***Protestant home rulers and constitutional nationalism in Ireland, c.1900-1914[[1]](#footnote-1)\****

In October 1903, Alfred Webb, a Dublin Quaker, social activist, and prominent home ruler, wrote a letter to John Dillon, deputy leader of the Irish Parliamentary Party. Webb was not in an optimistic frame of mind, telling his friend he doubted the Irish people’s willingness to make the ‘necessary sacrifices’ to attain home rule. He was even more despondent when writing about his fellow Protestants.

My life for fully thirty-five years has been moulded into my hopes for Home Rule … We believed Disestablishment would bring the Protestants to our side. We were mistaken. Where are the Protestant Home Rulers of 1870 and of the Morley … days? … I feel utterly bewildered.[[2]](#footnote-2)

Webb was referring, not to the Protestants who sat with the Irish Parliamentary Party at Westminster, but rather to the conspicuous lack of Protestant grassroots home rule activity, of the sort that had characterised the creation of the Home Government Association in 1870, and the first home rule bill in 1886. Following the virtual dissolution of the Irish Protestant Home Rule Association in 1887, no Protestant pro-self-government associational culture had re-emerged. For the home rule leadership, the lack of a Protestant grassroots had an undesired effect. Irish politics appeared cleanly divided on religious lines, with Catholics as nationalists, and Protestants as unionists. However, within five years of Webb writing, the Protestant MPs in the Irish Party would be augmented by grassroots organisations, which would culminate in widely-reported Protestant home rule demonstrations during the controversy over the enactment of the third home rule bill, 1912-14.

The romantic, often tragic experiences of Protestant advanced nationalists have been subjected to repeated analysis.[[3]](#footnote-3) Protestant home rulers, although more numerous than Protestant advanced nationalists, have received less attention. However, James McConnel (the leading scholar of the parliamentary tradition), Patrick Maume, and Paul Bew have explored the careers of Protestant Irish Party members.[[4]](#footnote-4) One recent development is the publication of biographies of home rulers from a Protestant background: lives of Alfred Webb, Stephen Gwynn, Shane Leslie and Jasper Wolfe have appeared since 2008.[[5]](#footnote-5) The Irish Protestant Home Rule Association (IPHRA), the most significant grassroots movement, has been assessed by James Loughlin and Oliver McCann.[[6]](#footnote-6) (The IPHRA was founded in May-June 1886, with the purpose of undermining unionist claims that Irish Protestants were unanimously opposed to home rule. The organisation, which was chiefly active from 1886 to 1887, held public demonstrations in an attempt to convince Protestants to support home rule). In an important article, J.J. Golden has excavated the Protestant influence on the origins of home rule.[[7]](#footnote-7) This author has recently discussed Protestant home rule organisation in the north, through the Ulster Liberal Association.[[8]](#footnote-8)

What is less understood is the extent to which Protestant home rule activism continued across Ireland into the 1910s, reaching its twentieth-century peak during the third home rule crisis, at which point the Irish Party, desperate to avoid the appearance of religious homogeneity, made recurrent use of these figures in its propaganda and at its rallies. However, all this occurred in the context of a home rule movement which was adopting a more Catholic character. The extent of this process can be seen by reference to the movement’s two principal affiliates. The United Irish League, a grassroots agrarian organisation, which by 1901 claimed about 85,000 members,[[9]](#footnote-9) was under heavy Catholic clerical influence.[[10]](#footnote-10) More explicitly exclusionary was the Ancient Order of Hibernians. The Hibernians were a Catholic fraternal organisation, whose dominant Board of Erin faction was led from 1905 by Joseph Devlin, member for West Belfast and the acknowledged leader of Ulster nationalism. Growth was rapid: 10,000 members in 1905, 60,000 in 1909, and 100,000 members across 1,800 branches by 1915.[[11]](#footnote-11) Although leading Hibernians claimed that the organisation preached tolerance of other faiths, the group’s growing influence allowed critics to portray the entire home rule movement as sectarian.

This article will show how Protestant home rule activism operated, and indeed expanded, in the midst of a wider movement that was becoming more Catholic. It will do so by, *inter alia*, reconstructing the various pro-home rule organisations that Protestants joined during this period. Unlike during the 1880s, there was no single IPHRA to which Protestant home rulers could join, a fact that has probably led historians to neglect this phenomenon. Instead, Protestant home rulers formed an associational culture through organisations such as the Dublin Liberal Association and Irish Imperial Home Rule Association, which, theoretically open to all, were in practice dominated by members of the Protestant churches. It was only with the crisis of 1912-14 that explicitly-denominational bodies, the Irish Protest Committee and the Irish Protestant Home Rule Committee, were created. As this article demonstrates, it was frequently the same activists who advanced from one organisation to another: the headed notepaper might change, but the underlying political culture did not. By looking at these organisations, this article will contribute to a growth area in Irish historiography, namely associational culture.[[12]](#footnote-12) This article will move beyond an exploration of the careers of a small number of prominent figures, and will instead highlight a distinct Protestant home rule associational culture which, although gaining the adherence of only a minority of Protestants, represented a complex and ideologically-contrasting counterpart to mainstream, Catholic nationalist activity.

The home rule movement’s self-image, not merely as a political party, but as the Irish nation in microcosm, facilitated great ideological diversity in its ranks. On the issue of the relationship between Ireland and the Crown and empire, one central division that this article will make use of is between ‘reformist’ and ‘national’ home rulers. Reformist home rulers were typically Protestants, intellectuals, or patricians, who saw the creation of a Dublin parliament as a way of resolving differences between Irish classes and creeds, and allowing for the peaceful development of the country. National home rulers, the vast majority, viewed home rule as insuppressible national demand, and frequently viewed the measure as a means to promote Catholic interests.[[13]](#footnote-13) Analysis of Protestant home rulers during the period 1908-14 suggests that most can be described as reformist home rulers. Protestant home rulers viewed the attainment of a parliament in Dublin largely as a reform which would improve the government of the country, and reduce strife between factions. Above all, the endorsement of home rule did not dilute their loyalty to the Crown, which remained of paramount importance, and could sit uneasily with the more ambivalent views held by many Catholic home rulers. Analysis of Protestant home rulers offers a means to investigate the ideological tensions within the Irish Party under John Redmond. Redmond himself, as we will see, sought to build the widest possible base for the Party, and was concerned to bring Protestants into the organisation. But with the home rule movement embracing a more sectarian identity through the Hibernians, quite how viable was the Redmondite project? To answer this question, we will assess how Protestants, who differed from Catholic home rulers in religion, attitudes to the Crown, and associational culture, found a place within wider constitutional nationalism.

This article, then, has three elements. The first section discusses the most visible representatives of the Protestant home rule tradition, those who sat on the Irish Party benches in Westminster. In the second section, the lens is widened and the underlying Protestant home rule associational culture is assessed. The final section describes the reactions of, and reactions to, Protestant home rulers during the most fraught period in Irish politics since 1798, the home rule crisis.

**I**

In January 1900, John Redmond was elected chairman of the reunited Irish Parliamentary Party. Redmond, a Catholic landowner from County Wexford, had more in common socially with Protestants than Catholics: his mother was from a Church of Ireland and unionist background, his second wife was Protestant, and he had attended Trinity College Dublin. Redmond was a naturally conservative man, and his rhetoric was more pro-Empire than his predecessor as Party leader, the Protestant landowner Charles Stewart Parnell (1846-91). He did not seek eventual independence (as Parnell occasionally flirted with), but his vision was of a self-governing Ireland, within the Empire, reconciled to the Crown.[[14]](#footnote-14) However, in one aspect Redmond did represent a continuation of the late leader’s strategy. He hoped that the attainment of home rule would prompt the rehabilitation of the landed gentry, who would play a leading role in a future Irish parliament.[[15]](#footnote-15) The policy of reconciliation with the Crown, and the ultimate rehabilitation of the gentry, which is known to historians as ‘Redmondism’, was precisely the sort of doctrine that would appeal to reformist home rulers. (However, the enormous Catholic grassroots were notably ambivalent about this policy: in his recent study of the home rule movement in provincial Ireland, Michael Wheatley has shown that traditional, or national home rule views were far more common).[[16]](#footnote-16) Unsurprisingly, Protestants were among the strongest Redmondites. And in turn, Protestants, who aligned closely with his educational and social preferences, were preferred by Redmond over Catholics as candidates for parliamentary seats.[[17]](#footnote-17) A speech in 1911, in which he prospected the composition of the future Irish parliament, provides insight into his thinking:

There will be many business men there … There will be many professional men – men representing science, literature, and art, and there will be representatives of the old landed gentry. You will have there men of all creeds – Catholic, Protestant, Presbyterian, and, if I understand the feeling of Irishmen aright, you will have non-Catholics in that House in a far larger proportion than their numbers would warrant as compared with the Catholics of the country.[[18]](#footnote-18)

For Redmond, bringing Protestants into the Party offered two advantages: first, as a means of demonstrating that the movement represented the whole of Ireland; and second, to show unionist and British opinion that under home rule the country would not be governed by a Catholic clique, and that patricians and professional men would be represented in a future Irish parliament.

