

## Nationalism and the Public Sphere: The *Nation* Newspaper and the Movement for the Repeal of the Union

Professor Smyth's scholarship celebrates a close attention to language, not only evident in his elegant prose but also in his attention to the ways historical changes have been incorporated as language change and language use. In 'Upheavals in economy, family naming patterns and language, 1530-1750,' Smyth traced the shifting linguistic tessellation of Irish and English both in naming practices and in the production, destruction, and reception of books.<sup>i</sup> Communication integrates space shaping identities and coordinating action. In this essay I want to examine the early days of the *Nation* newspaper as a window onto the complex of spaces that served as nationalist politics in late 1842. I shall attend to the shaping of identities by looking at the forms and forums of what we might, after Louis Althusser, call nationalist interpellation, while matters of coordination will be addressed by asking how the newspaper helped organize the nationalist movement.<sup>ii</sup> The mutual interdependence of these two sets of tasks will be taken up in the conclusion. I begin with some brief remarks about the general relations between publics and mass media both to identify the broader issues at stake in such a study and also to establish a comparative context for appreciating the significance of Irish developments.

### *Nationalism and the Public Sphere*

In *The structural transformation of the public sphere*, Jürgen Habermas argued that, in Europe, civil society as a distinct public realm, set apart from both the state and the market, was created in the eighteenth century, when the critical discussion of public affairs was facilitated by the circulation of newspapers together with the establishment of salons and reading rooms where they could be read and discussed.<sup>iii</sup> He saw this as a development within urban, bourgeois culture but others have recognized counterpublics, using mass media to articulate causes contrary to the exclusions of the male, capitalist, and middle-class world of the bourgeois public sphere.<sup>iv</sup> For our purposes we need note that Habermas had very little to say about nationalism while he excluded plebian culture on the grounds that in the eighteenth century it was largely illiterate. Both the exclusion and the claim have been challenged.<sup>v</sup>

Benedict Anderson has argued that by providing a medium through which people could identify with and follow a political movement, print capitalism, as an early form of mass media, was essential to nationalist mobilization.<sup>vi</sup> If nationalism created its own counterpublic with its own public sphere, then, suggested Partha Chatterjee, Anderson's model is too general since it takes the European nation-state as its paradigmatic case. For anticolonial nationalisms, the rejection of certain, particularly spiritual, aspects of European arrangements was essential if space were to be created for a new and autonomous society.<sup>vii</sup> With respect to the middle-class nature of the public sphere, many historians have claimed that socialists and feminists shared the ideology of rights and freedoms claimed for the bourgeois public sphere but that they explicitly sought to broaden the application of those claims. Thus, for example, James Epstein has suggested that in early nineteenth-century England, radicals took up constitutionalism but did so on behalf of the heretofore-excluded working class.<sup>viii</sup> Keith Michael Baker has shown how Mary Wollstencraft made arguments for feminism from within the terms of bourgeois republicanism.<sup>ix</sup>

These arguments are significant and relevant. If the public sphere serves as a space of rational debate where reason rather than force prevails, then, understanding its

bases may help preserve its functions. Furthermore, if the public sphere constitutes a civil society that hosts independent criticism of state and market, then, it is a vital resource against the excesses of both bureaucracy and capitalism. According to Habermas, the modern state and market had fused such that a welfare state now managed capitalism, while a mass media, organized oligopolistically, now stoked consumerism rather than sustained critical politics. Habermas thought that this deterioration was well underway by the nineteenth century and the purpose of his historical study was to highlight the lost potential of earlier times so that people might take up again the task of creating a genuinely rational and democratic public sphere.

The relevance of these issues for an understanding of the Irish public sphere might be developed along the following lines. Given the civil disabilities to which the Irish majority was subject the development of a bourgeois public sphere in the eighteenth century was always going to be limited. However, if counterpublics can sustain a public sphere sharing many of the characteristics of democratic and rational debate that Habermas detected in the eighteenth-century coffee shops and salons, then, the bases of democracy are broader than bourgeois. To some extent this might serve to recuperate the potential of what has been called civic nationalism.<sup>x</sup> However, we might also attend to Chatterjee's suggestion and ask if anticolonialism itself has had any distinctive potential for grounding or animating a democratic public sphere.<sup>xi</sup>

In this essay, I can only begin to develop some of the elements of this argument and I will do so by looking at the first few months of the nationalist newspaper, *The Nation*, and ask how it sought to contribute to the ongoing movement for the Repeal of the Union between Britain and Ireland.<sup>xiii</sup> I attend to two aspects of the work of the newspaper. First, I consider what the newspaper tells us about the sort of public sphere that it both addressed and shaped. Here, I find Althusser's notion of interpellation particularly helpful. Althusser suggests that ideologies make subjects through forms of address. In other words, the terms in which people are hailed, or addressed, invites them to reflect upon themselves in particular ways. When Shakespeare gave Mark Antony the opening phrase, 'Friends, Romans, countrymen, lend me your ears,' he presents him in such an act of interpellation for what Antony is doing is inviting his listeners to identify themselves as his friend, to accept their responsibilities as Romans, and to recognize the solidarity to which they are called as countrymen.<sup>xiiii</sup> Furthermore, he does them the courtesy of appealing for a hearing rather than offering them the challenge of an unanswerable argument. I ask the questions, then, who were the public that the *Nation* claimed to address and how did it invite this public to characterize itself?

After approaching the question of the work of the *Nation* in relation to the public sphere, I turn to the issue of what it did for the movement to repeal the Act of Union, specifically for Daniel O'Connell's (1775-1847) Loyal National Repeal Association. Here, I will reflect upon the tensions between the public that the *Nation* anticipated and that mobilized by O'Connell. Ultimately these differences led to a parting of the ways and the writers of the *Nation* went their own way, being known as Young Ireland, and from the depths of the Famine, they staged a rebellion which failed and which resulted in the exile of many of their leaders.

### ***The Newspaper and the Movement***

Writing to Dublin from New York in 1853, the exiled Thomas Francis Meagher (1823-1867) explained to Charles Gavan Duffy (1816-1903), one of the original editors of the *Nation*, that in New York Meagher planned to publish for Irish-Americans a newspaper, 'very much based upon the principles of the "Nation,"' and that the paper would 'stand true to the memory and teaching of Davis—that teaching was not for a party, or one moment, or one epoch—it was for an entire people—a struggle and a work of all time—and

for the career of an improved and still improving nation.<sup>xiv</sup> Thomas Davis (1814-1845) had been the chief writer for the *Nation* and was widely acknowledged as the chief framer of its ideology.<sup>xv</sup> The improving tone of the *Nation* was evident from its inception:

The necessities of the country seem to demand a journal to aid and organize the new movements going on amongst us; to make their growth deeper and their fruit more “racy of the soil;” and above all, to direct the popular mind and sympathies of educated men of all parties to the great end of Nationality[. . .] a Nationality which may embrace Protestant, Catholic, and Dissenter,—Milesian and Cromwellian,—the Irishman of a hundred generations and the stranger who is within our gates [...].<sup>xvi</sup>

At first blush, this is a very restricted public with the ‘popular mind’ confined to ‘educated men,’ albeit of ‘all parties,’ all religions, and all historical backgrounds. Yet the newspaper proposes also to educate ‘the new movements,’ giving them deeper roots so that their fruits might be more ‘racy of the soil.’ The original editors of the *Nation* (Davis, Duffy and John Dillon (1814-1866)) evidently liked this phrase since they placed it as the masthead of their editorial page where it was given in its original context: “To create and to foster public opinion in Ireland—to make it racy of the soil.” CHIEF BARON WOULFFE.<sup>xvii</sup> The soil of the ‘new movements’ should be deeper than the immediate interests of ‘educated men,’ and should incorporate broader social and historical interests. Among their more extensive interests, the educated classes needed to make common cause with the uneducated classes and to affiliate with the long-standing culture of their land, much of it safe at present only among the uneducated classes. The *Nation*, then, wanted to connect the ‘public’ of its readership to the broader ‘people’ with whom it lived, and herein lay the democracy of its nationalism. In short, the *Nation* wanted to persuade its educated public that its ‘community of fate’ comprised also the broad mass of the Irish people.<sup>xviii</sup>

