Irish Newspapers and the Spanish Civil War

A Master's Thesis Presented to the Graduate School at the University of Missouri—Columbia

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

by

CAROLINE EVANS

Prof. Timothy Vos, Thesis Supervisor

MAY 2010

The undersigned, appointed by the dean of the Graduate School, have examined the thesis entitled

IRISH NEWSPAPERS AND THE SPANISH CIVIL WAR

Presented by Caroline Evans,

A candidate for the degree of master of arts,

And hereby certify that, in their opinion, it is worthy of acceptance.

Professor Timothy Vos

Professor Michael Grinfeld

Professor Kerby Miller

Professor Yong Volz

Acknowledgements

For the success of this thesis, much thanks is due to my committee: Michael Grinfeld, Kerby Miller, Yong Volz and Timothy Vos. Special thanks is given to Timothy Vos, whose guidance and patience was invaluable.

I would also like to thank Dorothy Carner and the rest of the Missouri School of Journalism Library, who worked tirelessly to obtain the materials necessary for this project.

Finally, I would like to thank Michael P. Maxwell of McGill University, who first planted in me a love for Irish history.

Table of Contents

Abstract

The outbreak of the Spanish Civil War in 1936 generated debate in the Irish Free State over how (or whether) the emerging nation should intervene in the conflict. Examination of the debate reveals a deeper discourse surrounding the Irish Free State's role as a small but independent power in Europe and a discussion over what kind of nation that should be.

Newspapers were among the chief sites of discourse on the subject of Ireland's role in the Spanish Civil War. This discourse was influenced by the newspapers' alignments to specific political and ecclesiastical institutions in Ireland; thus, the debate over how the Irish Free State should proceed in its policy on Spain became a debate on what that policy would say about Irish National Identity.

This thesis examines that debate as it took place in four newspapers: the *Irish Times*, the *Irish Independent*, the *Irish Worker*, and the *Irish Press*. These newspapers had competing audiences and ideologies, and each had a different take on the Spanish Civil War that, in turn, shaped their perceptions of Irish national identity.

Introduction

In its first twenty years of independence, the leaders of the Irish Free State made conscious efforts to define the new nation in relation to movements in contemporary history (Brown, 2004, p. 168). In 1923, it was admitted to the League of Nations and in 1932 its new leader, Eamonn de Valera, was elected president of the League Council. Under de Valera's direction, Ireland played an important role in a movement that sought to secure international peace. "In this, Ireland, particularly under de Valera's direction, was to the fore in pressing the belief that small states should not become puppets of the larger powers" (Brown, 169).

The outbreak of the Spanish Civil War in 1936 provided Irish leaders with the opportunity to take an official position independent of that of Great Britain. The conflict, in which monarchist-fascists rebelled against the liberal Popular Front government, signaled for many a harbinger of what was to happen in Europe over the coming years: a fight between dictatorship and democracy. But in Ireland, a country with many historically competing factional alignments, discourse varied: should it intervene on behalf of its Catholic brethren? Should it intervene on behalf of the socialist republicans? Should it advocate a policy of non-intervention?

These discourses aligned to ecclesiastical and political institutions, such as the Catholic Church, political parties, and Christian societies. They were voiced and reinforced by politically and ecclesiastically aligned newspapers.

This thesis will examine Irish newspaper discourse surrounding the Spanish Civil War in terms of the press's relationships and alignments to other institutions. This

research is important because it highlights a little-studied but important era in the formation of Irish national identity and Ireland's current identity as an impartial political power.

Theories: Sociological Institutionalism and Discourse Analysis

Parsons (2007, p. 71) defines institutions as "formal or informal rules, conventions or practices, together with the organizational manifestations these patterns of group behavior sometimes take on." This thesis will focus on the organizational manifestations of political and ecclesiastical institutions in Ireland. Ecclesiastical conventions and practices are manifested in the institutions of the Catholic and Protestant churches in Ireland. Political conventions and practices are manifested in alignments to institutions of nationalism, conservatism and socialism, which are voiced by political parties.

The institution of the Irish press was influenced by its relationships with these political and ecclesiastical institutions to the point that those relationships had become institutionalized; The *Irish Independent* was long established as the voice of the conservative Catholic population, while the *Irish Times* was historically the paper of the small but powerful Protestant ascendancy in the South. The *Irish Press*, established in 1931, although a national newspaper, was the party organ of Fianna Fáil, and thus was aligned to that party's liberal nationalist views. The *Irish Worker* was another party organ, dedicated to the institution of Irish socialism, a branch of Republicanism (Horgan, 2001).

Van Dijk theorizes that ideologies find their clearest articulation in language. "The systematic organization of content in discourse, drawing on and deriving from the prior classification of this material in an ideological system, leads to the systematic selection linguistic categories and features in a text" (van Dijk 1985, p. 30). It is the

argument of this thesis that competing institutional alignments were voiced and reinforced by competing press institutions. Within this optic, this thesis will attempt to discern those competing alignments and ideologies through a discourse analysis of Irish newspapers from the 1930s. In order to discover competing discursive packages and differences in media discourse surrounding the Spanish Civil War, newspapers with distinct audiences will be examined.

The purpose of this thesis is to discover how these competing alignments and ideologies manifested themselves in the discourse of the newspapers mentioned above. This thesis will focus on Irish newspaper discourse on the Spanish Civil War, since the Spanish Civil War marked a critical juncture for ecclesiastical, political, and press institutions in Ireland. For the newly formed Free State, the international conflict presented a chance to take an official position independent of that of Great Britain. Opinion on the conflict was divided along ecclesiastical and political alignments; the Catholic church perceived the conflict as a war to protect itself from "godless" Communism (Bell, 1987; Horgan, 2002; McNally, 2009;), while socialists saw it as a monarchist attack on the legitimate government of Spain and advocated international intervention. Secular nationalists, meanwhile, advocated the official government policy of non-intervention as a way of securing an Irish national identity of neutrality and impartiality (McNally, 2009). Newspapers, aligned according to their relationships with the political and ecclesiastical institutions, acted as sites of these competing opinions.

Vincent (1997) recognizes the significance of the media as an institution in Irish life. "The press is the most influential institution, ahead of the family, the Church, government and politicians, when it comes to public opinion formation on the nuclear

threat, the Third World and issues of the Northern Ireland 'troubles' in contemporary Irish society," he writes (Vincent, 1997, p. 496). This may well be the case for press coverage of the Spanish Civil War.

To better understand how these institutions affect one another, this thesis will employ the theory of sociological institutionalism. According to Hall and Taylor, institutions operate through as "culturally-specific practices, akin to myths and ceremonies devised by many societies, and assimilated into organizations" (Hall and Taylor, 1996, p. 946,). This thesis examines the Irish press in terms of its relationships to other institutions and show how those relationships manifested themselves through press coverage of the Spanish Civil War.

This thesis explores the coverage of the Spanish Civil War by four different newspapers from the Irish Free State: the *Irish Times*, the *Irish Press*, the *Irish Worker*, and the *Irish Independent*. Each paper represents a different, institutionally aligned audience (Horgan, 2001; Bell, 1987; McNally, 2009) and it is hoped that, by researching these texts, we gain a clearer idea of how the competition among different Irish groups manifested itself in discourse surrounding the international conflict.

Because the *Independent*, the *Times*, the *Press*, and the *Worker* aligned themselves not just with specific institutions but also specific audiences, an understanding of media relationships with audiences is important. Sociological institutionalism addresses relationships between institutions and people. The press, as a social institution, has some influence over behavior and identity. "Institutions influence behaviour not simply by specifying what one should do but also by specifying what one can imagine oneself doing in a given context" (Hall and Taylor, 1996, p. 948). The

subject of identity is particularly important, since the role of the press in 1930s Ireland became one of nation-building and national identity-forming.

McQuail (1997) theorizes that audiences shape media coverage and media, in turn, shape their coverage around specific audiences. This is particularly relevant in the Irish case, where scholarship has identified several competing groups and audiences. These groups are identified largely as Catholic-nationalist and Protestant-unionist, but subgroups, including socialist-nationalist and Catholic-fascist also emerged.(Bell, 1987; Ferguson and Brinks et al.; Horgan, 2001; Kelly and O'Connor, 1997; McNally, 2009; Vincent, 1997).

In a study of community relations bulletins in Northern Ireland, Nolan (in Kelly and O'Connor, 1997) found that, regardless of how deeply embedded the intended (peace-making) message was, it was still capable of a wide range of interpretations by those who viewed it. The idea of the message shaping the ideas of a passive audience needed to "be replaced by an awareness of many different audiences, all of them performing their own reading of the text and capable of using those readings to confirm their existing beliefs" (Nolan, in Kelly and O'Connor, 1997, p. 124).

Although Nolan is writing about television broadcasting in the 1990s, this idea could also be applied to newspapers in the 1930s, especially those with such partisan readerships as the *Irish Press* or the *Irish Worker*. But he also acknowledges the presence of sub-audiences. Therefore, it can be assumed that media audiences in Ireland in the 1930s went beyond the simplistic pro-Franco or pro-intervention groupings. Rather, audiences voiced a multitude of diverse and changing opinions that were

determined not just by political or religious standing, but gender and class as well (Nolan, in Kelly and O'Connor, 1997).

Although Kelly and O'Connor (1997) focus primarily on recent broadcast media, their work is relevant because it looks at audience groups in terms of gender, class, and ethnicity and focuses on power, including the power of audiences in selecting media, the power of journalists in selecting and shaping news, and the roles of powerful groups in influencing "media definitions of events" (Kelly and O'Connor, 1997, p. 5). This last aspect is particularly relevant because it addresses the effect of powerful groups, such as political parties, the Church, and social classes, on news coverage. How did media alignments to powerful groups, such as the Catholic church or Fianna Fáil, influence newspaper coverage of events in Spain? How did newspapers attempt to serve the interests of their intended audiences through coverage? How did their differing coverage compete with each other?

Horgan (2001) establishes that certain national papers held certain positions in his history on Irish media, but his research here is not extensive. The *Belfast Telegraph* and The *Irish News* supported non-intervention, while The *Irish Independent* took a more pro-Franco stance. Socialist papers, such as The *Worker* and The *Irish Democrat*, were pro-intervention. (Horgan, 2001, p. 41). But, as Gamson and Modigliani (1998) point out, "frames should not be confused with positions for or against some policy measure…nor can every package be identified with a clear-cut policy position…packages, if they are to remain viable, have the task of constructing meaning over time, incorporating new events into their interpretive frames" (Gamson and Modigliani, 1989, p. 4).

Historical Background

The history of Ireland in the 20th century is a violent one, constructed of centuries of colonialism, rebellion, civil war, and religious conflict. The island had been a part of Great Britain since the 12th century, and after the Reformation it maintained a distinct identity as a largely Catholic, Gaelic nation governed by a British protestant minority (Ruane, 2006). After centuries of rebellion against colonialism, Ireland was promised Home Rule, or self-governance, in 1914, but this was postponed with the outbreak of World War I (Ruane, 2006, p. 521). By the time the war was over, "rebellion in Ireland had turned the demand for Home Rule into one for outright separation" (Ruane, 2006, p. 521). In 1916, a weeklong rebellion, the Easter Rising, ended in the imprisonment and execution of powerful republican leaders, who believed in the formation of an independent Irish republic (Bell, 1987, p. 64). After World War I, the newly formed Irish Republican Army carried out a systematic war against British secret service agents and informants (Bell, 1987, p. 66).

Barbrook (1992) identifies two distinct forms of separatism that developed during the struggle for Irish independence. One was a tradition of the belief that a democratic state could be created only through the consent of its citizens, and the inhabitants of Ireland had a democratic right to form their own independent nation. The other tradition was that of Catholic nationalism, or the belief that Catholicism was a vital distinguishing mark between the Irish people and the rest of Britain, and this mark was further reinforced by the partition of Ireland in 1921. "Although these two forms of nationalism were based on fundamentally incompatible worldviews, most Irish revolutionaries

attempted to combine these two strands of the separatist tradition" (Barbrook, 1992, p. 203). These two traditions continued to live on in nationalist thought, party politics, and, as we shall see, discourse surrounding the Spanish Civil War.

The Anglo-Irish Treaty of 1921 created the Irish Free State, which was made up of the 26 southern counties of Ireland. The six counties of Northern Ireland, however, were partitioned and remained a part of Great Britain because of its Protestant-unionist majority population (Bell, 1987).

Although the treaty granted the Irish people their own government, which many saw as a stepping-stone towards complete independence, many republicans were unsatisfied, mainly with the partition of the North and the stipulation that the Free State had to declare allegiance to the British Crown. To the republicans, this was a betrayal of the ideals of the rebels who had fought and died for independence in the 1916 Easter Rebellion and in the more recent Irish Revolution (Bell, 1987). A short but very real civil war ensued between pro-Treaty nationalists and anti-Treaty republicans; the republicans and their leader, Eamonn de Valera, who had also been a leader in the 1916 rebellion, were defeated and barred from participating in the new government (Bell, 1987; Dunphy, 1995; Horgan, 2001). A period of conservative nationalism under the party Cumann nGaedheal followed. According to Brown, "a general shift to the right was widely accepted by an Irish public that sought peaceful stability after a period of intense uncertainty" (Brown, 2004, p. 35).

By the 1930s, the Irish Free State was home to a variety of political and religious groups. Cumann nGaedheal's platform emphasized economic benefits from continued membership in the British Commonwealth (Brown, 2004, p. 36). Republicans, who had

made up the ailing Sinn Féin party, formed Fianna Fáil, in 1926 under de Valera's leadership. Fianna Fáil, which became the ruling party in 1932, voiced a platform of aggressive national programs that would form a more distinct, recognizable Irish national identity and eventually achieve complete independence (Bell, 1987; Brown, 2004; Dunphy, 1995). "To many of its followers Fianna Fáil *was* Ireland, and the people had no more right to turn their backs on it than they had to turn their backs on their country in the bitter days of the civil war" (Dunphy, 1995, p. 48).

There also existed in Ireland a short-lived fascist movement, known as the Blueshirt movement, which at one point was 40,000 strong, but collapsed as a result of confusion and infighting (Bell, 1987). There also existed an Irish socialist party.

