

solidarity’ can be historicised in isolation from white racial citizenship or the necropolitical differentiations this enjoyment entailed in settler societies.

Like the parameters of ‘the global’, Irish whiteness in the Pacific remains a subject of ambivalence in the volume. Nuancing a critique of ‘whiteness’ as an analytic category, Patrick Mannion’s study of the Friends of Irish Freedom in the Panama Zone broaches the question of racial fantasy in the (white) American Irish nationalist imaginary. Working through the unavoidability of race in this archive, Mannion highlights that ‘White Americans, whether Irish or not, were deeply invested in maintaining their privileged status’ (p. 187) in political locations circumscribed by racial hierarchy and exclusionary difference. Such tensions constitute a site of ongoing negotiation in future research on this period. This collection marks a turning point in the historiography of the Irish revolution that will challenge the field in years to come.

doi:10.1017/ihs.2023.21

JIMMY WINTERMUTE

‘MISERABLE CONFLICT AND CONFUSION’: THE IRISH QUESTION AND THE BRITISH NATIONAL PRESS, 1916–22. By Erin Kate Scheopner. Pp 275. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press. 2022. £95.

One of the features of the commemorative chorus of publications aimed at a wider readership in recent years was the re-publication of articles and editions of contemporary newspapers. The *Revolution papers* project reissued copies of national dailies alongside contextual articles by historians while individual newspapers included editions from the 1910s and 1920s alongside historical supplements. Such initiatives offered readers an opportunity to glimpse how people at the time read about the events and followed the news. Erin Scheopner’s new monograph, however, offers us more than a glimpse: it provides a detailed analysis of how British newspapers followed the political events of 1916 to 1922, while also posing questions about the role of newspapers and their readers more widely.

Scheopner’s work, based on her doctoral thesis, is a carefully researched book. The introduction is very useful and contextualises the development of the British press from the abolition of the ‘taxes on knowledge’ (1853–61), Hampton’s model of ‘educational’ and ‘representative’ ideals for understanding the role of newspapers, and the development of the new journalism. One of the exponents of the latter was, of course, Irish Party M.P., T. P. O’Connor, and he features in the newspaper analysis which follows alongside some familiar Irish political and literary figures like George Bernard Shaw and Stephen Gwynn.

The book is organised in a traditionally chronological fashion — focusing on phases in the Anglo-Irish question, beginning with the rise of republicanism after 1916 and concluding with the signing and passing of the Anglo-Irish Treaty. A key feature of the book is Scheopner’s categorisation of the newspapers according to what she calls the ‘dominant themes identified’ in her research. While she concedes this is ‘not rigid’, she assembles publications under the headings: partisan (whether Labour like the *Daily Herald*, or conservative like the *Morning Post*); settlement (including the *Manchester Guardian* and *The Times*); pragmatic (*Mirror*, *Telegraph* and *Observer*); and pro-government (*Daily Express* and *Daily Mail*).

From the outset, certain themes are visible. There is a concern to place Ireland and the Anglo-Irish question in wider context. British concern for American public opinion is made clear (the book opens with a quote from *The Times*’s Washington correspondent reporting on the Treaty), but so too is the wider imperial context. Winston Churchill is quoted concerning the ‘odious reputation’ which was ‘poisoning our own relations with the United States’ (p. 169) by 1921 while Lloyd George worried about the influence of the Irish diaspora across the empire.

While Scheopner’s case for the significance of the press is convincing, the study is necessarily, therefore, a chiefly high-politics one. The account of reports on the conscription crisis, for example, says little about the major civil action Ireland. This work fits, however, within

the trend of media history to argue that newspapers played an important role beyond merely reporting events, while readers themselves played an ‘active’ role in ‘consuming newspaper content’ (p. 9). As she argues, there was a ‘blurring of the line’ between the press as ‘facilitator of public discussion and the press as political mouthpiece’ (pp 251–2).

This comes across most strongly in the closing chapters which are the strongest in the book. Here, Scheopner argues that the press was influential in pushing the British government towards offering dominion status to de Valera in the summer of 1921 which they had been opposed to doing months earlier. Another pleasing feature is Scheopner’s analysis of political cartoons as well as editorials and columns, which enriches the overall consideration of the newspapers through the tumults of the time.

Indeed, the role of newspapers in the months leading into the Treaty negotiations are well brought out with controversies noted such as the *Daily Chronicle*’s reporting of a supposed conversation between the king and Lloyd George, engulfing press baron Lord Northcliffe in the eye of a political storm (p. 194), and *The Times*’s leaking of the settlement proposal given to the Irish plenipotentiaries on 3 December (p. 224). The imperial dimension is also used to good effect to contextualise press reporting on the diplomatic exchanges — as is the various newspapers’ stances on the position of Northern Ireland. The role of Jan Smuts in the talks before the Treaty negotiations is properly acknowledged, while by the end of the period surveyed, both the *Morning Post* and *The Times* concluded that Craig’s government would fare better dealing with its southern counterparts than the British government. Yet, for the *Daily Telegraph*, we read that the Treaty ‘will strengthen America in the belief in the essential sanity of the British political temperament and stimulate the tendency towards concord between the English-speaking nations’ (p. 230). Even the *Manchester Guardian* felt it would be regarded as a ‘symptom of the moral recovery of mankind’.

Such remarks would not, of course, bear the weight of the events which followed. Scheopner’s book, however, succeeds in illuminating the arguments and priorities of the various papers as they viewed the Irish question in British, imperial and wider contexts. A well-researched study, it will interest historians of Ireland and Britain more widely, as well as those engaged in the study of media history.

doi:10.1017/ihs.2023.22

MARTIN O’DONOGHUE
Department of History, University of Sheffield
 martin.odonoghue@sheffield.ac.uk

SHADOW OF A TAXMAN: WHO FUNDED THE IRISH REVOLUTION? By R. J. C. Adams. Pp 336. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2022. £65.00.

Shadow of a taxman explores a hitherto under-researched question: who funded the Irish War of Independence, 1919–21? This meticulously researched monograph offers novel insights into the subject, and in a wider sense Adams has uncovered a rich and fascinating story of contemporary politics, propaganda, peer-pressure and power.

Adams explains that the illegal and underground Dáil cabinet sought to fund the revolution through the sale of war bonds to subscribers at home and abroad. These were known as bond certificates that were liable to be repaid in the scenario that British forces had left Ireland and an independent Irish republic had become internationally recognised. Moreover, the War of Independence was internationally crowdfunded. The funds were primarily acquired from subscribers in Ireland and America, and the total sum raised exceeded expectations: £371,849 was raised in Ireland via the national loan scheme and almost \$6m was raised via the external loan schemes in America.

Most primary source records of the individual subscribers to the national or external loans have been destroyed or are otherwise currently inaccessible to researchers. However, Adams’s audit of the archival records has uncovered previously unresearched sources pertaining to both, including three registers of subscribers to the National Loan — pertaining to 1,605 subscribers from South Monaghan, 2,927 subscribers from Longford and 1,210