The 1885 general election had represented the nadir of Protestants in the Party, with only four returned.[[19]](#footnote-19) Over the next five years the Party embarked on a policy of selecting suitable Protestants, especially for by-election vacancies. Stephen Gwynn, later a well-known Party member, recalled, ‘Parnell’s Party was looking for recruits, and men of good brains would … be more than commonly acceptable if they came from the Protestant camp’.[[20]](#footnote-20) Between 1886 and the Party split in 1890, Protestants were returned for seven out of 24 successful by-elections. By the latter year, there were thirteen Protestants in the Party, amounting to about 15 per cent of total. In the 1892 general election, the two home rule factions returned a total of eight Protestants; in 1895, both factions returned twelve Protestants out of a combined 80 MPs. In 1900, the first election fought as a reunited party, this fell to eight of 76, and in 1906 the figure was eight of 81. In the January 1910 election, seven out of 71 were Protestant, and in December of that year there were nine Protestants returned out of a total of 72. Despite Redmond’s high regard for Protestants, as we will see below, the democratisation of the Party’s selection procedures would prevent him from any large-scale recasting of the Party’s representation. Indeed, during Redmond’s tenure, only five fresh Protestant MPs were recruited to the Party.

Who were the Irish Party Protestants? A total of thirteen sat in parliament at some point during Redmond’s tenure as chairman of the reunited Party.[[21]](#footnote-21) Protestant MPs were generally drawn from the upper-middle and landed class: there were three barristers, three merchants, two company directors, two journalists or writers, one landowner, one physician, and one army officer. Seven members, including Edmund Haviland Burke and Anthony Donelan, came from a landed background. Episcopalians dominated: ten of the thirteen belonged to that church. Jeremiah Jordan (a Methodist) and William Abraham (Congregationist) were the sole Nonconformists; there were no Presbyterians.[[22]](#footnote-22) Three of the thirteen members would convert to Catholicism: Anthony Donelan, Hugh Law, and Charles Tanner. Law converted to Catholicism in 1912, a fact which was not publicised by the Party. Donelan did likewise before his death in 1924.[[23]](#footnote-23) Tanner converted at some unspecified point before his death.[[24]](#footnote-24)

Most MPs showed no desire to convert to Catholicism. Edward Blake was described as a ‘devoted son of the Church of England’.[[25]](#footnote-25) Walter MacMurrough Kavanagh was a member of the Church of Ireland synod. Stephen Gwynn, an agnostic and nominal member of the Church of Ireland, was saddened by his wife Mary Louisa’s conversion to Rome, which resulted in his children likewise converting.[[26]](#footnote-26) Another devout figure was John Gordon Swift MacNeill (1849–1926), a University College Dublin professor of law*.* He was an Anglican, whose father had been an evangelical clergyman.[[27]](#footnote-27) In September 1908 Alfred Elliott, Church of Ireland bishop of Kilmore, Elphin and Ardagh, addressed his diocesan synod on the theme of Protestant home rulers:

It would be impossible, in the midst of such evil influences [home rule politicians], that some of our Church members should not be demoralised, but the actual perversions to Nationalism are very few. We are sure to be reminded that this or that public man amongst them is a Protestant. Sometimes the men are silly enough to proclaim it themselves, but *as far as we know their Protestantism never counted for much, and now it sleeps very soundly in the shadow of their politics and their disloyalty.* … We have reasons to be thankful that defections among our people have been so few. For at least a generation we have been living in the midst of a seditious community. [[28]](#footnote-28)

Elliott was rebuked by MacNeill, who stated that ‘I traverse absolutely your … assumption that National principles are inconsistent with membership of the Irish Protestant Church’. He argued that since disestablishment the Church of Ireland was a purely religious body with no political function, and stated that since 1887 he had represented South Donegal, ‘the most Catholic constituency in the Empire’. Protestant nationalists merely ‘prefer that Ireland should be governed by her own sons rather than by strangers’. Self-government had seen the Church of Ireland flourish: ‘It is because I believe that Home Rule will be as beneficial to Ireland as it has unquestionably proved for the Irish Protestant Church that I am, in your Lordship’s estimation, one among very many of “the actual perversions to Nationalism”’.[[29]](#footnote-29)

Protestant members played a prominent and effective role in the Party. There were no Protestants in what Michael Wheatley identifies as the ‘inner leadership’ at around 1910: John Redmond, John Dillon, Joseph Devlin, and T.P. O’Connor.[[30]](#footnote-30) However, in the years prior to his incapacity following a stroke in 1907, Edward Blake, the former premier of Ontario and leader of the Canadian Liberal opposition, was a member of the inner circle. The Canadian-born Blake, who believed that home rule would ultimately strengthen the empire, formed a close relationship with Dillon, and played an important role in reuniting the Party.[[31]](#footnote-31) Stephen Gwynn, elected in 1906, became a prominent member, and would play a leading role in the Irish Convention, 1917-18.[[32]](#footnote-32) J.G. Swift MacNeill’s knowledge of parliamentary procedure and expertise in constitutional law proved an asset to the Party. Richard McGhee, a confidant of Michael Davitt, played a role in Party efforts to import arms for the Irish Volunteers in August-September 1914.[[33]](#footnote-33) Some members held Party or senior United Irish League office. Captain Anthony Donelan, the suave, Sandhurst-educated member for East Cork, served as chief whip. William Abraham was joint secretary of the Irish Party, a member of the executive of the United Irish League of Great Britain, and was treasurer of the Irish Press Agency. Edmund Haviland-Burke served as a whip.[[34]](#footnote-34) Although Catholic clerical influence on the United Irish League is well known, this did not prevent Protestants from taking a leading role in the organisation. Swift MacNeill, Richard McGhee, Anthony Donelan, Stephen Gwynn, Alfred Webb, Edmund Haviland-Burke, and William Abraham were among those who served on the directory or standing committee of the organisation.[[35]](#footnote-35)

Protestants did not form a faction within the Party. Stephen Gwynn recalled that they were close personally and socially, but did not form a coherent unit.[[36]](#footnote-36) As a group, Protestants proved most useful to the Party as living testimony of Catholic toleration. Indeed, with several good speakers in a party in need of them, Protestants proved popular on British platforms. William Abraham made little impact in the Commons, but he was greatly in demand to address public meetings ‘as a sort of object-lesson in Irish religious tolerance’.[[37]](#footnote-37) Charles Kearns Deane Tanner sat for Mid Cork. Tanner was among the most flamboyant members of the Commons. He gained notoriety for fiery outbursts, leading to numerous disorderly scenes and suspensions from the house. One observer described him as ‘a madman – obstinate, vulgar, eccentric, violent in speech and action’. Despite concern at his eccentricity, he became one of the most popular platform speakers in the Party.[[38]](#footnote-38)

How were Protestant Party members politically aligned? Broadly speaking, Irish Party MPs were divided among those who were willing to express loyalty to the Crown, and those who desisted, in some cases postponing such statements until the attainment of home rule. James McConnel has shown how Redmond’s expressions of loyalty could discomfit some fellow nationalists.[[39]](#footnote-39) In fact, the Party, although officially advocating self-government, included a strong republican tradition.[[40]](#footnote-40) No Party Protestants from 1900 to 1910 came within this ambit.[[41]](#footnote-41) Protestant home rulers generally had a greater tendency to publicly express loyalty to the Crown than their Catholic counterparts, often going much further than Redmond was willing to. Indeed, although the Party leadership looked on their Protestant members as an asset, individual members’ recurrent demonstrations of affection for the Crown could cause occasional embarrassment, if not hostility.

