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Chapter Four

Irish Political Cartoons and the New Journalism

Elizabeth Tilley

Irish newspaper and periodical production at the end of the nineteenth century coincided with an era of remarkable political change on the island: the disestablishment of the Church of Ireland, agitation for land reform, the emergence of Parnellite politics, and the establishment of the Home Rule movement. Such events, all well covered in the Irish press by the 1870s, set the stage for the nationalist campaign in the 1880s and beyond. It is no accident that the very public debates surrounding these matters in both the “serious” press and in the comic papers should have occurred at just this point in time. A substantial increase in the number of papers published, as well as an increase in those that declared a nationalist political allegiance, coincided with technological advances in the newspaper business.¹ Ireland was frequently in the English news, and as such, a journalistic contest can be found between the English and the increasingly robust Irish responses to events that were identified as crucial to both.² It is only after 1870, though, that a critical mass of illustrated material can be traced in the Irish sphere, and it is the purpose of this chapter to try to understand the ways in which this material contributed to the campaign to popularize the nationalist movement. Popularly priced, profusely illustrated, the new papers bridged the gap between the high seriousness of much nationalist journalism and the searing social commentary found in English papers like *Punch*.

The shape of journalism in Ireland at the end of the century was subject to many of the same political forces and social influences as was the press in England, most crucially the pressures originating from the coverage of sensational crusades like those of W. T. Stead in the
Pall Mall Gazette. The introduction to this volume rehearses the well-known list of attributes now associated with Stead and what quickly came to be called the “New Journalism”; Matthew Arnold’s definition of the phrase and his condemnation of its tendency toward the “feather-brained” was surely instrumental in identifying and noting its increasing influence. A crucial aspect of this influence lay in the dependence of New Journalists on visual iconography as a correlative to text. In response to Arnold, Frederic Whyte’s biography of Stead contained an apt assessment of the popular origin and audience of such journalism:

What is miscalled the “New Journalism” is merely journalism goaded into passionate enthusiasm by the vast amount of unredressed grievances which a great people, patiently, but needlessly and uselessly, endure in silence.

It is certain that Whyte’s choice of the phrase “passionate enthusiasm” indicated an awareness of the overindulgence in textual or graphic metaphor frequently complained of in the New Journalism, and there is certainly much in the press in the 1880s and 1890s that would qualify as “excessive.” In any case, Ireland was uniquely poised to take advantage of the general consumer acceptance of Stead’s style of writing, both in terms of his advocating for the crucial issues that entered the public sphere, and in the fairly recent possibility of an effective legislative response (as opposed to an extralegal response) to those issues, as is evidenced in the press debate surrounding the possibility of Home Rule.

A number of legislative, technological, social, and political changes converged in the last decades of the nineteenth century to make Ireland a receptive location for the New Journalism. The abolition of taxes of various kinds—advertisement duty, stamp duty, paper tax—were all removed by 1870. The result was a cheaper product. Reduced production costs, which coincided with an increased literacy rate, ensured a relatively new audience of voracious readers. Shop
assistants, tenant farmers, clerks, and urban dwellers of all kinds could be relied upon to negotiate the complex dynamic between reader and text in the periodical in general, and the illustrated periodical in particular. After 20 years of experience of Reading Rooms, set up first by the Young Irelanders and then by the Land League, with their celebration of nationalist literature and emphasis on education, these readers were well catered for and well versed in the essential elements of the debates.  

Political events of the preceding years prepared the ground for a public airing of grievances in the press and fed a reading public accustomed to seeing the local point of view expressed forcefully. Editors, writers, and illustrators could not have employed Stead’s “government by journalism” until the late 1870s, when the conjunction of political and material forces made it possible. For instance, Fenian activity both in Ireland and abroad during the 1860s was fully documented in both the American and Irish press, so much so that the British government considered introducing legislation to control it. As Marie-Louise Legg has noted, In the 1860s, the press had been covert in its support of Fenianism; by the 1880s it performed a central and assertive role in the spread of Land League activity.” Law reform and Gladstone’s concessions to Ireland created an audience for political information regarding legislative efforts to achieve Irish self-determination. D. George Boyce pays tribute to the force of the Fenian threat and the press that kept it in the public mind in terms of its effect on British politics:  