Alliances between the educated and the uneducated, between bourgeois and plebeian, were basic to contemporary European politics yet these alliances were often on very particular terms. The plebeian classes were recruited to a cause promised as general. The bourgeois classes presented themselves as directing a movement that threatened violence should certain demands not be met. These demands concerned, in the main, the political reform of an *ancien régime* that had been directed by a monarch and an aristocracy. These democratic claims and eventual concessions were narrowly shaped by the understanding that responsibility was a quality of male, property owners and in this way the violence of the plebeian classes was both their ticket to the national debate but at the same time the reason why they could not be allowed to speak for themselves. Davis was impressed by the alliance of plebeian force and educated leadership in the Catholic Emancipation agitation of the 1820s noting that Daniel O’Connell ‘prevailed in ’29 by the power of fighting not the practice of it; may he not do so again?’<sup>xix</sup> Before 1829, no Catholic could take a seat in the House of Commons since the loyal oath required of all Members of Parliament included the recognition of the supremacy of the British monarch in matters of religion. O’Connell mobilised the small farmers and the Catholic priesthood through mass meetings that had the appearance of incipient revolution. This was the bourgeois-plebeian alliance that Duffy, at least, saw as a novel feature of British and Irish politics, but something that was taken up enthusiastically by British Liberals and made the basis of the parliamentary reform agitation of the 1830s.<sup>xx</sup> The concession of 1829 was accompanied by franchise reform so that while Catholics might now enter Parliament fewer of them were qualified to vote in the elections to send them there.

Despite these limitations, O’Connell was ever after known as the Liberator, not least by himself. In the 1830s, he turned his attention to the tithe. This was a compulsory tax for the exclusive support of the Established Church and it was raised upon the presumed

value of produce from rural landholdings larger than five acres. In Ireland, this meant a predominantly Catholic people was paying for the maintenance of churches it would never enter and vicars to whom it would never turn. Again, a compromise was effected with the tax to be levied on the value of land rather than its product and notionally at least upon owners rather than occupiers.<sup>xxi</sup> In 1840, O'Connell took up the cause of the Repeal of the Union. He proposed to lead a mass movement, the Loyal National Repeal Association, demanding the repeal of the Act of Union of 1800, which had ended the Irish parliament and had transferred all authority to a parliament in London where Irish representatives could only ever be a minority. O'Connell drew upon the same bases as in earlier campaigns, that is Catholic small farmers led by Catholic professionals, landlords and priests. He told them that the Union was responsible for economic catastrophe in Ireland since decisions were taken in London in favour of the quite contrary interest of Britain. The first public test of this opinion was the general election of 1841 and not a single Repealer was elected to the House of Commons, with even O'Connell failing to get elected in Dublin. He soon found a safer seat in a by-election and in 1842 he resigned as Lord Mayor of Dublin in order to devote himself full-time to the cause of Repeal. It was at this unpropitious moment that Young Ireland was, in effect, created.

O'Connell was leading a mass and a Catholic movement that loomed dangerously even while O'Connell preached restraint and purely moral rather than physical force. This is what Davis meant by 'the power of fighting not the practice of it.' Duffy was clear that Davis had a class-based distaste for mob politics. Insofar as the Repeal Association and its movement was plebeian, Davis was alienated from it as was the majority of the Protestant middle classes of Ireland and, for Duffy, this meant that: '[t]he most courageous incident in Davis's career [...] was to enter the Corn Exchange and announce himself a follower of O'Connell.'<sup>xxii</sup> Davis and Dillon joined the Repeal Association in April 1841 and very quickly Davis was chair of a sub-committee of the Repeal Association responsible for its registers, thus he came to know most of its activists.<sup>xxiii</sup> Young Ireland was born when certain urban professionals, largely Protestant, adopted as their own cause a movement that had been identified primarily as Catholic and rural.

The Repeal Association was organised through parishes, in each of which a Repeal Rent was collected by Repeal Wardens, who in turn were overseen by a Local Inspector, frequently the parish priest. Some of this Rent was returned to the local associations in the form of a subscription to whichever local paper was supportive of Repeal. This gave newspapers an interest in serving the cause but also provided reading material around which local Reading Rooms could sustain commitment to the movement. Duffy formerly edited the *Belfast Vindicator*, one of these approved newspapers. At its weekly meeting of 10 October 1842, the Repeal Association decided that the incipient *Nation* should be taken as 'one of their weekly papers, and sent to the repeal wardens.' Moving the motion, Edward Clements (?-1862) remarked that '[t]he value of discussion was very great, and when people met at their clubs they often discussed questions of vital importance to the country,' and supporting the motion Dr Stephen Murphy praised Duffy's 'great service to the cause of repeal as editor of the *Belfast Vindicator*.'<sup>xxiv</sup> With this institutional support alongside its private subscriptions, the wind stood fair for the new paper and Duffy was sure that '[t]here never was any Newspaper in this country which commenced with such a circulation as ours, nor, we venture to affirm, with half of it.'<sup>xxv</sup> For the movement, the paper undertook both interpellation and organisation. Both are clear from its very first number of 15 October 1842.

### *The eloquent address*

Interpellation covers a range of ways, both discursive and affective, that people are invited to self-identify in terms of race, class, gender, ethnicity, or nationality, among many other meaningful dimensions. On occasion, this is through oral appeal, as at public meetings. For example, from Somers Town, London, thirty-six teetotallers sent in their subscriptions with the comment that they ‘did not join the movement until they heard the eloquent address of W[illiam] J[ohn] O’Connell.’<sup>xxxvi</sup> From rural Limerick, came a reassurance that support for Repeal was growing ‘which, in a great measure, is to be attributed to the lucid and complete explanation of our grievances given by Mr [Thomas Matthew] Ray [1801-1881] on his visit to this town.’<sup>xxxvii</sup> They recognised themselves as the people described in Ray’s complaint and responded by identifying with his cause. In another explicit form of address, Daniel O’Connell named his movement the Loyal National Repeal Association in order to avoid the taint of treason, encouraging his followers to oppose legislation from London rather than contest the imperial rule of Queen Victoria. Indeed, the weekly meetings of the Association in Dublin ended often with a call ‘for nine cheers, for the Queen, Repeal and Old Ireland.’<sup>xxxviii</sup>

There were limits to the effectiveness of public meetings. In the first place, they could be proscribed by legal order. During the Chartist disturbances of 1842, public meetings were banned in many parts of northern England making Repeal agitation almost impossible there. In October 1843, Daniel O’Connell’s projected monster meeting in Clontarf was declared illegal and the Repeal Association never properly recovered from the demoralising climb-down of submitting to the eleventh-hour proscription. In other places, local prejudice could make congregation dangerous as in parts of Ulster where ‘they could hardly hold a meeting [...] but at peril of their lives, for the deluded and unfortunate Orangemen who were opposed to them.’<sup>xxxix</sup> The weather might also play its part. As November turned to December, two of the roving Provincial Repeal Inspectors reported that: ‘[w]e greatly fear that, from the shortness of the days and the uncertainty of the weather, we cannot hope to hold other open air meetings for some time.’<sup>xxx</sup>

Meetings were gatherings shaped by gender and by class. It is striking, that in one district where the Repeal Warden noted that ‘a great proportion of the contributors [to the Repeal rent] are females,’ and where ‘one of the women said to me, that “she would sell the stone of potatoes she had for her children’s dinner to the fund to bring home the parliament,”’ this ‘spirit [was] owing in some measure to the exertions of our patriotic pastor.’<sup>xxxi</sup> A sermon could reach hearts that public meetings could not.