By the time the Spanish Civil War broke out in 1936, we can envision the Irish Free State as a nation on the rise, engaged in nation-wide debates over what kind of a nation it would be. The Spanish Civil War, which was perceived by the rest of the world as a "clash of ideologies," that is, a conflict between Catholic monarchist fascist forces and secular communist republican forces, provided a chance for Ireland to prove to the rest of the world that it was prepared to participate in the resolution of international crises (Bell). But its many factions argued over the nature of that participation, whether it be as a communist intervener, as a Catholic one, or as an advocate of non-intervention.

Literature Review

The literature shows that Ireland has a long history of partisan media, each aligned to different ecclesiastical and political institutions (Bell, 1987; Ferguson and Brinks, et al., 2007; Foley, 2004; Horgan, 2001; Horgan et al., 2007; Kelly and O'Connor, 1997; McNally, 2009; Vincent, 1997). Foley (2004) argues that this partisanship developed as a reaction to the deeply entrenched history of conflict, crisis and colonialism in the collective memory of the Irish people. In such a society, he says, professional standards such as objectivity and fairness are nearly impossible since the country's history affects nearly everyone, including journalists.

The literature focuses largely on modern coverage of the Troubles in Northern Ireland, the period from 1968 to 1998 that was marked by violence and conflict between Protestant and Roman Catholic groups (Ferguson and Brinks, et al., 2007; Kinsella, in Horgan et al., 2007; Horgan, 2001; Kelly and O'Connor, 1997; Vincent, 1997). Although this literature is about a later time period than this thesis will study, it is relevant because it examines the press in terms of Ireland's deeply rooted ecclesiastical and political institutions. It also identifies specific viewpoints and audiences for each media outlet that could be applied to the 1930s and coverage of the Spanish Civil War (Ferguson and Brinks et al., 2007; Kinsella, in Horgan, 2007; Vincent, 1997). Path dependence theory shows that institutions are self-reinforcing, and that once an institution is set on a historical path, chances of reversal are slim (Pierson, 2000). The argument here is that Ireland's ethno-political institutions were set on a path long before the

Troubles began; these paths were reinforced by discourses surrounding the civil war and it was further reinforced by the Troubles.

The literature that exists on Irish coverage of the Spanish Civil War has identified the rough positions many of the newspapers took during the conflict (Bell, 1987; Horgan, 2001; McNally, 2009). It shows how the Catholic church advocated intervention on the Catholic-monarchist side, how socialists advocated intervention on the socialist-republican side, and how moderates favored non-intervention (Bell, 1987; Horgan, 2001; McNally, 2009).

Finally, some scholars identify the Irish press in the 1930s as a tool of nation building and nationalism (Bell, 1987; Foley, 2004; Horgan, 2001; McNally, 2009; Ryan, 2002). According to Foley (2004), after the Irish Civil War, the role of the journalist shifted from one of recruiting support for a political party to one of establishing an identity separate from that of Great Britain (Foley, p. 384). Bell (1987) singles out the Spanish Civil War as an important event in the creation of Ireland's international identity as a neutral, pacifist country. Ryan argues that newspapers in the Irish Free State not only played a crucial role in reporting the project of nation building, but also were key participants in that project (Ryan, p. 6). As the *Independent* stated in a 1925 editorial, one of its chief duties, in addition to providing criticism of the government and to helping readers make political decisions, was "to foster a strong spirit of sane nationalism" (Ryan, p. 8). How did this national identity manifest itself in coverage of the Spanish Civil War? What competing paradigms for national identity also existed in the coverage?

This review, then, will focus on two aspects of the literature: the positions of Irish newspapers on the Spanish Civil War and the press as a tool of nation-building and nationalism.

Irish Media and the Spanish Civil War

The Spanish Civil War saw the Irish media heavily divided along old political and ecclesiastical lines that were still strongly influenced by the implications of the Anglo-Irish Treaty of 1921 (Bell, 1987, p. 74). In Northern Ireland, Protestant unionists and Catholic nationalists remained "neither concerned with the radical ideologies of continental Europe nor the world outside Ulster. Their vision was largely limited to sectarian Irish affairs and their response to Spanish events fell into the same pattern" (Bell, 1987, p. 74).

This is confirmed by Horgan (2001), who found that newspapers aligned themselves with different positions based on their intended audiences. The Protestant-unionist *Belfast Telegraph* supported the British policy of non-intervention and saw the conflict as a wholly political one (Horgan, 2001, p. 38). The Catholic-nationalist *Irish News*, meanwhile, supported non-intervention for a different reason: that the Irish should focus on problems at home and "leave cloak-and-sword romance to the novelists" (Horgan p. 38). Meanwhile, the conservative Catholic *Irish Independent* took a pro-Franco stance. Socialist newspapers took the side of intervention on behalf of the Spanish Republic. *The Irish Press*, with a similar readership to the *Independent*, delivered relatively even coverage, as did the *Irish Times* (Horgan, 2001, 38). However, Horgan (2001) does not mention how coverage might have changed over time with changes in political, cultural and social climates.

McNally's (2009) work on Fianna Fáil's rhetoric surrounding the Spanish Civil War, however, follows changes in the *Irish Press*'s discourse over time. He argues that the Irish reaction to the Spanish Civil War cannot be reduced simply to a "'pro-Franco' position informed by Catholic essentialism; or 'absolute neutrality'; or, still less, a pro-Spanish Republic position" (McNally, 2009, p. 2). Rather, the rhetoric of the party suggested "an ideological battle with the opposition over the very meanings of the Spanish Civil War and the policy of 'Non-intervention'" (McNally, 2009, p. 2). This is helpful in understanding the character of one of the major media discourses surrounding the Spanish Civil War: the *Irish Press* wasn't just "pro-neutrality," but took one side in a complex debate over Ireland's role in the conflict.

McNally (2009) also found three different identities, each with different institutional alignments, that reacted differently to the conflict: one was made up of republicans and workers who were sympathetic to the Spanish government, "but nonetheless found themselves at the brunt of the opposition's attack on communism" (McNally, 2009, p. 2). Another group was made up of Catholics who "were at least initially pro-Franco and discontented with the Party's commitment to non-intervention" (McNally, 2009, 2). The final group was made up of those neutral or indifferent to the conflict in Spain (McNally, 2009, p. 2).

McNally (2009) also analyzes coverage between the *Irish Independent* and the *Press*, a difference only alluded to by Horgan. The *Independent*, which represented the interests of the opposition Fine Gael party and the Catholic Church, was quick to see the international conflict as a religious one "in which the forces of atheistic communism (the Republicans) were pitted against the defenders of Christianity (the Nationalists)"

(McNally, 2009, p. 5). The *Independent* demanded that the Irish government "assert its sympathies 'with our unfortunate fellow-Catholics who are the victims of red savagery,' and 'raise its voice to speak out the Irish people's horror and condemnation of the fiendish red campaign,'" (McNally, 2009, p. 6).

Jackson (1998) asserts that coverage of the Spanish Civil War by the communist bulletin *The Irish Worker* was "*primarily* influenced by the domestic political situation." Jackson's research finds that the *Irish Worker* interpreted the Spanish Civil War in terms of class and religion, that it used the conflict as a vehicle to criticize fascism and the Irish Labour Party. Jackson also states that, although the Fianna Fáil government remained neutral during the Spanish Civil War, "the opposition and virtually all the press were vociferously pro-Franco. Only the radical left offered any cohesive support for the government in Spain" (Jackson, 1998, p. 79).

Identity and the press

Barbrook (1992), in writing about early radio broadcasting, states that, for Ireland, "the assertion of political autonomy was an integral part of the struggle for national self-determination." Part of the media's role, then, was to establish the Irish nation as separate, distinct and independent (Barbrook, 1992, p. 205). Ryan (1998) also notes that "In the early decades of Southern Irish independence, newspapers were the dominant form of media communication, and played a key role in supporting, defining and explaining the newly created Free State to their readers" (Ryan, 1998, p.186). Thus, newspapers were the chief carriers of national discourse.

Although Ireland was trying to establish itself as a nation separate from Britain, McNally (2009) does not mention that non-intervention was also the official policy of

Britain and advocated by The *Belfast Telegraph* and the *Belfast Newsletter*. Thus, the distinction between discourses that served British interests and those that served Irish interests is lost, and the question of how Fianna Fáil's policy distinguished itself from the British policy while Ireland was trying to establish a separate national identity goes unanswered.

But to Bell (1987), Ireland's policies and discourses surrounding the Spanish Civil War helped create a new sense of nationhood and nationality. In officially taking a non-intervention route in 1937, Ireland was taking a stand against the great powers that had urged non-intervention at the start of the war but advocated intervention later (Bell, 1987, p. 91). By the end of the war, neutrality had become a mark of the Irish nation:

> As a neutral, Ireland could be independent, pursuing a policy that merely happened to parallel British interests…Irish neutrality, then, was not a cunning maneuver within a troubled global complex…the stand was an outward and visible sign of Irish unfettered nationalism" (Bell, 1987, p. 93).

Bell (1987) notes that the neutrality-as-nationalism identity was clearer at the end of the war than it had been at the beginning at the 1930s (Bell, 1987, p. 93). How, then, did this discourse develop in newspapers? Which newspapers subscribed to it, and which ones put forth alternative identities? Why?

Other scholars have addressed the development of cultural identity through media (Horgan 2001; Horgan 2007; Nolan in Kelly and O'Connor, 1997; Ryan 2002). Kelly and O'Connor (1987) point out that one of the current central questions in cultural studies is how local cultural identity can survive in an increasingly globalized society (Kelly and O'Connor, 1987, p. 8). They use as an example the television station RTÉ, whose programming was at least half imported. "Thus one might expect, according to the

postmodern hypothesis, an undermining of the subcultural and national identities" (Kelly and O'Connor, 8). Likewise, in Ireland in the 1930s, the question was how to establish a cultural, political, and economic identity that separated itself from that of Great Britain (Bell, 1987; McNally, 2002).

Horgan (2001) argues the *Irish Press* was a large factor in establishing a new national identity in Ireland. The national newspaper was founded by Fianna Fáil leader Eamonn de Valera in 1931, whose party was subsequently in power for 16 years. De Valera had established the paper in order to garner support for his marginalized party, and believed media attention was essential for his party to participate in the democratic process (Horgan, 2001).

The *Press* attempted to establish identity in a number of ways: it published stories in the Irish language, reported on Gaelic sporting events, and it allowed bright, young reporters who had been heretofore excluded because of their religious views (Horgan 2001, p. 30). "Henceforth other nations will have a means of knowing that Irish opinion is not merely an indistinct echo of the opinions of a section of the British press," wrote Frank Gallagher, the first editor of the *Irish Press* in its first issue (Horgan, 2001, p. 29).

In sum, the literature shows many historical ecclesiastical and political divisions among the Irish press. These divisions were thrown into sharp relief during the Spanish Civil War. The literature also shows how the press has been used in Ireland as a tool for nationalism and identity creation. The research carried out in this thesis will study Irish newspaper coverage during the Spanish Civil War in these terms.

Methodology

This thesis will examine the competing discourses in Irish national newspapers concerning the Spanish Civil War to find how domestic political, ecclesiastical, and cultural institutions were reflected in the coverage of an international conflict, exposing the deep divides that existed on the tiny island.

With this in mind, the following research questions are posed:

RQ1: What were the major competing newspaper discourses in Ireland concerning the Spanish Civil War?

RQ2: How did these competing discourses reflect the interests of their intended, competing audiences? In other words, what institutional influences are evident in the competing discourses?

In order to answer these questions, this study employs discourse analysis and historical research to explore the competing discourses in Irish coverage of Spanish Civil War.

Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis does not look at different perspectives as simplistic frames, but as media packages. Although each package has at its core a different frame, packages "ebb and flow in prominence and are constantly revised and updated to accommodate new events" (Gamson and Modigliani, 1989, p. 2). Where frames are static and are often centered around a single event, packages are more flexible and show how discourse changes over time. Izadi and Saghaye-Biria (2007), for example, studied discourse surrounding the Iranian nuclear program over a span of 10 years.

Discourse analysis is also helpful in terms of sociological institutionalism, because it does not see public opinion in terms of a single public discourse, but as a set of discourses that interact across institutional alignments in complex ways. Similarly, sociological institutionalism does not see the media as a single institution, but as an institution among many that interact with and shape one another. "Each system interacts with the other: media discourse is part of the process by which individuals construct meaning, and public opinion is the part of the process by which journalists and other cultural entrepreneurs develop and crystallize meaning in public discourse" (Gamson and Modigliani, 1989, p. 2). For this research, it is understood that the deeply divisive political and ecclesiastical institutions shaped how the press institutions covered the Spanish Civil War. Specifically, this research will search for how these institutions influenced coverage through institutionally specific rhetoric and symbols.

There are already two discourse "packages" concerning the Spanish Civil War that were discussed in the literature. These are McNally's (2009) "Communism as a threat to Catholicism" discourse and "Non-Intervention as a way of establishing Irish national identity." In order to identify the first discourse, research will look for aggressive language and symbols that admonish communism and praise Catholicism. To identify the second one, research will focus on language and symbols on nation-building and nationalism. For example, language that describes Ireland in terms of its relationship to Europe, its relationship to Britain, in terms of a united country or in terms of its many divisions. It will also examine coverage of the Spanish Civil War as a political and ecclesiastical issue. This thesis is not bound to these two packages; rather, it explores if there are other competing discourses surrounding the Spanish Civil War.

In order to understand what language and symbols are relevant to these discourses, historical research and use of secondary texts will be essential.

The largest amount of historical research will be devoted to the newspaper reportage of the Spanish Civil War. According to Berger (1998), the advantage to historical research is that it offers "interesting ways of looking at how our ideas about various topics, events, and personalities have evolved." This is particularly important in terms of sociological institutionalism, which is concerned with how institutions evolve over time, how they affect other institutions' development, and how they are in turn affected by those institutions.

This thesis will explore coverage in four newspapers from the Irish Free State. The *Irish Press* was chosen as a voice of non-intervention and for its alignment to Fianna Fáil. The *Irish Times*, though it advocated non-intervention as the *Press* did, was chosen as a voice of the middle-class Protestant ascendancy and because it is known to have sent a correspondent to cover the Spanish republican side (Horgan, 309). The *Irish Worker* was a socialist bulletin that supported the Spanish republic and condemned intervention on the side of Franco. (Bell, 1987; Horgan, 2001; McNally, 2009). The *Independent* was chosen as a voice of conservative Catholic opinion and opposition to Fianna Fáil.