Fenianism shocked Britain out of political apathy on Irish affairs; and its suppression enabled Irish politicians, wary of the danger of being too closely associated with violent means, to emerge and combine national fervor (which the Fenians had undoubtedly aroused) with practical politics (which the Fenians hoped to destroy).
Gladstone’s official policy, separating Fenianism from the people through fostering “institutions and conditions that would bind her all the more firmly to the British connection,” inspired the Irish to establish a forum in which national issues might be legitimately aired, free from the threat of coercion. The press became this forum, and, in effect, managed to “encourage a sense of solidarity, of combined power” in what had become a newly energized audience.

While the general influence of Irish newspapers in the 1880s is fairly well understood now, little scholarship has explored Irish illustrated comic papers, which superficially offer very different fare, but historically, representationally, and iconographically intersected with their more serious cousins. By the 1870s and 1880s, the cartoon was a common supplement to serious editorial content on the concerns of the day. As such, the comic paper cannot be separated from its sober-faced competitors. Both cartoons and articles addressed the same audience, worked for the same ends, and, most crucially, used the same tools. Further, cartoons themselves were often shared between titles. It is important, then, that the so-called ephemera of the press be properly recognized. The pictures, cartoons, and advertisements that acted as a corollary to the editorial matter and leaders in many of these papers were part of a web of meaning that extended across formats. This was possible largely because of the compact nature of the Irish publishing industry, and the relative homogeneity of the audience.

There were a number of comic papers produced in Ireland during this time period, but, as is frequently the case whatever their provenance, most were short-lived and often of uneven quality. Zozimus (1870–1872), Ireland’s Eye (1874–1875), Zoz (1876–1878), and Pat (1879–1880; 1881–1883) are perhaps the most frequently studied and are connected, in the sense that the chief artist for most of them was John Fergus O’Hea (c. 1838–1922). Very little is known about O’Hea beyond his record of employment. He worked for A. M. Sullivan on Zozimus for
the entirety of its run. In 1874, he collaborated with Edwin Hamilton to produce *Ireland’s Eye* until it ceased publication around July of 1875; from 1876 to 1878, O’Hea and Hamilton brought out *Zoz*, during which time O’Hea came under fire for an overenthusiastic attention to national politics.\(^{11}\)

In 1879, Hamilton and O’Hea founded *Pat* and the weekly paper ran (with one interruption in 1880) until 1883. Both men had extensive experience in the production of periodicals, and *Pat* certainly lasted longer than most. As there was very little material of note in the paper beyond the cartoons of O’Hea, it follows that those same cartoons must have drawn and sustained a loyal readership. In the absence of circulation figures and correspondence about the paper, the comments below must be speculative. Yet, based on the sheer rhetorical complexity of the images, coupled with its satirical tone, *Pat* undoubtedly occupied a place of importance on the Irish periodical scene at the end of the century. However, if we wish to include comic papers such as *Pat* as New Journalism, an alternative to a controlling editorial voice needs to be found. In *Pat*, that voice was complicated both by the format of the paper and by the circumstances of publication. Unlike *Punch*, *Pat* had no stable of authors to call on, nor did it have a clearly identifiable editor like W. T. Stead. What it did have was a ready-made association with other Irish periodicals of a similar type, through both its political stance and the services of O’Hea as principal artist. Because of the omnipresence of work by O’Hea in other papers, the potential audience for *Pat* included the readers of the *Weekly Freeman* and *United Ireland*. An apparent absence at the center of *Pat* requires the employment of supplementarity (in Derrida’s terms), and that supplementarity is found in the columns of associated papers—both complementary and antagonistic—that together illustrate the interdependence of the Irish publishing scene.\(^{12}\)
Joel Hollander has analyzed the web of meaning present in the cartoons of O’Hea in these papers and others in terms of their contribution to the widely diverging range of public opinion. Hollander has drawn attention to the fact that O’Hea was the principal cartoonist for the *Weekly Freeman*, and his compositions would have been immediately recognizable by readers of both papers. The textual matter accompanying the cartoons in the *Weekly Freeman*, however, often included an instruction to the reader to turn to a particular page within the newspaper where the issue depicted in the cartoon would receive further elaboration and commentary. In other words, the meaning of the visual was incomplete without the textual appendage—rather than the other way round. Cartoons in *Pat*, however, were free-floating in a sea of trivia, unaccompanied by text beyond the legend appended to the bottom margin. The impact of the cartoon depended on both an accurate decoding of visual signs and an understanding of the connectedness of O’Hea’s work for this paper with his cartoons in papers with heavy editorial content like the *Weekly Freeman*. For instance, in January of 1882, *Pat* published a center cut outlining the only individuals—lawyers—likely to benefit substantially from Gladstone’s 1881 Land Act, the act that provided the “3 Fs” of Parnell’s campaign. The same cartoon then appeared seven months later in Parnell’s *United Ireland* for August 1882, with the same textual matter printed below but without direct acknowledgment of its original appearance in another paper.