Davis, Dillon and Duffy were clearly speaking in terms of class when they proposed that ‘[a] newspaper is the only conductor to the mind of Ireland.’ A paper as elevated in tone as the *Nation* might even bring into its pages writers who had previously disdained the common medium of weekly journalism but who might now be willing ‘to turn with us from the study of mankind in books, to the service of mankind in politics.’<sup>xxxii</sup> The readers of the paper were here identified both with mankind in general and with mankind under the form of citizen. This is a central theme in the thought of Davis but it is clear that this enlightenment discourse was already characteristic of the nationalist movement under O’Connell.<sup>xxxiii</sup> For example, in supporting an appeal for funds to sustain Daniel O’Connell in the absence of his former income as Lord Mayor, his supporters in one part of Dublin wrote of their wish:

[T]o evince by acts our grateful appreciation of the untiring services of Ireland’s great moral Regenerator, of the PATRIOT CHIEF of swordless glory, who raised the standard of Civil and Religious Liberty, and by the moral force of open moral combination, peacefully and triumphantly achieved Emancipation, amid the applause of an admiring world, by

energetically, judiciously, and perseveringly using the weapons of truth, reason, and argument, in the ways of righteousness and the paths of peace.<sup>xxxiv</sup>

Stressing ‘moral’ regeneration, ‘civil’ as well as ‘religious’ liberty, and the reliance of the Emancipation movement upon ‘reason,’ represented the political Irish as the very antithesis of the irresponsible, superstitious and violent spectre that haunted the British imagination. The most prominent of O’Connell’s sons, John, struck a similar note when he reported to a meeting of the Repeal Association that the people ‘are beginning to think that they also have rights to struggle for.’<sup>xxxv</sup>

For Daniel O’Connell, this meant that Irish people must feel solidarity with a host of other similarly oppressed peoples. Noting the wide range of liberal causes that solicited his oratory, the paper wrote that ‘[w]herever tyranny is to be denounced, there is he—its most active foe.’<sup>xxxvi</sup> As the Irish could be proud of this prominence, they must submit also to his homilies. Of anti-Black riots in Philadelphia, ‘he blushed to say that Irishmen took a prominent part—victims of cruelty in their own country inflicting wrongs on those they ought to have respected as fellow-sufferers. Now, nothing was more absurd than the filthy aristocracy of the skin (hear).’ He would continue to struggle, he promised, ‘to give every man of every colour and of every clime a perfect equality of right (loud cheers).’<sup>xxxvii</sup> To address its readers as potential citizens was to induct them into a world of extensive solidarities, concerns, and responsibilities.

Irish citizenship could have no place for sectarianism. From Chapelizod on the west of Dublin, one Repeal Warden wrote that while he was ‘a humble and conscientious Protestant,’ the other Warden for the parish was ‘an honest Catholic,’ yet they were ‘both pulling together, heart and hand for the common good of our common country; and thus should all Irishmen struggle together, forgetting the difference of their religious sentiments whilst labouring in the sacred cause of Ireland’s regeneration.’<sup>xxxviii</sup> The cause of anti-sectarian citizenship was thus a universal one and this note is struck explicitly in James Clarence Mangan’s (1803-1849) poem greeting ‘The Nation’s First Number,’ where he avers that while their first love is ‘Old Ireland,’ they will happily embrace ‘all lands under heaven’ so that, wherever ‘Truth and Liberty’ are valued, ‘[f]rom the Suir to the Tweed, from the Boyne to the Humber,’ all people should hail ‘The Nation’s First Number.’<sup>xxxix</sup> In this respect, there was no fundamental conflict between the people of Ireland and the people of England and from expatriate Irishmen in London came the reassurance that in their efforts for independence, ‘we are nobly supported and assisted by numbers of our English fellow-subjects. They feel in common with us, that the bonds of union are only to be strengthened by the removal of jealousy, and that Great Britain acquires strength and power when Ireland obtains liberty.’<sup>xl</sup> Whatever of wishful thinking there might be in such sentiments, they are typical of a self-representation of Irish nationalists as civic republicans with a lineage descended from the American and French revolutions.

The division between public and people was partly between those who read (and spoke) and those who listened (and marched) but the democratic aspiration was a promiscuously civilising one questioning the patronising tone of the public and the vulgarity of the people. After one mass meeting of 15,000 people in a rural district in the west of Ireland, a Repealer from Dublin, having spoken to the crowd for two hours, exclaimed in his report: ‘[t]he more I see of our people the more proud I become of their moral and intellectual qualities. [...] Their mental quickness is evinced by the judicious mode in which they cheer or otherwise testify the impression made upon their minds—a mode that contrasts itself strongly with the far-famed “beastly bellowings” occasionally heard in certain other assemblies.’<sup>xli</sup> In ironic reversal, here, the rural crowd is compared

favourably with the vulgarity of the House of Common where speeches in favour of Ireland were hooted down with disgraceful regularity.

Alongside this appeal to the Irish as citizens, a second theme apparent in both the editorial and the news columns of the *Nation*, was an emphasis upon the shame of colonialism. The first editorial was unequivocal:

With all the nicknames that serve to delude and divide us—with all their Orangemen and Ribbonmen, Torymen and Whigmen, Ultras and Moderados, and Heaven knows not what rubbish besides, there are, in truth, but two parties in Ireland: those who suffer from her National degradation, and those who profit by it. To a country like ours, all other distinctions are unimportant.<sup>xlii</sup>

A ‘country like ours,’ then, is one degraded by dependence; the Irish are political children, political slaves: ‘*We* are slaves, and *our* country is a province because our Protestant fathers were tyrants, and our Catholic fathers were slaves.’<sup>xliii</sup> Shame is a very powerful element in this Irish nationalism and the paper addresses its readers as people whose cheeks should burn at the condition it reports on. O’Connell told one weekly meeting of the Repeal Association that, in a report on the trials after recent Chartist riots in Britain, he ‘had read of an examination [...] in which a witness swore he saw a ruffianly person, and from his appearance he took it for granted he was an Irishman.’<sup>xliiv</sup> The Glasgow Repealers noted that ‘none of the Glasgow newspapers, even the most Liberal, say one word on [...] the wrongs of unfortunate Ireland; but if any unfortunate Irishman commits the smallest fault you will then see it in black letters, “such and such committed by an Irishman,” and attributed to the wickedness and immorality of the country.’<sup>xliv</sup> Rejecting one submitted squib on ‘Paddy’s Adventures in England’ as ‘beastly trash,’ the paper comments of such writers that ‘[t]he worst effect of their slang wit is, not that England is taught habitually to regard us as a race of blundering servant men scarcely fit to deliver a message, and utterly unfit for anything better; but that we form some such notion of ourselves.’<sup>xlvi</sup> Praising, in contrast, the work of Thomas Moore (1779-1852), his *Captain Rock* (1824) was hailed as ‘the wisest, wittiest, and most successful attempt ever made to interest the honor, humanity, the imagination, and good humour of the oppressor, in the cause of the wronged, without in the least compromising the pride and honor of the oppressed.’<sup>xlvii</sup>

The *Nation* addresses its readers as people who will be ashamed of the reputation of their compatriots, but also as people who should be ashamed of their treatment by their English masters. There are frequent reports on discrimination against Ireland and its people. Shame, anger and resistance should follow one upon the other but to their permanent disgrace many Irish people accepted, meekly and slavishly, their current subjugation. On this, again, the public needed to connect with the people:

Degraded as Ireland at present is, how great—how past words would be her degradation were she to be altogether quiescent. But there is, thank Heaven, little fear of that; for if patriotism had altogether deserted the wealthier classes, it would still be found warm, and active, and efficient as ever, among those who form the bone and sinew, and heart and spirit of Ireland—the noble People of Ireland. And we are not without hopes of seeing, before long, many of those classes who have hitherto stood aloof from the “*People’s struggle*,” coming forward to throw themselves heartily and generously into it.<sup>xlviii</sup>

The Irishness of the people is the basis of their self respect and of the admiration they inspire in Young Ireland. Shame is prominent in the writings of Davis and in those of John Mitchel (1815-1875).<sup>xlix</sup>

In his report on the state of Repeal agitation in the province of Leinster, William Joseph O'Neill Daunt (1807-94), wrote of the agitation as awakening people to the 'real glory and substantial advantage of being free citizens of a well-governed kingdom.'<sup>1</sup> One correspondent wrote of the lesson learned from John O'Connell (1810-1858) that:

[F]rom the alarming depreciation of agricultural produce, the destructive operation of the tariff, as regards them, rendering it difficult or impossible to pay high rents and oppressive taxes, they are beginning at length in right earnest to feel that the first evil they must rid themselves of is foreign legislation, as the fertile source from which all their grievances, all their distresses, emanate.<sup>li</sup>

The Irish were being told that they might trace their problems to a single cause, foreign rule. This is to ignore local class relations, among many other things, but it is an economic analysis that places colonialism at the heart of the problem and later, when faced with the tragedy and crime of the Famine, Young Ireland would hear from Mitchel this analysis as a gospel of hatred. Things were not yet this extreme but foreign rule is yet understood as having direct economic consequences. Daunt found the proposed new Poor Law for Ireland to be a very unpopular measure:

It is, indeed, no wonder that it should be so; the poverty of the Irish people was, in a very great measure created by the Union. Hundreds of thousands of the poorer Irish flocked to England in search of that subsistence of which they were thus defrauded at home by English tyranny and injustice. Whereupon English statesmen (who have never called for a law to send home the wealthy Irish absentees) demanded an Irish poor law, in order to enable them to throw back upon Ireland the poorer Irish emigrants, and to tax the impoverished people of Ireland for the support of Irish paupers, whose pauperism was, in a very large measure, of English creation.<sup>lii</sup>

Colonialism was understood as a wider political relationship, not local to Ireland. In a humorous piece purporting to be the address of General William Nott (1779-1852) to the Irish among the British army at Kandahar in which he would fain believe that any among them would refuse to fight the Afghans, the potential for anti-colonial solidarity was apparent.<sup>liii</sup> Nott was presented as reminding the Irish soldiers that they are surely 'ready as ever to shed your blood for England.'<sup>liiv</sup> After all, he is rendered as arguing, the Afghans are 'an audacious people who question our supremacy—deluded men, who refuse the blessings of our sway.' Coincidentally, the Afghan rebels marched behind a 'rebel flag' of 'insurgent green.' Nott is given as appealing to Irish gratitude: '[b]y your flourishing trade, by your liberties guaranteed, by your prosperous peasantry and your unimpeached nationality—On to the fight!'<sup>liiv</sup> Of course, the readers of the *Nation* would see Irish trade as anything but 'flourishing' and the Irish peasantry as anything but 'prosperous,' and they were being invited to draw an obvious conclusion about the side they should take in Afghanistan. Similarly, reporting on the British war against China, the paper editorialises that fighting a war to force a people to accept imports of opium 'is, truly, an honorable warfare for a *great, moral (!), and religious (!)* nation to be engaged in; and we need hardly say, we wish it all the success it deserves.'<sup>livi</sup> Reporting on the new arrangements whereby Lower Canada, after a period of open resistance, was given greater self-government, the *Nation* editorialised that: '[w]hat Ireland did in 1782, Canada has done to-day. She has taken advantage of the military weakness of England to extract from her *almost* independence.'<sup>liiii</sup> In Afghanistan, China, and Canada, then, the Irish interest was best served in solidarity against the British Empire. John Mitchel would later have a column in his *United Irishman* newspaper where he reported on British colonialism under titles such as 'The enemy in Asia,' and 'The enemy in Africa.'<sup>liiii</sup>



The penalties of dependence were reckoned in part economic and this insight was later developed in a very sophisticated manner for Young Ireland by James Fintan Lalor (1807-1849), but it was equally evident that prosperity was not a matter of bread alone: ‘every man in the country who has not an interest in the existing system ought to be shown, as clearly as an abstract truth can be demonstrated, that National feelings, National habits, and National government, are indispensable to individual prosperity.’<sup>lxix</sup> Independence was described as a habit of mind that required self-control and brought self-respect. It commands, thereby, the respect of others: ‘[t]here is no doubt at all that the chief source of the contempt with which we are treated in England is our own sycophancy. We abandon our self-respect and we are treated with contempt.’<sup>lxx</sup> In Ireland, there was a significant middle class that identified strongly with their British rulers. Daunt castigated ‘those cringing, crouching and degraded creatures,’ ‘the wretched, selfish, brainless squires and squireens’ who were no more than ‘loose hangers-on upon the outskirts of aristocratic society, whose supreme ambition is gratified by occasional admission to the house or table of some worthless scamp of a lord or baronet; creatures who are scorned for their loathsome desertion of country by the very aristocracy who reluctantly tolerate their presence.’<sup>lxxi</sup> Referring back to the Emancipation agitation, a poem entitled, in pure O’Connell style, ‘We Want No Swords,’ scorned ‘a victory stain’d with blood’ for despots would quake ‘when swells our voice abroad.’ If the Irish could control the passions ‘which bind the mind,’ they might again show ‘what giant mind | Can do, when full awakened.’<sup>lxxii</sup> O’Connell assured his followers that the ‘exercise of moral power was quite enough to achieve liberty, and, if he thought otherwise, he would abandon agitation altogether (cheers).’<sup>lxxiii</sup>

The early issues of *The Nation* reported and repeated a view of O’Connell as judiciously restraining, even training, the masses. His friends praised him to the echo as one ‘who, while his virtue and prudence keep her ill-treated and chivalrous sons from recurring to violence, is able to direct all their energies in the legitimate course for obtaining their just rights.’<sup>lxxiv</sup> It is for this reason that the temperance crusade was so important to O’Connell and to the *Nation*. Temperance promoted good public order, countering English prejudice about Irish manners. From Manchester, the local Repeal Warden took pride in the ‘character for good citizenship’ given by the Protestant local authority to the Catholic clergy for the civilising effects of their temperance crusade among the Irish.<sup>lxxv</sup> In a further letter from Manchester, another warden commenting on the recent Chartist riots, ‘rejoices that there was not one Irishman joined the late outbreaks in Manchester.’<sup>lxxvi</sup> The Irish were being invited to recognise themselves as long-suffering and as content to believe that by force of argument and civil conduct, they will be restored to a national citizenship unjustly wrenched from them.

The *Nation* warned of the many ways that the Irish were in thrall to English habits and attitudes. It was not enough to reject the Englishman and all his works, indeed this was too much for ‘[w]e must learn to think sensibly and candidly about him.’<sup>lxxvii</sup> On the other hand, the Irish ‘have certainly taken too much to praising themselves, and it is no harm for them to hear something the other way, at least when it is urged respectfully; nor should they be content (if disposed to eulogy) with rhetoric—their historians supply an honester testimony to Irish valour than her orators.’<sup>lxxviii</sup> The evaluation of both parties to the colonial relationship must be measured. The readers are being addressed as people capable of sober judgement.

David Lloyd has written brilliantly of the implicit critique of the bourgeois aspects of nationalism articulated in the person and poetry of Mangan.<sup>lxxix</sup> There was already something of this in the *Nation*’s first number. In an article on the treatment of nationality in the latest issue of the *Dublin Monthly Magazine*, Davis praised the broadly

temperance stance of the journal but there was also a caution about too severe an attempt to change the:

[V]ehement, enjoying, Celtic Irishman into a bad imitation [...] of the phlegmatic, monotonous glutton John Bull the yesman—or the dyspeptic and crafty slave, John Bull the shopkeeper—or the mean starveling, John Bull the weaver—or the black beast, John Bull, the collier—we would prefer our old state.

The people of Ireland must have excitement and pleasure—must have food for their imaginations as well as their stomachs.<sup>lxx</sup>

Readers of the *Nation* were called to an identity quite other than the anaemic, bourgeois respectability of the English. This newspaper would give them a different savour, make them racy of quite a different soil. They were, for example, referred back to the music of their country, a music suppressed by the rich and now held fastest by the poor: '[h]ow much there is in our national music! The history of the country breathes through it: its tunes and songs celebrate or lament our great men and great events. It tells our old manners—from the wedding jig, or the babe's lullaby, to the keen for the dead.'<sup>lxxi</sup> It is notable that the first two portraits promised in a series on 'distinguished Irishmen, Living and Dead,' were of literary figures, Thomas Moore and Gerald Griffin.<sup>lxxii</sup> There is, we must concede, an anti-modernist ring about this summons to the spirit of Old Ireland. Such anti-modernism, however, could open a space for a critique of bourgeois values, of capitalist relations of production and of urban-industrialism as a way of life. It provided resources for resisting contemporary English civilisation and the *Nation* interpellated its readers as resisters first and foremost, and as a resisting public identifying with a resistant people.

### ***Organisation***

The relationship between the paper and the movement was initially a simple one. The *Nation* served the cause of Repeal, and of the Repeal Association, by addressing educated public opinion on matters broached most successfully hitherto at mass public meetings. We might identify six ways the paper served the movement; it could advertise, report, encourage, recruit, animate and instruct the movement. These functions overlap but provide a simple framework for exploring the dialectic between paper and movement.