Ferguson and Brinks et al. (2007) conducted a study on coverage of the IRA apology of 2002, in which they sampled editorials and news stories from newspapers in Northern Ireland, England and the United States. Their sampling method provides a good model for this research, because their choice of newspapers was deliberately chosen to reflect a variety of readerships within Ireland that would have varying contact with the Northern Irish conflict. In addition to the English and American newspapers, the study

sampled three Irish national newspapers, the *Belfast Telegraph*, which is read by both Catholics and Protestants, the *Irish News*, a Catholic paper, and the *Belfast Newsletter*, a Protestant paper. The study also sampled local newspapers from Omagh and Ballymena, thought to be "typical" Catholic and Protestant towns, respectively (Ferguson and Brinks et al., 2007).

Sample

A system of purposive sampling was used to explore the content of the newspapers and determine critical discourse moments. Gamson and Modigliani (1989) refer to Chilton's "critical discourse moments," events that make the culture of an issue visible (Gamson and Modigliani, 1989, p. 11). Critical discourse moments, they say, "stimulate commentary in the media by sponsors and journalists" (Gamson and Modigliani, 1989, p. 11). This sort of sampling is slightly problematic in that it creates "a small series of snapshots of media discourse at irregular intervals instead of a movie" (Gamson and Modigliani, p. 11). For the purposes of this study, "critical discourse moments" will be determined by coverage surrounding an event, person or issue.

The critical discourse moments used in this study were significant enough to yield multiple articles around the same issue or event. The most coverage was found towards the outbreak of the war in July 1937 and towards the end in February and March 1939. There was also a large amount of coverage dedicated to non-intervention. Debate was heated when an international ban on volunteers was enacted in February 1937, and Eamonn de Valera's defense of non-intervention as president of the League of Nations in September 1938 also caused media stirrings. Finally, the end of the war in March 1939 caused the newspapers to reflect on the success or lack thereof of non-intervention, when

the new Franco government should be recognized, and what the outcome meant for the future of Europe.

Mostly letters and editorials were examined for the purposes of this study. Reportage was originally meant to be included; however, most reports, upon investigation, were found to be from the wire services rather than original. Some reports were included because they were written by the newspapers' own correspondents.

Letters to the editor offer opinions from audience members, helping to define what the audience identifies as a critical event, and how their opinions reflected those of their preferred media. Editorials were examined because, according to Izadi and Saghaye-Biria (2007), their main function is the expression and persuasive communication of opinions, and so they make up a "relevant body of text for the examination of predominant ideological assumptions in a society" (Izadi and Saghaye-Biria, 2007, p. 148). Letters to the editor were also examined because, although more personal and providing the voice of a "typical" Irish person, are selected by publishers and editors and may thus reinforce their own opinions and persuasions. Many of these letters were also written by scholars and political figures. These added a less editorial, more universal edge to the discourse.

A total of 260 articles were examined for this thesis. Ninety-six reports, editorials, and letters were sampled from the *Irish Times*. Thirty-eight of these were letters, 31 were editorials, and 27 were reports from the newspaper's own correspondents (as opposed to wire reports). Eight-five articles from the *Independent* were examined. Twenty-two were letters to the editor, 28 were editorials, and 35 were reports from

correspondents. The data sets for these two newspapers were complete from 1936 to 1939, the years of the Spanish Civil War.

The samples for the *Worker* and the *Press* were considerably smaller. In the case of the *Worker*, this was because the weekly ceased publication in 1937 due to financial constraints; its publishers, the Communist Party of Ireland, combined with the Republican Congress and the Northern Irish Socialist Party to produce the *Irish Democrat*. Because of it being cut short, and because it only produced 36 issues, the sample for the *Worker* would naturally be smaller (Jackson, 1998, p. 86). Fifty-six editorials were sampled from the *Worker*. Because of the editorializing nature of the newspaper, every article was classified as an editorial.

In the case of the *Press*, issues before the summer of 1938 were unavailable. Also by 1938, coverage of Spain in most publications grew scarce as newspapers focused more of their attention on Hitler and Eastern Europe. Only 23 editorials, letters, and reports were culled from the *Press*. Three of these were letters, six were editorials, and 14 were reports from correspondents.

In summary, this thesis studies the competing discourses found in Irish newspaper coverage of the Spanish Civil War. Understanding that Ireland was divided into many competing ecclesiastical and political groups, this study will research four different newspapers, each sympathetic to a different group's viewpoint. It attempts to show how press coverage of the Spanish Civil War reflected the conflict among competing groups in Ireland in the 1930s.

Results

The Irish Times

The Irish Times approached the war in Spain as a strategic conflict that might have little immediate effect on Ireland at large. Unlike its rival, the *Independent*, the *Times* referred to the role of religion in the conflict almost as an afterthought and concentrated on the political divisions between the fascist and liberal factions. On another level, the paper portrayed the conflict almost in fatalistic terms, that the war was merely a symptom of a growing disease of conflict in Europe. The outcome, whether it be liberal or fascist victory, would inevitably be dangerous for Europe and, subsequently, Ireland, because whatever the outcome, constitutional law would lose its power. The discourse package exhibited by the *Times* appears to be "The Spanish Civil War is a complex conflict, the outcome of which will threaten democracy in Europe, since neither party is bound to enact constitutional law when the conflict is over."

From the start, the conflict was portrayed by the *Times* as a tragic event that was more than a fight between two competing parties. An editorial from August 9, 1936, about three weeks after the outbreak of the Civil War, claimed "It is a misleading simplification to regard the struggle as a conflict between Fascism and Communism. Though it may be regarded as a distorting mirror in which Europe can see an exaggerated reflection of her own divisions…" ("From the Times: Europe and Spain," *The Irish Times* (hereafter *Times*), August 9, 1936, p. 8)

This reflects the views that would shape the *Times*' opinion of the war for its duration: the war was carried out by two opposing, equally morally guilty parties, it was

not a simple Communist vs. Fascist or Catholic vs. Anti-religionist struggle, and it signified a larger European conflict.

Finally, the *Times'* coverage appears to have been influenced by the political tradition and institutionalized belief that power is given to rulers by the people. Though the *Times* had been against separation, this strain of separatism appears to have influenced the newspaper's judgment that the Spanish republic was legal. Still, the *Times* appeared supportive of Great Britain as a political ally (while others, notably the *Independent*, remained suspicious) and defended Ireland's non-intervention policy when others accused it of being too "British."

At the beginning of the war, the *Times* saw the conflict as an isolated, domestic dispute in Spain that was tragic, but did not directly affect Ireland. The *Times* did, however, appear to support the liberal government of Spain on the grounds that it had been elected by the people, and to contest it would set a dangerous precedent for other elected democracies in Europe.

A week and a half after the conflict began, the *Times* began portraying the war as a strategic one between Fascism and Communism:

> It is not of great importance to us in Ireland whether Spain decides to throw in her lot with Communism or with Fascism: for either alternative is equally detestable to people of a liberal tradition. Yet, in our view, it is of great importance to Spain that her Government should know its own mind—that it should decide definitely who its friends are and who are its enemies, and that it should abandon the effort—which has brought several Republican Governments to grief—to run with the Fascist hare and hunt with the Communist hounds" ("Revolt in Spain," *Times*, July 20, p. 6).

As more information from the war made its way into the Free State, the *Times* began to advocate a position of non-intervention. It also made the initial argument that

the outcome of the war, no matter which side won, would be a detriment to democracy. "The choice between a dictatorship of the right and a dictatorship of the left is not particularly difficult. In either case the individual will have no rights" (*Times*, "Spain in Turmoil," *Times*, July 29, p.6). The *Times* continued this argument into September, when the outcome of the war, whether it resulted in a communist or a fascist victory, was bound to be a threat to democracy. "Now the Civil War has unleashed forces which nobody can pretend to control, and no man can foretell the outcome. Whatever happens, one thing is almost certain. There will be no human freedom in Spain for a century" ("A Bitter Choice," *Times*, September 3, p. 8).

The call for non-intervention became stronger as more nations became involved in the international debate on what was to be done about Spain and as nations began to pledge support to the insurgents or the republicans. In its editorials, the *Times* supported the republican government on the grounds that it had been lawfully elected by the people of Spain. "A rebellion has broken out against the regularly constituted Government of that nation and, if there is any question of arms or help from abroad, it is to the Government they should be given" ("Spain And Europe," *Times*, August 3, p. 6).

The *Times* continued to support the Popular Front government on the basis of constitutional law. Some six weeks after the conflict began, an editorial, titled "Unhappy Spain," ran: "According to our own Free State Constitution, all power comes from God to the people. The people of Spain, for better or for worse, elected the Government which at present is fighting for its very existence."("Unhappy Spain," *Times*, August 26, 1936 p.6).

Some letters reflected the *Times*' own fatalistic view of the war that democracy in Spain was impossible, no matter who won the war. One reader, James Hogan of University College Cork, wrote "the struggle is now a struggle between a dictatorship on the one side, which might be called a military dictatorship for want of a better term, and Communism and Anarchism on the other." ("Letters," *Times*, September 8, 1936, p. 8). Another reader asserted "This war between the "Reds" and the "Patriots" is in reality a Fascist revolt against a lawfully elected democratic Government. Heretofore in Ireland we were taught that all power came to Governments from God through the people," ("Letters," *Times*, August 18 1936 p. 5). The author, George Lennon, also explained that the Government of Spain wasn't necessarily anti-Catholic, but anti-clerical. To Lennon, the Catholic Church in Spain had become a corrupt power that no longer served the interests of the working class. "The real danger to Christianity does not come from the workers, but from the un-Christlike practice of its ministers in allying themselves with the powerful against the poor."

The paper published a response from reader Maurice Power in the August 22 issue. Power expressed his disgust at both Lennon and the *Times*. "Your paper has had…sufficient dignity to exclude all writings antagonistic to the Catholic Church. Therefore, one deplores this unusual lack of discretion…I am not as much concerned with his letter as I am grieved at your giving it publicity" ("Letters," *Times*, August 22, 1936, p. 5)

As mentioned before, the war continued to be portrayed as a brutal, tragic conflict that was being carried out by two equally guilty parties: the anti-clerical (not anti-Catholic) liberal government and the monarchist-fascists under the leadership of General

Franco. "We are sickened, as all civilized persons must be sickened, by the dreadful crimes that have been, and are being, committed in Spain," ran an editorial. The editorial pointed to the murder of priests and monks and the burning of churches by anti-Fascist extremists, but also mentioned the massacre by Fascist forces at Bajadoz, the "savage conduct of the Moors, or the murderous spirit of the Fascist generals" ("A Bitter Choice," September 12, p.8).

In this editorial, the *Times* also condemned publications and politicians that sensationalized and misrepresented the conflict. It accused newspapers of gloating over real and imagined atrocities, of seeking to inflame emotions, and of treating "the situation in Spain as if all the filth were on the one side and all the nobility on the other" ("A Bitter Choice," September 12, 1936, p. 8).

The memory of the Irish Civil War was still fresh to the editors of the *Times,* and would have been to many readers; thus, the *Times* referred to that event in "A Bitter Choice," asking its audience to not be so judgmental of the reported atrocities in Spain. "Our own experiences during the civil strife of fourteen years ago ought to make us in this country humble in our penitence, rather than arrogant and self-righteous in our judgments." This probably was a jab at the *Independent* and newspapers like it, which had taken a decidedly pro-Franco stance and framed the conflict as a religious rather than political one.

As more news from the war, especially news about murdered priests and nuns, trickled into the Free State, the *Times* attempted to clarify events in Spain and admonished other publications for printing false or misleading information. In an August 11 editorial, the *Times* decried the European yellow press for misleading readers about

events in Spain. "When the Government shoots somebody it is accused of brutal murder, whereas shooting by the rebels are described as salutary executions; in fact, the natural position of affairs has been reversed" ("The Spanish Tangle," *Times*, August 11, 1936, p.6).

The *Times* attempted to expose these "gross distortions" in its editorials, hoping to throw light upon what it perceived was a more complex subject than a clash of –isms. It defended the Spanish working class as a people who embraced the Catholic Church, rather than one who waged war on it. "To argue that the Fascist officers are fighting for the Roman Catholic Church against the legions of the 'anti-God' is to deny that the Church has any hold on the plain people of Spain" ("Spain's Agony," *Times,* August 19, 1936, p.6).

The newspaper continued its war on newspapers it perceived were exploiting and skewing facts about the war. On August 26, the paper noted that news from Spain continued to be "confusing and untrustworthy. Most of the newspapers on the spot seem to be sending precisely the kind of dispatch that pleases their editors, with the inevitable result that the public is being bemused by a welter of exaggeration and contradiction" ("Unhappy Spain," *Times*, August 26, 1936, p.6).

The *Times*, then considered it its duty as a tool of knowledge and truth, to set right the accounts of the war. "It surely ought to be the duty of civilized persons—and particularly of responsible newspapers, which exert so much influence on public opinion—to try to find out the truth about events in Spain, and, above all, to avoid hysterical over-statements which are calculated to create an atmosphere of hatred and ill-feeling" (*Times*, "Unhappy Spain," 26 August 1936 p. 6).

At this point, the *Times* moved from portraying the conflict as a single, isolated, domestic conflict, to one that was connected to a larger global struggle against both communism and fascism. In "A Bitter Choice," it was written "If the Anti-Fascists win Spain, there probably will be a period of chaos and slaughter from which the country may never recover. If the Fascists win…the result may be another European war" ("A Bitter Choice," *Times*, September 12, 1936, p.8).

Following the recognition of the Franco government by Hitler and Mussolini, the association of the Spanish Civil War with a larger European conflict was apparent. In a November editorial titled "A Delicate Situation," the *Times* claimed "An exceedingly delicate situation has been created in Europe in consequence of the joint decision of Germany and Italy to afford official recognition to General Franco as ruler, *de facto* and *de jure*, of Spain" ("A Delicate Choice," *Times*, November 21, 1936, p. 8).

Acknowledging the alignment of Great Britain and France to non-intervention regarding the Spanish Civil War and Russia's blatant support of the Spanish republic, the *Times* then observed that the conflict in Spain was just a pretext for the Great Powers to engage in a larger European war, and "it would not be the first time in history that she would be used as a pawn in the international war game" ("A Delicate Choice," *Times*, November 21, 1936, p. 8).