As in the English *Punch*, *Pat* occasionally employed a spokesman to voice what might be termed an editorial position, though the earliest manifestation of the spokesman was very far from what he would become by the end of the magazine’s run. Rotund, broadly smiling, with a self-satisfied, prosperous look about him, the figure of Pat showed no sign of the simian-like features familiar in English caricatures of the Irish, but neither did he inspire confidence (see fig.
4.1). What intelligence he possessed seemed based on a circus performer’s crude cunning. In place of an editorial, the reader of this first issue was treated to the showman’s patter, delivered in dialect:

PAT—Ladies an’ gentlemin, it’s meself is proud to inform yez that the show is now open, an’ I hope that you’ll all look in ivery week, an’ I promise to show yez the best side of ivery thing that turns up, whether political, historical, astronomical, dramatical, tragical, comical, farcical, cynical, or diabolical, for the ridiculously small charge of threepence. Come early and bring your friends. Walk up, walk up, walk up, the only show in the fair.¹⁴

It is significant, however, that the inventive phonetic spelling disappeared halfway through the introduction. The “showman” mask was quickly dropped, implying that the figure it concealed was its direct opposite. Fellow readers were addressed frankly, and having first developed this semantic bond, Pat quickly began using Standard English and sharing the self-parody with those capable of understanding it as such. By early 1880, the body of Pat had slimmed considerably; his eyes were now wide open and his nose had lost its snub look. The traditional accouterments of the figure remained, though: clay pipe, gaiters, shovel hat; but Pat’s rhetorical stance no longer carried the air of self-parody. His role was less that of a showman at a fair than of a spinner of tales. For example, the cover for the 1879 volume (presumably drawn at the end of the year), which stylistically resembles Tenniel’s designs for Punch (see fig. 4.2), features Pat, whose hand clutches not the blunderbuss of English parody but a steel pen, while his audience, the ubiquitous pig, wears spectacles and sits waiting to record Pat’s memorable stories.¹⁵ In addition to responding to the English press, the process was akin to revealing a new version of reality at home, one that had hitherto been hidden. Visually, this takes the form of Pat often
appearing at the edges of the stage, peeping over walls or half turned away from the audience. The “showman” Pat was quickly replaced by the “storyteller,” but the idea of Irish politics as a carnival persisted. This interpretation of contemporary concerns accorded with what Irish audiences knew to be true; it also contradicted journalistic portrayals of the Irish across the water.

The carnival metaphor was extended, further complicating the issue of voice. The December 27, 1879, issue included an alternative “manifesto” within the paper rather than on the cover; this manifesto continued the verbal wordplay but went beyond the stereotypical to hint at the more serious subject matter to be considered in later issues:

Penetrating patriotic public, plentifully purchase PAT’S periodical. PAT’S peerless pencil produces pictures photographically portraying present political positions, prominent parliamentary politicians, puissant personages, premiers, princes, potentates. Punctilious purchasers pronounce PAT’S portraits positively perfect. PAT praises parties properly provoking panegyric, persistently pummels pestilential persons, possible pardoning prostrate penitence proscribing perjured, palpably perfidious, pseudo-philanthropic parasites. PAT’S pathetic poetry produces philanthropy. PAT’S powerful poignant prose Philippics pulverize poltroons. PAT’S pointed paragraphic projectiles pierce plaguy, pompous, pachydermatous pedants. Pretty pets pursue PAT; PAT permits pursuit petting pretty pursuers. (Peruse PAT’S prefatory poem, primary page). PAT’S proper pride preventing prolixity, PAT’S peroration proceeds:—Princes, peasants, pugilists, philosophers, pantaloons, poets, patriots, puppies, peers, pirates, parsons, pressmen, pickpockets, possibly penniless, probably poor, pocket professional pride,
pilfer, plagiarise, peculate, practice pretence, pawn portable property, provide pelf.

procure PAT’S paper, purchase peace, plenty, perennial pleasure, permanent prosperity.

Again, beyond the alliterative playfulness, the message offered a cascading portrait of gritty reality to the paper’s readers. It remained anonymous, however, and nothing else within the paper elucidated any more clearly a specific, verbal response to any political issue. What the consumer was offered was visual, even when it appeared to be textual.

From its earliest incarnation in December of 1879, Pat privileged illustration over text. Both the front and back covers were illustrated, and the main attraction of the paper was the double page center cut, most frequently designed by O’Hea. The lithographically produced front matter meant that the title of the periodical was drawn rather than set in type, with the result that each week’s cover typeface was different. The creation of a loyal readership depended therefore on consumer recognition of the word “Pat” as the title rather than on a visual recognition of the title’s appearance. The paper was distinctive, despite the variations in its visual presence. O’Hea’s style dominated the whole; he emphasized recognizable figures and produced strongly drawn chromolithographs using thick lines and a far less cluttered canvas than the work produced by his nearest rivals at Punch or Fun in England. O’Hea had attended the Cork School of Design in the 1850s and was later involved in producing trade union banners. It is likely that this experience of large-scale, highly symbolic projects had a profound impact on his conceptualization of space and the placement of character. O’Hea’s use of broad strokes rather than detail made an immediate impact; more than an incidental wash, his use of color subtly invoked mood.

Part of the striking difference between the work of O’Hea and his rivals Tenniel and Sullivan was due to the aesthetic qualities inherent in lithography as opposed to the wood
engravings favored by the English papers. Chromolithography was, by the 1880s, associated with highly successful commercial posters, often by fine artists; in comparison to wood engravings, it was faster (though not necessarily cheaper) to produce. The process was also used for trade union cards and certificates, children’s books, business invoices, material that ultimately set up an association between lithography and “public art.” As Marie-Louise Legg has observed, a working-class home was more likely to have lithographs on the walls than engravings.\(^{16}\) Anthony Griffiths notes that there was a “strong feeling that lithography, being cheap, was the democratic medium \textit{par excellence}.”\(^{17}\) The aesthetic worth of these pictures was debated from at least the 1850s, with Ruskin articulating the prevailing sentiment: “Let no lithographic work come into your house if you can help it.” American-printing firm Currier and Ives knowingly confused the public understanding of the difference between engraving and lithography by advertising their lithographic prints as “colored engravings for the people.”\(^{18}\)

Lithographs are drawings and, as such, are capable of rapidly expressing free and immediate reactions to events and emotions, as opposed to the occasionally overdetermined, fussy wood engravings produced by \textit{Punch}. Democratic, popular, cheap, colorful—the lithograph was exactly right for both the tone and audience of \textit{Pat}. Further, the double-page center cut was often designed to be removed from the body of the periodical, similar to the commonplace selling of cartoons as single sheets in the eighteenth century. \textit{Pat’s} center cut cost a penny (as opposed to 3d for the paper as a whole), with the price indicated on the border of the picture.\(^{19}\) The practice was an opportunity for increased circulation and recognition through “added value” rebranding, something always crucial in the magazine market.

