First World War it is important to note *The Times's* status in the British society and especially the paper's owner Lord Northcliffe. In 1908 Lord Northcliffe had acquired two thirds of *The Times's* shares and thus became the owner of the paper, although, he had to pledge not to change the editorial policies of the paper²⁹¹. However, after the outbreak of the war, that is exactly what Northcliffe did. He criticized heavily the British army's lack of munitions and pressed for the creation of a separate Ministry of Munitions and for the formation of a wartime coalition government, and it was no consequence that in 1918 Northcliffe was appointed by Lloyd George, who had acted as the Minister of Munitions and was currently the Prime Minister of the Coalition cabinet, as the director of propaganda aimed at enemy countries in the newly found Ministry of Information²⁹². Thus, Lord Northcliffe's media empire (including *The Times*, *Daily Mail*, *Daily Mirror* and *The Observer*) was harnessed for the British propaganda machine²⁹³ so it is important to keep that in mind while analysing the editorials of *The Times*.

2.2.1. Irish question ties into the British war effort

After the war had broken out and the Home Rule Act had been placed into the statute books *The Times* published two more editorials before the end of 1914. Already the tone of the paper's writings had shifted. On October 1914 the paper wrote about the Nationalist recruitment campaign in Ireland which the paper actually sympathised with. *The Times* wrote that "they [Nationalists] have laboured manfully to induce their people to enlist in the Army,

²⁹¹ Torvinen 1982, 83–84.

²⁹² "Alfred Charles William Harmsworth, Viscount Northcliffe", *Britannica*.

²⁹³ Carruthers 2000, 67.

to convince them that success of the Allies is as much an Irish as a British interest, and to swing the Irish democracy in line with the rest of the UK²⁹⁴.”

Obviously, it was futile for the paper to resist the Home Rule anymore, so it had to focus on what was best for the British war effort. Irish Nationalists were not the enemy anymore and they were even recruiting to fight in the British army, so *The Times* had to seek enemies from elsewhere which it found from Sinn Féin and Irish socialists. The paper saw Sinn Féin and the socialists to embody the anti-British spirit and to encumber the progress of the Nationalist recruitment, and it asserted that “it is for the Government to assist them [Nationalists] by cutting away the noxious weeds²⁹⁵.” However, as the Nationalist recruitment was getting more difficult, the more familiar tone of *The Times* raised its head again when it wrote on November 24th that “anti- British, anti-recruitment, pro-German campaign in Ireland, - -, still pursues its course of favoured impunity” and that in Nationalist Ireland “terrorism in some form or other is the rule of life²⁹⁶.” On late November 1914 *The Times* was concerned of the rising sedition in Ireland and according to the paper “Ireland at present seems to be an administrative no-mans-land, with the civil and military authorities waiting politely on one another to stop the stream of sedition²⁹⁷.” However, these worries were decreasing by December when the authorities in Ireland had shut down couple of seditious newspapers²⁹⁸. This editorial would remain the last editorial for a long time concerning the events in Ireland.

The Irish question returned in early January 1916 when the Military Service Act became relevant. What is notable that in their editorial titled “The Bill” *The Times* was not calling for extending the conscription to Ireland because it saw that “the whole community was unalterably opposed to the Bill” and the paper stated that “we have none of us time to deal with an aggravated “Irish question” just now²⁹⁹.” While at this point *Helsingin Sanomat* was taking a more principled manner of an approach to the Irish question, *The Times* was assuming a more practical line of thought which would be visible for the rest of the war. *The*

²⁹⁴ *The Times* 31.10.1914.

²⁹⁵ Ibid.

²⁹⁶ *The Times* 24.11.1914.

²⁹⁷ Ibid.

²⁹⁸ *The Times* 7.12.1914.

²⁹⁹ *The Times* 8.1.1916.

Times, concerned of the British war effort, saw that at the time it was best to leave Irish question be because it would most definitely cause hindrance to the war effort if the government had to deal with that instead of focusing winning the war. Unfortunately for *The Times*, those seditious groups which the paper had been so worried about in 1914 were about to force the government to deal with the Irish question sooner than they had preferred.

The Times during the Rising

The Times published its first editorial regarding the Easter Rising on Wednesday April 26th 1916 and the paper had first reported on the rebel activities in Dublin on the previous Tuesday. At first the character of the Rising was misunderstood due to the censorship forced in Ireland and *The Times* focused on the German element of the events which “drew attention from the national and revolutionary spirit of the revolt.” The first report on Tuesday was titled “A raid on Ireland. German attempt to land arms” and it was not until May 1st when *The Times* published the Proclamation of the Provisional Government of the Republic of Ireland that the paper showed to possess a clearer comprehension of what was happening in Ireland.³⁰⁰

The first editorial of the Rising which was published on April 26th still emphasised the German element and attempted to provide some sort of picture of the events that had already taken place in Dublin. However, the paper focused more heavily on the alleged German involvement and criticising the Irish administration, which was led by Chief Secretary for Ireland Augustine Birrell. At this point the paper did not put much weight on the Rising and it wrote that “we shall be greatly surprised if the general population even in Dublin take the “insurrection” very seriously”, and the paper also predicted that the Rising would be quelled quickly.³⁰¹

On the following day’s editorial, the focus had already started to shift away from Germany³⁰² and the paper continued criticising the Irish administration and also the government for not informing the public of the events in Ireland. *The Times* was concerned that this sort of “mystery-mongering is the very best and surest means to create distrust at home and abroad”

³⁰⁰ Mowat 1968, 142.

³⁰¹ *The Times* 26.4.1916.

³⁰² Although Germany would still be seen connected to the Rising for years to come.

and the paper also questioned the need for censorship if the position in Ireland was actually as trivial as the government had suggested³⁰³. Nevertheless, the paper asserted that “the rising was predestined to ignominious failure” but *The Times* did not blame the seditious Irish groups (which the paper distinguished from the “many thousand brave Nationalists who are gallantly fighting beside their fellow subjects”) for the outbreak of the Rising so much as the Irish administration and Birrell, who had allowed these movements to grow under their eyes.³⁰⁴ At this point *The Times* avoided blaming the Irish for the Rising and the paper was sure to make a distinction between the seditious groups and the Nationalist volunteers so it would not aggravate the situation in Ireland, which was the course of action it had already assumed earlier in January. Had the Rising happened in pre-1914 conditions the paper would have definitely been more aggressive on their views against the Irish since *The Times* had back then practically divided the island into Unionists and Nationalists, the latter including all the seditious groups in Ireland as far as the paper was concerned.

The rebel actions were still continuing by Friday 28th of April and the censorship was still maintained but now, according to *The Times*, the government had awakened to the “serious side” of the Rising, which the paper saw as “a reassuring step³⁰⁵.” Even though the Rising did not achieve the independent Irish Republic and it was considered as a failure in the end, notwithstanding its effect on the Irish public opinion, the Rising itself had evolved from “a minor insurrection” to a serious revolt that needed to be quelled in *The Times*’s opinion. The paper was concerned that the British Press would use the Rising “to provoke political dissensions over the Irish question” while the country was at war and the paper worried that this could affect the nation’s unity³⁰⁶. The paper deprecated these kinds of attacks and according to the paper so did the Irish leaders Redmond and Carson, who the paper surely wanted to portray more in accordance in order to promote national unity during difficult times.

³⁰³ *The Times* 27.4.1916.