In the same editorial, the *Times* expressed support for non-intervention, a view it kept for the duration of the war. "Punctilious observance of the non-intervention pact—in spirit as well as in letter—offers the surest—in fact the only—way of escape from the present *imbroglio*" ("A Delicate Choice," *Times*, November 21, 1936, p. 8).

The *Times* voiced its support of non-intervention from the beginning, claiming it was the choice of the public: "the great mass of public opinion is firmly opposed to any taking of sides, and desires nothing more strongly than that the conflagration should not be allowed to spread." ("From the Times: Spain and Europe," *Times*, August 9, 1936 p. 8).

On August 21, the paper ran an editorial that called non-intervention "a necessary safeguard of reasonable international relations…the right of every people to work out its own destiny without interference from outside must be respected as the foundation of international law and comity," ("From The Times: Europe and Spain," August 21, 1936, p. 6).

On August 22, an editorial simply stated "intervention by anybody on either side inevitably would lead to war," and hypothesized that, whatever the outcome of the Spanish Civil War, a larger European war would ensue. "If the rebels win, a totalitarian State will be established in Spain…On the other hand, if the Government forces are successful, a strong swing towards the Left will be more than likely" (*Times*, August 22, 1936, p. 9).

The editorial also aimed to clarify the roles of the factions in Spain. The war was larger than a conflict between conservative and liberal values. Rather, it was a conflict between two irreconcilable world views. "Actually the struggle in Spain is between two opposing *Weltanschauungen*—the Fascist and the democratic, not the Conservative and the Communist points of view."

These editorials are in line with the *Times*' reportage of the war and reflect the point of view of the political establishment. Non-intervention was the policy of Great

Britain, and the *Times*' support of that policy can be found in its political coverage as well. In an August 20 report, the *Times* reported that "the British Government has not the slightest intention of interfering in Spain," and quoted First Lord of the Admiralty Sir Samuel Hoare as saying "if we attempted to impose our will upon the Spanish factions we might well involve Europe in a general conflagration" ("Britain and Spain," *Times*, August 20, 1936, p. 8).

This report ran alongside one titled "Excesses in Spain: Sequel To Army's Cruelty." The article reports summary executions on both sides in Spain, and makes it clear that atrocities had been committed on both sides f the Spanish conflict. The correspondent's source brought "the tale of systematic executions of insurgent sympathisers who are tried by revolutionary committees…the bodies are left by the roadsides, and later are collected by motor lorries and taken to the morgues." Yet, the article acknowledged "it must be said in all fairness that there is abundant evidence of wholesale executions and cruelties behind insurgent lines" ("Excesses in Spain: Sequel to Army's Cruelty," *Times*, Ausust 20, 1936).

The *Times*' view was not always shared by its readers. In fact, the outbreak of the Spanish Civil War prompted a host of readers to send letter to the *Times*. In fact, the letters appear to make up a different type of discourse altogether. The debate here wasn't over what kind of a war was taking place or even necessarily over which party was in the right. Rather, the letters tended to focus on the credibility of the *Times*' and the accuracy of Irish accounts of the war. The paper ran a letter from Guillermo Alvarez, a lifelong resident of Spain, who took issue with a previous letter penned by prominent Irish socialist Peadar O'Donnell, a former Irish Republican Army officer, who had been a

visitor to Spain for two weeks during the war. "It is evident he did not come as an impartial witness; it was to back up the parties of the Left and to excuse the atrocities committed by the Anarchists and Communists," Alvarez wrote ("Letters," *Times,* August 18, 1936 p. 5). He also refuted the *Times'* position that the government in Spain had been democratically elected and was therefore lawful. He claimed to have witnessed intimidation tactics used by the Spanish republicans to keep "good Catholics" away from the polls. At any rate, "The elections held on February 16th were not a fair test of the wishes of the electors."

Three days later, the *Times* published a strongly-worded letter that rejected the paper's view that the conflict in Spain was a political struggle and stressed that it was, in fact, a serious war between "godless" communism and Catholicism. "The *Irish Times* continues to talk of lawfully constituted authority, and strains every nerve to blacken those who have risen against intolerable tyranny and against the Red menace to all that they hold dear—kindred, Faith, and country" ("Letters," *Times,* The Rev. Stephen J. Brown, 21 August 1936, p. 8).

Brown's letter garnered several responses, both in agreement and disagreement with the priest's views. One letter, signed simply "J.J.G.", disagreed fully with Brown and supported the *Times*' right to express its views. "If the minority in Spain who refused to recognise the will of the people adopted a more Christian attitude than plunging the country into bloodshed, there would be no burning of churches and no murdering priests" ("Letters," *Times,* 22 August 1936 p. 5).

Others expressed concern that what happened in Spain could happen at home. A. Morrow wrote "Does any person seriously imagine that the politicians will solve

Ireland's problems? That way is the way of Spain—smoking churches, murdered priests and fleeing nuns; 'the red steed stands neighing in his stall!'" (*Times,* 22 August 1936 p. 5).

However, one reader, Joseph A. Gaffney, who claimed his politics differed "profoundly" from those of the *Times,* found the newspaper's coverage of the war in Spain fair and balanced. He complimented the *Times* on its "enlightened and just commentaries," and wrote that, were it not for the *Times*' even coverage, the Irish people "might easily succumb to the blindly prejudiced accounts submitted to us day after day by some of your contemporaries, whose passionate bigotry and exploitation of religion are only too sickeningly obvious" ("Letters," *Times,* August 22, 1936 p. 5).

The debate surrounding Brown's letter continued until August 24, when M.C. and R.F. Griffith classified Brown's view as un-Irish. Ireland was famous for its love of liberty and its resistance to armed dictatorship, they wrote, and therefore should be ready to help any country that fights for freedom. "Ireland has long fought for the right of a democratic government; an Irishman should, therefore, be particularly sympathetic with other nations in their struggle to attain it and to keep it when once attained."("Letters," *Times,* August 24, 1936, p. 5). The Griffiths also expressed support for what they viewed as the *Times*' fair, unbiased coverage "It is to be hoped that Father Brown's one-sided view of the situation will not cause the *Irish Times* to abandon an impartiality which is all too rare in the present crisis."

On the 26th, a letter was published supporting the *Times* over Brown, saying "Your readers should be grateful that they have in Ireland one paper which will not 'doctor' the truth or be dictated to" ("Letters," *Times,* August 26, 1936 p. 5).

One letter, whose author adopted the name of one of Ireland's foremost socialists and signed "Connollyite", called on Irish politicians to join European leaders in expressing their support for the government of Spain. "They support the legitimately elected Government against the Fascist rebels. They take their stand for the forces of democracy against Fascism. In the Irish Free State, however, our Labour leaders have remained completely silent…"

The announcement of formation of the Irish Brigade, which was established by Irish Fascist (Blueshirt) leader Eoin O'Duffy to fight on behalf of Franco in Spain also received some attention from readers. One reader was outraged that Irishmen were being recruited to fight in Spain while their fellow Catholics in Northern Ireland languished "The plight of the Northern Catholics under 'Orange' Craigavon has never evoked the martial spirit that is now in full blast against 'Red' Azana"(*Times*, September 10, p. 5)

It appears that, by 1937, the debate surrounding the war in Spain had died down. Coverage of the war itself became sparse as the issue of non-intervention loomed large. As the Irish parliament prepared its own bill to adopt the policy of non-intervention, the *Times'* coverage shifted from explaining the international conflict to explaining the domestic policy that would keep Ireland from becoming involved.

In February, the *Times* published two editorials, each days apart, as the Non-intervention Bill was being put through the Dáil. The *Times* sounded its unwavering support of the policy in both, and perceived the adoption of non-intervention as a step by the Free State toward joining the larger powers on the world stage. "We congratulate Mr. De Valera's Government on its clear vision and on its willingness to act in concert with the whole civilised world" ("Volunteers," *Times*, February 19, 1937, p. 6). The bill

banned Irish volunteers from enlisting in support of either side, and while the *Times* acknowledged, as it long had, that the Spanish people had a right to work the conflict out without foreign interference, the paper claimed the policy was, in fact, what was best for Ireland. "If a ban on volunteers hurts…the conscience of many Irishmen, they must recognise that the Free State Government is playing a small, but vital, part in preserving the world's peace. General Franco's loss is the world's—and Ireland's—gain."

A few days later, after the Non-intervention Bill passed, the *Times* documented its own disappointment that Ireland's version of the law did not go into effect in concert with those of other nations: "The international ban came into force at midnight on Saturday; but one nation—the Irish Free State—will not be in a position to enforce its veto on volunteers until the end of the present week. Once again the *Saorstát* is being "different"…" ("Ireland and Spain," *Times*, February 2, 1937, p. 6). It also defended the de Valera government from critics who found its policies too "British." "Needless to say, nothing could be farther from the truth; for, whatever Mr. De Valera may, or may not, be, he certainly is no slavish camp-follower of the British."

By July, the relationship of the Spanish Civil War to the political health of Europe was undeniable to the *Times*, and while Europe found itself being more or less pulled into the conflict, the *Times* remained steadfast in its support of non-intervention and of Great Britain's position at the bargaining table. If Italy and Germany would not agree to neutrality, the British government would withdraw, "and while preserving the strictest form of neutrality, will reserve to itself full freedom of action in all respects. Both France and Russia will follow Britain. Many of the smaller Powers will also support her point of view" ("Spain and the World," *Times*, July 5, 1937 p. 5).

By September 1937, however, it was clear to the *Times* that non-intervention was not working, since Germany and Italy volunteered aid to Franco and Soviet Russia to the republic. But the paper continued to support it as the best means possible. "None can maintain that the non-intervention system, though it has succeeded so far in averting the spread of hostilities beyond Spain, is yet either fully effective or even fully worked out" ("From the Times: Precedents or Progress," *Times*, September 1, 1937 p.6).

The leaders of the League of Nations met in late September and early October of 1937 to discuss the non-intervention policy. When de Valera opposed a paragraph in a new resolution that would end the policy if foreign volunteers in Spain could not be recalled, the *Times* recognize his resistance with the headline "Mr. De Valera Hits Out." The paper reported that de Valera had declared non-intervention would be consistently the policy of the Free State government and quoted de Valera's speech at the League, in which he said "We are a small state, it is true, and we may not count for a great deal, but from the point of view of principle I think our policy should count for a great deal" ("Mr. De Valera Hits Out," *Times*, October 1, 1937 p.9).

By 1938, coverage of Spain was being supplanted by coverage of Hitler's conquests of Eastern Europe. Yet the *Times* remained conscious of the previous non-intervention debates in Europe, using them as a precedent for greater preemptive action by European powers.

> It is high time that the Irish people should put this question to themselves, and examine it coldly and objectively against the stark probability of war. If such a calamity should befall mankind, this State, in common with every other State, must have a policy; and such a policy cannot be left to generate itself spontaneously on the eve of war, or a day or a month afterwards. ("Ringside Seats?" *Times*, September 3, 1938).

Yet the *Times* continued to portray the outcome of Spanish conflict as a vital one to the future of Europe. "It may be true that there is no chance of an equitable arrangement with General Franco. Nevertheless, Europe's comfort demands that hope shall not be abandoned until the last possibility has been explored."

The *Times* continued to cover the war in Spain in terms of the domestic political situation. In April, a Labour Party conference turned toward the war in Spain: "The matter of Spain arose out of a resolution congratulating the Labour Party in the Dail on their resistance to the recognition of Ireland of Italy's conquest of Abyssinia, and calling upon the Labour Party at all times to protest against Fascist and imperialist aggression" ("Warm Debates," *Times*, April 7, 1938 p. 8).

The *Times* continued to defend the Spanish government, even when it seemed that Franco would triumph. In November, it reported an eyewitness testimony from the Duchess of Atholl, who had been in Spain at the beginning of the conflict. According to the article, the Duchess said that "priests had been murdered and churches burned in Spain in the early days of the war, but the persons responsible for some of these outrages were frequently 'irresponsibles,' and the Government had closed the churches to prevent further attacks" ("Closing of Spanish Churches," *Times*, November 4, 1938, p. 8).

In September, de Valera was elected President of the League of Nations at its meeting in Geneva. To the *Times*, this was a "signal honour for Ireland," which recognized the state as being on the same level as larger, more established nations. The *Times* stressed not only the honor of the appointment, but the importance of the session that an Irishman would lead, and pointed out that the meeting was described by the League's secretary general as "the most important in the history of the League and the

most vital to the peace of Europe and the world" (September 13, 1938, "Mr. de Valera as League President" p. 7). "The Nominating Body, a fully representative organization established by the League last year, then unanimously decided to put forward the name of Mr. de Valera." "In Irish circles in Geneva the appointment of Mr. de Valera has been received with unbounded enthusiasm."

As non-intervention became more of an issue, the *Times* published more letters concerning the policy. One correspondent, using the name "Hibernia," the Latin word for Ireland, echoed the *Times'* argument that neutrality was not just the best course for Europe, but the best course for Ireland. Hibernia's argument was that any other course than neutrality would expose Ireland to war and destruction and that foreign armies of occupation would threaten the nation's liberty. "Nations as small as ours…successfully maintained neutrality in the last war—Denmark, for example. If we cannot do what they did the fault—and the responsibility—'is not in the stars, but in ourselves, that we are underlings.'" ("Peace With Honor" *Times*, April 7, 1938, p. 5).

Hibernia's letter received a response from a correspondent who believed neutrality was bound to not be adhered to by nations such as Russia and Germany. R.E. Barrow suggested "The problem for Ireland is not one of remaining neutral, for no attacking force would give her any choice in the matter. Her choice is: will she assist the democratic States to resist aggression or will she run the risk of being overrun by the Dictators?" ("Peace With Honour," *Times*, April 11, 1938, p. 5).

Mrs. Betts De Courcy wrote that the Irish should not forget about the region of Catalonia, a persecuted region ravaged by both factions in the civil war. In Catalonia, she found, the people struggled for the right to use Catalan in church services, which echoed

the same struggle that had taken place in Ireland years before. "Support for the struggle of the Catalans for precisely those and other rights, for which so many Irishmen have fought, should be enthusiastic and widespread" ("The Spanish War," *Times*, April 20 1938).

By 1939, the end to the Spanish Civil War was in sight, and the *Irish Times* grew reflective on the significance of the war. "Public opinion throughout the British Commonwealth has been changing very rapidly of late in regard to Spain… If the Spanish Government is defeated, France and Britain will share its defeat, and the chances of a peaceful solution of Europe's problems will disappear" ("Suffering Spain," *Times*, January 17, 1939, p. 6).