Two of the five MPs who disobeyed Party orders and attended Edward VII’s coronation were Protestant.[[42]](#footnote-42) Jeremiah Jordan decorated his shop with Union flags for the occasion.[[43]](#footnote-43) Another who defied the greener wing was Hugh Law (1872-1943), member for West Donegal. Law caused controversy in the nationalist press when he rose on the occasion of the King’s health being drunk in Derry.[[44]](#footnote-44) Samuel Young understood the difficulties that could arise from public displays of loyalty. He was the sole Irish Party member to attend one of Queen Victoria’s garden parties at Windsor. It is alleged that on hearing of his attendance, an intrigued Victoria asked to meet him. Young sheepishly declined, stating: ‘I have already sufficiently compromised the political situation by my [coming] here. No! It is better for her Majesty and better for me that we should not meet’.[[45]](#footnote-45) Latent unionism led to the defection of only one member. Major John Eustace Jameson, a member of the well-known distilling family, served as member for West Clare from 1895 to 1906. As an MP, his conservatism and unionist sympathies were obvious, and from about 1901 Party whips left him alone. In 1904, to no-one’s surprise, he defected to the Conservatives, and unsuccessfully contested Chathamin 1906.[[46]](#footnote-46)

Four members, J.G. Swift MacNeill, Edmund Haviland-Burke, Samuel Young, and Stephen Gwynn had a family tradition of nationalism or eighteenth-century patriotism. MacNeill was proud of his collateral descent from Jonathan Swift; however, his memoirs also give prominence to his grandfather’s cousin, a 1798 rebel.[[47]](#footnote-47) Haviland-Burke was a great-great-grandnephew of the statesman and philosopher Edmund Burke (1730-1797).[[48]](#footnote-48) Young (who on his death in 1918 was the oldest MP) claimed that his father had held a pike and fought with the rebels in 1798.[[49]](#footnote-49) Gwynn could claim, through his mother’s side, one of the most illustrious names in Irish nationalism. Lucy O’Brien’s father was William Smith O’Brien, leader of the Confederate rebellion.[[50]](#footnote-50) At least seven of Gwynn’s close relations were active in home rule or advanced nationalist politics. However, he absorbed a different tradition from his father’s family: the Gwynns, a Church of Ireland clerical family, were strong unionists. This synthesis of influences may help explain his unusual politics: Gwynn was a moderate voice in the Party, he was involved with the Gaelic League, he opposed the Boer War but fought in the Great War, and later disgusted nationalists by stating that temporary partition might be expedient.[[51]](#footnote-51)

United Irish League (UIL) selection rules, as well as a strong localist feeling in some constituencies, ensured that Redmond did not have the right of selection, and could not pack the Party with his preferred candidates.[[52]](#footnote-52) Previously, Parnell and a small group of senior associates had enjoyed significant influence over candidate selection.[[53]](#footnote-53) However, from 1900, control was vested primarily in the UIL, which held local conventions to decide candidates.[[54]](#footnote-54) These came to be dominated by Catholic clergy, a fact which may have impeded Protestants from seeking nomination. (There is no evidence that any Protestant clergyman ever attended a selection convention, as was their right).[[55]](#footnote-55) F.S.L. Lyons has shown how, between 1900 and 1910, UIL selection conventions were able to put forward more lower-middle-class men, and fewer upper-class figures, which itself reduced the potential for increasing Protestant membership.[[56]](#footnote-56) Redmond could occasionally use his influence to promote a favoured candidate. He intervened to ensure the return in by-elections of Abraham after he had been defeated by William O’Brien, and Donelan after he was unseated by petition.In the January 1910 election, a nationalist split in Mid Tyrone allowed the unionist candidate to prevail. In the second election of that year, the local nationalist factions allowed the Party leader to choose the candidate. Redmond, seeking more Protestant members, chose Richard McGhee to contest the seat. McGhee won the approval of both factions, and prevailed.[[57]](#footnote-57)

Some individuals played the religious card for advancement. In 1910 Gerald Villiers-Stuart, an Episcopalian landlord, wrote to Redmond, seeking his support to run as an independent home ruler in West Waterford. The Villiers-Stuart name was known to nationalists: his grandfather Henry Villiers-Stuart’s defeat of a proponent of Protestant ascendancy in the Waterford election in 1826 was a significant step towards Catholic Emancipation.Gerald Villiers-Stuart based his claim to the seat on religion and lineage:

If my grandfather had become a Catholic, his work for Catholic Emancipation would have been futile. It was because he fought as a Protestant that his championship of the Cause was so helpful to Daniel O’Connell.[[58]](#footnote-58)

Redmond declined the approach, and Villiers-Stuart soon became associated with the rival All-for-Ireland League.[[59]](#footnote-59)

How did the grassroots view the presence of these prominent Protestant members? Undoubtedly, many were unimpressed with their favoured status.[[60]](#footnote-60) The Catholic Association brought together prosperous merchants and professionals, underplayed nationalism and instead sought concessions from the British administration. The association was disliked by the Party, which found their clerical domination threatened attempts to construct an image of Irish nationalists as religiously-tolerant.[[61]](#footnote-61) Redmond, at a speech in Belfast in 1900, reproached the group, stating that the Party’s ‘idea of Ireland was one that did not mean the ascendancy of any class or creed, but the regeneration and the freedom of a nation made up of all her sons’.[[62]](#footnote-62) These comments elicited a response from a senior Catholic Association member, who offered a scarcely-qualified denunciation of Protestant home rulers, and of Redmond’s attempts to recruit them:

I am … of the opinion that until these persons can make a propaganda for National purposes among their non-Co-Religionists that they have no claim to recognition on mainly Catholic platforms & I regard with much suspicion their utility and earnestness – there are no doubt many notable exceptions – but if you see much gain from their promised intercession with your movement … it is perhaps because you are too sanguine of their influence in assisting your cause … if you [finger?] them [Protestants] into their proper position as a hostile & intolerant party … and merely assured them of their proportionate rights, there might be some progress made in their conversion – but so long as your struggle is being [conducted] to their gain & advantage … there will be no secessions worth considering to your side. My reading of history is that since 1782 they have wiped off the slate every claim to patriotism & that they are a purchasable & purchased party ought to be easily understood by you – many of your adherents of this class have merely taken their wares to another market. [[63]](#footnote-63)

Joseph Devlin (1871-1934), who detested factionalism, and shared the leadership’s desire for a non-sectarian movement, had come to prominence in battles against the Belfast Catholic Association and their patron, Bishop Henry Henry, in the years after 1896. However, having seen off one threat, after 1902 he was forced to contend with a resurgent Ancient Order of Hibernians (AOH). Rather than take them on, Devlin, an able and highly ambitious figure, took control of the organisation and transformed it into an Ulster, and then all-Ireland powerbase. Devlin was personally free of sectarian animosity, and understood the importance of winning working-class Protestant support, but in leading an organisation that so closely resembled a Catholic Orange Order, he damaged not just his own reputation, but ultimately that of the Party.[[64]](#footnote-64)

Exclusively Catholic political organisations may have been on the rise, but the nationalist movement and its press were careful to avoid any criticism of Protestant Irish Party MPs. One major exception was D.P Moran, the editor of *The Leader,* who wasfiercely hostile to Protestants in the home rule movement:

There is a gratuitous ‘superiority’ in people labelling themselves as, say, ‘Protestant Home Rulers’, as if it were a condescension for a Protestant to be a Home Ruler or anything else in common with an ordinary mere Irish Catholic. The plain fact that stares everyone in the face is that the non-Catholics of Ireland are apart from the Irish nation – no odd exceptions make any appreciable difference to the main fact.[[65]](#footnote-65)

However, these sorts of remarks were discouraged by the Party leadership. Indeed, Protestant MPs would proclaim the tolerance of their colleagues and electors. John Pinkerton stated in a press interview in 1888 that his religion made him a small minority in the Party, but he felt at home in the organisation, as his fellow MPs were ‘men of very broad views’.[[66]](#footnote-66) William Abraham, Jeremiah Jordan, Walter MacMurrough Kavanagh, J.G. Swift MacNeill, and Samuel Young all claimed that their election for predominantly Catholic constituencies was testament to the electors’ tolerance.[[67]](#footnote-67) In private, however, Protestant members had concerns. Stephen Gwynn wrote to Dillon, stating that while ‘the Mollies [AOH] are excellent people with Devlin at their head … their existence has always disquieted me a little about the future and you may take it as disquieting more than [a few] … good people’.[[68]](#footnote-68)