In his examination of \textit{Punch’s} “self-branding,” Patrick Leary draws attention to a comparable repackaging of material from the magazine as evidence of its marketing strategy.
The most popular or topical articles and accompanying cartoons were extracted and republished in order to be enjoyed again:

From an early period, this publishing strategy took what had been the greatest weakness of comic magazines—their ephemerality, borne of their close engagement with the passing topics of the moment—and successfully commodified it in the norm of nostalgia.20

*Pat’s* form of rebranding depended on a similar desire on the part of its audience to see itself and its concerns repeatedly reflected. Though nowhere near as successful as *Punch*, *Pat* used a shared sense of nation, based not on religion but on class and political sympathy, in order to create and address the widest possible number of readers. Ephemeral aspects of each issue—theater reviews, short comic tales, word puzzles, and occasionally reviews of other comic magazines—were placed in the first few pages. Like *Punch*, it produced its greatest impact through delaying, then revealing, the subject of the large cut. Whereas *Punch* covered a wide range of topics, *Pat’s* constant focus for its four years of existence was the struggle for Home Rule and land reform. The magazine had neither the resources nor the interest in commenting on the wide range of subjects that *Punch* addressed. The fact that none of the issues were paginated increased the sense of the paper’s impermanence, beyond the constant of O’Hea’s work.

Color was crucial to the effect of O’Hea’s lithographs. The September 7, 1880, drawing of Gladstone contemplating a rising (or possibly setting) sun over the old Parliament in Dublin is completely empty of living forms other than Gladstone’s own, and College Green is emptied of buildings (see fig. 4.3). The composition of the piece would seem to be highly optimistic (or pessimistic); Gladstone is either waiting for the place to come to life or contemplating its new role as a mausoleum. The text appended to the lithograph does not solve the puzzle: “OF WHAT
IS THE OLD MAN THINKING. / ‘MR. GLADSTONE stood opposite the Old Parliament House RAPT in deep reflection.’ /A Penny for his Thoughts.” The result is an uneasy amalgam of possibilities opened and simultaneously closed off. The colors O’Hea employed in the cartoon are muted. Gladstone stands in what appears to be a desert, tinted appropriately, though in fact the area was (and still is) one of the busiest in Dublin. The dark blue sky resembles the evocative, brooding landscapes produced by Matt Morgan for Tomahawk in the 1870s. The lithograph expresses, therefore, an indeterminate future, principally through its refusal to place Gladstone in the position of arbiter. Further, the impact of the cut depends on the familiarity of Pat’s audience with the debate surrounding Gladstone’s involvement in the issue. Ultimately the meaning of the lithograph is created through both the visual and verbal allusions connecting Pat with United Ireland and a host of other periodicals produced during the same period in a web of meaning that stretches across both form and geography.

The Land War and the rise of Parnell provided numerous opportunities for both the serious press and its comic companions to analyze and satirize debates. The conflict between Parliament and the Home Rule party touched all classes, though Pat’s imagery confirmed that the paper was clearly on the side of the tenant farmer as opposed to the landowner. For example, the cover for the June 12, 1880, issue of Pat depicts the iconic figure rolling up his sleeves in a workmanlike manner to illustrate his allegiance. He also carries the appropriate implements, ready to deal with what he hopes will be a vastly improved harvest after a number of years of bad weather (see fig. 4.4). Again, the text appended to the illustration comments on its ambiguous nature: “Pat up in Arms. / Let us hope that in the prospect of a grand harvest, that the above arms are the only ones that PAT will use for many a long day.” Pat faces the audience and
displays the tools of his trade to us, but the scythe arches over his head and points directly at a soldier in the background, looking distrustfully at the figure in front of him, and writing what is presumed to be a report for the English government on suspicious activity in Ireland. The image suggests that Pat could replace his scythe with arms if necessary; Pat’s knowing face reveals that he understands this as well as the audience does—and that the possibility of alternative action is shared with that audience. The cartoon thus works on a number of levels: As a historical image, it portrays a particular moment in time. As a technical image, the sketched look of the lithograph relays the idea of haste. As an iconographic image, Pat “stands” for a strong, independent Irish audience, as opposed to the shadowy, slight figure of the English soldier in the background. Finally, as a representational image, it refuses national caricature; even its stereotyping is benign rather than degrading.