In the first place, advertisements were valuable income for the paper and thus it was cheering for its editors that the Repeal Association decided 'that the advertisements of the Association be inserted in the *Nation* as well as the other Liberal weekly papers.'<sup>lxxiii</sup> The weekly meetings of the Association were announced on the first page of each issue of the *Nation*. The paper also carried advertisements from others who used their affiliation to the movement as a selling-point. Thomas Arkins (1799/1800?-1880), for example, was a prominent Repealer and, indeed, meetings planning the collection of the O'Connell annuity were held at his home and shop on Ormond Quay, Dublin, but he was also able to present himself, and to advertise separately, as 'tailor and robe-maker to the Lord Mayor of Dublin,' at that time O'Connell himself.<sup>lxxiv</sup> Various herbal medicines were promoted in notarised letters sent by leading Repealers to O'Connell himself, as with Robert Roe promoting '[B]efore the Right Hon. the Lord Mayor of Dublin, Daniel O'Connell, at the Mansion-House,' and 'at the request of the proprietor' of a Botanic Establishment, a 'Balsamic Medicine' that cured scrofulous ulcers on his leg.<sup>lxxv</sup> Similarly, various publishers of Catholic books took space to advertise their wares in a journal so strongly identified with the Catholic followers of O'Connell.

The earliest numbers of the *Nation* coincided with the annual collection of the 'O'Connell Compensation Fund,' also styled the 'O'Connell annuity.'<sup>lxxvi</sup> This tribute was to compensate O'Connell for the income he forewent working for the national cause.

For weeks, the paper carried paid announcements noting the time and place of public meetings supporting the collection that were being held in various parts of Ireland. This gave the foremost Repealers in each place an opportunity to proclaim their allegiance by appending their name to these calls for the public to ‘discharg[e] the debt of gratitude we owe the Liberator.’<sup>lxxxvii</sup> A two-column editorial published the week before the collection was to be made (in most cases outside parish churches on a Sunday) said that O’Connell was irreplaceable and should be supported by all who supported his causes, from ‘reviving Irish trade and manufactures,’ through ‘freedom of conscience,’ to the retention of £6million of absentee rents in Ireland.<sup>lxxxviii</sup>

Reports amplified meetings bringing the message to many more than had been present. Meetings to organise the O’Connell tribute were reported from the city of Waterford,<sup>lxxxix</sup> and from the parishes of St Michan’s and St Catherine’s in the city of Dublin.<sup>lxxx</sup> When the collections began coming in, the paper gave details, including a return from the parishes of Dublin that showed how much greater was the current collection than had been the average of the previous four years,<sup>lxxxxi</sup> and it quickly began a series of returns in which it would ‘place before our readers in unbroken succession the substantial evidence which every post supplies of the just liberality with which the collection has already been effected in numerous parts of the kingdom.’<sup>lxxxii</sup>

A very large part of the paper each week comprised report of the Dublin meeting of the Repeal Association (already two-and-a-half of its sixteen pages by the second issue).<sup>lxxxiii</sup> These meetings, which lasted on average about four hours of each Monday afternoon, are recorded almost verbatim; normally it would appear from the notes of one of the editors although in a few cases other papers, notably the *Freeman’s Journal* and the *Register*, are credited. Duffy is noted as present at many of these meetings and on occasion took the chair, as on 12 December.<sup>lxxxiv</sup> In addition, a large part of each issue included full report of O’Connell’s speeches as he stumped the country at public meeting and laudatory public dinners; as at Waterford from whence his words at meeting and dinner were recorded in one-and-a-half pages of the paper.<sup>lxxxv</sup> The paper also contained its own correspondents’ reviews of the Repeal movement such as one from Manchester where the author had ‘been at special pains to ascertain the amount of Irish strength, as tested by Irish patriotism, which may be relied on in this quarter.’<sup>lxxxvi</sup> Reports of Repeal Association meetings included many letters from different places together with an account of the moneys received at Dublin.

The Association clearly kept its own records, and Davis was involved with its registration system. O’Connell forwarded one contribution from the United States with the request that ‘[y]ou will take care to have the names of the subscribers duly enrolled in our American book.’<sup>lxxxvii</sup> When the Repeal Wardens of Dublin were called together to examine how the collection of the Repeal Rent might be improved, the Association decided to keep a distinct register for them so that it might replace Wardens who collected nothing in each of three successive weeks.<sup>lxxxviii</sup> The Association, then, did not need the paper’s record for its own administration but, rather, the public accounting of the moneys it had received was proof for distant contributors against fraud. Duffy, for example, informed the meeting of 19 December 1842 of the amount forwarded him by the Repeal Wardens of Ulster.<sup>lxxxix</sup>

These reports of remittances and meetings also encouraged others to matching effort. One teacher wrote of his success at enlisting his ‘classical pupils’ as Repealers and asked whether other teachers might do likewise for he felt ‘proud to have mine the first to set so patriotic an example.’<sup>xc</sup> Likewise, one Warden who had organised a collection among the workers at a distillery, wrote that, whereas the Repeal Rent was organised in the main on the basis of parishes, it might be that in factories, ‘to which Repeal Wardens could have no access, it would be well to have a Warden chosen from amongst the men

themselves, who would undertake the collection of the Repeal rent from them, and transmit it to the association (hear, hear, and cheers).<sup>xc</sup> Daunt, as one of the Provincial Inspectors, noted that '[a]lthough the spirit of Repeal universally exists, yet it is absolutely necessary to carry the detailed organisation into every locality separately, in order to render that spirit practical and effective.'<sup>xcii</sup> Their ambition was 'to bring the agitation for the national question into every parish—to the door of every cottager.'<sup>xciii</sup>

Another Provincial Inspector, Ray, recorded that the 'plan which he had adopted was the organisation of central towns, the influence exercised in which was disseminated throughout the adjoining parishes.'<sup>xciv</sup> The paper tried to diffuse best practice describing, week after week, the success in various parts of Ireland where first the towns and then the countryside were organised by Repeal Wardens. In publishing the receipts to the O'Connell Annuity, the paper assured its readers that most parishes, even those making no contribution in previous years, would soon contribute and it headed a list of the week's contributions with the injunction that '[i]f incitements were wanting to impel the most apathetic locality into co-operation, they would be found in such manifestations as we rejoice to append hereto.'<sup>xcv</sup> The paper promised that it would continue to publicise these returns 'while a single parish of the kingdom remains uncollected.'<sup>xcvi</sup> Much was made of the contributions collected among the poor, in farthings as often as pennies. O'Connell lauded modest contributions, such as from one man who sent five shillings on behalf of himself and his four sons which was, 'in his situation, [...] a large sum.'<sup>xcvii</sup>

When John O'Connell spoke one week of the Repeal Rent as entirely from Ireland with 'the exception of a few shillings sent from Great Britain,'<sup>xcviii</sup> in the next issue of the paper Richard Sheil replied from Manchester that much more than a few shillings came from Britain; it was in fact about one-seventh of the Rent received in the week in question. Sheil urged that 'gentlemen should be extremely cautious in introducing any matter before the public calculated to materially injure the glorious cause of Repeal.'<sup>xcix</sup> Cut off from direct experience of the mass meetings, the expatriate Irish of Britain and North America, relied upon the press for their information and for their encouragement, as one Warden wrote from Drury Lane, London, '[t]he provincial agitation at home has given a fresh stimulus to our expatriated countrymen on this side of the channel.'<sup>c</sup> Similarly, in noting the proposal to extend the O'Connell Annuity outside Ireland to the Irish in Britain, the paper praised the 'honest Liberals' of Liverpool for their initiative; 'not only important on account of the locality in which the movement is to be made, but especially so for the example which it affords to men of the same principles throughout Great Britain generally.'<sup>ci</sup>

In advertising, reporting and exhorting the Repeal Association, the *Nation* was a true disciple of O'Connell. However, in recruiting, animating and instructing it became more independent. For many of his Catholic supporters, O'Connell's mission was literally divine. From a poor district in Scotland, came not only their mite but a prayer for O'Connell that 'God will prolong your days, in order to complete the great work for which, I humbly believe, you were to be the instrument of his Providence.'<sup>cii</sup> When O'Connell himself chose to write for the *Nation*, he styled his contribution a Repeal Catechism. The civil disabilities under which Irish people suffered were part national, part religious. The Repeal movement revived the organisation that had campaigned around religious liberty in the 1820s. From one part of Dublin, a Repeal Warden wrote that he had 'formerly been a collector of the Catholic rent in the same parish, and he was ready and willing to devote his energies to the cause of Repeal with equal zealousness.'<sup>ciii</sup> This continuity was clear in the parochial basis of most collections and in the important role played by parish priests who allowed collections to be taken outside Sunday mass and in many other ways interpellated their flock as separatist Irish, as did the patriotic

archbishop of Tuam, John MacHale, who wrote to a great Repeal meeting at Waterford that he applauded the ‘truly Irish spirit again reviving among us.’<sup>2civ</sup>