Grassroots ambivalence about non-Catholics in the movement did not prevent the Party leadership from reaching out to another religious minority. In 1908 the Judaeo-Irish Home Rule Association was founded in Dublin. Redmond and Dillon sent messages of support, and Stephen Gwynn addressed an early gathering, telling members that if Irish Jews converted to nationalism, the Party ‘should have gained an invaluable ally to the cause of home rule’. This meeting, held in the Mansion House, was marred by fighting between Jewish home rulers and co-religionists opposed to the creation of the organisation.[[69]](#footnote-69) The Party’s warm welcome may have been informed by the Limerick ‘pogrom’ of 1904. The unionist and Protestant press widely reported the economic boycott and intimidation that occurred at the instigation of a Redemptorist priest, viewing it as presaging the sort of treatment they would receive under home rule.[[70]](#footnote-70) Nationalist Jews, then, as with nationalist Protestants, served a useful propaganda purpose. Although it is likely that few Irish Party supporters shared Redmond’s vision of a Protestant and landed-dominated movement, most could understand the benefits derived from the appearance of religious diversity. However, the position of Protestant MPs in the Party can tell us only so much. Although scholars such as James McConnel and Paul Bew have done fine work in tracing the careers of these figures, in order to understand the full extent of Protestant home rule activism one must look beyond the Parliamentary Party and investigate the grassroots. Who were the ordinary Protestant home rulers? And how did they organise?

**II**

It was the Liberal victory in the 1906 general election, rather than the reconciliation of the Irish Party six years before, that prompted the first steps towards the re-emergence of Protestant home rule activism. The reunion of the Irish Party in 1900 had been prompted by the creation of the UIL.[[71]](#footnote-71) However, strong Catholic-clerical influence on the UIL seemed to suggest that a Protestant organisation should be created. Furthermore, with constitutional questions being more frequently expressed in religious terms, Protestant home rulers would need their own society. Additionally, the new administration in Dublin Castle would disperse patronage to its supporters: re-establishing a Liberal organisation was an obvious means for self-advancement.[[72]](#footnote-72) The often-overlapping organisations which would be founded in this period would demonstrate the vitality of pro-home rule sentiment outside the formal structures of the Irish Parliamentary Party and its affiliates.

In the aftermath of the Liberal landslide, the Ulster Liberal Association was founded. Over the next four years this organisation would develop into an effective Protestant home rule association in the north. This revival was not confined to Ulster. In October 1906, the first meeting of the Dublin Liberal Association (DLA) was held, at which T.W. Russell, the Ulster agrarian leader, was elected president.[[73]](#footnote-73) Although little came of this first effort, in 1908 the organisation was again revived.[[74]](#footnote-74) The DLA had the support of two prominent figures: Russell and Lord Castletown. T.W. Russell, an intelligent and energetic man, had, until recently, presented a major threat to Ulster Unionism. Nine ‘Russellite’ candidates had contested northern constituencies in 1906, although only two were returned. This setback resulted in Russell ceasing agrarian agitation, and taking office in Dublin under the Liberal administration.[[75]](#footnote-75) In 1907 he was appointed vice-president of the Department of Agricultural and Technical Instruction for Ireland, a post he retained until 1918. Originally a Liberal unionist, by the early 1900s he revised his position; he used his role as president of the DLA to declare for home rule and encourage his co-religionists to follow suit.[[76]](#footnote-76) Another figure whose politics had undergone revision was Bernard Edward Barnaby Fitzpatrick, 2nd Baron Castletown (1848–1937). A former Conservative MP and later Liberal unionist, by the late 1890s he came to support the Gaelic revival, and advocate home rule. He chaired the organisation.[[77]](#footnote-77)

A total of 122 DLA members have been identified.[[78]](#footnote-78) Almost 56 per cent of members, for whom data on denomination is available, belonged to one of the Protestant churches. A striking number – about 38 per cent – were Nonconformists. Methodists made up the single largest Protestant denomination, with about 18 per cent of members. As the group’s name suggests, this was a strongly urban organisation, with about 75 per cent of members residing in the city or county of Dublin in 1901 or 1911. Ten of the Protestant members were born in Ulster. Although it is possible that this is due to residual Gladstonian liberalism, it is also likely that for these Ulstermen, residing in Dublin, the thought of Ulster exclusion carried a special horror. In May 1908, the DLA denied rumours that it was about to change its name to the Irish Protestant Home Rule Association.[[79]](#footnote-79) Any change of name to the IPHRA would have involved jettisoning over 40 per cent of members, who were Catholics or Jews. Almost 28 percent of members were Catholic. This figure may seem high, considering the Irish Party’s Young Ireland Branch was created with a well-to-do Catholic membership in mind. In fact, thirteen of the nineteen Catholic members were barristers. Members of the bar joined the DLA so as to gain positions from the Liberal administration; the Irish Party officially forbade its activists from seeking Crown office. There were also a number of Jewish members. At least eleven Jews were active in the DLA, several of whom were also members of the Judaeo-Irish Home Rule Association. It is notable that a group of Jewish home rulers chose to join the Protestant-dominated DLA, rather than the largely-Catholic UIL – pro-home rule Jews may have felt more comfortable in a largely upper middle-class body, which was dominated by members of other minority religions.

Higher professionals dominated the DLA, with barristers, journalists, and JPs well represented. However, businessmen were the largest group, amounting to about 37 per cent of members. This may be explained by the desire for Dublin Protestant businessmen to identify as moderate nationalists and escape censure which could adversely affect their business.

The DLA principally promoted its policies by means of public meetings, which appear to have been generally well-attended. At one gathering it was claimed that ‘hundreds’ were turned away.[[80]](#footnote-80) From its inception the DLA was less circumspect about its support for home rule than its equivalent organisation in Ulster, which only publicly expressed nationalist views from 1910. In a speech in 1909 Russell claimed he ‘never had any real difficulty with the abstract question of self-government’, but that he had previously feared the legislation an Irish assembly might pass on the land issue. He stated:

The land question has been settled in principle … and those who were afraid that the landlords might be robbed by an Irish assembly – and I was one of these – may sleep quite comfortably in their beds. Whoever has been robbed, it is not the Irish landlords. The speaker then referred to the smooth running of his own department [Agricultural and Technical Instruction], and the success of the local governing bodies throughout the country, and added – With all these considerations in view, and bearing in mind the fact that the great trunk questions of the Church, land, and education are all settled, and that Ireland … will soon be wholly a nation of agricultural freeholders, the most conservative form of existence in the world, I have been forced to ask myself what the raging fight really is all about. [[81]](#footnote-81)

Russell denied that religious intolerance existed outside of Ulster: ‘all over the South and West Protestant shopkeepers were very often the biggest business men in the towns, and he knew that Protestant farmers were put into positions of trust and responsibility by Catholics in connection with [the Department of Agricultural and Technical Instruction]’.[[82]](#footnote-82) He referred to the success of the department as forcing him to re-evaluate his attitude to home rule.[[83]](#footnote-83)

In 1908, the re-emergence of federal home rule ideas prompted the formation of another Protestant-dominated organisation, the Irish Imperial Home Rule Association (IIHRA).[[84]](#footnote-84) Federalist ideas had always proved attractive to Protestant (or reformist) home rulers. Under most schemes for federal home rule, Ireland would be granted a subordinate legislature, with control over customs remaining with the Imperial parliament in Westminster. Self-government might be offered within a ‘home rule all round’ framework, in which devolved parliaments would be granted each nation in the British Isles. This could be precursor to a grand scheme of Imperial federation, which would embrace the dominions. For Protestant home rulers, the advantages of such a scheme were plain: Irish national aspirations would be met, but the future development of the country would be within the United Kingdom. Isaac Butt had been a strong advocate of federalism in the 1870s.[[85]](#footnote-85) In the late 1880s Swift MacNeill had been instrumental in securing a large financial donation from Cecil Rhodes to Irish Party funds, on the basis that the next home rule bill would retain Irish representation at Westminster, and thus advance the cause of imperial federation.[[86]](#footnote-86)

The leading members of the IIHRA were George Bryers (an Episcopalian publisher), Adam Seaton Findlater, jnr. (a Presbyterian and prominent businessman), and George Ryce (a Catholic scientist). The organisation was founded at a time when some British intellectuals, including Conservatives, were coming to endorse proposals involving federal and imperial home rule.[[87]](#footnote-87) Indeed, the ultra-Tory *Morning Post* warmlygreeted the creation of the IIHRA. The liberal *Daily News* believed that the *Post’s* intervention “represents a shift towards home rule by the Tories, so long as it is labelled ‘Imperial Home Rule’”.[[88]](#footnote-88) The association believed that in imperial home rule they had found a formula that would be as acceptable to moderate Irish unionists as it was to some Tories. George Ryce stated that in the organisation ‘both “Imperialist” and “Home Ruler” may combine’.[[89]](#footnote-89) However, despite some earnest propaganda efforts, the group received little positive attention from Irish unionists.[[90]](#footnote-90) Nor was there much in the association’s programme to impress nationalists. The practicality of federal home rule would be tested in 1910, when Irish Party leadership supported a Liberal government proposal to introduce such a measure. However, the initiative failed when it was rejected by the grassroots.[[91]](#footnote-91)

To the amusement of their critics, the IIHRA declined to publish membership lists in the press, although they claimed the support of 200 ‘noblemen, professional men, and merchants’.[[92]](#footnote-92) The association was probably very small: only 21 members have been traced.[[93]](#footnote-93) Of the sixteen members whose religion has been determined, eleven were Protestant.