Parnell’s rising popularity made his face immediately recognizable and provided O’Hea with a fine adjunct to the figure of Pat. The frequent pairing of the two on the page offered readers an extraordinary imaginative vision: if Pat was the “public face” of the Irish, Parnell, dignified and intelligent, was its reality. Together, Pat and Parnell represented a wide spectrum of the Irish population, just as the Land League itself did, because they offered a multitude of positions on the land question—from violent revolution to peaceable parliamentary reform. Both personality and visual representation helped make possible the universality of a seemingly ephemeral paper like Pat. As the introduction to this collection notes, Parnell used the power of the press in Ireland to popularize and strengthen his position. He founded the newspaper United Ireland (1881–1898) and was, at one time or another, the proprietor of Flag of Ireland (United Ireland’s predecessor, 1868–1881), Shamrock (1866–1922), and The Irishman (1858–1900). Legg documents how Parnell tailored his speeches to fit the length and layout of the printed
page, and he made good use of technological innovations (trains, telegraph, faster presses) to help unify the nationalist cause between 1880 and 1890. These choices by Parnell resulted in a close observance of the Irish press by the British, and a highly efficient system of communication amongst nationalists themselves, both in Ireland and abroad. Parnell’s Land League was actively engaged in Stead’s idea of “government by journalism,” in airing debates within the public domain. In the Irish context, this meant that the plethora of daily and weekly newspapers, reviews, supplements and pamphlets of all kinds blanketed the country with interlocking visual and textual material.

Parnell was arrested under the Coercion Act in October of 1881, charged with sedition and potential sabotage of the Land Act through inciting farmers to refuse to pay rent. Parnell’s accusation that Gladstone had finally shown his true colors meant that Gladstone’s image in Ireland quickly altered, from the reasonable promoter of the Land Act, to that of a devious oppressor and supporter of the Coercion Bill. The cartoon appearing in Pat on April 8, 1882, shows Gladstone unmasking himself, casting off the cloak of “benevolence” and clutching the sword of “martial law” (see fig. 4.5). A paper labeled “cloture”—the parliamentary device allowing the shutting down of debate—is tucked into Gladstone’s belt. The face revealed behind the mask shares characteristics that would soon become familiar to Punch readers: Tenniel’s engraving of the “Irish Frankenstein,” which first appeared in Punch a month later, depicting a wild-eyed, grimacing Fenian, ready to attack. If Tenniel’s cartoon did owe something to O’Hea’s work (and it should be noted that there is no hard evidence for this), the irony of the most notorious image of the Irishman in the nineteenth century being based on a depiction of Gladstone is surely wonderful. O’Hea’s cartoon was tinted red, intimating that Gladstone was about to wade through a sea of blood. There is much about the drawing that requires prior
knowledge of its occasion and significance, and as there was no editorial matter accompanying the center cut, readers would have been forced to unravel the visual metaphors for themselves. Again, Pat’s audience would have performed this work effortlessly, surrounded as they were by content from competing and complementary periodicals, illustrated or otherwise.

Pat’s response to the Phoenix Park murders in 1882 made clear the paper’s antagonistic stance to violent action. The center cut for the May 13, 1882, issue was bordered in black and featured a classically draped Erin bowed over the caskets of Cavendish and Burke (see fig. 4.6). This time there was no ambiguity or tension between the text and the lithograph. Erin was “The Chief Mourner” and the multiplicities of meanings available in other illustrations are closed off here; there was only one response to the murder. As such, the drawing is flat, predominantly in black crayon, relieved only by a pale purple wash. There was no editorial offered other than the poem in typescript at the bottom of the page, and the bare facts of the incident given above the verses.

The Victorian periodical press has been called an “inescapable ideological and subliminal environment . . . part of a matrix of meaning that encompasses the total semiotic field.”25 In Irish publishing at the end of the nineteenth century, this matrix included textual and visual elements, humorous and serious content, high and low culture. The connections between the visual and textual matter discussed here were formed from a broadly shared ideology, a desire for change, and a quick adaptation of the tools of modern technology applied to the public sphere. Most importantly, periodical publishers/proprietors/editors depended on an intelligent and insatiable audience willing to enter the semiotic field as participants in making meaning, the evidence for this being the relative longevity of Pat. The journal provided continuity: the same artist, the same
subject matter, the same visual message repeated through the years, and echoed in other nationalist papers, created a network of information that showcased the ability of its readers to see themselves reflected, both as they were and as they hoped to be.
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