As the newspapers reflected on the history of the conflict, the *Times* looked ahead to the future of non-intervention and neutrality. "If it should suit a European Power to respect Irish neutrality, Irish neutrality would be respected; but that neutrality would become a fiction from the moment when its infringement should be deemed to entail the slightest advantage" ("Ireland's Duty," *Times*, February 17, 1939, p. 6). The same editorial admitted that if war were to break out, Ireland's best option for defense would be to ally with Britain, an idea loath to many Irish. However, the editorial argued, "To neglect [Ireland's] defences would be to leave itself exposed to attack or, alternatively, forced to beg the protection of its powerful neighbour. Either alternative would be a sorry reflection of national pride."

Before the war ended, when Franco's victory was obvious, the *Times* finally changed its position regarding the republican government in Spain. Where the paper had once defended the government as being lawfully elected by the Spanish people, now

"the *regime* which emerged from the general election in Spain fell away from the views expressed by its supporters at the time of the election, and developed many of the most sinister characteristics of Bolshevist rule" ("From The Times: Recognition" *Times*, February 15, 1939 p. 6).

In fact, the *Times*, by the end of the war, appeared skeptical of the impact of non-intervention, acknowledged that the policy was openly disregarded by Germany and Italy and covertly disregarded by France. "During the last two and a half years the Italians and the Germans have been backing General Franco…Any Frenchman who fought in the International Brigade served as *bona fide* volunteers" ("Nearing The End," *Times*, February 15, 1939, p. 6). The cynicism with which the *Times* reported the end of the war is striking. The paper, which had once praised non-intervention as the best hope for Europe and Ireland, acknowledged the futility of such a policy. "The principle of non-intervention has worked out entirely in favour of General Franco…when Mr. Neville Chamberlain made a mild protest to Signor Mussolini in Rome last week he was told more or less politely to mind his own business" (*Times*, January 20, 1939, p. 6).

The cynicism with which the *Times* reported the end of the war was echoed by some readers. "That admirable body, the International Committee for Non-Intervention in Spain, has been handicapped in its work by the fact that most of its principal members have been engaged in wholehearted intervention on one side or the other," wrote one correspondent. ("Spain," *Times*, March 6, 1939, p. 2).

The Irish Independent

If the *Irish Times'* discourse on the war in Spain reflected the tradition of constitutionality, then the *Irish Independent's* discourse reflected the Catholic nationalist tradition. From the beginning, the *Independent* hailed the fascist insurgents as Catholic heroes and crusaders, calling upon their Irish brethren to intervene on Franco's side. Unlike the *Times*, who diplomatically referred to the fascists as insurgents and the liberal government as republicans, the *Independent* adopted the more provocative terms "patriots" and "Reds." The discourse package here would be "Ireland should intervene on behalf of its Catholic brothers in Spain."

Like the *Times*, the *Independent* saw as its primary mission the protection of its readers from misinformation and the relay of reliable, accurate information. They simply had different opinions of what misinformation meant. To the *Independent*, it meant holding the powerful (in this case the liberal Free State and Popular Front governments) accountable. The *Independent* also tried to represent its conservative Catholic readership's interests by providing a Catholic voice in what it perceived as an overwhelmingly secular press.

A few days before the first reports of the war surfaced in Dublin, the *Independent* was already expressing its disapproval of Spain's liberal government and voiced its support for the Franco's monarchist fascists. "Ever since the victory of the Popular Front last February, Spain has known nothing, save internal turmoil and bloodshed, engineered by the Communist forces which back its weak-kneed Socialist government" ("Unhappy Spain," *Irish Independent* (hereafter *Independent*), July 15, 1936, p. 8).

Once information on the war in Spain had trickled into the country, the *Independent* quickly characterized it as a war between right and left factions. However, where the *Times* saw either outcome to the war in Spain as potentially dangerous, the *Independent* indicated that a fascist victory was desirable, since it would "bar the advance of the Bolshevistic movement…All who stand for the ancient Faith and traditions of Spain are behind the present revolt against the Marxist regime in Madrid" ("The Struggle In Spain," *Independent*, July 22, 1936, p.7).

While the *Times* argued in editorials that the Popular Front government in Spain had been lawfully elected by the people, the *Independent* argued that the Popular Front was dangerous to the people in Spain, and especially dangerous to the Catholic church. The fascists, the paper argued, protected the rest of Europe from the spread of Soviet communism. After the republicans took Barcelona, the *Independent* reported "The city and surrounding districts are now in the grip of a Red Terror…Countless nuns and priests have also been done to death in thus fashion during the past few weeks" ("Red Dawn in Spain," *Independent*, August 3, 1936, p. 8). Meanwhile, reported aid to the Popular Front from Soviet Russia spelled danger for both the government and the church. The Popular Front quickly came to represent the type of liberal government feared by the Catholic Church. The newspaper described the government and the mob in Spain as "the would-be fulfillers of Lenin's prophecy that Europe would one day witness the birth, in blood and terror, of the Spanish Soviet Republic."

In September, an editorial praised the fascist insurgents as "heroes of Spain" and as men of God. "They successfully repelled every attack by the Red horde…They did make one request, and that was for a priest to administer spiritual comfort, a request

proving, if proof were needed, that they are fighting for Faith and their God" ("Heroes of Spain," *Independent*, September 29, 1936 p.7).

The *Independent* dedicated nearly a full page to an analysis by Captain Francis McCullagh, a former soldier and war correspondent who had been held prisoner by the Bolsheviks during the Russian Revolution. The analysis ran with the headline "The Truth About Spain," and subheadlines such as "Patriots' Action Justified," "Lenin's False Promises," and "The Gallant Patriots." The analysis compared the Spanish Civil War to the Russian Revolution and documented the heroism of the fascists in Spain. The fascists, the newspaper reported, had enough public support to defend themselves, while it was the liberals "who yelled to France for bombers and poison gas…and when they saw that the Reds were on the point of establishing a Red Soviet they struck hard, struck quickly, and struck all together." To McCullagh, the Spanish fascists were the hope of Christianity in Europe. "The Spanish Christians will save not only themselves. They will save Europe again. They will save Christendom" ("The Truth About Spain," *Independent*, September 23 1936, p.7).

The *Independent* ran another opinion piece by McCallagh in December. By then, the *Independent*'s portrayal of the war as a religious one was fully developed. McCallagh's piece appeared under the banner "Spain's Fight For Faith," and ran with the headline "When Madrid Falls to the Crusaders."

The call for intervention on the side of the Spanish republic was treated almost as a joke by the *Independent*, which saw it as a sign of the weakness of the republic. In a story with the headline "Fight-Shy Reds Are Squealing!", the *Independent* described the paradox of non-intervention—that the powers who blatantly intervened were not

reprimanded, since punishment would be a form of intervention—as "grimly amusing…Fortunately, however, the Red-favouring Powers—England, France, and Russia—are not in the least likely to interfere in any overt manner, while Germany and Italy are so very alive and kicking" ("Fight-Shy Reds Are Squealing!" September 29, *Independent*, 1936, p. 7).

By October, the Spanish Civil War had fully become a Catholicism vs. Communism struggle for the *Independent*, and the newspaper was blatant in its support for the Fascists, characterizing the republicans as the "hordes of the Antichrist." "From the very outset the *Irish Independent* adopted a definite line of policy, standing behind the Army that is defending the Faith…It was a policy dictated only by conscience, and none other would…be worthy of a Christian country" ("Our Policy In Spain," *Independent*, October 21, 1936 p. 6).

While the *Independent* voiced support for the Spanish fascists, it denounced the policy of non-intervention. "It is deplorable and disedifying that the Christian Government of this Christian land should recognise an Anarchist and Atheist Government engaged in a ruthless anti-Christ campaign." In the same editorial, the newspaper reflected on itself as a carrier of the truth about the atrocities in Spain, working to inform the Irish public about the dangers to the faith. "Not a word by the President or Government of this Christian nation has been uttered in condemnation of these Red brutalities, barbarities and blasphemies. The *Irish Independent* has exposed these atrocities" ("The Government and Spain," *Independent*, November 28, 1936, p. 10).

As the adoption by the Free State government of a policy of non-intervention grew more likely, the *Independent* reached to history to advocate the country's intervention on behalf of the fascist rebels. It was Ireland's duty to help the Catholic Spanish, the paper argued, because Spain had long come to the aid of Ireland throughout the country's tumultuous relationship with Great Britain. An opinion piece, titled "Ireland Remembers Her Debt to Spain," penned by the Rev. Myles V. Ronan, appeared in the December 18 issue of the *Independent* and claimed Ireland was praying for the soldiers fighting for the "defence of civil and religious liberty in a country that made heroic efforts on many occasions in ages past, in spite of adverse fortune, to lift Dark Rosaleen out of the mire of 'reformation' and the ignominy of conquest" ("Ireland's Debt To Spain," *Independent,* December 18, 1936, p. 11).

A few days later, emphasizing Ireland's historic alliance with Spain, the *Independent* began a short series called "Ireland's Links With Spain." The series, written by Trinity College professor of Spanish Walter Starkie, described the Basque, Castilian and Galicians as Ireland's "Brother Celts." He recalled a young man from Pamplona who said to him "if Spain as a religious war, may we not appeal for the Irish to help us in our struggle for our religion. Ireland in the past gave us some of the greatest leaders in our wars" ("Ireland's Links With Spain-Part I: Centuries-old Ties," *Independent*, December 22, 1936, p. 12).

The *Independent* often reported on the plight of those in holy orders, including nuns, priests, and monks. In December, it reported a story on the executions of monks by republican extremists under the headlines "Hunted Friars of Spain: Terrible Tales of Massacres: Diabolical Hatred." In November, it reported that many monks of the Marist

order had been "slain by the Reds." "In Toledo and Lerida they have been massacred to the last man, making in these two Communities about 30 brothers killed…Details of these killings and arrests are much the same everywhere" ("The Marist Brothers In Spain," *Independent*, November 12, 1936, p. 5)."

Though the position of the *Irish Independent* was obvious in both its coverage and its editorial pages, the paper ran several letters that challenged the Catholic nationalist perspective. One reader, M.J. Wolfe, wrote in protest of the way the newspaper treated the liberal government and its supporters. "The rebels have and are still being presented as patriots fighting for Christianity, while the Government supported are usually referred to in very abusive terms, frequently as devils of various hues, all bad, of Moscow Red." Wolfe made the point championed by the *Times*, that the conflict was a strategic rather than political or religious one, and that the Spanish government had been lawfully elected, thus the rebels were in the wrong ("Letters," *Independent*, August 25, 1936, p.14).

Another correspondent showed support for non-intervention, despite what he had read in the *Independent*. If the Spanish government, he wrote, was "all that the Press makes it out to be, even then it is no reason why we should embroil ourselves in the struggle. Any action of ours would not mend matters but make them worse" ("Against Action," *Independent*, August 27, 1936, p. 6).

In fact, the *Independent*'s coverage of the conflict appears to have alienated some non-Catholic Irish. One correspondent took offense when the newspaper claimed that those who died for the Irish Republic would have more gladly died for their faith like the Spanish "patriots."

> Many non-Catholic Republicans have lived and died for the Republic, and many of them worked hard for their Catholic fellow-countrymen, and were maligned at the time and since. Apparently you deny that they were either Nationalist or Republican." As for the coverage of the conflict, "your paper contends that all the patriotism is on one side. But well-known Catholics have given evidence to the contrary…" ("Republicans and Spain," *Independent*, Cluad de Ceabhasa, Nov. 12, 1936, p. 9).

One correspondent saw the Spanish conflict as a warning sign. "Do not we, Irish Catholics, suffer from somewhat similar conditions?… We are not more catholic than Spain was. Forewarned is forearmed" ("A Lesson from Spain," *Independent*, October 15, 1936, p. 5).

1937 brought a more heated argument against non-intervention, as the Dail prepared its non-intervention bill in February. For the *Independent*, the adoption of the policy showed ignorance of the opinions of the Irish people and represented an undesirable mimicry of Great Britain. The newspaper accused Eamonn de Valera of "in imposing sanctions against Italy, in continuing to recognise the Murder-Government in Spain and in prohibiting volunteers from going to Spain—slavishly followed by the policy adopted by British Ministers" ("A National Shame," *Independent*, February 19, 1937, p. 10). The *Independent* saw as false Eamonn de Valera's view that the conflict was "between one –ism and the other," and attempted to dispel this through its editorials, claiming that the war was, in fact, one of religion. "The fight is not between Fascism and Democracy but between Christ and the anti-Christ." Furthermore, the paper said, the war in Spain was a holy war and a noble cause in which faithful Irish Christians were prohibited to participate while they were unfairly allowed to take up arms on behalf of socialist nations to champion less noble causes. The *Independent* pointed out the paradox

that Irishmen were allowed to join the French Foreign Legion or the British Army, "however, Like Communist Russia, Socialist France, and Imperialist Britain, we are now, thanks to this Bill, to be neutral in the war between Christendom and Satan." ("'It Shall Not Be Tolerated,'" *Independent*, Feb. 9, 1937, p. 8).

In another editorial, published a week later, the *Independent* claimed that hundreds of Irishmen considered it their Christian duty to "enrol in the Army that is fighting for the Cross against the Red Flag. But henceforth no countryman of their's [sic] can join them; any who attempt to do so will become criminals" ("The New Criminals," *Independent*, February 25, 1937, p. 8).

In 1937, the *Independent* published several opinion pieces by the Marquis Merry Del Val, a former Spanish ambassador to Great Britain. The Marquis' pieces furthered the *Independent*'s agenda of portraying the war as a Christian struggle against communism. The first piece, titled "The Real Issue in Spain: Struggle Against Bolshevism," claimed that the real threat was the expansion of Soviet power into Spain and that Fascism, though present, played only a small part in the struggle. "It must be recorded here that Fascism in Spain occupies by its numbers and activity approximately the same place as its homonym in Great Britain. It is more a reaction against Communism than anything else," ("The Real Issue in Spain," *Independent*, January 12, 1937, p. 11).