³⁰⁴ *Ibid.*

³⁰⁵ *The Times* 28.4.1916.

³⁰⁶ *Ibid.*

By Saturday 29th of April no new information from Ireland had reached the papers so *The Times* continued to emphasise the fact that “the country and the world” had been left in “utter ignorance³⁰⁷.” The paper considered the position too serious at the moment and “the anxiety felt for friends and relatives in Ireland too deep, for indulgence in this complete and callous treatment of Public opinion³⁰⁸.” If we consider the style of reporting of *The Times*, which did not provide any proper news of Ireland due to the lack of information and made it very well known, and *Helsingin Sanomat*, which published news from any tiny bits and pieces it could find³⁰⁹, which of these reporting styles could better calm the readership: *The Times*’s “mystery-mongering” or *Helsingin Sanomat*’s bits-and-pieces news? It seems that *The Times*’s style of criticizing the censorship and emphasising the lack of information, although warranted, would not be the best way to promote the national unity which the paper sought to do.

Nevertheless, on the editorial of April 29th, *The Times* was not so much worried of the “Sinn Féiners³¹⁰”, who the paper regarded as “mere fraction of the population”, and the paper asserted that the real danger lay in the “floating and indeterminate body” of population that cherished “a sentimental sympathy with all anti-English movements” and who were not rebels but “raw material out of which active rebels” could be made³¹¹.” Because of this the paper argued that this part of the population should be educated on how serious a crime a rebellion during war actually was and in order to achieve that nothing would be so unwise than “half-hearted measures of suppression” so “complete, strong and drastic measures” should be taken against the insurgents immediately³¹². Little did the paper know that these measures would have exactly the opposite effect on the Irish population.

³⁰⁷ *The Times* 29.4.1916.

³⁰⁸ *Ibid*.

³⁰⁹ Although this news might have been factually incorrect when it came to the quantity of the rebel forces or the names of the rebel leaders.

³¹⁰ *The Times* 26.4.1916: The rebels had been already on April 26th identified as “Sinn Féiners.”

³¹¹ *The Times* 29.4.1916.

³¹² *The Times* 29.4.1916.

The Aftermath

The rebel surrenders were delivered before May 1st, of which *The Times* was relieved to report. If a week earlier *The Times* had considered the Rising to be a small insurrection of no serious nature, now on May 1st the paper dubbed the Rising as “the most formidable outbreak in Ireland since 1798³¹³.” The fighting had ceased and now was the time to seek the guilty parties and allocate the blame for the Rising, which the paper had already been doing during the Rising. On May 1st *The Times* went straight after the government and the Irish administration by stating that “the Irish outbreak is the direct result of the cabinet’s neglect” and in the second editorial on the same paper *The Times* wrote that “outbreak itself is the severest condemnation possible not only of the Irish executive, whose callous supineness made it possible, but of the successive Governments who tolerated their laxity and indifference³¹⁴.” The paper concluded its second editorial of May 1st by asserting that “prompt steps must be taken to give Ireland, Nationalist and Unionist, the firm and vigorous administration which she demands and requires³¹⁵.” This statement had some ambiguity in it: what did the paper mean by “firm and vigorous administration which she demands and requires?” Ambiguous or not it is probable that *The Times* was referring to Home Rule which Ireland obviously was demanding for herself. Earlier in January 1916 *The Times* had written that it would be best to leave the Irish question alone and avoid aggravating it during the war. However, now that the rebels in Dublin had forced the British government to face the Irish question once again, *The Times* could not sit on its hands anymore and the paper was calling for solution to the Irish question. The paper could have very well been silent about it until the end of the war but the Easter Rising forced *The Times* to take a stance on the question again.

After the editorials of May 1st, it was not until May 10th that *The Times* again published an editorial concerning Ireland and the aftermath of the Rising. According to the paper the Rising was still distracting too much attention from the prosecution of war. The majority of the May 10th's editorial was used to defend and admire Unionist leader Edward Carson who according

³¹³ *The Times* 1.5.1916; The chief effect of the failed 1798 rebellion was the Act of Union which abolished the Irish Parliament.

³¹⁴ *Ibid.*

³¹⁵ *The Times* 1.5.1916.

to the paper was being attacked by some “inveterate party politicians.³¹⁶” Where *Helsingin Sanomat* had put the blame for the outbreak of the Rising on Edward Carson, *The Times* wrote how “the suspensions during the war of the chronic feud that divided Unionists of Ulster from the Nationalists has largely been owing to him [Carson].” According to *The Times* it was due to Carson’s leadership that the King’s peace was kept in Ulster and the North and that Ireland, Great Britain and the Empire were indebted to him for that.³¹⁷

However, the paper concluded its editorial with something other than Carson when it brought up the Military Service Bill and the paper saw that there was no reason why Ireland should be excluded from it³¹⁸. This of course was exactly opposite of what the paper had written in January 1916 when it thought that the including Ireland would only aggravate the Irish question. *The Times* went on to further comment that the paper understood that in the current position the Bill would do more harm than good³¹⁹ but nonetheless it is noteworthy that the paper even made the point of including Ireland in the Bill. It could be said that due to the Rising the damage had already been done so *The Times* did not have to worry so much of aggravating the Irish question anymore, so the paper might have felt safer to comment more along its own alignment than the government’s.

The Times was done with the reporting of the Rising’s aftermath in its editorials well before the end of May 1916. While *Helsingin Sanomat* refrained from commenting the executions of the rebels, *The Times* tackled the subject directly. On May 12th the paper wrote:

*Everybody will learn with relief that the necessity for further executions of a summary kind is now over, but a certain number of these executions were absolute necessary to teach the traitors who take german money that they cannot cover Dublin with blood and ashes without forfeiting their lives.*³²⁰

³¹⁶ *The Times* 10.5.1916.

³¹⁷ *Ibid.*

³¹⁸ *Ibid.*

³¹⁹ *Ibid.*

³²⁰ *The Times* 12.5.1916.

The paper did not hide that it saw the executions necessary, but it was clearly attempting to soften its words in the quote above by writing things like “everybody will learn with relief” and “to teach the traitors who take german money”, which yet again emphasised the alleged German influence on the Rising. *The Times* also stated that “where there is doubt about the justice of a summary execution, there must, of course, be the fullest inquiry.” However, in the very next sentence the paper declared that “we must not suffer a hunt for scapegoats or any other domestic question, however important, to turn our thoughts from the struggle on which all our rights and liberties depend.”³²¹ This must have meant that the government should not hunt for scapegoats because *The Times* itself had allocated blame for the outbreak since the Rising had begun. Furthermore, at this point the paper was starting to emphasise the on-going war and its importance.

The Times clearly wanted to move on from the Rising altogether and start yet again focusing on the war. The paper had written in conclusion of its May 12th editorial that “for the moment we are inclined to believe that the interests of Ireland, as well as the interests of the Empire, will be best served by limiting public discussion to the outbreak itself and its causes³²².” The last editorial that referred to the aftermath of the Rising was published on May 22nd. On that editorial *The Times* listed three practical problems that needed to be solved in Ireland:

*First problem is to get back to the war, carrying Ireland as far as possible with us, but ensuring that her affairs shall be of no hindrance to victory. The second problem, which follows from this, is to constitute a Government in Ireland that will govern. A third problem, which has only arisen through mishandling but has become extremely insistent, is to prevent Irish problem complicating our relations with neutral countries, especially with America. The executions in Dublin, few as they were by comparison with the ghastly death-roll which the rebels caused, have had the worst possible effect overseas.*³²³

³²¹ *The Times* 12.5.1916.