The association gained some prominence between 1908 and 1909, when the press reported on merger discussions between it and the Irish Reform Association.[[94]](#footnote-94) The Irish Reform Association had been founded by Lord Dunraven in 1904, as an organisation of landowners who recognised the hopelessness of the southern unionist case and sought to build a consensus in favour of devolution. In late-September 1908, representatives of both bodies held a conference chaired by Lord MacDonnell, a Catholic and former under-secretary for Ireland, with the aim of creating an ‘Irish Centre party’.[[95]](#footnote-95) MacDonnell’s advocacy of a devolved administration in Ireland had sparked the ‘devolution crisis’ in 1904-05, and more recently, his renewed attempt to introduce such a scheme had led to his resignation as under-secretary in July 1908.[[96]](#footnote-96) MacDonnell intended that the new party would propose a devolution scheme, which he would introduce in the Lords. The proposal seems to have floundered on the IIHRA’s insistence that the new party should advocate a full measure of home rule; MacDonnell and the Reformers were only willing to support a more limited measure.[[97]](#footnote-97) There was an air of unreality to all this: an Irish Council Bill, which would have introduced devolution, had been proposed by the Liberal government in 1907; although the Party leadership were sympathetic, it was decisively rejected by a UIL convention.[[98]](#footnote-98) It was clear that the gap between reformist and national home rulers was growing. Indeed, the IIHRA itself became inactive around 1910.

During the January 1910 general election, the DLA supported Irish Parliamentary Party candidates in Dublin constituencies.[[99]](#footnote-99) Russell maintained that the organisation could deliver ‘six or seven hundred’ liberal votes in the city.[[100]](#footnote-100) These votes could be decisive, particularly in south Dublin constituencies, which were finely balanced between nationalists and unionists. At one point the DLA contemplated running Russell as a Liberal in South County Dublin, but eventually decided to support the Irish Party candidate. This led Russell to make a highly-unusual reference to denominational differences among southern Protestant home rulers. He told a DLA rally:

South Dublin … cannot be won from the Tories by the Nationalist vote alone. It can be won by this association. It can be won by the Liberals, Presbyterian and Methodist, who are sick of being tied to the English brewery cart. … I believe there are some hundreds of Protestant Liberals in South Dublin who will not poll for the precious representative of Irish landlordism [Bryan Cooper], which the Tory Party has had the temerity to bring into the field.[[101]](#footnote-101)

DLA support was not enough to win the seat, which was taken by a unionist, with a much-reduced majority.

Throughout the home rule crisis, the religious question predominated in Irish politics to an extent not seen since Catholic Emancipation. During this period the DLA acted as an effective IPHRA, with its members frequently speaking on Protestant home rulers’ behalf. Jonathan Pim, the vice-president of the DLA, denied claims of unionist consensus among Protestants:

The large majority of members of this association belong to one or other of the Protestant churches. We mention this only for the purpose of showing that opposition to home rule is not, so far as Protestants are concerned, even approximately unanimous. We believe … that the number of Protestants willing to accept [home rule] is very much greater than at all suspected.[[102]](#footnote-102)

A later meeting dealt with the ‘minority’ issue in Ireland. The DLA position was that the current politically situation was ‘abnormal’, as it was stratified between home rulers and unionists. Dublin Liberals looked forward to a time when the existing political system would degenerate and be replaced with a bipolar conservative/liberal system with former home rulers and former unionists sitting side-by-side: ‘Members of the minority of today will be members of the majority of tomorrow, and will share in all the advantages that may flow from the privilege of being in the majority’.[[103]](#footnote-103) But this state of affairs would require the attainment of self-government, something which was imperilled by the Protestant unionist resistance. For this reason, during the home rule crisis, Protestant home rulers would see themselves forced from the margins of political life, and find a new role, as object lessons in Catholic tolerance.

**III**

On 11 April 1912, Prime Minister Asquith introduced the third home rule bill. It provided for a bicameral parliament in Dublin, comprised of a 164-member house of commons and a 40-member senate. Religious freedom was guaranteed, and certain powers, such as those concerning war and peace, and the military, were reserved. The lord-lieutenancy would be retained, and 42 Irish MPs would continue to sit in Westminster. The passage of the bill was opposed by two groups that claimed to speak for Irish Protestants: a well-organised popular resistance in Ulster, and the wealthy and influential representatives of southern unionists. Unionists argued that home rule threatened their liberties, and the connection with Great Britain. Redmond and the Party adopted a four-part strategy to counter this challenge: first, the denial of Catholic intolerance of Protestants; second, return of Protestants to public office; third, the exhibition of Protestant home rulers on public platforms, where they could rebut unionist accusations; and fourth, the granting of amendments to the home rule bill.

Redmond’s public comments sought to counter accusations of Catholic bigotry.[[104]](#footnote-104) He denied religious persecution existed in Ireland, and claimed clerical influence in self-governing Ireland would be limited:

Religious bigotry had always been foreign to the nature of Irishmen (cheers). He would never have been a Home Ruler for one moment, unless Home Rule, to his mind meant a free Ireland; free for all creeds; free, in all secular and religious matters, from a spiritual domination either from Rome or any place else.

He asked Protestants to trust in the self-interests of Catholics, who understood that evidence of religious bigotry would compromise self-government.

They might rest secure … in the common sense of the mass of the Irish people themselves, who would know – and they were no fools – that injustice done on any ground to any man in Ireland would mean the immediate ruin of their new constitution.[[105]](#footnote-105)

Redmond’s record as former leader of the Parnellite anti-clerical faction of the Parliamentary Party should have given him some credibility to speak on such matters. However, the growing influence of the AOH undermined this, as did the repercussions of the *Ne Temere* decree. *Ne Temere* which was issued by Pius X in 1907, invalidated religiously-mixed marriages unless conducted by a Catholic priest, and led to a requirement that the children of such unions would be raised Catholic. The McCann case (1910), in which, owing to *Ne Temere,* a Catholic husband took his Presbyterian wife’s children away from her, became a cause célèbre for unionists, and seemed to augur their treatment under home rule.[[106]](#footnote-106)

Redmond’s colleagues, similarly, sought to counter claims of Catholic intolerance. Jeremiah MacVeagh (1870-1922), a Belfast Catholic and member for South Down, published volumes of testimony by Irish Protestants, in which they denied that they suffered ill-treatment.[[107]](#footnote-107) Stephen Gwynn addressed the gentry, a number of whom, under the influence of Lord Dunraven, had been wavering in their commitment to unionism. Adopting a Redmondite stance, Gwynn suggested that the landed interest could, if they engaged with the coming order, regain their old influence, and win the respect of their former tenants, who would put them into the new Irish parliament.[[108]](#footnote-108) Others were less conciliatory. T.P. O’Connor characterised unionist accusations of intolerance as ‘a gigantic, shameless and impudent calumny’.[[109]](#footnote-109) One important section of the population was neglected. Neither Redmond nor his lieutenants made overtures to the Protestants of the north-east.[[110]](#footnote-110) Only Devlin showed any understanding of their potential, making a direct appeal for Protestant working men’s votes before the 1906 election, stating that he was ‘as devotedly attached to the cause of labour as … to the cause of Irish nationality’.[[111]](#footnote-111) However, Devlin’s involvement with the Hibernians would prove anathema to northern Protestants. In choosing to lead the AOH rather than seek to cultivate the Protestant working class, Devlin was aiding the cause of the Union.