Certainly, religious questions could not be ignored and the *Nation* campaigned against the injustice of the tithe but it did so not only on behalf of Catholics but also, and explicitly, on behalf of dissenters such as the Unitarians who found their legal title to church property was insecure, a circumstance the paper described as a ‘cruel attempt to revive obsolete penal laws.’<sup>2cv</sup> There was, however, a fine line to be drawn between defending the rights of Catholics to worship in their own manner and going further and defending those beliefs themselves. When one of the Provincial Inspectors, Daunt attacked the tithe by noting the assaults upon Catholic belief made by a priest of the established church in Ireland, his letter on the subject took three columns in the *Nation* and highlighted not only the intolerance of his opponent but also his blasphemy for he was most appalled that ‘[h]ere stands forth Mr Stoney, promulgating the doctrine taught by Satan to Luther—and with Satan blaspheming the Catholic worship. The Union enables this reverend gentleman to make you pay him money for reiterating the blasphemies of Satan against your creed.’<sup>2cvi</sup>

The *Nation*, if not perhaps everyone in the Repeal Association, wanted to recruit Protestants of all stripes to the national cause. This was the doctrine of ‘Nationality’ that Duffy said that he had learned from Davis: ‘Davis it was who induced me to aim [...] to bring all Irishmen, of whatever stock, into the confederacy to make Ireland a nation.’<sup>2cvii</sup> Duffy, in a form of self-criticism, pleaded for tolerance when one Catholic in the Association attacked a Belfast newspaper for slandering Protestant belief as ‘a miserable heresy.’<sup>2cviii</sup> Duffy pointed to the severe sectarian pressures upon opinion in Ulster and asked for understanding and forgiveness of a paper sympathetic to their cause but ‘written in a hot moral atmosphere, and allowance should consequently be made for the excited state of the writer’s feelings.’<sup>2cix</sup> The *Nation* was committed to broadening the support for Repeal publishing a series of ‘Letters of a Protestant on Repeal,’ with the hope that as ‘the writer belongs to the section of our countrymen least favourable to that measure,’ this might ‘induce his Fellow-Protestants to listen to what one of their own communion has to say on the question.’<sup>2cx</sup>

The *Nation* tried to be ecumenical. Davis was clear that its task was to bring into the national movement the type of people who had hitherto stayed away. Cautioning against any attack on Irish Whig M.P.s who were not as ardent in the cause of Repeal as they might be, he warned Duffy that ‘[w]e have need of tolerants as well as allies for a while.’<sup>2cxi</sup> Duffy had, even as an editor in Belfast, solicited work from the poet Mangan and had already been encouraging him to try something political for in reply to one entreaty Mangan pleaded: ‘[d]on’t ask me for political articles just now. I have had no experience in these *genre d’ecrire*, and I should infallibly blunder.’<sup>2cxii</sup> The *Nation* tried to recruit a broad range of writers and to interest many of them writing more politically than they had in the past. Many of these contributions were anonymous which preserved the writer from prosecution should they be judged seditious. For example, one of Mangan’s early, and martial, contributions was ‘Faugh a Ballagh’ (the Irish battle cry of ‘Clear the Way’) and in one contemporary newspaper there was the speculation that ‘[t]here is but one man in Ireland could have penned these magnificent lines—that man is the Korner of our revived literature—even our friend, Clarence Mangan, to whose name be honour!’<sup>2cxiii</sup> The *Nation* pleaded that it would ‘never answer such questions,’ although publishing the speculation was as good as an admission and allowed its readers to see some of the authors it drew upon in justification of the paper’s claim that it ‘contains more Original Matter, and by more Distinguished Writers, than *any Newspaper in the Empire*.’<sup>2cxiv</sup> The *Nation* recruited its writers and readers on terms of its own choosing.

Reflecting upon its work, Duffy thought that while the leading articles on politics had been very good, it was its historical ballads that had ‘produced the most marvellous results.’<sup>cxv</sup> This had involved prodding Mangan to write on historical topics but Duffy had also encouraged Davis and Dillon to turn from prose to narrative poetry and Davis soon developed a lively versifying felicity with national topics. The principal writers ‘met once a week at a frugal supper to exchange opinions and project the work of the coming week.’<sup>cxvi</sup> It was not as dull as all that: ‘we [...] met at each other's house in succession. Tea and serious debate occupied the time till ten o'clock; then a light supper, pleasant talk, fun and song till midnight.’<sup>cxvii</sup> Beyond those writers present in Dublin, the paper also drew upon a wider circle of correspondents some of whom sent in material unsolicited. These correspondents were acknowledged each week in the paper and those with views congruent with those of the journal were encouraged as when “‘Merus Hibernus’ is thanked—his contribution will be used in our next number, and we will be glad to hear from him as often as he pleases.”<sup>cxviii</sup>

Anonymous publication was part of the paradoxical publicness of the bourgeois public sphere as in journals such as the *Spectator*. By not claiming credit for their writing, authors could adopt an abstract persona with historical or geographical associations, but this disembodied communication staged a desire to be seen to be reflecting upon public affairs from a dispassionate rather than vested interest.<sup>cxix</sup> Pseudonyms were sometimes playful but for many writers, such as Mangan himself, there was the necessity that they had jobs that might be imperilled by their strong identification with a nationalist newspaper. Something of the camaraderie was evident in Mitchel's query to Duffy: ‘[w]e got the *Nation* yesterday and simultaneously asked each other which of us was the enthusiastic gentleman referred to in “Answers to Correspondent,” who requires his letter to be addressed to the Woman of the Roses and Roaring Meg.’<sup>cxx</sup> A more serious side of pseudonymous correspondence was disclosed when Lalor wrote that his own letter should be burned after having been read although ‘I will require an acknowledgement of receipt either through the Post-office, or in the “*Nation*”. If in the *Nation*, acknowledge to the nom de guerre of “*Rolla*”.’<sup>cxxi</sup>

Through the writers it solicited and the correspondents it encouraged, the *Nation* built up a network that was somewhat independent of the Repeal Association, thus the paper did not only recruit to O'Connell's Repeal movement but increasingly to its own. It also animated its community in quite distinctive ways. It is clear that the *Nation* looked to both the Repeal Association and the associated temperance movement. The Repeal Association had its network of Reading Rooms. This provided a context in which serious debate could occur, away from the bluster of the public meeting. The temperance movement had weaned hundreds of thousands of Irish men and women off heavy drinking. It was, to reformers such as Davis, a magnificent achievement and opportunity. Teetotalism was a new way of life that made people reliant upon each other in quite new ways. They were now ‘banded together’ in a new ‘brotherhood of Teetotalism’ and were now ‘ripe and ready for new advances towards virtue and happiness; and, for the first time in the history of any country, a whole People can be reached *at once* by any teacher entitled to their attention.’<sup>cxxii</sup> From Manchester, one Repeal Warden wrote that it was among teetotalers that the collection of Repeal was most avid and this explained why Manchester sent in more money than Liverpool for ‘total abstinence has made much greater progress among the Irish Catholics of Manchester than those of Liverpool.’<sup>cxxiii</sup> This was now a people in which ‘educated opinion’ could at last take an interest for it was ‘ripe and ready’ for new leadership, however, it was also a people that had foresworn its established ludic resorts. Its priests would not allow it to swap bottle for dance for fear of the sexual congress that dances invited.

The *Nation* wanted to promote national and rational recreation. It argued that a series of 'literary and scientific institutions,' or 'popular universities,' might be established from a Testimonial to be raised in honour of the apostle of teetotalism, Father Mathew. In this way, the Irish could become 'the most cultivated,' as they were already 'the most virtuous' people in the world.<sup>cxxiv</sup> For fun, they were to be given national ballads. It is hard to exaggerate the benefits that these nationalists expected from song. Popular ballads could link classes in a common Irish humanity and teach all a common nationalist history. The writers of the the *Nation* published a series of books on the national cause and the most successful of these was *The Spirit of the Nation*, its collection of some of the poems and songs published in the paper.<sup>cxxv</sup> In animating its movement in this way, the paper was avoiding religion to find a martial, ludic, historic, and demotic register for celebrating the Irish nation. This is, again, a slightly different emphasis to that of the Repeal Association which instead animated its followers through allegiance to the person of Daniel O'Connell and fidelity to the Catholic cause he espoused.