³²² *Ibid.*

³²³ *The Times* 22.5.1916.

Solving the second problem would solve the first problem and therefore the settlement of the Irish question was now in *The Times's* interests since it would unburden the British war effort from Irish difficulties. However, if *The Times* wanted to appear more conciliatory towards Ireland why would the paper downplay the executions by comparing them to overall death-roll of the Rising? After all, it was the executions of the rebels who were tried behind closed doors and the internment of nearly 2000 untried Irish prisoners that affected the public opinion in Ireland³²⁴.

Nevertheless, *The Times* thought that the practical line of advance would be to “settle first the outstanding geographical dispute between Ulster and the rest of the Ireland” and a prompt agreement between Redmond and Carson would help to solve many other difficulties³²⁵. However, on May 12th the paper had already stated that “the Irish question is not to be settled in a day³²⁶.” *The Times* was clearly becoming anxious for a settlement which might explain why the paper tried to oversimplify the Irish question as “an outstanding geographical dispute” which could be promptly solved. Solving the Irish question would also remove any hindrance Britain might have had on winning the war. With knowledge of the Irish question’s history, the paper was not eager to see the situation escalating once again and therefore hoped for a rather prompt solution before the situation would get any worse and further hinder the war effort.

Although the Rising had been “an ignominious failure” *The Times* saw that it had done some service to its “instigators” as it had distracted Britain’s attention “from the one and only thing” the country should be focused on: defeating the Germans³²⁷. ‘The war effort’ argument for settling the Irish question would quickly become the most dominant argument in the paper’s reporting for the rest of the war. When compared to the paper’s editorials between 1910 and 1914 there is a major difference how the paper began to write after September 1914 and more clearly in the Spring of 1916. The paper made more clear distinction between different Irish Nationalist groups and it adopted a more neutral stance on the Irish question. Although

³²⁴ Bartlett 2014, 396; Kee 1972, 573–579.

³²⁵ *The Times* 22.5.1916.

³²⁶ *The Times* 12.5.1916.

³²⁷ *The Times* 12.5.1916.

after the outbreak of the Rising the paper started to promote the settlement of the Irish question and attempted to promote unity in the United Kingdom, there was still some nuances left of the old edge the paper had had in its writings. However, it became abundantly clear that *The Times* was concerned of the Irish question only in the context of winning the war and the paper did not pretend otherwise. This would also continue in the post-Rising years of the war.

2.2.2. Irish question: “A national and imperial necessity”

After the re-emergence of the Irish question due to the Easter Rising it was obvious that *The Times’s* editorials concerning Ireland would become more frequent than they had been in the last two years. Like *Helsingin Sanomat* at the same time, *The Times* conformed with the government’s Irish policy but sided secondarily with the Unionists. From summer of 1916 onwards, *The Times* had a clear urge to portray the Irish question as distinctly a domestic policy issue and the settlement of it was considered “a national and imperial necessity.” The reasoning behind these arguments was naturally the British war effort.

After the Rising Prime Minister Asquith appointed David Lloyd George to settle the Irish question, a decision which *The Times* applauded because the paper considered Lloyd George to be “passionate about winning the war” and who would “not allow himself to be distracted³²⁸.” Nevertheless, the paper was not thrilled of the first proposal that Lloyd George came up with in June 13th 1916³²⁹, however, two days later the paper wrote that “the less said about the controversial aspects of the Irish question while the present negotiations are pending the better³³⁰” which was a stark contrast to the paper’s methods between 1910 and 1914.

In *The Times’s* case the Irish question received its importance through the burden it placed on the British government and the war effort. Therefore, it was important for the paper to promote national unity in order to help the settlement of that burden. Although the paper

³²⁸ *The Times* 26.5.1916.

³²⁹ *The Times* 13.6.1916.

³³⁰ *The Times* 15.6.1916.

still continued to compliment Carson for his leadership in Ulster, *The Times* had adapted a more neutral attitude towards the Irish Nationalists and their leader John Redmond, and the paper saw no benefit in the attempts of the other newspapers to embarrass Redmond since it would be “a poor service to the cause of unity before the foreign enemy³³¹.” In the editorial of June 21st, the paper mentioned two domestic policy issues that could affect the war effort, one of which was the Irish question, which the government was now regarding as “a national and imperial necessity³³².” *The Times* did not make any attempts to contest the government’s views and the paper actually tried to explain what the Home Rule settlement would entail:

*It does not, as we understand it, affect in any way either the control of our defences by the naval and military authorities or the responsibility of the British government to maintain law and order in Ireland through the police.*³³³

These were the exact same security concerns *The Times* and the Conservative politicians had brought up since 1910³³⁴. Furthermore, in the next editorial on June 26th the paper provided “three elementary facts” of the Irish question as an answer to people who doubted the government’s Irish policy and the paper wrote that the current proposal was more satisfactory towards Ulster than what ended up in the statute book two years ago³³⁵.

By the end of June 1916, *The Times* deemed that the Ulster problem was virtually settled³³⁶ and the paper must have been sure of this for about two weeks earlier the paper had written that raising “premature shouts of triumph” would be “mischievous” towards the settlement of the Irish question³³⁷. Although *The Times* saw the exclusion of Ulster from Home Rule as an “immense gain to unionism” all in all the paper considered this as “a war measure, not an ideal settlement” and concluded that this was not the time for “disunion on a matter of domestic politics³³⁸.” However, this was again barely the calm before the storm for the British

³³¹ *The Times* 15.6.1916.

³³² *The Times* 21.6.1916.

³³³ Ibid.

³³⁴ See pp. 35 of this thesis.

³³⁵ *The Times* 26.6.1916.

³³⁶ *The Times* 28.6.1916.

³³⁷ *The Times* 15.6.1916.

³³⁸ *The Times* 28.6.1916.

government was drifting towards a cabinet crisis and the campaign of the Somme had begun on July 1st, so the government's attention was needed on the European front. On an editorial published on July 3rd the paper wrote something that would appropriately describe the paper's attitude towards the Irish question for the rest of the war:

*It seems impossible at such a time as this to devote a single thought to the Irish question, and we would gladly leave it in silence if there were good reason to suppose that the "situation was well in hand".*³³⁹

On July 10th *The Times* was happy to declare the Cabinet crisis was over and that the Irish question would at last to be dealt with "in the full light of the day" although in the very same editorial the paper regarded the Home Rule Act as "an utterly indefensible and unworkable measure"³⁴⁰. However, what was notable in this editorial was that the paper stated that "the publicity of the Parliament should at least put a stop to the theory, that the Irish leaders have only come to an agreement through receiving different versions of the new scheme of government"³⁴¹. This of course referred to Lloyd George's 'shuttle diplomacy' between the Irish parties which is a fact in the light of the previous academic research (e.g. Kee, Turner). It is questionable if *The Times* actually knew of Lloyd George's negotiation tactics and was actively trying to put down the rumours of them, but it is certain that the paper would have probably acted all the same with or without the knowledge to safeguard the British war effort and unity from unnecessary scandals.