Redmond’s overtures to Protestants were informed by a split in the home rule movement. William O’Brien (1852-1928), the member for Cork City, and the founder of the UIL, believed that following the success of the 1903 Land Purchase Act, the Party should embark on a policy of conciliation with the gentry, and seek to absorb them within the movement. O’Brien had enormous faith in what he termed the ‘conference plus business’ model: a round-table conference between nationalists and landowners which would approve a devolved system of government, which, he felt, would inevitably lead to home rule.[[112]](#footnote-112) In this endeavour he formed an alliance with Lord Dunraven, who had chaired the land conference that led to the 1903 Act.[[113]](#footnote-113)

On 9 February 1909, a UIL convention met in Dublin to consider the new land bill. Dubbed the ‘baton convention’, the event has become notorious for Devlin’s alleged use of AOH stewards to attack O’Brien’s supporters. The affair further damaged the Hibernians’ reputation, and won Devlin a reputation as a Tammany Hall figure from West Belfast. That year, O’Brien founded his own party, which would develop into the All-for-Ireland League. Arguing that the Irish Party, due to its Hibernian links, was now entirely sectarian, he sought to attract the landed gentry and Protestants. For O’Brien, the presence of a Protestant group on the Party benches meant nothing: they were a ‘little group of tame Protestant home rulers maintained for obvious reasons at Westminster as nominees of a Hibernian party to whose inner rites their religion forbade their admission’.[[114]](#footnote-114) Conference plus business remained his central policy: the new party sought settlement of the Irish question by all-party conference, which would lead to devolution, as a precursor to full home rule. Besides Dunraven, O’Brien won over a small number of landlords such as Lord Castletown, Lord Rossmore, Lord Monteagle, Sir John Keane and Gerald Villiers-Stuart. Only one Protestant, Moreton Frewen (1853-1924), an English-born Episcopalian landowner with an estate in Innishannon, County Cork, entered parliament as a member of the League. Frewen served as member for North-East Cork from December 1910 until July 1911, when he gave up his seat, and went on, in an eccentric move, to sign the Ulster Covenant the following year. However, well-connected both in Westminster and America, he continued to advocate behind-the-scenes for a federal settlement.[[115]](#footnote-115) Although the League was successful in gaining some Protestant support in Cork (the heartland of O’Brien’s movement), it was unable to bring about a wider-scale realignment.[[116]](#footnote-116) O’Brien’s memoir reveals frustration at the failure of prominent southern unionists to join his movement.[[117]](#footnote-117) The presence of T.M. Healy, the maverick nationalist, in the party was one complication. Healy’s clericalism, underlined by his alliance with Cardinal Logue, inhibited the creation of a truly secular, pro-Protestant body.[[118]](#footnote-118) Although the League was electorally unsuccessful, its leader’s rhetoric embarrassed the Party, and forced its officers into protestations of non-sectarianism.[[119]](#footnote-119) More damagingly, it would mean that during the 1912-14 period the only figure who could rival Redmond in his desire to win over the gentry was outside the Party.

Edward Carson, the unionist leader, maintained that he did not fear the enactment of discriminatory legislation under home rule; he feared that seemingly-benign legislation would be interpreted to favour Catholics, who would monopolise the distribution of public offices.[[120]](#footnote-120) Nationalists had traditionally sought to counter this sort of assertion by appointing Protestants to prominent positions, particularly parliamentary seats. Redmond suggested that more Protestants should be encouraged to enter local government as nationalists, although lack of willing candidates and indifference by local UIL branches impeded the success of this policy.[[121]](#footnote-121) Indeed, there is little evidence that nationalists were willing to appoint Protestants to the grander municipal offices. Since 1883, when nationalists took overwhelming control of Dublin Corporation,only two Protestant home rulers had been elected to the lord mayoralty.

Latterly, UIL activists realised the propaganda benefit of having a Protestant hold prominent office in the city. In January 1912, the North City Ward branch of the UIL unanimously resolved that Dublin Corporation should elect ‘a Protestant Home Ruler for the position either of Lord Mayor or High Sheriff for the ensuing year’.[[122]](#footnote-122) James McWalter, an independent nationalist member of the Corporation, had a year previously offered some insight into the motivation of those who promoted Protestant candidates:

I … confess to being influenced by another motive besides the justice of the case. Home Rule is not yet won, and some day or other unkindly critics on the other side will subject our Corporation to scrutiny, to see how our toleration works in actual practice. Unless, then, we are able to show that we have had at least one Protestant Mayor or Sheriff in ten years we shall not show to advantage.[[123]](#footnote-123)

The following year McWalter proposed Andrew Beattie (d. 1923) as high sheriff, telling councillors ‘that by electing Mr Beattie the Council would be doing something good for Ireland’s cause’.[[124]](#footnote-124) Beattie was a Presbyterian company director and member of the corporation, who had been a member of the DLA, and the Irish Imperial Home Rule Association, and had attended meetings of the Ulster Liberal Association. This was not enough to convince nationalist councillors, who alleged he was a unionist. Although Beattie admitted having previously contested three Ulster seats as an independent unionist, he claimed that as a liberal by conviction, he was now converted to home rule.[[125]](#footnote-125) A stormy debate ended with Beattie withdrawing his candidature; the high shrievalty was instead taken by a Catholic.

These events must be understood in the context of a mania for the advertising of Protestant home rulers that took hold of the UIL during the home rule crisis. Protestants had always been popular on platforms;[[126]](#footnote-126) one of the main functions of the IPHRA in the 1880s had been to supply suitable speakers. This tendency reached its peak from 1912-14. A survey of the nationalist press shows that, excluding former or serving MPs, at least twenty UIL demonstrations were addressed by Protestant home rulers during this period, where these generally-obscure figures, who had little previous political involvement, made strikingly-similar statements testifying to the toleration of their Catholic neighbours and spoke of the disastrous consequences of partition.[[127]](#footnote-127) Accounts of these meetings suggest that in most cases these men were not UIL members, but were rather Gladstonian liberal relics, or more recent converts to home rule. Likewise, during this period Protestant home rule MPs, among them Samuel Young, Swift MacNeill, and Stephen Gwynn, fulfilled their traditional function by strenuously denying claims of Catholic intolerance.[[128]](#footnote-128) In early 1913, the Derry City by-election demonstrated the extent to which the ‘Protestant’ tag could be used for propaganda purposes. The Party declined to run an official candidate, and instead fielded an Ulster Liberal activist, David Cleghorn Hogg, who ran as a ‘Protestant home ruler’, in the hope of attracting liberal voters, and to demonstrate the prevalence of non-unionist Protestants in the province. Hogg prevailed by 57 votes, prompting nationalist elation.

The Party leadership was also willing to amend the home rule bill to include further safeguards for religious or political liberty. Redmond stated, ‘I have publicly declared my willingness to give practically any safeguard asked for by the Protestants of the country’.[[129]](#footnote-129) This policy became evident when the Proportional Representation Society of Ireland made an unsuccessful effort to persuade Redmond to advocate a proportional system in elections to be held under home rule. The society, which was under the presidency of Horace Plunkett, had a substantial Protestant home ruler membership. It argued that proportional representation would lead to fairer representation of minorities and would reduce unionist objections to home rule. Members suspected, with some justification, that Redmond was unwilling to unilaterally concede a provision which might be sought by unionists as part of an agreement to accept a Dublin parliament.[[130]](#footnote-130) Even more instructive was Redmond’s attitude to Trinity College. In October 1912, the board of Trinity voted for a resolution exempting the college from the jurisdiction of the Irish parliament. This won the reluctant agreement of the Irish Party.[[131]](#footnote-131) However, the measure was defeated following a campaign by students and some fellows and professors.[[132]](#footnote-132) It is unlikely that Redmond’s stance won a single convert to home rule. However, the controversy is not without importance. Redmond’s willingness to allow the country’s oldest university to be remain under the jurisdiction of Westminster, rather than be placed under a Dublin parliament, prefigures his later desperate attempts to win unionist support for home rule.