*The Nation* promised that 'our pages will be always open to fair discussion' and thus it hoped to 'gather the popular suffrage' within its pages.<sup>cxxvi</sup> This was to be its work of instruction. The Repeal Association already had its weekly meetings where Daniel or John O'Connell would speak to the affairs of the day. The paper was another forum. It reported the Repeal meetings quoting the speeches extensively. Yet, its editorials developed themes of their own; some of which the leaders of Repeal embraced and others of which they spurned. For example, the paper criticised British wars in Afghanistan, 'where, really and truly, they had no business whatsoever.'<sup>cxxvii</sup> The weekly meeting of the Repeal Association only took up the issue when the Dublin Corporation proposed to vote a testimonial to the British soldiers at the end of the hostilities and John O'Connell suggested instead that the Corporation 'confer the freedom of the city on Akbar Khan, who returned our prisoners sound and healthy to their friends, although he might have treated them with indignity and cruelty.'<sup>cxxviii</sup> The paper could take satisfaction from the rejection of the proposed testimonial remarking that while '[w]e owe allegiance to VICTORIA, Queen of Ireland—we owe no allegiance either in *law* or *conscience* to the prosperity of English crime.'<sup>cxxix</sup>

In affirming its support for the idea of citizenship, the paper frequently went much further than did O'Connell in recognising value in French republicanism. After an article in which its correspondent from France, reviewed recent French politics, John O'Connell took the *Nation* to task. While admitting that the paper 'had been established on the soundest of Repeal principles,' he criticised its affection for France, saying that 'he did not think there was anything about France that would make him anxious to be too closely connected with her.' He proposed that the French, apart from a small Catholic party, were addicted to 'war and violence,' and that it was only out of spite that they opposed England. Indeed, he promoted English constitutionalism over French 'anarchical revolution' and 'military despotism.'<sup>cxxx</sup>

These differences were symptomatic of how the *Nation* drew to itself a new public that it interested in national politics through critical support for the Repeal Association, in an attempt to connect people and public around a nationalism indifferent to religious affiliation. The paper published with pride a letter from one of its readers, perhaps even one of its own editors, who rejoiced that at last, in *The Nation*, they had a journal that 'instead of being content to re-echo the sentiments of the people—will, with a fearless love of truth and freedom, boldly embody the embryo wishes of the country—disseminate the principle of the incipient desire itself—and, finally, scout bigotry and oppression from the land.'<sup>cxxxi</sup> In the first of his 'Letters of a Protestant on Repeal,' Davis warned that:

[E]verything which identifies Repeal and Roman Catholicity as meaning two parts of the same thing, must disguise their true interest from the

Protestants, and must excite their feelings against the restoration of a native government. If you would liberate Ireland, and keep it free, you must have Protestant help—if you would win the Protestants, you must address their reason, their interest, their hopes, and their pride.<sup>cxxxii</sup>

This was indeed its struggle and work of all time.

- 
- <sup>i</sup> W. J. Smyth, *Map-making, landscapes and memory: a geography of colonial and early modern Ireland, c.1530-1750* (Cork, 2006), ch. 11. Note also Smyth's work on the *Atlas of Irish Names*, a project to map Irish surnames; <http://www.ucc.ie/research/atlas/>.
- <sup>ii</sup> L. Althusser, 'Ideology and ideological state apparatuses' [1970] in *idem, Lenin and Philosophy and other Essays* (New York, 1971), pp 121–76.
- <sup>iii</sup> J. Habermas, *The structural transformation of the public sphere: an inquiry into a category of bourgeois society* [1962] (Cambridge MA, 1989).
- <sup>iv</sup> O. Kneigt and A. Kluge, *Public sphere and experience: toward an analysis of the bourgeois and proletarian public sphere* [1972] (Minnesota, 1993); N. Fraser, 'Rethinking the public sphere: models and boundaries,' in C. Calhoun (ed.), *Habermas and the public sphere* (Cambridge MA, 1992) pp 109-12.
- <sup>v</sup> G. Eley, 'Nations, publics, and political cultures: placing Habermas in the nineteenth century,' in Calhoun, *Habermas and the public sphere*, pp 289-339.
- <sup>vi</sup> B. Anderson, *Imagined communities: reflections on the origins and spread of nationalism* (London, 1991).
- <sup>vii</sup> P. Chatterjee, *The nation and its fragments: colonial and postcolonial histories* (Princeton NJ, 1993).
- <sup>viii</sup> J. Epstein, 'The constitutional idiom: radical reasoning, rhetoric and action in early nineteenth-century England' in *Journal of Social history*, 23 (1990), pp 553-74.
- <sup>ix</sup> K. M. Baker, 'Defining the public sphere in eighteenth-century France: variations on a theme by Habermas,' in C. Calhoun (ed.), *Habermas and the public sphere* (Cambridge MA, 1992) pp 181-211.
- <sup>x</sup> W. Kymlicka, *Multicultural citizenship* (Oxford, 1995).
- <sup>xi</sup> Chatterjee, *Nation and its fragments; idem, Nationalist thought and the colonial world: a derivative discourse?* (London, 1986).
- <sup>xii</sup> The Union of Britain and Ireland (and dissolution of the Irish parliament) was established in 1800 by Acts passed in the British and Irish parliaments, respectively: The Union with Ireland Act 1800, 39 & 40 Geo. III c.67; The Act of Union (Ireland) 1800, 40 Geo. III c. 38.
- <sup>xiii</sup> William Shakespeare, *Julius Caesar*, Act 3, Scene 2, line 79.
- <sup>xiv</sup> N.L.I. MS 5757, n.p. Meagher to Duffy, 17 January 1853.
- <sup>xv</sup> I have described this ideology in my 'Time and some citizenship: nationalism and Thomas Davis' in *Bullán: an Irish Studies Journal*, 5 (2001), pp 23-54.
- <sup>xvi</sup> R.I.A. MS 12 P 19 (12b). Prospectus for "The Nation," 1842.
- <sup>xvii</sup> *Nation*, 15 October 1842, 8a. Woulffe made his remark to Robert Peel in a debate on the value of granting Irish towns self-governing corporations. Peel thought such corporations were pointless in a place as poor as Ireland but Woulffe adverted, in this manner, to the civilising effect of local responsibility; *Nation*, 5 November 1842, 59b.
- <sup>xviii</sup> The idea of the nation as a community of fate (*Schicksalsgemeinschaft*) was widely discussed in early twentieth-century Germany from both conservative (Max Weber, Friedrich Meinecke) and socialist positions (Otto Bauer); see, P. Baehr, *Caesarism, charism and fate: historical sources and modern resonances in the work of Max Weber* (New Brunswick NJ, 2008); O. Bauer, 'The Nation' [1907] in G. Balakrishnan (ed.), *Mapping the nation* (London, 1996) pp 39-77.
- <sup>xix</sup> N.L.I. MS 5758. Davis to [Daniel Owen] Maddyn, [n.d. probably c.1842], f.7
- <sup>xx</sup> Duffy, *Young Ireland, Vol. I. A fragment of Irish history, 1840-1845* [1880] (Dublin, 1884), p.7.
- <sup>xxi</sup> Tithe Rentcharge (Ireland) Act 1838, 1 & 2 Vic. c.109.
- <sup>xxii</sup> Duffy, *Thomas Davis: the memoirs of an Irish patriot, 1840-1846* (London, 1890), p. 58.
- <sup>xxiii</sup> Michael Doheny, *The Felon's track, or the history of attempted outbreak in Ireland, embracing the leading events in the Irish struggle from the year 1843 to the close of 1848* [1849] (Dublin, 1914), p. 17.
- <sup>xxiv</sup> *Nation*, 15 October 1842, 15a.
- <sup>xxv</sup> *Nation*, 15 October 1842, 8a.
- <sup>xxvi</sup> *Nation*, 22 October 1842, 30a. A kinsman of Daniel O'Connell, William John O'Connell was the principal Repeal Warden for London.
- <sup>xxvii</sup> *Nation*, 10 December 1842, 142b. Ray was the Secretary of the Repeal Association.



- 
- xxviii *Nation*, 22 October 1842, 31a.
- xxix *Nation*, 24 December 1842, 174a.
- xxx *Nation*, 3 December 1842, 126a.
- xxxI *Nation*, 17 December 1842, 158c.
- xxxii *Nation*, 15 October 1842, 8b.
- xxxiii For Davis' account of nationality as citizenship, see Kearns, 'Time and some citizenship.'
- xxxiv *Nation*, 15 October 1842, 1b.
- xxxv *Nation*, 15 October 1842, 15b.
- xxxvi *Nation*, 19 November 1842, 92a.
- xxxvii *Nation*, 22 October 1842, 30b.
- xxxviii *Nation*, 15 October 1842, 15b.
- xxxix *Nation*, 15 October 1842, 9c.
- xl *Nation*, 15 October 1842, 14d.
- xli *Nation*, 22 October 1842, 29c.
- xlII *Nation*, 15 October 1842, 8a.
- xlIII *Nation*, 22 October 1842, 25c.
- xliv *Nation*, 22 October 1842, 30b.
- xlv *Nation*, 29 October 1842, 46d.
- xlvi *Nation*, 22 October 1842, 24d.
- xlvii *Nation*, 29 October 1842, 44b.
- xlviii *Nation*, 12 November 1842, 72d.
- lix See my account of this in Kearns, "‘Educate that holy hatred’": place, trauma and identity in the Irish nationalism of John Mitchel' in *Political Geography* 20 (2001), pp 885-911.
- <sup>l</sup> *Nation*, 15 October 1842, 14b. Daunt was a founder member of the Repeal Association and had overall charge of Leinster.
- <sup>li</sup> *Nation*, 15 October 1842, 15b. John O'Connell was a son of Daniel and followed him to the House of Commons. From 1844 he became more militantly Catholic in his politics and he was perhaps the most effective opponent of moves to accommodate Young Ireland within the Repeal Association.
- <sup>lii</sup> *Nation*, 15 October 1842, 14b. 'Absentees' refers to absentee landlords who collected rents in Ireland but lived in England. By repute, they cared little for the improvement of their Irish estates or for the well being of their Irish tenants.
- <sup>liii</sup> Nott was in charge of a brigade of the British army in Afghanistan where he suppressed a local rebellion in 1842.
- liv *Nation*, 15 October 1842, 9c.
- lv *Nation*, 15 October 1842, 9d.
- lvi *Nation*, 29 October 1842, 40b.
- lvii *Nation*, 22 October 1842, 24d.
- lviii Kearns, 'Educate that holy hatred.'
- lix *Nation*, 15 October 1842, 8b.
- lx *Nation*, 15 October 1842, 8b.
- lxi *Nation*, 15 October 1842, 14c.
- lxii *Nation*, 15 October 1842, 10d.
- lxiii *Nation*, 22 October 1842, 30c.
- lxiv *Nation*, 22 October 1842, 17b.
- lxv *Nation*, 22 October 1842, 28b.
- lxvi *Nation*, 22 October 1842, 30a.
- lxvii *Nation*, 15 October 1842, 8b.
- lxviii *Nation*, 15 October 1842, 11c.
- lix David Lloyd, *Nationalism and minor literature: James Clarence Mangan and the emergence of Irish cultural nationalism* (Berkeley CA: University of California Press, 1987).
- lxx *Nation*, 15 October 1842, 11a.
- lxxi *Nation*, 15 October 1842, 11a.
- lxxii *Nation*, 15 October 1842, 8a.
- lxxiii *Nation*, 12 November 1842, 78b.
- lxxiv *Nation*, 15 October 1842, 1b.
- lxxv *Nation*, 26 November 1842, 98a.
- lxxvi There is a very good account of the finances of the Repeal Association in: M. Keyes, *Funding the nation: money and nationalism in nineteenth-century Ireland* (Dublin, 2011).
- lxxvii *Nation*, 15 October 1842, 1c.

- 
- lxxviii 'The O'Connell Tribute,' *Nation*, 22 October 1842, 24c-d.
- lxxix *Nation*, 15 October 1842, 1c.
- lxxx *Nation*, 22 October 1842, 17b-c.
- lxxxi *Nation*, 5 November 1842, 61b.
- lxxxii *Nation*, 10 December 1842, 129a.
- lxxxiii *Nation*, 22 October 1842, 29c-d, 30a-d, 31a-d.
- lxxxiv *Nation*, 17 December 1842, 157a.
- lxxxv *Nation*, 12 November 1842, 68a-d, 69a-b.
- lxxxvi *Nation*, 10 December 1842, 141a.
- lxxxvii *Nation*, 31 December 1842, 190a.
- lxxxviii *Nation*, 5 November 1842, 60d.
- lxxxix *Nation*, 24 December 1842, 174a.
- xc *Nation*, 12 November 1842, 79d.
- xc1 *Nation*, 24 December 1842, 174a.
- xcii *Nation*, 12 November 1842, 77b.
- xciii *Nation*, 15 October 1842, 14b.
- xciv *Nation*, 12 November 1842, 77b.
- xcv *Nation*, 10 December 1842, 129a.
- xcvi *Nation*, 17 December 1842, 156a.
- xcvii *Nation*, 29 October 1842, 47a.
- xcviii *Nation*, 10 December 1842, 143d.
- xcix *Nation*, 17 December 1842, 156a.
- c *Nation*, 15 October 1842, 14d.
- ci *Nation*, 10 December 1842, 137b.
- cii *Nation*, 15 October 1842, 15b.
- ciii *Nation*, 19 November 1842, 94c.
- civ *Nation*, 12 November 1842, 68b.
- cv *Nation*, 29 October 1842, 49c.
- cvi *Nation*, 10 December 1842, 134a. Daunt was himself a convert from Protestantism to Catholicism.
- cvi1 Duffy, *Young Ireland I*, 196.
- cvi11 *Nation*, 17 December 1842, 157d.
- cix *Nation*, 17 December 1842, 158a; the paper was the *Belfast Vindicator* that Duffy had edited formerly.
- cx *Nation*, 17 December 1842, 153c. The author was Davis; Duffy, *Young Ireland I*, 195.
- cx1 N.L.I. MS 5756, 54. Davis to Duffy, 29 August 1843.
- cx2 N.L.I. MS 5756, 1. Mangan to Duffy, 4 May 1840.
- cx3 *Nation*, 5 November 1842, 56b. Karl Theodor Körner (1791-1813) was a German patriotic poet.
- cx4 *Nation*, 5 November 1842, 50b.
- cx5 Duffy, *Young Ireland I*, 63.
- cx6 Duffy, *Davis*, 95.
- cx7 Duffy, *Young Ireland I*, 204-5.
- cx8 *Nation*, 29 October 1842, 40b.
- cx9 See, for example, the argument of: M. Warner, 'The mass public and the mass subject' in Calhoun, *Habermas and the public sphere*, pp 377-401.
- cx10 N.L.I. MS 5756, 185. Mitchel to Duffy, 22 August 1845.
- cx11 R.I.A. MS 12 P 15/6(i), n.p. Lalor to Duffy, 11 January 1847.
- cx12 *Nation*, 10 December 1842, 136b.
- cx13 *Nation*, 10 December 1842, 141b.
- cx14 *Nation*, 10 December 1842, 136b.
- cx15 The writers of the *Nation* newspaper, *The Spirit of the Nation* (Dublin, 1843). This was followed the next year by a second volume of *Ballads and Songs* (Dunlin, 1844). There were a dozen more Irish editions over the next half century of the joint volume published in 1845. In 1893, collecting together songs and ballads published in *The Nation* since the consolidated collection of 1845, Charles Gavan Duffy published in his New Irish Library of patriotic books: Martin MacDermott (ed.), *The New Spirit of the Nation* (London, 1893).
- cx16 *Nation*, 15 October 1842, 8b.
- cx17 *Nation*, 29 October 1842, 40b.
- cx18 *Nation*, 10 December 1842, 142d.
- cx19 *Nation*, 10 December 1842, 136d.

---

<sup>cxxx</sup> *Nation*, 10 December 1842, 143a.  
<sup>cxxx<sup>i</sup></sup> *Nation*, 12 November 1842, 74b.  
<sup>cxxx<sup>ii</sup></sup> *Nation*, 17 December 1842, 153d.