However, the Irish question was not "virtually settled" in July 1916 and by July 25th *The Times* reported that the Irish question was yet again at deadlock which according to the paper was caused by the delay of the settlement which allowed "the seeds of disunion" to germinate in Ireland³⁴². Prime Minister Asquith himself declared on the last days of July that the government could not find any solution for the Irish question³⁴³ which led to *The Times* focusing its critique towards the government instead of the political extremists of different

³³⁹ *The Times* 3.7.1916.

³⁴⁰ *The Times* 10.7.1916.

³⁴¹ *The Times* 10.7.1916.

³⁴² *The Times* 25.7.1916.

³⁴³ *The Times* 1.8.1916.

parties. The Irish question was buried for a short period of time, but it would soon make its return.

The Times conforms to the government's policy

The manpower crisis surely affected the return of the Irish question and already on October 1916 *The Times* brought up twice the subject of the manpower needs of the British army and Ireland. Earlier in 1916 *The Times* chose not to aggravate the Irish question any further by calling for extending the conscription to Ireland but now the paper had shed its cover of neutrality and was calling out the Irish people. *The Times* wrote on October 3rd that "there was no logic or justice" in withholding the Military Service Act last spring and argued that "things cannot possibly remain as they are without disastrous consequences." By the latter remark the paper was referring to Ireland who in the eyes of *The Times* was opting out of the war and how the Dominions of the British Empire, conference of which was supposed to bring forth the settlement of the Irish question after the war, were "rapidly revising - - their impressions of the Home Rule Cause."³⁴⁴

It was not until the January 1917 that the Irish question made its return in *The Times's* editorials and there had definitely been a shift in the paper's approach to the question. *The Times* maintained that the Irish question was "essentially a domestic problem" (the Dominions could be consulted about it) but at this point *The Times* did not consider the government to be responsible of finding the settlement but Ireland itself, more accurately the Irish Nationalists.³⁴⁵ A few things are noteworthy at this point. Lloyd George had succeeded Asquith as the Prime Minister in last December and *The Times's* owner Lord Northcliffe had supported Lloyd George as Asquith's replacement³⁴⁶. Northcliffe had also in 1915 pressed for the creation of Ministry of Munitions³⁴⁷ (which was headed by Lloyd George) and supported Lloyd George's views of universal conscription³⁴⁸ so it is safe to say that *The Times* favoured Lloyd George's government more than Asquith's. Therefore, it is reasonable to argue that the

³⁴⁴ *The Times* 3.10.1916.

³⁴⁵ *The Times* 6.1.1917.

³⁴⁶ Temple 2008, 32.

³⁴⁷ "Alfred Charles William Harmsworth, Viscount Northcliffe", *Britannica*.

³⁴⁸ Turner 1992, 65–66.

paper's stance on the Irish question resulted from Lloyd George becoming the head of the government. A government which stability in early 1917, as Turner put it, "depended on its ability to deflect political problems which were not directly about war" (e.g. the Irish question)³⁴⁹.

After the editorial of January 6th two months passed before *The Times* published another editorial concerning the Irish question, however, the editorial published on March 7th was rather extensive. The editorial was based on the paper's own correspondent's, who the paper considered to be "competent and unusually detached observer", "plain, unbiased account"³⁵⁰. However, in the context of the Irish question there was nothing unbiased in *The Times* views.

In the editorial the paper referred to the widening breach between the Home Rulers and the Unionists, Sinn Féin and the Irish economy amongst other things. The "unbiased" correspondent claimed that "anarchists" (*read* Sinn Féin) were threatening the Home Rulers with extinction, which in the grand scale of things was true, but *The Times* regarding Sinn Féin as anarchists did not exactly speak for unbiased views. Furthermore, at this point and similarly to *Helsingin Sanomat*, *The Times* did not consider Sinn Féin as a "coherent political force" and rather "representing an atmosphere."³⁵¹ The paper once again emphasised the responsibility of the Irish representatives in achieving the settlement and at the same time warned the politicians:

*... an Irish debate is always too apt to develop into sham sentiment about small nationalities, grotesque comparisons with Belgium and Poland, elaborate denunciation of injustice and oppression which are conceded so far as the past is concerned, but have no reality whatever in the present.*³⁵²

³⁴⁹ Turner 1992, 176.

³⁵⁰ *The Times* 7.3.1917.

³⁵¹ *The Times* 7.3.1917.

³⁵² *Ibid.*

The quote above is a striking example of that even though *The Times* preferred Lloyd George over Asquith as the Prime Minister, the paper and Lloyd George were not completely ideologically compatible. After all, Lloyd George was a Liberal and at least according to his *War Memoirs* he often mirrored Belgium and Ireland, and wanted to portray himself as the protector of small nationalities³⁵³.

Irish question, Irish solution

From March 1917 onwards *The Times's* editorials concerning Ireland became more frequent again. At this point Germany's unrestricted submarine warfare had been on-going for a while and Britain desperately wanted the United States to join the war against Germany and this was certainly reflected in *The Times's* writings as well³⁵⁴. *The Times* even willingly admitted that "failure to reach a settlement reacts on British interests from Australia to Quebec and gravely affects our relations with the United States³⁵⁵" which had not been typical for the paper's editorials before.

After the last editorial concerning Ireland on March 7th the attention of the British politicians turned to debate over Indian cotton duties and by the time that debate was finished *The Times* was glad to state that "we may be allowed to return to a more serious domestic problem", the Irish question. The paper aimed to keep up a hopeful image of the question and wrote that despite the on-going war there has been a "greatly increased public desire" to face the question. According to *The Times* the paper had received vast amount of suggestions for the solution of the Irish question which according to the paper "all testify to the widespread anxiety which exists everywhere in England lest the new tactics of the Irish Nationalists should prejudice their unfortunate people any further" and the paper continued that "the desire in this country to see Ireland peaceful and prosperous was never so universal or so entirely disinterested as it is at this moment." However, despite of all the alleged English

³⁵³ See for example: Lloyd George 1933 (vol. 1), 2; Lloyd George 1933 (vol. 2), 697; Lloyd George 1936, 2668–2669.

³⁵⁴ Thompson 1999, 243: Lord Northcliffe even headed a British war propaganda mission into the United States on the second half of the 1917.

³⁵⁵ *The Times* 15.3.1917.

support, once again the paper placed the responsibility for reaching the settlement entirely on the Irish themselves.³⁵⁶

Although *The Times* attempted to appear more conciliatory in its writings during early 1917, the paper's real sentiments towards the Irish question were at times still shining through. On March 20th the paper described the Irish question as an "interminable and most mischievous controversy" and the paper also quoted its owner Lord Northcliffe who had said that there were not any concrete wrongs or disabilities to be remedied in Ireland nowadays, and there was only "a condition of uncertainty and unfulfilled expectation which does to some extent weaken our military effort at home and reacts most unfavourably among Irishmen abroad³⁵⁷." This of course had been the Conservative way of thinking from at least since 1910 when the project for the third Home Rule Act had begun and *The Times* had occasionally brought up economic arguments which would prove that Ireland was doing quite well as it currently was³⁵⁸. So even though the paper clearly wished that the Irish question would be solved for the benefit of the British war effort, *The Times* clearly saw no actual need or reason for the Irish self-government.