Redmond’s campaign to win Protestant support was aided by the re-emergence of Protestant home rule activity. Until 1912, no attempt had been made to reconstitute the IPHRA since a stalled initiative in 1893.[[133]](#footnote-133) In the interim, the DLA, the Ulster Liberal Association, and to a lesser extent the Irish Imperial Home Rule Association, acted as surrogates, drawing together substantial numbers of pro-self-government Protestants. Protestant nationalists, wary of accusations of sectarianism, elitism, or exclusivity, were reticent about forming explicitly denominational organisations, until the signing of the Covenant in 1912, and concomitant threat of partition and civil war, prompted a reconsideration. Propaganda factors were centre-stage: one prominent activist stated, ‘We are greatly in want of practical suggestions. Yet one would think that *Protestant* Home Rulers would be a useful card to play just now!’[[134]](#footnote-134) The home rule crisis period spawned two closely connected bodies, the Irish Protestant Home Rule Committee (IPHRC) and the Irish Protest Committee (IPC), which sought to fulfil the old IPHRA’s function, by reminding the British and Irish electorate of the extent of Protestant support for home rule.

One significant feature differentiated Protestant home rule activism in this era from the 1880s. The Dublin branch of the IPHRA, under the influence of figures such as T.W Rolleston and C.H. Oldham, had adopted a pseudo-aristocratic, republican ethos. Nothing of this sort happened in the 1910s. It is easy to imagine certain Protestant republicans of this era, such as Darrell Figgis, Seán Lester, or even Bulmer Hobson, joining the IPHRA of the 1880s, supporting Parnell after the split, and advocating home rule in the hope that it would lead to something else. However, by 1912, the younger set had been seduced by advanced nationalism and its more assertive demand. The failure to attract radical-minded activists shaped the IPHRC and IPC: rather than seek to craft a vision of Irish self-government that might entice wavering unionists, they instead adhered closely to the Irish Party script: partition would be unthinkable; and Protestants had nothing to fear from home rule.

The creation of the IPHRC and IPC was partially informed by the decision of the representative bodies of the Church of Ireland and the Presbyterian Church to pass resolutions condemning home rule. In early-February 1912, a special Presbyterian anti-home rule convention was held in Belfast. 12,000 to 15,000 attended the convention, which was composed of ten separate meetings, each of which passed a resolution stating that, in light of Ne Temere, any minority safeguards included in the home rule bill would be meaningless.[[135]](#footnote-135) However, 200 ministers declined to attend the convention.[[136]](#footnote-136) On 16 April the Church of Ireland held a special meeting of the general synod to discuss the bill. John Baptist Crozier, the primate, denounced the measure, which, he claimed, would see the ‘majority … tyrannising over the minority’. He defended the actions of the Ulster Volunteers, arguing that they were organising for ‘Faith and Fatherland’. The archbishop was scathing about Protestant home rulers:

There is, no doubt, a small – a very small – faction of Home Rulers amongst us – I venture to declare not anything approaching to one per thousand of our members, who, like a stage army, are exploited on all occasions.[[137]](#footnote-137)

Just five members out of 402 dissented, among them the Rev. James Owen Hannay (the rector of Westport and popular novelist), and Walter MacMorrough Kavanagh, the former Irish Party member for Carlow.[[138]](#footnote-138) Hannay was unmoved by the unionist consensus, and spoke of belonging to a minority ‘not insignificant in the matter of numbers … intelligence and capacity’.[[139]](#footnote-139)

In early-November 1912 the IPHRC was founded with an office on the Strand, London.[[140]](#footnote-140) The organisation’s London base highlights the importance Protestant home rulers had begun to attach to propagandising British opinion. The chairman was Major-General George J.H. Evatt, the surgeon-general. Pierce ‘The’ O’Mahony, a former Irish Party member, served as vice chairman, and Stephen Gwynn was involved in organising the venture.[[141]](#footnote-141) On 6 December 1912, the IPHRC held a large demonstration in London, which protested ‘against the attempts being made by certain sections of Irish Protestantism to provoke religious rancour and intolerance in Ulster’. Reports in the nationalist press claimed 1,200 people filled the hall, and 2,000 were unable to gain admission, who were addressed in an overflow meeting.[[142]](#footnote-142) Speakers included Stephen Gwynn, George Bernard Shaw, Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, and Captain Jack White. As was by now commonplace for any assembly of Protestant home rulers, the meeting heard several speeches which denied that the existence of religious bigotry in Ireland. Jasper Wolfe, a Methodist solicitor from County Cork, was invited to relate his personal experience as a southern Nonconformist. Wolfe stated:

I can bear testimony to the tolerant treatment meted out to Protestants by their Catholic neighbours. I have personally experienced it, as a private citizen, and in my profession as a solicitor, as well as on local government bodies…When I am told that I am to be persecuted I do not believe it. (Cheers).[[143]](#footnote-143)

The speeches, in which imperial unity was prominent, demonstrated the reformist home rule perspective of the members. The meeting resolved that:

the restoration of self-government to Ireland will revive the prosperity, promote the unity, and secure the loyalty of Irishmen in Ireland and throughout the world, results which have attended the granting of self-government in every community of the British Empire.

Indeed, the conciliation of Ireland within the Empire informed Arthur Conan Doyle’s support for home rule. The Sherlock Holmes author stated that he looked forward to the day when “HMS ‘Connaught’ or ‘Munster’ voluntarily subscribed and Irish-manned, swing into her place in the battle line of the Empire. That’s the fruit that has always sprung from the Home Rule seed”.[[144]](#footnote-144) The reluctance of one well-known Protestant nationalist to address the meeting suggests that doubts lurked behind the denials of Catholic intolerance. W.B. Yeats declined to attend the rally, writing Gwynn, ‘There is intolerance in Ireland … it is the shadow of belief everywhere and no priesthood of any church has lacked it’.[[145]](#footnote-145) The poet had been advertised to speak at the meeting; his absence was explained away as owing to a ‘railway accident in the West of Ireland’.[[146]](#footnote-146) Organisers and the nationalist press judged the event a triumph. The London unionist press, the *Morning Post,* the *Daily Mail,* and the *Times,* gave the rally paltry coverage. The liberal *Daily News* was most encouraged. Responding to the eclectic platform at the rally, it stated: ‘The idea that Protestants in Ireland are unanimously opposed to Home Rule has been … dissipated. The truth is that most of what is best in Protestant Ireland is in enthusiastic sympathy with Home Rule… The Unionist cause in Ireland is intellectually and spiritually bankrupt’.[[147]](#footnote-147)

The IPHRC had an Irish counterpart, the Irish Protest Committee. Like the IPHRC, it was a moderately-active organisation, whose activities culminated in a large demonstration. It was ‘a Committee of Irish Protestants formed to protest against the introduction of religious differences into party politics’.[[148]](#footnote-148) The president of the committee was Sir Nugent Everard, 1st baronet (1849-1929), a reforming landlord who had been in the Irish Reform Association.[[149]](#footnote-149) The IPC had a varied membership, which included Douglas Hyde, Sir Thomas Myles, George Fitzhardinge Berkeley, Rev. James Brown Armour, Lord Dunraven, and T.W. Russell. It had about 600 members.[[150]](#footnote-150) A partial list of those who attended the January 1913 meeting has been preserved.[[151]](#footnote-151) This list, which records 176 names, provides a substantial sample of the IPC.

Analysis of these names demonstrates the existence of a distinct Protestant home rule associational culture. There was some level of collaboration between the IPC and the IPHRC: sixteen members belonged to both. Eleven had formerly belonged to the Irish Reform Association. Thirteen had been in the DLA, and five had been members of the Irish Imperial Home Rule Association. The conversion of the Ulster Liberal Association to home rule is evidenced by the large number of its members who enrolled in the IPC: 31 in total.The removal of Ulster Liberals from the sample gives an approximate indication of the denominational and socio-economic profile of Protestant home rulers in the southern three provinces. Episcopalians dominated the IPC, amounting to almost 62 per cent of members. There were seventeen Presbyterians, amounting to 14 per cent. This is a reversal of the religious breakdown of the Ulster Liberal Association, where Presbyterians amounted to 62 per cent of Protestant members, and Episcopalians slightly over 10 per cent. The second largest denomination in the IPC was the Methodists, which had 20 members. There were also seven Quakers and two Unitarians.[[152]](#footnote-152) Members were drawn primarily from the upper-middle commercial and professional classes, with a strong landed element. There were 27 businessmen (including merchants and company directors) as well as four mill owners and three manufacturers. Fear of commercial boycott from nationalists may have contributed to their decision to declare for home rule. There were eighteen clergymen, twelve barristers, eleven farmers, five physicians, five army officers, five engineers, four solicitors, and three academics. At least 34 were JPs. There were four peers of the realm: Lord Dunraven, Edmund FitzEdmund Roche, 2nd Baron Fermoy, Rowland Allanson-Winn, 5th Baron Headley, and Derrick Westenra, 5th Baron Rossmore.