On the same page, the *Independent* ran an interview with Capt. Liam Walsh, an advocate for the Eoin O'Duffy's Irish Brigade, which fought on behalf of the Fascists. Walsh explained the cause of the war was not the intention by fascists to overthrow the government; rather, it was the inaction of the government to investigate the assassination

of fascist leader Calvo Sotelo. "The truth is that Army revolted against a Communist-controlled Government, and the assassination of Senor Calvo Sotelo…It compelled the Right to take action after a period of inaction during which the Government in power made no attempt to find the murderers," ("The Wisdom of Sending Volunteers to Spain," *Independent*, January 12, 1937, p. 11).

The *Independent* continued to publish letters that supported its own opinions on the war in Spain. One distinguishing feature is the amount of letters that voiced their disapproval of coverage in other newspapers. "The 'Irish Press' has disappointed 'the profoundly Catholic sentiments of our people' by its 'neutrality' in the war. It is evidently afraid of openly siding with Franco.'" ("The Patriot Cause In Spain," *Independent*, January 5, 1937, p. 5).

Though the *Independent* argued tirelessly that the majority of Irish were overwhelmingly in favor of intervention on behalf of Franco, one correspondent, signed "Catholic And Irish," argued that the majority were in fact apathetic or in favor of non-intervention. "More than half of those I meet will tell you that the Catholics in Spain are getting only what they deserve…No satisfactory evidence has been produced to them in proof of the charges that the Reds have committed any atrocities" ("Letters," *Independent*, January 12, 1937, p. 11).

Other letters voiced skepticism of non-intervention. "Nor does this policy of non-intervention promise to be anything more than a farce—like our loudly vaunted "sanctions" ("Reds and Non-intervention in Spain," *Independent*, March 16, 1936, p. 14).

By 1938, more countries had come to recognize the Franco government in Spain, and the *Independent* reported on "the new Spain" that would emerge once the war was

over. Where the *Times* saw that either alternative to the outcome in the war would only lead to dictatorship and a larger European war, the *Independent* saw victory by the Franco as a positive outcome that would lead to a peaceful, religious society. "Behind Nationalist lines in Spain there is already an immense work of spiritual and material reconstruction in progress…a new Concordat will be drawn up with the Vatican. Relations with all but Soviet powers will be harmonious" (*Independent*, January 20, 1938, p. 8).

The *Independent* also strove to portray Franco as a merciful military leader in comparison to the Popular Front forces. In an interview with a New Zealand priest who had been to Spain to photograph Franco's forces, the paper reported that "Nationalist Spain is giving a striking example of Christian chivalry, patriotim [sic], justice, and charity" ("Visit to Insurgent Spain," *Independent*, August 17, 1938, p. 6). Meanwhile, the liberals, painted as communists, stood for chaos and disorder. "While the Reds murdered bishops, priests and nuns, and destroyed churches and desecrated cemeteries, in Insurgent Spain there was a spirit of deep piety and practical Catholicism."

As non-intervention moved forward and the evacuation of foreign troops from Spain became a reality, the *Independent* continued to portray Franco as a fair and peace-loving leader. Six weeks after what became known as "the British plan" outlining the details of non-intervention was adopted, the paper reported "General Franco offers to respect the establishment of two safety ports in the enemy zone. This offer is made as a proof of the National Government's generous attitude towards foreign commerce and the peaceful provisioning of its adversaries" ("Spain and Foreigners," *Independent*, August 22, 1938, p. 8).

The *Independent* continued its campaign for the Irish government to officially recognize the Franco government. It once again turned to history to reinforce its position. A nation such as Ireland, with its history of rebellion against repressive regimes, "should have been the first to express its admiration and sympathy for a gallant nation fighting for the Faith and defending the liberties of its people against a fiendish campaign of sacrilege, terror, and murder" ("Ireland and Spain," *Independent,* October 11, 1938 p. 10).

The *Independent* saw the Irish government's hesitation over recognition as a weak position that went against the will of the Irish people and interpreted it as the nation's leaders waiting on Great Britain and France to make a move. "It is no credit to this country that eleven nations have already preceded us in the course we have vainly urged upon the government… is Ireland to wait until England and France have given recognition to General Franco…"" ("Ireland and Spain," *Independent,* October11, 1938, p. 10).

For the *Independent*, everything about "Red" Spain was dangerous. As a mouthpiece for conservative Catholic Ireland, the newspaper perceived any Leftist regime as anti-religion, and thus, anti-Catholic. In an examination of the education system, the paper found that "no doubt remains about their actual purposes, which are none other than those of Lenin and Stalin, the establishment of universal atheism" ("Education in Red Spain," *Independent,* December 30, 1938, p. 6).

Coverage of the election of Eamonn de Valera to the position of League of Nations President was nearly identical to that of the *Times*, since both were taken from wire reports. However, it did make more present a speech by the President of the League

Council who said, "'we hope that peace will be preserved. We know that if peace is violated it will not be possible for any who violate it to count on the neutrality of even those countries that may appear most remote" ("President of the League of Nations," *Independent*, September 13, 1938, p. 9).

Surprisingly, the *Independent* praised the election of de Valera a "signal honour to this country and to its representatives in Geneva." The editorial pointed out that the honor showed the esteem with which the Irish Free State was held since its formation a mere 15 years previously. "Ireland's influence at Geneva, in committee work and otherwise, has been fully recognised…by their vote yesterday the League members paid both to Ireland and to Mr. de Valera a compliment of which Irishmen will feel justly proud" ("Ireland Honoured," *Independent*, 13 Sept. 1938, p. 8).

But as the Spanish Civil War drew to a close, the *Independent* rejoiced at the imminent victory of fascist forces. "The fall of Barcelona spells out the extirpation of Bolshevism and Godlessness in Spain." ("Real Spain's Triumph," *Independent*, January 27, 1939, p.7). The paper continued its plea for the Irish government to recognize the Franco government. "Why does the Government of Eire hesitate to grant this recognition? It is now absurd to pretend that there is any Government other than the National Government in Spain"

Furthermore, the newspaper called the British Government's call for Franco to exercise restraint in the captured territory hypocritical. "It may be asked did it exercise restraint and refrain from acts of revenge when the Black-and-Tans were let loose in this country" (*Independent*, January 26, 1939, p.6).

The Worker

The *Irish Worker*'s coverage of the Spanish Civil War showed a strong influence from the political institution of Irish socialism, an ideology with its roots in Marxism but with the additional belief that capitalism and the British Empire went hand-in-hand. An independent Ireland, therefore, depended on a united working class. Irish socialism was a branch of the Irish Republican movement, and the *Worker* was largely targeted towards "militant workers, anti-imperialists and opponents of coercion" ("A Few Words," *The Worker* (hereafter *Worker*), July 18, 1936, p. 1). For Ireland to become truly *Irish*, it had to reject capitalism.

The *Worker* was a four-page bulletin that began publication shortly before the war in Spain began. It was intended to take the place of the *Irish Worker's Voice*, which folded because of financial constraints. The *Worker* identified its mission as "expression to the workers viewpoint on current questions, and to campaign for financial support for a regular-sized paper" (*Worker*, July 11, 1936, p.2). In its first issue, it asked for contributions to be sent to pay for publication and distribution. In the Spanish Civil War, it found a topic of discourse that would allow it to establish its own identity as a publication as well as provide an alternative discourse to that in what it described as "the capitalist press." In fact, the discourse package here would be "The Spanish Civil War is a struggle between the working classes and the monarchist Fascists in Spain."

On July 25, 1936, the bulletin ran a full page dedicated to the conflict. Like the *Times* and the *Independent*, the *Worker* claimed its main objective was to throw light on what was happening in Spain, an objective it said the other media were unable to do

because of their obligations to their publishers. The paper also identified the Spanish workers as the brothers and sisters of Irish workers, much as the *Independent* had done with Spanish Catholics.

> The reports printed by the capitalist press are like a dust cloud obscuring the fighters as they strain in combat, but from glimpses of the truth we can picture the rest; and the heart of working class Ireland goes out to our Spanish brothers and sisters and their life-and-death struggle with Fascism ("Spain," *Worker*, July 25, 1936, p. 3).

The report also portrayed the workers as noble, fearless fighters battling for the survival of their republic. "The workers and peasants rallied swiftly to the defence of the Republic and democracy. They poured from the factories and fields to defend their liberties and the Republic…Greetings to our heroic Spanish brothers and sisters in their glorious fight!"

In August, the *Worker* refuted the *Independent*'s view that the civil war was a reflection of what had happened in Ireland's own revolution and civil war. It was not a rebellion as had taken place in 1916. Rather, it was "a rebellion of the slave-owners against the freedom of the workers and peasants" ("Truth About Spain," *Worker,* August 1, 1936, p. 3).

Notably, the *Worker*, without the budget and number of correspondents of the mainstream press, aggregated reports from other publications, measuring the truth of each report. One of its main targets was the *Irish Independent* and its publisher and main shareholder, William Lombard Murphy. The *Worker* also accused the *Independent* of obstructing the path toward Irish independence and saw the publication's views on Spain as an extension of its anti-republican, anti-socialist agenda. "Murphy's 'Irish

Independent,' which got Connolly done to death for leading the Easter insurrection against the British enslavement of this country, says that victory for the Spanish Republic 'would be an unparalleled disaster…" ("Truth About Spain," *Worker*, August 1, 1936, p. 3).

The *Worker* accused the mainstream press of aiding and abetting the fascist cause, and was especially accusatory toward the *Irish Press* and the *Independent*. "We cannot permit the Murphy-deValera papers to misrepresent Ireland by supporting Spanish Carsons, Cronins and O'Duffys. The Irish working class particularly must speak… LONG LIVE THE SPANISH AND IRISH REPUBLICS" ("Truth About Spain," *Worker*, August 1, 1936, p. 5).

The following week, the *Worker* admonished the *Press* and *Independent* for slandering the Spanish republicans. "If poison pens could kill, the Spanish people would have been defeated long ago…The 'Irish Press' and 'Independent' have never acted more foully than they are acting on Spain" ("Poison Pens At Work on Spain," *Worker*, August 8, 1936, p. 4).

By late August, the *Worker*, though sympathetic toward republican Spain, began to articulate a position of pro-non-interventionism while still blatantly supporting the Popular Front government. When it pointed out that nations, including Germany and Italy, had sent munitions and bombers to aid Franco, it called on the Irish to mobilize support for non-intervention. "Foreign intervention is a reality in Spain to-day…The workers of Ireland must add their voice to the growing demand: 'Hands off Spain!" ("Fascist Barbarism," *Worker*, August 22, 1936, p. 4).

With its limited resources and aggregation-based techniques, the *Worker* aimed to expose what it saw as falsities and errors in the mainstream press. In its August "Lies of the Month," the *Worker* found that a photo published in London's *Daily Express* of republican soldiers marching to fight against Franco's fascists was later published in the *Independent*. The *Independent*, however, identified the men in the photograph as that of that of fascist soldiers "as that of Fascists being marched out to be 'massacred by the Reds'" (*Worker*, August 22, 1936, p. 4).

In the same issue, the *Worker* published an editorial urging Irish workers not to get caught up in a war that did not concern them while there were problems of poverty and social justice that needed their attention at home, such as slums, under-nourishment, and unemployment. "Irishmen and women! Take up the fight in your own country for your own rights. Your enemies are at home. Organise in every locality for work, bread and Freedom!" The editorial, "We Fight For Neither King Nor Kaiser—But Ireland," adopted its title from that of a speech given by James Connolly, the prominent Irish socialist who had been executed—and somewhat martyred—after the Easter Rising of 1916 ("We Fight For Neither King Nor Kaiser—But Ireland," *Worker*, August 22, 1936, p.1).

The paper connected the *Independent* with the Irish fascist (Blueshirt) movement, and saw the efforts made by Irish fascists such as O'Duffy to aid Franco as a conspiracy to revive the fascist movement in Ireland. "The whole stunt of the 'Independent' and its Fascist 'Napoleon' O'Duffy, is a cunning plot by the discredited imperialist groups to fetch the Irish Fascists out of obscurity," ("Smash This Conspiracy!" *Worker*, August 29, 1936 p. 1).

To the *Worker*, the *Independent* had a history of working against the interests of Irishmen and women. It had urged the Irish to take part in wars that did not concern the country and hindered the Republican cause. "This same newspaper sent tens of thousands of Irishmen to their death in that last big war fighting for British imperialism. What was its war cry then? "SAVE CATHOLIC BELGIUM". What is its war-cry now? "SAVE CATHOLIC SPAIN" ("We Fight For Neither Lombard Murphys Nor Mohammedan Moors," *Worker,* August 29, 1936).

In fact, the *Worker* blamed the *Independent* for the deaths of republicans and socialists during the struggle for Irish independence, and accused the newspaper of advocating the executions of Connolly and Sean MacDermot. Interestingly, this communist organ expressed disgust at the perceived hypocrisy with which the Catholic-owned newspaper reported. "Yet this bloodstained organ dares to pose now as the champion of Catholicism!…Like the tiger, once it has tasted blood, the 'Independent' cannot get enough victims" ("We Fight For Neither Lombard Murphys Nor Mohammedan Moors!" *Worker,* August 29, 1936, p. 2).

In fact, the *Worker* appears to have reconciled itself with religion, arguing that the very people who claim to be defending it were, in fact, the ones harming it.

"We say they are the greatest enemies of religion, of justice, of truth and decency. Enemies of religion – because they are seeking to use it as a cover for Fascist barbarism, seeking to exploit the difficulties of the Church in Spain for their own political ends," ("Ireland's Duty," *Worker*, September 12, 1936, p. 1).

The *Worker* also expressed its view of British and French neutrality as a "bogus" move that deprived Republican Spain of supplies while Hitler and Mussolini aided the

fascists in open disregard for the non-intervention agreements. Non-intervention, the *Worker* argued, "meant depriving the lawful government of Spain of the right to buy arms and munitions from other countries…the Spanish people are being murdered by world fascism with the permission of the democratic Powers, headed by the British National Government." ("A Crime Against Spain," *Worker*, October 3, 1936, p. 1).

In November, the *Worker* accused Great Britain of "aiding Hitler and Mussolini to turn Spain into a chaos of blood," by refusing to sell supplies to the Republican government and of forgiving Germany and Italy for their flouting of the non-intervention policy ("England Abets," *Worker*, November 28, 1938, p. 1).