During March 1917 there seemed to have been a minor shift in *The Times's* way of thinking. Since January the paper had emphasised the Irish Nationalists' role in achieving settlement in Ireland but since Ulster had been offered safeguards against coercion to Home Rule earlier in March, the paper saw that the next move would be with the Ulster minority³⁵⁹. On the editorials published on March 20th and 23rd the paper emphasised that now Ulster held the keys to the settlement and that "their victory is won, and they have a supreme opportunity to make statesmanlike use of it³⁶⁰." Of course, *The Times's* move to shift the attention from the Nationalists to the Unionists could be seen as an attempt to influence the large Irish Catholic minority in the United States who were opposing the war. *The Times* was definitely concerned of the American opinion of the Anglo-Irish relations in general and on April 27th the paper even published some carefully picked American views on the Irish question which

³⁵⁶ *The Times* 15.3.1917.

³⁵⁷ *The Times* 20.3.1917.

³⁵⁸ Latest of these economic arguments had been brought up in March 7^{th's} editorial.

³⁵⁹ *The Times* 20.3.1917.

³⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

not so surprisingly saw the future Irish Parliament more or less “like one of their own State legislatures³⁶¹” and not as an independent government.

It was important for *The Times* during the spring of 1917 to stress a certain unity of Irish sentiment and interests which obviously would help to reach a settlement and would therefore positively affect the British war effort. What was interesting in the editorial published on April 11th was that *The Times* was debunking news that had appeared in the English Press of alleged Sinn Féin rioting on Easter Monday³⁶². If it was not for the war this might have been an opportunity for *The Times* to propagate against Irish nationalism but since the paper was not trying to aggravate the Irish question any more the paper chose to strive for truth. This also marked the first time in *The Times*’s editorials that the paper presented Sinn Féin more as a political party than “an atmosphere” for the paper commented that a Sinn Féin candidate might gain a seat over the Nationalist candidate in the next by-elections³⁶³. However, the paper remembered to mention that the Sinn Féin candidate was “a convicted rebel³⁶⁴” so the paper’s views should be considered to take Sinn Féin more seriously but not acceptingly.

The Easter Rising in 1916 brought along a definite change in *The Times*’s reporting on the Irish question. In the early months of 1916 the paper would have preferred to stay silent of the Irish question and this silence it had to reluctantly break and adapt to the post-Rising situation. During the next year after the Rising and until May 1917 *The Times*’s views of the Irish question could be described as neutral and at times even conciliatory. Before the Rising the Irish question had been something that could not be changed so therefore it should not be touched but after the Rising the question quickly evolved into “an imperial necessity.” *The Times* viewed the re-emerged Irish question as an essentially domestic question, although the paper was concerned especially the United States’ opinion of it. As for the different political actors of the Irish question, the paper stopped antagonising the Irish Nationalists and

³⁶¹ *The Times* 27.4.1917.

³⁶² *The Times* 11.4.1917.

³⁶³ *The Times* 11.4.1917.

³⁶⁴ *The Times* 11.4.1917.

although the paper attempted to remain neutral towards the Nationalists, there was clearly more pressure directed towards them for achieving the settlement on the Irish question.

In May 1917 *The Times* considered that the Irish settlement had entered into a new phase where “public opinion in England, as reflected in the newspapers, had for the first time in Irish controversy been unanimously sympathetic and helpful³⁶⁵” and the resistance for Home Rule, according to *The Times*, came from Ireland herself³⁶⁶. Also, the Irish convention, where the Irish parties could themselves work out a constitutional framework for the Irish Home Rule, was just around the corner. The final chapter of this thesis focuses on the time period of May 1917 until the early 1919.

2.2.3. The slowly decreasing importance of the Irish question

The United States had entered the war in April 1917, so Britain had an obvious need for a settlement in Ireland in order to appease the foreign opinions and to finish the war without further distractions. The Irish convention that convened from July 1917 to March 1918 was supposed to bring forward that long needed Irish settlement, but the convention disbanded after it failed to provide a constitutional framework for Ireland. In chapter 2.1.3. I wrote of the *Helsingin Sanomat*'s watershed moment concerning the Irish question which was the alleged German plot in May 1918. In *The Times*'s case the disbanding of the Irish convention in March 1918 and also the armistice of November 1918 could be seen as similar moments in the paper's attitudes towards the Irish question, although not as radical as *Helsingin Sanomat*'s.

The Irish convention: “Failure may have been inevitable”

The convention was announced in May 1917 and *The Times* did not spend much time on commenting the government's decision, and merely thought that the convention was “a foregone conclusion³⁶⁷.” The paper did not indulge in speculating the convention's

³⁶⁵ *The Times* 21.5.1917.

³⁶⁶ *The Times* 8.5.1917.

³⁶⁷ *The Times* 22.5.1917.

proceedings prematurely and the convention was mentioned only in a couple of editorials before its convening, mainly concerning its composition. On July 25th, the day that the convention was supposed to begin its work, *The Times* stated that “it would be the merest commonplace to emphasize the magnitude of opportunity ... for the development Irish politics” but the paper did not consider the convention to be completely representative due to the abstention of Sinn Féin, although, the paper did not see any reason why the convention could not produce “a practical scheme of self-government.”³⁶⁸

During the autumn of 1917 *The Times* dedicated little time to write of the convention’s proceedings which was understandable since the proceedings were held behind closed doors. Despite the lack of writing *The Times* thought that the convention “had made a good beginning³⁶⁹”, although once again the paper was careful not to build excessive hopes on the Irish solution, and that the convention was “full of promise for the future³⁷⁰.” Outside of the convention, the paper commented on the Irish political atmosphere that “menace of widespread unrest” was growing in Ireland. For some reason *The Times* did not mention Sinn Féin by name in this editorial, but it was perfectly clear who the paper was talking about since it also mentioned that these people “refused with scorn” the convention invitation and that behind them was “the sinister shadow of German propaganda.”³⁷¹ Of course it would be fair to describe Ireland restless at least at the time but holding on to the idea of Sinn Féin-Germany alliance was only meant to hamper the Sinn Féin cause and almost to parallel Sinn Féin as an enemy of the British empire likewise to Germany.

After October 1917 *The Times* did not publish any editorial concerning the Irish situation until January 1918. The editorials concerning the Irish politics had been rather shortly worded since May 1917 but on January 14th 1918 the paper took a wider look in the situation. *The Times* was showing slight optimism on the convention’s success when it wrote that necessities which brought the convention into existence in the first place were also insisting that it shall end in success³⁷². However, the paper was outspoken of the anxiety for the settlement and the

³⁶⁸ *The Times* 25.7.1917.

³⁶⁹ *The Times* 10.8.1917.

³⁷⁰ *The Times* 24.10.1917.

³⁷¹ *The Times* 24.10.1917.