The IPC’s main demonstration, which was held in Dublin on 24 January 1913 was well-attended, though without the chaotic scenes that accompanied the IPHRC’s London meeting. Douglas Hyde and W.B. Yeats, who could hardly have fallen victim to a second train derailment, made speeches that denied the existence of religious intolerance in Ireland. Yeats, in fact, made no reference to the concerns he had recently confided to Gwynn. The IPC rally received favourable coverage in the nationalist press. One or two nationalist editors broke ranks. The *Southern Star* claimed that Protestant home rulers:

Recognised the hopelessness of the Unionist position, and having already got all they could from their own side, came to the conclusion they would also, at an opportune time, make peace with and get anything going from the other side.[[153]](#footnote-153)

In demonstrating the existence of a minority tradition within Irish Protestantism that opposed Carson’s policy, the IPHRC and IPC provided a much-needed propaganda boost for the home rule movement. However, if the organisers expected that their actions would derail the drift towards partition, they were disappointed: no significant political initiative came as a result of their campaign. Indeed, much of this activism is as suggestive of fragility as it is of confident opposition. Protestant home rulers 1912-14 showed less organisation than the IPHRA, and there were no serious attempts to found non-metropolitan branches. The IPC leadership was unable or unwilling to sustain the organisation: the group appears to have fallen into abeyance shortly after the Dublin meeting. Nor did anything come of the IPHRC’s plans to consolidate their London rally with a series of meetings in provincial Britain. This speaks, as much as anything else, to the speedily-reducing sphere of southern Protestant politics, which owed much to demographic decline and the advance of Catholic democracy. By 1906, the Irish Unionist Alliance (the southern unionist organisation) had essentially abandoned constituency branches and sub-branches in favour of county committees, large, set-piece Irish rallies, and, above all, an energetic campaign in Britain.[[154]](#footnote-154) Protestant home rulers had more in common with their unionist co-religionists than they realised.

Grassroots Protestant home rule activism was not confined to Dublin and London. On 24 October 1913, north County Antrim was the scene of the famous Ballymoney Protestant home rule meeting. The event was organised by three Protestant nationalists: Sir Roger Casement, a former British diplomat, turned Irish separatist, Captain Jack White, a Boer war veteran and devotee of numerous progressive causes, and Alice Stopford Green, the historian and prominent home ruler. Ballymoney was essentially an Ulster Liberal Association demonstration repackaged as ‘Protestant home rule’, prompted by unionist claims of Protestant consensus around the union.[[155]](#footnote-155)

What these disparate Protestant home rule elements required was strong leadership, and there was great frustration that Sir Horace Plunkett did not come forward to provide it. Plunkett (1854-1932), had founded of the Irish Agricultural Organisation Society, which had introduced the cooperative agricultural movement into Ireland, and had been unionist member for South County Dublin until 1900. After 1900, he revised his unionist views, and by 1911 he privately admitted to being pro-home rule.[[156]](#footnote-156) Despite reservations, he supported the home rule bill in 1912, but did not make his views public, for fear of damaging the cooperative movement. Plunkett’s hesitancy exasperated Roger Casement, who believed his intervention would persuade many Protestants to revise their views: ‘if Horace Plunkett would come out of his co-operation creamery and give us something other than skim milk to drink – I am sick of the co-operative movement’.[[157]](#footnote-157) It was only in 1914 that the spectre of partition induced Plunkett to propose a compromise with Ulster unionists: he suggested implementing home rule for the whole island, but allowing Ulster the right to secede after a stated period.[[158]](#footnote-158) However, nothing came of this proposal, which was rebuffed by Carson.

Protestant home rule activism had a peculiar coda. The gun-running at Howth and Kilcoole, the nationalist response to Ulster unionist gun-running at Larne, was almost entirely organised and carried out by a network of Protestant home rulers and advanced nationalists. The key instigator was Casement, who arrived in London in early May 1914, seeking support for a counter gun-running. There, he found a ready constituency of liberals horrified by the inability of the British government to face down the Ulster Unionists, and willing to help arm the Irish Volunteers. A London-based committee was formed, with Alice Stopford Green as chairman and treasurer. The majority of subscribers to the fund were Anglican.[[159]](#footnote-159) Among the Protestant home rule activists to take part in the conspiracy were George Fitzhardinge Berkeley, a former member of the Irish Reform Association and the IPHRC, Hervey de Montmorency, who had acted as treasurer of the IPHRC, James Creed Meredith, who had been a member of the IPC, and Sir Thomas Myles, a prominent surgeon, who had been a member of the IPHRA in the 1880s. The gun-running operation was led by Erskine Childers (1870-1922), an English-born Anglican, with Wicklow landed connections, and former House of Commons clerk. Childers captained his yacht *Asgard,* and Conor O’Brien (a cousin of Stephen Gwynn’s) his yacht *Kelpie,* on the expedition. On 26 July the *Asgard* was landed at Howth, north Dublin, and its cargo distributed to waiting Volunteers. Ireland was one step closer to rebellion.

The gun-running was by no means a prelude to wider Protestant home rule conversion to an advanced nationalist position. In fact, by the middle of 1914 Protestant home rule activism was under threat of extinction, undermined by forces beyond its control. Conor Mulvagh has shown how by November 1913 Redmond had conceded in principle to the temporary exclusion of Ulster, having been persuaded by the prime minister of the strength of Ulster resistance.[[160]](#footnote-160) In March 1914, Redmond was forced to acquiesce to temporary exclusion for a period of six years, which was enough time for the Tories to win a majority in which case the arrangement could be made permanent.[[161]](#footnote-161) Desperate to introduce some measure of home rule, Redmond had in effect agreed to permanent partition, the very spectre he and his followers had railed against for years. Although sometimes seen as a casting off of northern nationalists, and as preparing the way for advanced nationalists to launch a rebellion two years later, it also did much to destroy Protestant home rule activism, by depriving it of its *raison d'être,* the avoidance of partition. Indeed, in 1914 the DLA was wound up. The IPHRC continued in diminished form until at least 1916, at which point it was involved in raising funds for Irish soldiers in the British army.[[162]](#footnote-162) The 1916 Rising, the executions that followed, and the 1918 general election, which saw Sinn Féin win a landslide outside of the north-east, led to the destruction of the home rule movement. Constitutionalists, of either religion, would take one more opportunity to regroup. The Irish Dominion League (1919-21), led by Horace Plunkett, which advocated an all-Ireland parliament and membership of the Empire, included a substantial number of Protestant home rulers and other parliamentary nationalists. However, the War of Independence era, with the enormous home rule grassroots defected to Sinn Féin, and much of the country clamouring for a republic, was a deeply unpromising period in which to launch a constitutional movement. Above all, the 1920 Government of Ireland Act, which partitioned the island, and created a home rule administration in Belfast, destroyed any hopes for a strong constitutionalist movement. In November 1921, the Dominion League was dissolved, and with it died the Protestant home rule vision of an all-Ireland parliamentary settlement, and the dissolution of inter-religious political differences.

A recent study has found that Redmondism was a ‘minority taste’ among activists.[[163]](#footnote-163) Indeed, it may only have been Redmond’s immense personal prestige, coupled with a pragmatic sense that a pro-Empire policy would accomplish home rule, that ensured some sort of acquiescence with his policy. What did this mean for Protestant home rulers? Protestants had been a fixture of the home rule movement since the first meeting in Bilton’s Hotel, Dublin, in May 1870. The first three leaders of the movement were Protestant, and Protestants had an enthusiastic supporter in John Redmond. However, it is hard to escape the conclusion that by 1910, the future, if home rule had a future, belonged to the AOH and the UIL wings of the movement, rather than the Protestants, the imperialists, and the conciliators. Redmond may have held out the promise of the restored Irish parliament on College Green, with the gentry and aristocracy dignifying the upper house, and commercial magnates and men of letters populating the lower, but there was little reason to believe that this would ever really come to pass, or, indeed, that the public would ever approve of it. The Protestant home rule perspective gained the support of the party leader, but could never appeal to the enormous home rule grass roots; this, to a great extent, explains the failure of the project.
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