With the deployment of the Irish Column to the International Brigade to fight on the side of the Spanish republicans, the *Worker* published letters from the column's leader, Frank Ryan. Ironically, the *Worker* was able to maintain its pro-non-intervention stance while supporting the column. "Frank Ryan's letter must inspire every Irishman and women worthy of the name to redouble their work in the cause of the Irish Section of the International Column. We must annihilate the Fascist plague HERE." ("Frank Ryan," *Worker*, February 6, 1937, p. 1).

While the *Irish Times* praised Fianna Fáil's acceptance of the international ban on volunteers to Spain, the *Worker* cried foul. "To encourage a Fascist rebellion against a constitutionally elected Government by promising the Fascist reels recognition is an outrage. It misrepresents the Irish people as aiders and abettors of Fascist rebellion" ("De Valera Capitulates To Fascism," *Worker*, February 20, 1937, p. 1).

The Irish Press

The *Press*' unique position as the official paper of the leadership directed its coverage to emphasize the Fianna Fáil stance and promote an image of Ireland as a peaceful, diplomatic, independent nation. The *Press* made concerted efforts to distinguish the Irish policy from that of Great Britain. It used a republican platform in addressing non-intervention, uses the partition of Ireland as the ultimate example of what could happen when foreign powers intervene in a nation's domestic affairs. The discourse package here is "The Irish Free State will play a key role in promoting peace in Spain and Europe."

An article on July 14, 1938 made an effort to repudiate a suggestion that the Irish government's policy of non-intervention was dictated by Great Britain. The article, in which Eamonn de Valera defended the official defense position of the Free State in the Dail, related an exchange between de Valera and a member of the assembly. De Valera assured the Dail that the Irish government's intentions was to fulfill its obligations to the League of Nations "Mr. Belton—At the dictation of England.

Mr. de Valera—That is an untruth, a falsehood, a falsehood which is known to be a falsehood to every member of this House as well as by the Irish people."

("The Taoiseach States Defence Position," *Irish Press*(hereafter *Press),* July 14, 1938).

In the same article, de Valera seemed to address the concerns of the *Worker*, which accused the government of using non-intervention as a way of avoiding helping Republican Spain. He defended his government against accusations of indirectly aiding the fascists or republicans by simply advocating and practicing non-intervention. Rather,

de Valera said his government adopted it because it was the best means for achieving peace in Europe. "[The government] believed it was the best from the point of view of the general preservation of peace in Europe… That the Government had supported non-intervention should not be interpreted as approval of the actions of any one side" ("The Taoiseach States Defence Position," *Press*, July 14, 1938).

In early September, the *Press* covered International Day, an event held in County Waterford that welcomed representatives from Britain, France, Italy and Belgium. The article, titled "Ireland's Peace Message," portrayed Ireland as a peace-loving nation leading the movement for peace in Europe.

> It was fitting that the Land of Saints and Scholars, the land of the Gospel of Peace, should reply to the threat of war by holding the first real honest League of Nations of Peace…Rural Ireland sounded the call of peace" ("Ireland's Peace Message," *Press*, September 1, 1938, p. 1).

On September 13, the *Press* led with the news that de Valera had been elected president of the League, and, as such, was pointing "the way to peace." A week later, it led with the news that de Valera deplored "War Psychology." "He said that he deplored the war scare that had been worked up. He explained the psychological danger of bringing war before men's minds and driving peace out of them…" (*Press*, "De Valera Deplores War Psychology," *Press*, September 20, 1938).

As the war in Spain drew to a close, the *Press* published more editorials reflecting on the policy of non-intervention and tying it to the peaceful identity it attempted to establish. "Ireland is one of the countries that enjoys peace and that has no territorial or strategic ambitions. The hand of nature has marked out its island frontiers with a finality that is absolute, and it has no other desire than to live its own free and unfettered life

within its sea-girt shores," ("1939 And Its Task," *Press*, January 2, 1939). This editorial, however, is interesting because it progresses from an endorsement of non-intervention to a plea for the end to the partition of Ireland. Partition, the *Press* argued, was the result of a foreign nation—Great Britain—intervening in Ireland's domestic problems. "No party in Ireland, North or South, demanded it or voted for it. It was imposed by an Act of an alien Parliament for purposes which had nothing to do with the peace or general welfare of this country." This plea reflects Fianna Fáil's and the *Press'* own visions of and hopes for a united Ireland.

Unlike the *Times*, the *Press* did not go back on its support of non-intervention, which is not surprising, since it was the voice of the ruling party. Interference, the *Press* argued, was a bad idea no matter where it came from or for what purpose. The majority of the Irish people, from their "long and bitter experience of foreign intervention in Irish affairs are fully aware of this fact … we believe that the majority recognise that the attitude of our Government throughout the Spanish Civil War has been wise and just" ("Spain's Opportunity," *Press*, February 20, 1939, p. 8).

In March, as recognition of Franco became more likely, the *Press* urged even stricter observance of non-intervention to hasten the end of the war. "The quarrel is a Spanish one and the Spaniards should at least be permitted to arrange the peace terms amongst themselves…Should foreigners try to prolong the struggle or hinder the task of appeasement, it will be to serve their own ends and not the good of the Spanish people," ("The End In Spain," Press, March 8, 1939, p. 8).

Discussion

What were the major competing newspaper discourses in Ireland concerning the Spanish Civil War? The results show four different perceptions of the Spanish Civil War, each influenced by institutionalized ideologies within Ireland: The *Irish Times* displayed a discursive package of supporting the Spanish republicans on constitutional grounds; the *Independent* supported the fascists on religious grounds; the *Worker* adopted a socialist view that pitted the working class against the monarchist factions in Spain; and the press sought to portray Ireland as a peaceful mediator in the conflict.

Yet, these competing discourses have a deeper meaning, which leads to Research Question 2: How did these competing discourses reflect the interests of their intended, competing audiences? In other words, what institutional influences are evident in the competing discourses? Each discourse appears to have been influenced by each publication's alignment to a certain institution, whether political, ecclesiastical, or historical.

The *Irish Times* coverage adopted a discursive package of "The Spanish Civil War is a complex conflict, the outcome of which will threaten democracy in Europe, since neither party is bound to enact constitutional law when the conflict is over." This package emphasized the legality of the Republican government in Spain and argued that countries should be allowed to settle domestic disputes without the intervention of foreign powers, shows the influence of a strain of Irish separatism based on the belief that the Irish people should choose their government, free from outside interference. The *Times'* readership was a conservative, mostly Protestant one, and one that had been

against the separation of the Irish Free State from Great Britain. However, in its coverage of the Spanish Civil War, the newspaper acknowledged that, whether or not it agreed with the Spanish government's policies, a state chosen by the people was still a legitimate one. Possibly, this was an indirect effort at acknowledging the legitimacy of the Irish Free State.

Similarly, the *Irish Independent* was the voice of the conservative Catholic demographic, and its coverage reflected this. Its discourse on the Spanish Civil War can be categorized in the package "Ireland should intervene on behalf of its Catholic brothers in Spain." Over and over again, we see references to the war in Spain as a war between Catholicism and atheism, and the *Independent* advocated throughout the war for Irish intervention on behalf of Franco, who they perceived stood for the Church. The coverage focused on Ireland's identity as a Catholic nation, insisting that Irish should intervene on behalf of their fellow Catholics in Spain. This coverage clearly shows the influence of the institution of Catholic nationalism, another strain of Irish separatism that focused on development of a Catholic identity.

The coverage in the *Worker* shows the influence of Irish socialism, a separatist tradition that argued that capitalism went hand-in-hand with the British Empire. Its aim to dismantle capitalism in Ireland was characterized by its efforts to expose embellishments and errors in the mainstream press. Thus, its discourse package was "The Spanish Civil War has been obscured by the mainstream and Catholic press in order to prevent mobilization of the working classes to support the Spanish Popular Front." Since the *Worker*'s target audience was the working class of Ireland, this influence is not surprising. What is interesting is that it imitated the constitutional argument made by the

Times and advocated non-intervention. However, it did voice support for the Irish section of the International Column that fought on behalf of the Spanish republicans.

The *Irish Press*' coverage showed alignment to Fianna Fáil's mission to create a united Irish identity, independent from Britain but able to hold its own in an international forum. It also used the Irish experience of partition as an example of It adopted the discursive package "The Irish Free State will play a key role in promoting peace in Spain and Europe." The many references to peace make clear its mission to identify the Irish as a peace-loving people in spite of their rebellious past. The conflict in Spain appears to have provided Fianna Fáil leaders with an opportunity to build a new, modern identity, one that did away with the old, violent stereotype and brought forth a new, peaceful image.

An interesting feature of the results is a perceived sense of being in a minority. The *Times* argued that most Irish people were misinformed and believed the Spanish Civil War to be one of religion. Meanwhile, the *Independent* stated that most Irish saw the war as a political or strategic struggle and that only a handful saw it as a religious war. The *Worker* saw itself as a small publication adrift in a sea of capitalist press. Only the *Press* does not appear to have perceived itself as an underdog. However, the *Press* did appear to need to identify the Irish government's policy of non-intervention as one that was formed independently of Great Britain.

Another interesting feature is the importance of truth claims in each of these publications. Each newspaper argues that the Irish are not receiving the "truth" about Spain, and that what's really going on can be found in the accusing paper's pages. The *Worker* even had a section called "Lies of the Week," which pointed out the errors of the

mainstream press. To the *Independent*, the "truth" was that the war was one of religion. To the *Times*, and the *Worker*, it was a strategic conflict in which the powers of communism and fascism continued to play out their international war game. To the *Press*, it was an unfortunate European event and the solution was immediate peace. Going deeper, non-intervention should be the policy of the Irish Free State because Ireland had experienced firsthand the negative effects of foreign powers intervening in domestic affairs.

These different perceptions of the war each reflect how each newspaper addressed to their separated readerships. The *Independent*, which served a conservative Catholic population, adopted a Catholic nationalist view of the Spanish Civil War that perceived the conflict as one of religion. It advocated intervention by Irish Catholics on behalf of the conservative insurgents, who the *Independent* perceived as standing for the "old faith." Thus, it was Ireland's obligation as a fellow Catholic country to help out.

The *Times*, however, whose readership was somewhat more Protestant and pro-British, adopted a view that argued that the republican government in Spain was legal because it had been lawfully elected.

The *Worker*, meanwhile, identified with a more working-class population, and framed the conflict in terms of class. Interestingly, it also worked to refute accounts of the war in the "capitalist" press, pointing out that the conflict was not a religious one but a strategic and political one, and called upon Irish workers to support their Spanish "brothers and sisters."

For the *Press*, which wanted to establish a new, independent identity for Ireland, the conflict was an opportunity to establish the country as a peace-loving one after

centuries of rebellion and conflict. The policy of non-intervention was one that was adopted after centuries of a foreign power interfering in Irish affairs, and to the *Press*, Ireland's stringent adoption of the policy set a precedent for the end of partition.

In spite of its sympathy for the Popular Front government, the *Times* appears to have made an effort to urge its readers to gain fair and accurate information and encouraged readers to observe the reports of the war from both sides. "Readers who wish to form an opinion of the condition of affairs can be recommended, at best, to read the reports that emanate from both sides and to strike a balance between them" ("Spain's Distress," July 23, p.6).

That several of the newspapers appeared to have dialogue among themselves is significant. Specifically, the *Worker*'s accusatory nature toward the *Press* and the *Independent* as well as the *Independent*'s occasional discussion with the *Times*. These dialogues not only spouted the newspaper's own beliefs—they set out to prove other newspapers' beliefs wrong. This highlights the competitive nature of the discourse that took place during the Spanish Civil War. It shows a clash of ideologies among different competing groups, each influenced by different competing institutions. As van Dijk (1985) claimed, ideologies find their expression in discourse. Here we see not only competing discourse, but competing ideologies as well.

The letters to the editor also provide a different type of discourse. In the case of the *Times* and the *Independent*, the letters appeared to have not necessarily been about the war, but about the nature of the papers' coverage. Many letters came from scholars, politicians, and diplomats and offered arguments different from or, in some cases, direct opposition to the newspapers' views. It is possible that this was a way not only of

providing readers with more information and a diversity of opinions, but also a way of creating an image of fairness.

Conclusion

The research here shows how an informal, domestic debate on national identity manifested itself in press discourse on the Spanish Civil War, a conflict that seemingly did not involve Ireland. In fact, the debate on whether Ireland, an emerging nation, should be involved and to what extent appears to be the issue around which the discourse revolved. We see elements of Irish separatist thought in each discourse, yet each discourse is competing for dominance. In an emerging country that housed many divergent political, social and religious groups, each was competing for dominance in the political, social and ecclesiastical arenas, with the aim to become the voice of the new nation.

Sociological institutionalism theory defines institutions as "formal or informal rules, conventions or practices, together with the organizational manifestations these patterns of group behavior sometimes take on" (Parsons, 2007, p. 71). So strong were the press' alignments to competing political and ecclesiastical institutions that by the time of the Spanish Civil War, those relationships had themselves become institutionalized. This is evident in the different discursive packages mentioned in the results. Since discourse analysis dictates that ideologies find their clearest articulations in language, the newspaper discourse here revealed ideologies aligned to those institutions mentioned.

This thesis finds itself in line with much of the previous literature that argues that the island of Ireland has a long history of partisan media aligned to different ecclesiastical and social institutions. The research found that this was true for all four newspapers in their coverage of the Spanish Civil War: the *Irish Times* aligned to constitutionality, the

Irish Independent to Catholic nationalism, the *Worker* to Irish socialism and the *Irish Press* to a more aggressive form of nationalism. Foley's (2004) argument that the partisan media developed as a reaction to the Irish people's collective memory of conflict, crisis and colonialism, and that professional standards are near impossible because that history affects nearly everyone is an interesting one, and in some cases true. The *Independent* and the *Worker*, perhaps the most blatantly subjective of the newspapers, routinely mocked their opposition and made few attempts to be fair or balanced to the other side. The *Times*, however, regularly reminded its readers that atrocities were committed on both sides and that the outcome of the war would not be positive no matter who prevailed. The *Press*, meanwhile, aimed to diminish Ireland's identity as a rebellious and warlike country and promoted the government's policy of non-intervention as a peaceful one.

All of the newspapers studied regularly reported their views in the name of truth and accuracy. Only their perceptions of the truth differed. Furthermore, the fact that the newspapers often published letters that exhibited opinions in direct conflict with the newspaper's own shows some attempt at fairness.

The study found that McNally's (2009) ideas on the *Press* and *Independent* were more or less accurate. The *Independent* did not simply take a "pro-Franco" stance, but took up a more involved argument that stated the Spanish Republic represented a communist and atheist threat to Catholicism. However, his study neglects the final phase of the *Press'* coverage of the war, which depicted the Irish Free State as a peace-loving nation and the policy of non-intervention as a peaceful solution. It may be argued that

the *Press'* discourse helped establish the modern nation of Ireland as an advocate for peace in the international theater.

This thesis also reconciles with Jackson (1998), who argued that the *Worker* was "*primarily* influenced by the domestic political situation," and whose research found that the *Worker* interpreted the Spanish Civil War in terms of class and religion. This is true for the *Worker*, but also true for the other newspapers as well. Jackson also argued that "virtually all the press were vociferously pro-Franco." This study, however, finds otherwise. Of the four newspapers studied, only one was found to be a staunch supporter of Franco's cause. The others were all advocates of the non-intervention policy, and the *Times*, a moderate newspaper, proved to be supportive of the Spanish republic on constitutional grounds.

Of course, these four newspapers do not represent "all" press in Ireland. There is still a good amount of work to be done in this field. This study selected nationally distributed newspapers. It would be beneficial to look at how smaller, regional newspapers covered the Spanish Civil War to see how discourse and public opinion differed across the country. Also neglected by this thesis were Northern Irish newspapers, since Northern Ireland was a separate political entity from the Irish Free State. However, the two regions shared history, language, and religion, and it would be interesting to see how coverage in the Irish Free State compared with coverage in Northern Ireland. Partition was still a new and fresh topic; the fact that the *Press* made it in an editorial that discussed the state of peace in Europe shows that the topic was foremost in the minds of those who wished to see a united Ireland.

This study suffered from several limitations, the most glaring of which is the omission of a large body of the *Irish Press*. The only library that lends the *Irish Press* in the United States was itself limited to issues beginning in the summer of 1938. Libraries in Canada and Ireland that had the missing issues were contacted, but were unable to lend the necessary microfilm.

The *Worker* was also limited because it ceased publication in the summer of 1937 due to financial constraints. This left us without the publication's reactions to a number of critical discourse moments, including the non-intervention crisis of 1938, Eamonn de Valera's election as President of the League of Nations, the end of the war and recognition of the Franco government. However, there was enough material to establish a general discourse.

We have seen here how a debate about national identity manifested itself in coverage of a seemingly unrelated international event. The research conducted here shows how newspaper coverage of the Spanish Civil War was influenced by competing alignments of newspapers themselves: the *Times*, with its secular, Protestant foundation and audience, analyzed the Spanish Civil War as a political, strategic conflict and took a position sympathetic to the British government. The Catholic-owned *Independent*, on the other hand, reflected the Catholic-nationalist point of view and portrayed the war as a crusade against Godless communism. Non-intervention was derided as a "British" policy, and the newspaper accused its supporters of being too "British." Meanwhile, the communist bulletin, the *Worker*, focused coverage largely on what it perceived as the misuse of the war by the mainstream press to mobilize support for its own agendas. The real conflict, it argued, was one of workers against the powerful ruling classes. And the

Press, the organ of a party dedicated to forming a new, independent, peaceful national identity of the Irish Free State, covered the conflict in terms of Ireland's role as an essential peacemaker in the war.

The *Irish Press*' image of the Irish Free State, though the least studied here, was perhaps the most lasting. As the official view of the ruling party, it presented to Ireland and the world an image of a peace-loving, diplomatic, and independent nation.

For centuries, Ireland had fought to achieve independence from a strong colonial power. The memories of revolution and civil war were still recent to many in the Free State. When Eamonn de Valera reprimanded the League of Nations powers for wanting to do away with the non-intervention policy, it was another instance of the small nation's determination to not be pressured by the great powers of Europe. Only now, its defiance was marked in diplomacy and peacemaking efforts, an image that exists in the Republic of Ireland to this very day.

References: Secondary Sources

Barbrook, R. (1992). Broadcasting and National Identity in Ireland. *Media, Culture and Society*, *14*, 203-227.

Bell, J. B. (1987). *The Gun in Politics: An Analysis of Irish Political Conflict, 1916-1986*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Berger, A.A. (1998). *Media Research Techniques*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Brown, T. (2004) *Ireland: A Social and Cultural History, 1922-2002*. London: Harper Perennial.

Dunphy, R. (1995). *The Making of Fianna Fáil Power in Ireland, 1923-1948*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.

Ferguson, N. and E. Brinks et al. (2007). The IRA Apology of 2002 and Forgiveness in Northern Ireland's Troubles: A Cross-National Study of Printed Media. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, *13 (1)*, 93-113.

Gamson, W. A. and A. Modigliani. (July 1998). Media Discourse and Public Opinion on Nuclear Power: A Constructionist Approach. *AJS (95)1,* 1-37.

Hall, P. A. and R.C.R. Taylor. (1996). Political Science and the Three New Institutionalisms." *Political Studies XLIV*, 936-957.

Horgan, J. (2001). *Irish Media: A Critical History Since 1922*. London and New York: Routledge, 2001.

Horgan, John et al., eds. (2007) *Mapping Irish Media: Critical Explorations*. Dublin: University College Dublin Press.

Izadi, F. and H. Saghaye-Biria. (April 2007). A Discourse Analysis of Elite American Newspaper Editorials: The Case of Iran's Nuclear Program. *Journal of Communication Inquiry, 31 (2)* 140-165.

Jackson, P. (1998) "A Rather One-Sided Fight: The *Worker* and the Spanish Civil War." *Saothar*, *23*, 79-87.

Kelly, M. J. and B. O'Connor, eds. (1997). *Media Audiences in Ireland: Power and Cultural Identity*. Dublin: University College Dublin Press.

McNally, M. (February 2009). Fianna Fáil and the Spanish civil war 1936-1939: The rhetoric of hegemony and equilibrium. *Journal of Political Ideologies, 14 (1),* 69-91.

Parsons, C. (2007). *How to Map Arguments in Political Science.* Oxford: Oxford UP.

Pierson, P. (June 2000). "Increasing Returns, Path Dependence, and the Study of Politics." *American Political Science Review, 94(2),* pp. 251-266.

Ruane, J. (2006). "Majority-Minority Conflicts And Their Resolution: Protestant Minorities In France And Ireland." *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics, 12,* 509-532.

Ryan, L. (2002). *Gender, Identity and the Irish Press, 1922-1937: Embodying the Nation.* Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press.

Van Dijk, T. (1985). *Handbook of Discourse Analysis, Volume 4: Discourse Analysis and Society.* London: Academic Press, Inc.

Vincent, R. C. (1997). The "Troubles" as Portrayed in Four Irish Newspapers. *International Communication Gazette 59. 495-519.*

References: Primary Sources

The Irish Times

From the Times: Europe and Spain. (1936, August 9). *The Irish Times*, p. 8.

Revolt in Spain. (1936, July 20). *The Irish Times*, p.6.

Spain's Distress. (1936, July 23). *The Irish Times*, p. 6.

Spain in Turmoil. (1936, July 29). *The Irish Times*, p. 6.

Spain and Europe. (1936, August 3). *The Irish Times*, p. 6.

Unhappy Spain. (1936, August 26). *The Irish Times*, p. 6.

A Bitter Choice. (1936, September 12). *The Irish Times*, p. 8.

Hogan, J. (1936, September 8). Letter. *The Irish Times*, p. 8.

Lennon, G. (1936, August 18). Letter. *The Irish Times*, p. 5.

Power, M. (1936, August 22). Letter. *The Irish Times*, p. 5.

The Spanish Tangle. (1936, August 11). *The Irish Times*, p. 6.

Spain's Agony. (1936, August 19). *The Irish Times*, p. 6.

A Delicate Situation. (1936, Nov. 21). *The Irish Times*, p. 8.

From The Times: Europe and Spain. (1936, August 21). *The Irish Times*, p. 6.

Spain. (1936, August 22). *The Irish Times*, p. 8.

Britain and Spain. (1936, August 20). *The Irish Times*, p. 8.

Alvarez, G. (1936, August 18). Letter. *The Irish Times*, p. 5.

Brown, S.J. (1936, August 21). Letter. *The Irish Times*, p. 8.

J.J.G. (1936, August 22). Letter. *The Irish Times*, p. 5.

Morrow, A. (1936, August 22). Letter. *The Irish Times*, p. 5.

Gaffney, J.A. (1936, August 22). Letter. *The Irish Times*, p. 5.

Griffith, M.C. and R.C. Griffith. (1936, August 24). *The Irish Times*, p. 5.

Letter. (1936, August 26). *The Irish Times*, p. 5.

Connollyite. (1936, August 26). *The Irish Times*, p. 5.

Letter. (1936, September 10). *The Irish Times*, p. 5.

Volunteers. (1937, February 19). *The Irish Times*, p. 6.

Ireland and Spain. (1937, February 22). *The Irish Times*, p. 6.

Spain and the World. (1937, July 5). *The Irish Times*, p. 5.

From The Times: Precedents or Progress. (1937, September 1). *The Irish Times*, p. 6.

Mr. De Valera Hits Out. (1937 October 1). *The Irish Times*, p. 9.

Ringside Seats? (1938, September 3). *The Irish Times*, p. 6.

Warm Debates. (1938, April 7). *The Irish Times*, p. 8.

Closing of Spanish Churches. (1938, November 4). *The Irish Times*, p. 8.

Mr. de Valera as League President. (1938, September 13). *The Irish Times*, p. 7.

Hibernia. (1938, April 7). Letter. *The Irish Times*, p. 5.

Barrow, R.E. (1938, April 11). *The Irish Times*, p. 5.

De Courcy, Mrs. Betts. (1938, April 20). Letter. *The Irish Times*, p. 5.

Suffering Spain. (1939, January 17). *The Irish Times*, p. 6.

Ireland's Duty. (1939, February 17). *The Irish Times*, p. 6.

From The Times: Recognition. (1939, February 15). *The Irish Times*, p. 6.

Nearing the End. (1939, January 20). *The Irish Times*, p. 6.

Spain. (1939, March 6). *The Irish Times*, p. 2.

The Irish Independent

Unhappy Spain. (1936, July 15). *The Irish Independent*, p. 8.

The Struggle In Spain. (1936, July 22). *The Irish Independent*, p. 7.

Red Dawn In Spain. (1936, August 3). *The Irish Independent*, p. 8.

Heroes of Spain. (1936, September 29). *The Irish Independent*, p. 7.

The Truth About Spain. (1936, September 23). *The Irish Independent*, p. 7.

Fight-Shy Reds Are Squealing! (1936, September 29). *The Irish Independent*, p. 7.

Our Policy In Spain. (1936, October 21). *The Irish Independent*, p. 6.

The Government in Spain. (1936, November 28). *The Irish Independent*, p. 10.

Ireland's Debt To Spain. (1936, December 18). *The Irish Independent*, p. 11.

Ireland's Links With Spain-Part I: Centuries-old Ties. (1936, December 22). *The Irish Independent*, p. 12.

Wolfe, M.J. (1936, August 25). Letter. *The Irish Independent*, p. 12.

Letter. (1936, August 27). *The Irish Independent*, p. 6.

Cluad de Ceabhasa. (1936, November 12). *The Irish Independent*, p. 9.

Liam de Roiste. (1936, October 15). *The Irish Independent*, p. 5.

A National Shame. (1937, February 19). *The Irish Independent*, p. 10.

It Shall Not Be Tolerated. (1937, February 9). *The Irish Independent*, p. 8.

The New Criminals. (1937, February 25). *The Irish Independent*, p. 8.

De Val, M. (1937, January 11). The Real Issue In Spain. *The Irish Independent*, p. 11.

The Wisdom of Sending Volunteers To Spain. (1937, January 12). *The Irish Independent*, p. 11.

The Patriot Cause In Spain. (1937, January 5). *The Irish Independent*, p. 11.

Letter. (1937, March 16). *The Irish Independent*, p. 14.

The New Spain. (1938, January 20). *The Irish Independent*, p. 8

Visit To Insurgent Spain. (1938, August 17). *The Irish Independent*, p. 6.

Spain And Foreigners. (1938, August 22). *The Irish Independent*, p. 8.

Ireland And Spain. (1938, October 11). *The Irish Independent*, p. 10.

Education in Red Spain. (1938, December 30). *The Irish Independent*, p. 6.

President of the League of Nations. (1938, September 13). *The Irish Independent*, p. 9.

Real Spain's Triumph. (1939, January 27). *The Irish Independent*, p. 7.

Assailing Spain's Patriot Army. (1939, January 26). *The Irish Independent*, p. 6.

The Worker

A Few Words. (1936, July 18). *The Worker*, p. 1.

Give Support For Workers Newspaper! (1936, July 11). *The Worker*, p. 2.

Spain. (1936, July 25). *The Worker*, p. 3.

Truth About Spain. (1936, August 1). *The Worker*, p. 3.

Poison Pens At Work on Spain. (1936, August 8). *The Worker*, p. 4.

Fascist Barbarism. (1936, August 22). *The Worker*, p. 4.

Lies of the Month. (1936, August 22). *The Worker*, p. 4.

We Fight For Neither King Nor Kaiser—But Ireland! (1936, August 22). *The Worker*, p. 1.

Smash This Conspiracy! (1936, August 29). *The Worker*, p. 1.

We Fight For Neither Lombard Murphys Nor Mohammedan Moors! (1936, August 29), p. 2.

Ireland's Duty. (1936, September 12), p. 1.

A Crime Against Spain. (1936, October 3), p. 1.

England Abets. (1936, November 28), *The Worker*, p. 1.

Frank Ryan. (1937, February 6), *The Worker*, p. 1.

De Valera Capitulates To Fascism. (1937, February 20), *The Worker*, p. 1.

The *Irish Press*

The Taoiseach States Defence Position. (1938, July 14). *The Irish Press*, p. 6.

Ireland's Peace Message. (1938, September 1). *The Irish Press*, p. 1.

De Valera Deplores War Psychology. (1938, September 20), *The Irish Press*, p. 1.

1939 And Its Task. (1939, January 2), *The Irish Press*, p. 8.

Spain's Opportunity. (1939, February 20). *The Irish Press*, p. 8.

The End In Spain. (1939, March 8). *The Irish Press*, p. 8.