³⁷² *The Times* 14.1.1918.

pressure of the foreign opinion which it did consider to be uninformed though³⁷³. Although the paper was worried of the outside opinion, it asserted that the opinion was uninformed and thus reinforcing the view that the Irish question was a domestic issue for Britain and it would be solved within its own borders. *The Times* then continued to correct “one or two palpable misunderstandings”:

*It is not mere boredom, nor indifference, nor the pressure of interested politicians under the cover of war, which makes a settlement imperative now. It is the fact that Irish disunion, often grossly misrepresented as English oppression, is an intolerable and increasing handicap in the war itself. Moreover this handicap is by no means limited to the failure of Ireland as a whole to play any part but that of a not too friendly neutral in the general conflict of liberty with tyranny. We do not forget for a moment the gallantry of the Irish regiments, North and South, and the self-sacrifice on the battlefield of some of the most devoted champions of Irish nationalism.*³⁷⁴

The Times concluded that the consensus of opinion was worldwide: “the settlement in Ireland has become an essential war necessity, far transcending in importance every argument in the old Irish controversy except the security of these islands.” To summarise the paper’s views presented above: the Irish question became an essential war necessity because the Irish disunion and Ireland’s lack of participation were hampering the war effort. According to *The Times* the war itself was not an excuse or the reason for the need of the settlement and that the need actually stemmed from the Irish disunion which was harming the British war effort. Furthermore, the paper did not specify what it meant by Irish disunion, but it could be interpreted as including both the Nationalists and the Unionists. *The Times* was usually sure to distinct these two groups into their own “nations” unless it better fit the paper’s narrative of Irish unity or disunion. Also, it is worth noticing how *The Times* downplayed the English oppression side of the Irish question. The last remark of “the most devoted champions of Irish nationalism”, however, was clearly placed there to soften the impact of the previous sentences and also as a segue for the upcoming conscription that *The Times* also brought up next.

³⁷³ *The Times* 14.1.1918.

³⁷⁴ *The Times* 14.1.1918.

On the editorial of January 14th, *The Times* stated that it would prefer “rough-and-ready” settlement over none at all³⁷⁵ and the paper continued to emphasise the need for the settlement of the Irish question during the next months, although, there were only handful of editorials published before the Irish convention’s disbandment. However, on April 13th after the final report of the Irish convention had been published, *The Times* had a different tone. The paper considered that the results of the Irish convention were “almost parochial by comparison with the tremendous events” which were occurring in the world at the time³⁷⁶. *The Times* asserted that what the convention had managed to do was to reveal the existence of a nucleus of moderate opinion in Ireland which had thus laid a foundation for the Irish agreement³⁷⁷. Furthermore, *The Times* considered that due to the fact that the Irishmen could not find a settlement to the Irish question among themselves would finally put an end to “the grotesque but persistent conception of Ireland as a subject and downtrodden nation, longing only for freedom to order her own affairs³⁷⁸.”

The Times showed optimism towards the Irish convention at least until January 1918 after which it seemed to merely emphasise the importance of the Irish settlement. The paper’s description of the convention might have been caused from the lack of knowledge because the proceedings were held behind closed doors but the most likely approach to this would be *The Times* conforming to the government’s policy especially since Lord Northcliffe joined the Ministry of information in early 1918³⁷⁹. This is also supported by the fact that on May 7th the paper wrote that “the failure [of the convention] may have been inevitable³⁸⁰” which is the exact opposite sentiment that the paper had after the convention began in July 1917 or in January 1918. As Turner put it, by assembling the Irish convention the British government was merely buying time in order to focus to the war and it was trying to suppress the Irish controversy to safeguard the government’s majority³⁸¹. Moreover, the convention’s proceedings were far from optimistic in reality but it was for the benefit of the British

³⁷⁵ *The Times* 14.1.1917.

³⁷⁶ *The Times* 13.4.1917.

³⁷⁷ Ibid.

³⁷⁸ *The Times* 13.4.1918.

³⁷⁹ Carruthers 2000, 67.

³⁸⁰ *The Times* 7.5.1918.

³⁸¹ Turner 1992, 242.

government to keep the convention running³⁸². Turner concluded that the convention “succeeded in the government’s intention of taking the Irish constitutional question out of the Westminster politics³⁸³.”

The fading necessity of the Irish question

After the convention the government tried once more to implement Home Rule in Ireland, but they decided on a ‘dual policy’ which meant introducing the Home Rule and Military Service Act side by side. Reason behind this was Germany’s Spring Offensive that had begun already on March 21st which led to so-called conscription crisis in the United Kingdom.³⁸⁴ On April 12th 1918 *The Times* wrote that there was a “burning sense of unfairness” in Britain towards “complete divorce of Ireland as a whole from the sacrifices of the war” which, however, could be “removed in a moment by an effort of patriotic self-sacrifice, or it may remain to make Ireland the future outcast of the civilized world³⁸⁵.” Although the paper also remembered to mention “the splendid heroism of Irish regiments”, as it often did when writing about the conscription, it was clear that the attitudes expressed towards Ireland were slowly becoming less and less neutral after the convention had finished.

It could be argued that the Irish convention became a graveyard for the Irish Home Rule. The real winner of the convention was Sinn Féin, who did not participate in the convention in the first place, and who had been slowly increasing its popularity in Ireland since the Easter Rising. Turner has argued that the convention dissolved the link between the Irish community and the Irish Parliamentary Party and that “Sinn Fein had not superseded Nationalism; Nationalism had become Sinn Fein³⁸⁶.” So it was only logical that Sinn Féin was among the leading actors of the Irish anti-conscription movement in the spring of 1918. According to BRIAN FEENEY “it quickly became obvious that the attempt to extend the conscription to Ireland would fail” and the number of British troops that would be needed to enforce the

³⁸² Turner 1992, 242–248; 278–285.

³⁸³ Turner 1992, 284.

³⁸⁴ Turner 1992, 286–288.

³⁸⁵ *The Times* 12.4.1918.

³⁸⁶ Turner 1992, 284.

conscription in Ireland would defeat the whole purpose of it all³⁸⁷. However, it did not stop Lloyd George from threatening to enforce the conscription until the autumn of 1918. On May 3rd *The Times* wrote that the government “cannot go back on their Military Service Bill without abandoning the authority of the Imperial Government³⁸⁸” and therefore because of this “humiliating defeat” (Feeney’s words) it was necessary for Lloyd George to keep up the charade.

“The German plot”, that was revealed in May 1918 and led to the arrests of 73 Sinn Féin members, was directly linked to the success of the anti-conscription movement. Of course, it was not surprising that *The Times* sprang into defend the government’s actions during the next month. On May 20th the paper wrote that the authenticity of the evidence against Sinn Féin was beyond question and that it was necessary for the government to publish it in order to “dispel the cloud of sensational rumour³⁸⁹.” *The Times* must have learned something from the closed-door trials after the Easter Rising since the paper wrote that “rest of the Empire will not judge them unheard³⁹⁰” and despite that the paper was shifting towards less neutral point of view, it still attempted to appease the Irish in order not to aggravate the situation any further. In the same editorial the paper also wrote that “the Government hold the proofs that through Sinn Fein leaders the Germans have made a “treacherous attempt” ... to “defame the honour of Irishmen for their own ends³⁹¹” and from this it could be deduced that the government and *The Times* were not in touch of the political realities in Ireland. Sure, the government must have seen Sinn Féin as a force to be reckoned with but at that time the government and *The Times* must have not had a full conception of the Sinn Féin’s influence over the Irish. During next month *The Times* wrote two more editorials concerning the German plot where the paper sought to emphasise Germany’s role in the alleged conspiracy by stating that “if anything is clear from this sordid story of Sinn Fein commerce with the foes of civilization, it is that it could in no way bring any profit to Ireland” and that “the Sinn Fein leaders were the dupes of Germany’s rulers³⁹²” as if to play down the Irish part of it all.

³⁸⁷ Feeney 2002, 99.

³⁸⁸ *The Times* 3.5.1918.

³⁸⁹ *The Times* 20.5.1918.

³⁹⁰ *The Times* 20.5.1918.

³⁹¹ *The Times* 20.5.1918.

³⁹² *The Times* 25.5.1918.

The summer of 1918 marked the nearly total disappearance of the Irish question from the pages of *The Times*. On June 27th the paper wrote that “no peaceful settlement is possible in Ireland until that unprecedented and sinister challenge is fairly met³⁹³” and after the armistice in November the Irish question seemed to lose its importance in the British politics. For example, on November 14th the paper wrote that “the Prime Minister lays a far greater stress on these measures of social reform than on the Irish policy” although the paper claimed that Lloyd George still regarded Home Rule as “essential³⁹⁴.” However, during the war there had been no domestic issue that had superseded the Irish question at least according to *The Times’s* own writings. The seemingly most major shift in the paper’s views after the armistice, and compared to the views presented on the earlier years of the war, came in December 14th when the paper stated: “When will people realize that Ireland is not a question of domestic politics only, but a permanent disturber of the compass in our foreign and colonial policy too?³⁹⁵” This statement could have been interpreted as *The Times’s* opinion that the Irish question had transformed from a domestic question to a question of foreign policy and that the paper wished for outside help in solving the Irish question. However, this was not case as the paper clearly continued to emphasise the domestic nature of the Irish question from March 1919 onwards.

I will end this chapter on February 1919 as I also did with the *Helsingin Sanomat*. *The Times’s* final editorial regarding Ireland, as far as this thesis is concerned, was published on February 26th 1919. Sinn Féin had won 73 seats in the Westminster Parliament in the general election held in December 1918 but the whole party chose to abstain themselves from Westminster. Instead the newly elected Sinn Féin Members of Parliament repudiated the Westminster Parliament and Britain’s right to govern Ireland, and on January 21st 1919 constituted themselves as the Parliament of Ireland, the *Dáil Éireann*³⁹⁶. *The Times* chose not to discuss Sinn Féin’s historical victory in the general election or the establishment of the *Dáil* in its editorials, although they were reported in the news section of the paper. The editorial that was published on February 26th was not actually about Sinn Féin or the *Dáil* but of

³⁹³ *The Times* 27.6.1918: *The Times* was referring to the Catholic bishops who had played a part in stopping the conscription and Home Rule.

³⁹⁴ *The Times* 14.11.1918.

³⁹⁵ *The Times* 14.12.1918.

³⁹⁶ Feeney 2002, 112.

“Reconstruction in Ireland”, as the title said, and it mainly concerned Ireland’s housing issues³⁹⁷. Nevertheless, the paper offered a very brief commentary on Sinn Féin and the *Dáil* towards the end of the editorial. The paper wrote that:

*Sinn Fein is not too sure of its ground, in spite of its apparent strength. It won its success in December very largely on its anti-conscription policy, which was already a dead issue, although the Irish electorate did not realize the fact. The sham Parliament in Dublin was a ridiculous failure, and Sinn Fein will gain no foothold in Paris.*³⁹⁸

Unlike *Helsingin Sanomat*’s views of Sinn Féin in February 1919, *The Times*’s opinions of the party or the *Dáil* did not come as a great surprise. *The Times* must have greatly wanted to express these three sentences since they were written in an editorial that had nothing to do with the quote above. Although Sinn Féin’s electoral victory could be considered remarkable in the context of modern Irish history, *The Times* sought to undermine that victory by asserting that it was won over “a dead issue”. Of course, the paper would not have given legitimacy to any Irish government no matter which Irish party established it but all in all these three sentences merely echo pettiness since the paper did not even care to dedicate a single editorial in order to discuss these issues, which it clearly did not care for enough or just did not want to address.

There are great differences in *The Times*’s editorials before and during the war. Between 1910 and 1914 *The Times* was an outright agitator that did not even avoid personal attacks against politicians and the paper was definitely not worried about what effect it might have on the Irish question. The war changed everything though and *The Times*, as one of the largest newspapers in Britain, was forced to adopt a more conciliatory role amongst the British press. After the Easter Rising in 1916 the paper went from conforming to the government’s policy, straight into the government’s pocket as the paper became an unofficial propaganda outlet for the government. Since January 1917 the paper had begun to emphasise the responsibility of the Irish in finding the settlement for the Irish question and soon enough the government announced its plans for the Irish convention which the paper seemed to support until the

³⁹⁷ *The Times* 26.2.1919.

³⁹⁸ *The Times* 26.2.1919.

disbandment of the convention in March 1918, after which the paper's attitude towards Ireland seemed to slightly have shifted towards the pre-war era. Since the paper had for years referred the Irish question as "an imperial necessity" due to the on-going war, it was not that surprising that the paper was able to drop the question after the armistice in November 1918 as quickly as it had picked it up in 1916 after the Easter Rising.

Conclusions

In the context of the newspaper's coverage of the Irish question, the period from January 1910 until January 1919 can be divided into two larger parts: the parliamentary phase from January 1910 until September 1914 and the wartime period between September 1914 and November 1918. The outbreak of the war was clearly the first distinguishable watershed moment in both *Helsingin Sanomat's* and *The Times's* writings regarding the Irish question after which both papers adjusted their reporting on the subject.

During 1910–1914 *Helsingin Sanomat* tied the Irish question heavily into Finland's political situation under the Russification process that threatened the country's autonomy. The paper constantly strived to strengthen this discourse by making both direct and indirect comparisons between Russo-Finno and Anglo-Irish relations in order to show how a large empire should ideally treat smaller nations under its rule. However, *Helsingin Sanomat* was not anti-Britain and the paper clearly seemed to favour the Liberal led British government (which became more apparent during the war years) more than the Irish Nationalists, and the paper showed significant disdain towards Conservative party's policies.

After the war broke out *Helsingin Sanomat's* reporting on the Irish question plummeted as the paper focused heavily on the events of the war but in April 1916 the Easter Rising brought the Irish question back. The paper continued its discourse of the rights of the small nationalities and promoted parliamentary means over extraparliamentary in achieving them. However, *Helsingin Sanomat* was not comparing Finland and Ireland's situations (or Russia and Britain) anymore which most likely was caused by the fact that the Irish Home Rule had been placed into the statute book in 1914 which practically meant that Ireland had been granted its autonomy, although, the act had been suspended for the duration of the war. Also, Finland had gained its independence from Russia in December 1917 which meant that *Helsingin Sanomat* did not have to try to protect the Finnish autonomy anymore and therefore, in this regard, comparing the Finnish and Irish political situations did not serve a function anymore. From the Spring of 1916 onwards, the paper gradually made it clear that its sympathies were more with the Liberal party than the Irish themselves but the alleged

“German plot” in May 1918 turned *Helsingin Sanomat*’s alignment towards the republican Sinn Féin party which strived for the Irish independence.

Between 1910–1914 *The Times*’s views on the Irish question differed completely from *Helsingin Sanomat*’s views. The paper aligned itself with the Conservative party and severely opposed the Irish Home Rule which became the paper’s discourse at least until the war. *The Times* provided imperial, economic and security arguments against the Home Rule and the paper even portrayed the Irish Nationalists as the enemy of Britain in order to strengthen its own narrative. Even though the paper did not condone violence at any point, the paper clearly justified Ulster’s resistance against the British government in order to prevent Irish Home Rule from happening. Like *Helsingin Sanomat*, *The Times* often used arguments of democracy and constitutionalism when writing about the Home Rule, but unlike *Helsingin Sanomat*, *The Times* used the arguments against the Home Rule.

After the Home Rule Act had been placed into the statute books there was a clear change in the paper’s discourse. Because the Act had already passed there was no longer a need to oppose it anymore, so the paper adopted a more neutral stance towards the Irish question. This was also due to the paper’s concern of the British war effort, so after the re-emergence of the Irish question in 1916 *The Times* deemed the settlement of the Irish question as “a national and imperial necessity”, although, this shift can be seen to be caused only by the paper’s need to appease the political situation in the United Kingdom. This re-adjustment was also visible in the number of editorials published concerning the Irish question since quantity of editorials published between 1916–1919 was significantly higher than between 1910–1914.

The focus of this research was to find out how *Helsingin Sanomat* and *The Times* reported on the Irish question between 1910–1919. Both of the papers showed significant interest on the subject, but from very different viewpoints: *Helsingin Sanomat* approached the question from the standpoint of the rights of the small nations and used the Irish question to promote Finland’s own political status, whereas *The Times* was distinctly anti-home rule before the war but in order to safeguard imperial unity and the British war effort the paper was forced to adapt a more neutral stance for the good of the Empire. Even though *Helsingin Sanomat*

became a staunch advocate of the Irish Home Rule early on, the paper aligned itself more with the Liberal led government than the Irish Nationalists, and only after the alleged “German plot” in 1918 did the paper lean more towards the Irish and the Sinn Féin party. *The Times* on the other hand actively presented the Irish Nationalists as the enemy of Britain before the war but from Easter Rising 1916 onwards it adopted a more neutral approach towards the Irish and the paper also heavily conformed with the Lloyd George led coalition government’s policies and did not criticise them like during Asquith’s premiership.

Bibliography

I PRIMARY SOURCES

Helsingin Sanomat (HS) 1.1.1910–18.2.1919.

The Times 1.1.1910–26.2.1919.

II ENCYCLOPEDIA

“Act Of Union”, *Encyclopedia Britannica*.

“Alfred Charles William Harmsworth, Viscount Northcliffe”, *Encyclopedia Britannica*.

“Conservative Party”, *Encyclopedia Britannica*.

“Easter Rising”, *Encyclopedia Britannica*.

“*Helsingin Sanomat*”, *Encyclopedia Britannica*.

“home rule”, *Encyclopedia Britannica*.

“Parliament Act of 1911”, *Encyclopedia Britannica*.

“Sinn Féin”, *Encyclopedia Britannica*.

“*The Times*”, *Encyclopedia Britannica*.

III RESEARCH LITERATURE

Adelman, Paul & Pearce, R. D. 2008: *Great Britain and the Irish Question 1798–1921*. Hodder Education Group, London. (EBSCO)

Bartlett, Thomas 2014: *Ireland: A History*. University Printing House, Cambridge.

Boyce, David George 1992: *Ireland 1828–1923: from ascendancy to democracy*. Blackwell, Oxford.

Carruthers, Susan L. 2000: *The Media at War: Communication and Conflict in the Twentieth Century*. Macmillan Press, London.

Dudley Edwards, Owen & Pyle, Fergus 1966: Extract from *The Easter Rising*. Published in *Was it for this? Reflection on the Easter Rising and what it means to us now* (2016). Edited by Ronan Mc Greevy. Irish *The Times* Books, Dublin.

Feeney, Brian 2002: *Sinn Féin: A Hundred Turbulent Years*. The O'Brien Press Ltd, Dublin.

Ferriter, Diarmaid 2015: *A Nation and not a Rabble: The Irish Revolution 1913–1923*. Profile Books Ltd., London.

Henning, Carl 2003: *Päivälehti – Helsingin Sanomat. Helsingin Sanomat*, Helsinki.

Jussila, Osmo & Hentilä Seppo & Nevakivi Jukka 2009: *Suomen poliittinen historia 1809–2009*. 6th edition. WSOY Oppimateriaalit Oy, Helsinki.

Kee, Robert 1972: *The green flag: a history of Irish nationalism*. Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London.

Kenny, Kevin 2004: "Ireland and the British Empire: An Introduction". *Ireland and the British Empire*, pp. 1–25. Edited by Kevin Kenny. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Kortti, Jukka 2016: *Mediahistoria: viestinnän merkityksiä ja muodonmuutoksia puheesta bitteihin*. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, Helsinki.

Lee, J. J. 1990: *Ireland 1912–1985: politics and society*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Lloyd George, David 1933: *War Memoirs of David Lloyd George vol. I*. Nicholson & Watson, London.

Lloyd George, David 1933: *War Memoirs of David Lloyd George vol. II*. Nicholson & Watson, London.

Lloyd George, David 1936: *War Memoirs of David Lloyd George vol. V*. Nicholson & Watson, London.

Mansergh, Nicholas 1978: *The Irish Question 1840–1921*. University of Toronto Press, Toronto.

Mikkonen, Kalevi 1983: *Yhdysvallat ja Irlannin kysymys vuosina 1916–1931*. Master's thesis of general history. University of Oulu.

Mowat, C. L. 1968: "The Irish question in British politics (1916–1922)". *The Irish Struggle 1916–1926*, pp. 141–152. Edited by Desmond Williams. Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., London.

Richardson, John E. 2007: *Analysing Newspapers: An approach from critical discourse analysis*. Palgrave Macmillan, New York.

Temple, Michael 2008: *The British Press*. Open University Press, McGraw-Hill Education, Maidenhead, England.

Thompson, J. Lee 1999: "'To Tell the People of America the Truth': Lord Northcliffe in the USA, Unofficial British Propaganda, June–November 1917". *Journal of Contemporary History*, vol.34, no.2 (April 1999), pp.243–262. Sage Publications Ltd., London.

Torvinen, Taimi 1982: *Ulkomaisen sanomalehdistön historia*. Weilin+Göös, Espoo.

Turner, John 1992: *British Politics and the Great War: Coalition and Conflict 1915–1918*. Yale University Press, New Haven and London.

Vahtola, Jouko 2012: *Suomen historia: Jääkaudesta Euroopan Unioniin*. 5th edition. Kustannusosakeyhtiö Otava, Helsinki.

Appendixes

Appendix 1:

<i>Helsingin Sanomat</i> (news articles) 1910–1919													
Year	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total:
1910	14	15	4	7	3	1	4	3	1	-	6	12	70
1911	3	3	1	2	-	1	1	3	-	-	-	-	14
1912	1	4	2	6	2	2	-	2	8	3	3	-	33
1913	3	2	-	-	-	3	3	1	5	10	5	5	37
1914	1	3	10	6	9	3	7	-	3	2	1	2	47
1915	1	1	-	-	2	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	7
1916	2	1	-	7	26	6	14	4	-	4	2	4	70
1917	-	2	7	3	8	4	-	-	-	3	2	1	30
1918	2	-	-	7	8	2	2	2	3	-	1	1	28
1919	7	1											8

Appendix 2:

<i>The Times</i> (editorials) 1910–1919													
Year	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total:
1910	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
1911	-	1	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	1	9
1912	3	1	1	5	2	4	-	2	1	2	-	1	22
1913	4	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	6
1914	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	5
1915	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
1916	1	1	-	4	7	5	6	2	1	2	-	1	30
1917	1	-	4	2	3	1	1	1	-	1	-	-	14
1918	2	-	1	4	6	2	-	-	-	-	2	1	18
1919	-	1											1

Appendix 3:

