

James Connolly

# Compositors and the Linotype

(30 September 1899)

The Workers' Republic, 30 September 1899.

We have ere now pointed out in the columns of the **Workers' Republic** that the ordinary capitalist press can find time and space in its pages to chronicle anything and everything, except those matters which are of the most importance to the wealth producers. In considering this phenomenon we are often at a loss to determine whether such neglect of matters affecting the social welfare of the vast majority of the race is malice aforethought, is the product of a desire to please the capitalist paymaster to whom the journalist has sold his pen – and his conscience, or is only the offspring of a real, though disgraceful, ignorance upon all such matters. We might be inclined to attribute this boycott of the graver issues of life to the latter cause, ignorance, rather than to the former, deliberate malice, were we not deterred from taking this charitable view by remembering the fact that the journalists in question can always be depended upon to gravely undertake to act as instructors-general to the working class, during every crisis in our history, be the crisis political or industrial. As the assumption of the functions of instructor precludes the possibility of taking shelter behind the plea of

ignorance we feel constrained to regard capitalist journalism as an effective weapon in the hands of a well-informed, but utterly unscrupulous, enemy, rather than merely as an unbiassed, but ill-informed, recorder of passing events.

Those reflections are suggested to us by a consideration of the absence from the columns of our Irish newspapers of all reference to the present state of the printing trade, and especially to that branch of it represented by the caseroom, viz., the compositors. This once flourishing and all-powerful trade is now practically ruined. In Dublin alone, we are informed, there are something like 140 members on the books as unemployed [\[1\]](#), and a like state of affairs is also reported, not only from every other centre of the trade in Ireland, but from Great Britain and America. In fact, in the last named countries the outlook for compositors is even blacker than at home, as the introduction of linotype machines has set in longer, and is therefore at the present time much more general than in Ireland. But a perusal of the advertising columns of our daily papers will show that scarcely a week passes without some fresh printing office adopting the machine and discharging its hand compositors, so that we may fairly expect that in a very short time, as far at least as newspaper work is concerned, hand-setting of type will only be a memory. The effects of such a change will be far-reaching and, for the men, disastrous. No trade union can long stand the strain on its resources of such a large proportion of its members as are now being thrown upon the out-of-work funds of the Typographical Society. Interested officials, or optimistic members in employment, may shut their eyes to the danger or question the inevitableness of the coming crash, but the most far-seeing and wisest of the craft readily recognise the gravity of the approaching crisis, and readily recognise also that no power within the scope of trade union action can avert it.

We have said that the near future will possibly see the entire displacement of hand-setting for newspaper work, and the members of the Typographical readily concede the point, but what they do not so readily concede is that hand-setting for jobbing work is equally threatened with ruin. Their failure to perceive this is due to their inability to conceive how the intricate, and at times almost artistic, work involved in display advertisements and certain kinds of book work, etc.

could be satisfactorily performed by the machine. We readily grant that in its present state the linotype could not perform such work, but we see no reason why the perfecting of the machine to the point where it could perform such work should be considered impossible when we bear in mind the wonderful fact of the machine itself. Even as some optimistic compositors now say that a machine can never perform jobbing work, so a few years ago most compositors thought, and asserted, that a machine could never satisfactorily perform compositor work of any description. We have seen the one dream rudely shattered, may we not also see the other as ruthlessly dispelled? But, apart altogether from the danger involved in a further development of the powers of the linotype, there is another danger arising out of the wholesale displacement of news hands which directly affects the prospects of the whole trade. It lies: First, in the exhaustion of the funds of the Trade Union, and consequent weakening of its power of resistance to the encroachments of the employers: Second, in the competition for work on the part of the cleverer of the news hands, who could, in a few months at most, adapt themselves to the requirements of jobbing work: Third, all apprentices to the trade will henceforth betake themselves to the acquirement of the technical knowledge necessary for the practice of the more intricate forms of the typographical art: Fourth, that because of all the foregoing reasons there will soon be a practically unlimited supply of labour seeking employment at the one branch of the trade not yet touched by the linotype, and in face of such a congestion of the labour market no trade union can possibly keep up wages against the downward pressure of capitalist greed.

We are now speaking of the crisis as if it belonged to the future, but in a very real sense it is already with us. Some of the most important printing firms of Dublin have already utilised the linotype to enable them to completely discard their trade union employees – Messrs Healy and Co. furnish a notable instance, other and smaller firms have been encouraged by their success to follow their example without the aid of the linotype, and the daily and weekly newspapers have reduced their staff of hand compositors to such small dimensions that the statement that these journals are produced by “trade union labour” has no longer any serious meaning.

In view of this grave state of matters in the printing trade we would ask our friends of the Typographical what do they mean to do? They must see that all the miseries that are come upon them are the result of a logical adherence to the rules of business prescribed by capitalism; that the master class in all they have done have only acted as their class interests impelled them, and finally that non-political trade unionism has no remedy for this intolerable evil. For, what is the evil? It is the displacement of labour by machinery, the performing by a machine of work hitherto done by human beings. It is not the machine, nor its inventor that is at fault. The fault lies in the system which permits private individuals to own the machine, and use it to destroy the happiness of the workers, instead of making it the public property of society, to be used to lessen the labour whilst increasing the comforts of all. In other words, the machine itself might be a blessing, but the private ownership of the machine has made it an unmitigated curse. Thus when the compositor thinks of the linotype let him remember that it is only as an instrument in the hands of the master class it is to be execrated; as an instrument in the hands of emancipated Labour it would be hailed as a glorious achievement for lightening toil and increasing pleasure.

And remembering this, let them rally to the support of the Socialist Republican Party, the only party in Ireland which stands for the interests of the working class, seeking to capture the political power necessary to make the instruments of Labour the property, not of a class, but of a free people in a free social order, the Socialist Republic.

## **Note**

1. That is, members of the Typographical Society claiming unemployment benefit from the union.

# **James Connolly**

# Home Thrusts

(23 September 1899)

**The Workers' Republic,** 23 September 1899.

The land for the people!

A splendid rallying cry, a fine old wheeze.

What is wanted is a good rallying cry; it does not matter whether it is sense or nonsense, whether it means anything or nothing, so long as it has a good, sonorous sound about it – and will fetch the working man.

Therefore, hurroo for the land for the people!

The United Irish League is now raising this good old cry again, and Mr Davitt MP is stumping the country to the old, old tune that served the professional agitators so well in the days of the Land League.

The old tune, and the old game. Any amount of cheering, band playing, demonstrating, and orating of leaders, but no toleration of anything in the nature of an intelligent discussion of the meaning of the words we are using, or the application of the principles we are invoking.

The land for the people!

In the days of the Land League every politician in Ireland professed to desire the land for the people, but scarcely two of them meant the one thing, and any

man who would venture to rise at a public meeting to ask a speaker to explain what he meant was certain to be howled down as if he were a traitor.

And ran grave risks of having his neck broken as a reward for his temerity.

Home Rule MPs complain about the “gag” at Westminster, but no English Minister ever dared to stifle discussion half as rigorously as our Irish middle class have done when they had the power.

But that day is gone. The new working class democracy of Ireland is too alert, and too confident of its own strength, ever to surrender its political conscience to the care of leaders.

The land for the people! By all means, but

What is meant by “the land”?

And who are “the people”?

Mr Davitt said at a meeting in Duhallow that there were at present 40,000 farmers in Ireland who had become owners of their holdings since 1885, and he claimed this as a step in the direction of the “land for the people”.

How does the Socialist regard the matter? That there are now 40,000 more individuals interested in maintaining private ownership of land than there were in 1885.

Just how this is making “the people” owners of the land passes my comprehension.

Mr Davitt, and all the other posturing patriots who are using the United Irish League to boost themselves once more into notoriety, speak as if the tenant farmers alone constituted the people, but a common person like yours truly would even venture to include in that category the entire population of Ireland.

Farmers, and those who never turned a spadeful of earth on a farm, the people of our towns and cities as well as the people of our hills and valleys, the clerk as well as the cottier, the artisan equally with the agriculturalist.

All these are, collectively considered, the people.

The men whose fathers were hunted off the agricultural lands by landlord tyranny in the past have just as much title to the land as the men whose fathers were not hunted therefrom.

The land for the people should therefore mean the land for ALL the people.

Not to be divided up, or shared out, but to be vested in the nation at large as its public property.

The national ownership of the land – that is the real “land for the people”, but Mr Davitt and the wirepullers of the United Irish League know well that every one of the 40,000 peasant farmers he refers to as owners of their land are as much opposed to national ownership as Lord Clanricarde himself.

And when they speak of land why do they only refer to agricultural land?

What moral law, or maxim of political economy, can be held to justify private landholding in the cities which does not justify landlordism everywhere?

The land, alike in city and country, is the property of the entire people, and is only held by a class to-day because of the laws forced upon our fathers at the point of the sword.

Rent is the modern substitute for the tribute exacted from the dispossessed “Irishry” by the mail-clad invaders under Strongbow and his successors.

The land was once the property of the Irish clans. The clans were then the corporate embodiment of the life of the Irish nation. The clans are no more and could not be revived even if it were desirable to do so, which is more than questionable, but the right of ownership still lives on and should now be

established in the modern corporate embodiment of the Irish nation – our public boards, municipalities, and independent Irish Congress, when we are men enough to win one.

*Spailpín*

## James Connolly

# Home Thrusts

(9 September 1899)

**Workers'**                      **Republic,**                      9                      September                      1899.

Rebel Cork!

Well, well, who'd have thought it?

Cork, whose Labour men showed such a splendid example to Dublin [\[1\]](#); Cork, whose Labour men fought their way into the Council, while the Dublin Labour men only begged their way in; Cork, whose Labour men forced on the Evening Sittings [\[2\]](#) while the Dublin men had not the manliness to press the question; Cork, whose Labour men, immediately they were in, increased the wages and bettered the condition of the Corporation labourers; Cork now takes a flop back into the bog of reaction, and its treacherous middle class councillors deal Labour a terrific slap in the face.

In the course of one sitting the rule establishing Evening Sittings, and the rule enforcing the insertion of a Fair Wages clause in all city contracts were rescinded by a majority of the City Council.

One councillor gravely informing the meeting that if the Fair Wages clause was insisted on it would close all the factories in the country inside twelve months.

This is as much as to say that the factories of Ireland are dependent upon the systematic underpaying of their employees, and that if they were to pay what is known as a 'Fair Wage' they would speedily be ruined.

Remember, a Fair Wage, as here understood, means nothing more than the wage established as a standard by trade-union effort in the district.

It is not an ideal wage, nor even necessarily a high wage.

It may even be a starvation wage.

It is only 'fair' in so far as it is the standard agreed upon between the trade union and the majority of the employing class.

Therefore, when the Cork City Council thus rescinded the resolution enforcing a fair wage, they were virtually declaring the standard wage of the district to be too high, and therefore inviting every employer in the city to refuse to continue paying that wage to their employees.

And plead the example of the City Council as their justification.

The whole disgraceful performance is a confirmation of the truth I have so often pointed out, that the employing class are the most immediate enemies of the Irish workers, and that until we have mustered up courage, and acquired knowledge, enough to drive this home-made breed of tyrants from public life we need not delude ourselves with the hope that the gates of national emancipation will ever open to us.

The English oppressor, indeed! Why, here are Irishmen – rulers elected by Rebel Cork ' openly declaring that the prosperity of Ireland depends upon the robbery of her working class, and that to insist upon a Fair Wage being paid would ruin the country.

Thus showing that when men of their class speak of 'loving their country' they do not mean that they love the people, but only the soil – the inanimate earth, not the living, suffering men and women.

But I have every hope that the working men of Cork will, at next election, remember the men who thus trampled upon the political and social rights of the labourer.

And remembering them, give them a much-needed rest from municipal exertions.

The Labour Councillors of Cork were careful to disassociate themselves from the ISRP [\[3\]](#) during, and immediately after the elections.

They wished to respect the 'rights of property', and, I think, honestly believed that the propertied classes could be brought to listen to reason and the appeals of common humanity.

They should know better now. They should be able to realise now that the members of the propertied class are so blinded by the lust for gold, have their souls so steeped in the desire for power, that they cannot be reasoned with, or argued out of their resolve to maintain unfettered their rights to plunder, any more than the tiger in his jungle can be reasoned or argued out of satiating his appetite upon his helpless victim.

The Labour men of Cork should now, in the light of this latest object lesson in the cannibalistic instincts of the employing class, reconsider their attitude towards the Socialist Republican Party.

Listen, Oh, Men of Cork!

The employing class has said, through its representatives on the City Council, that it will have no compromise with you, but will fight you to the bitter end.

The only answer you can make, and still preserve your self-respect, is to accept that challenge, and tell them in addition that since they will not have a compromise with you, neither will you ever more dream of suggesting a compromise with them, but

That henceforth you will rally the working class to fight for the full fruits of their labour, all they produce by their toil, which can only be made theirs through the subjugation and dispossession of the propertied class.

When you are urging their extinction as a class they can not fight you more bitterly than they are doing now.

Therefore, let the Socialist Republic be your watchword; the tools to those who use them, the product to the producers.

The Socialist Republic! What does that mean?

It means that the industries of Cork shall be owned by the people of Cork, that the organized trades of Cork find in their own ranks men to undertake all the managerial work and superintendence of those industries, that you, the workers, could elect suitable men to such positions, and having elected them would serve under them as zealously as you now serve the slave-driving foremen of a private employer; that therefore the capitalist is unnecessary, and the profits he now absorbs could be retained for the use of the workers – to whom they properly belong.

And that, freed from the necessity of maintaining this idle and superfluous class, the length of the working day could be easily cut in half, while the remuneration for your toil might be multiplied fourfold.

That no one should want, that none should be overworked, that none should live in insolent idleness, that man should no longer prey upon his fellow man, that JUSTICE will be realised.

That productive property – all property held for profit – should be made the public property of the community, State or City, and co-operatively operated by

the labour of the adult population, under whatever rules they themselves might like to frame for their own guidance.

That is Socialism, in brief. Not so awful, is it?

But the mere advocacy of it would frighten more reforms out of the master class than all the speeches you could make about the rights of Labour.

***SPAILPÍN***

## Notes

1. Cork elected nine Labour candidates in 1899.
2. Evening sittings of the Corporation, so that workers elected could attend without endangering their employment.
3. The Irish Socialist Republican Party, founded by Connolly in 1896.

**James Connolly**

# **The Re-Conquest of Ireland**

**(1898)**

Republished in **James Connolly: Lost Writings**, (ed. Aindrias Ó Cathasaigh), [Pluto Press](#) 1997.

The movement in favour of the direct employment of labour by the County Councils, established under the Local Government Act, has scarcely attracted as much public attention as it deserves. Our national press is, as a rule, so much wrapped up in the work of recording the gyrations of its political chiefs, and so little capable of realising the importance of any movement outside of, and uninfluenced by, the ordinary currents of political activity, that they can spare no space to chronicle the progress of a movement which, if consistently followed up, will do more to place the destinies of the people in their own hands than has been effected by all the political movements of the century.

It appears that throughout the South of Ireland the labourers are at present vigorously agitating against the system of letting out public works to private contractors, and in favour of the direct employment of all labour by the County Councils. This proposal, which virtually means that the labourers have emancipated their minds from the social superstition that a private, profit-hunting capitalist can do work better for the community than the community itself can perform it through its elected and responsible officials, has been already adopted by some of the County Councils, and is being discussed by others. The labourer thus finding in his hand one weapon of his emancipation – the ballot box – has already shown himself prepared to use it with an amount of political discernment not a little disconcerting to the men who fondly imagined that the parrot cry of Home Rule would still have its old effect in weaning the minds of the workers from any movement for the bettering of their position as a class. And this, be it noted, is only a beginning. As the movement progresses, as the labourer sees that the vote which has placed him in the position of being able to elect his representative on the local governing bodies, may also, if properly used, enable him to transfer himself from the employment of an irresponsible master to the servant of a public board, of which he himself is one of the masters, he cannot fail to observe that the arguments and fallacious reasonings with which each step in that direction is met by the propertied class, are exactly the same in every respect

as those with which the demands of his nation for political justice have always been met by the enemies of national freedom. He will observe that the nationalist propertied class hurl against the labourer the same epithets, and allege the same incapacity for administration, as they have had hurled at themselves when putting forward their demand for legislative independence; he will also observe that the propertied Unionist will line up, solid as a rock, along with the propertied Nationalist in defence of their joint interest in the subjection of labour; and finally he will discover that in this apparently insignificant movement for direct employment of labour there lies a path to freedom not only for his class, but for his nation.

The subjection of Ireland which is represented to-day as a mere political question is instead an economic, a social question. It is only political that it may be economic. In other words, the political machinery is only held by a dominant nation in order that the social powers may be held by a dominant class. The conquest of Ireland is founded upon the dispossession of her people from all right to the soil, and from all right to life except upon terms dictated by the possessing class, in field, farms, or workshop owned and possessed by that class. That is to say, that the subjection of Ireland, like all other such subjection, is based upon the economic dependence of the oppressed upon the oppressor. The army, navy, and police are but the instruments with which this class enforces its domination, and the political subjection of Ireland to England means nothing more than that the possessing class were astute enough to place the control of those instruments of domination beyond the reach of the Irish people. On the same line of reasoning it will be seen that the cry for a 'Union of Classes' is in reality an insidious move on the part of our Irish master class to have the powers of government transferred from the hands of the English capitalist government into the hands of an Irish capitalist government, and to pave the way for this change by inducing the Irish worker to abandon all hopes of bettering his own position, and to assume such an attitude of meek resignation to his lot as a wage-slave as might convince the English government that he would make no revolutionary use of his political power, but would leave things much as they are. The bitterness of the opposition to the new labour movement is the outcome of the chagrin felt at the failure of this plot to delude the Irish worker in the interest of his Irish master.

Instinctively the labourer feels that every move which lessens his economic subjection to a master raises him a step nearer to the heights of freedom; he gradually recognises that in exact proportion as the workers take the control of the work of the country from the hands of private individuals and vest it in the charge of public bodies representing the Irish people, in the same proportion does Ireland strike from off her limbs the shackles of slavery. By a steady pursuit of this policy the subjection of Ireland can be, in great part, reversed. The Socialist Republican Party has, ever since its formation, based its hopes upon the successful issue of this policy, and can not but be delighted that the line of action it had sketched out as the most immediately practical – sketched out after deep study of the social and political conditions of this country – is now being taken up by the labourers of Ireland. The fact that most of the men now pursuing this policy would repudiate all connection with Socialism is the greater proof of the insight, alike into human nature and political developments, possessed by the band of pioneers who formulated this programme of action, knowing the self-interest of the workers would force such action on, apart from all theorisings, or knowledge of its greater possibilities.

People who talk of difficulties in the way of Socialism do not, as a rule, realise the nature of the Socialist plan of campaign. The workers are a subject class, but the workers are in the majority; therefore the workers may, by voting together, oust from every public board the majority of their masters, and replace them by a majority of class-conscious workers – workers conscious of the fact that the workers are a subject class, and determined to destroy such class subjection – and this majority of class-conscious workers can vote to take every industry from the hands of the master class and vest it in the hands of associations of workers, serving under the public bodies. Being in a majority the workers are irresistible – when enlightened.

In the course of this socialization of society, this gradual re-conquest of Ireland, the public boards in question will eventually find their paths crossed by the capitalist Imperial government; then Labour, from a dominant local, will rise to the position of a dominant national party, and the fight for complete independence will be taken up by the working class already in possession of the

internal government of the country, with all the prestige arising from that fact, and with all the leverage arising from the circumstance that whatever action they may take will have been forced on by a desire to protect the interests of the majority – the workers. Such a crisis, and it is unavoidable if this line of action is consistently followed up, would bring the question of what is called national independence home to the fireside of every worker as a fight for the security of their daily bread, and under such conditions the war for freedom will not fail for lack of an army of adherents.

Therefore every worker who studies the social and political conditions of the day must see that the Irish Socialist Republican policy, already so justified by the unconscious adoption here pointed out, is the only policy which blends in one irresistible force the interests of Ireland a Nation and the interests of the working class.

## James Connolly

# Law and Order

(1899)

<b>Workers’</b>	<b>Republic,</b>	26	August	1899.
Republished in Owen Dudley Edwards & Bernard Ransom (eds), <b>James Connolly: Selected</b>				
<b>Political</b>	<b>Writings,</b>	New	York	1974.

The statement is often made that Socialists are opposed to Law and Order, and made by men and women who find in the belief implied in the statement a sufficient reason for withholding their support from the aggressive Socialist

movement. We do not mean to propitiate that section of our critics by denying our hostility to the governmental powers that be, but we would suggest that a little calm reflection – supplemented by historical inquiry – upon the origin and uses of the terms ‘Law’ and ‘Order’ may be of use in determining whether the sanction of legality should be sufficient to protect any social or political institution from attack.

It is worth remembering in this connection that every movement for the improvement of the condition of the human race, every step forward in civilisation, has of necessity had to face the opposition of Law, and disturbed the stability of Order. The pioneer of progress has ever been an enemy of Law, and directed all his efforts to the destruction of Order. The reason is obvious. The human race in its progress upward from savagery has had, at each upward move, to meet the opposition of the class who, thriving upon the misery of their fellows, found their security in the maintenance of the status quo and its attendant evils. This class coming together for mutual support imposed upon their weaker, or less cunning, fellows certain rules and observances calculated to weaken the power of the multitude and augment the privileges of the few. Those rules and observances were called the Law, and in the early stages of human history, as to a lesser extent today, the majority of the race grew into the habit of accepting and even reverencing such rules or Law from the mere fact of their promulgation – especially when such promulgation dated from a period anterior to their own birth as individuals. This blind unreasoning acceptance by the majority of rules made for their own subjection, this passive and spiritless acquiescence in the rightfulness of the social or political condition of the day, is called Order. Every proposal made by the more far-seeing and intelligent to abolish such iniquitous rules is an attack upon Law, and every effort to arouse the multitude from their state of slavish subjection and inspire them with a desire to win better conditions of life, is necessarily aimed at the disturbance of Order. But the habit of thought engendered by the fact of so many generations having lived under the rule of Law – although that Law may have been but the self-preserving ordinances of a tyrannical class – has given to the term ‘Law’ a commanding influence over the minds of men which even the friends of progress feel compelled to avail themselves of. The first impulse of the average citizen is to yield to the uniforms

and trappings with which lawmakers and administrators clothe their offices a reverence and obedience which they would by no means willingly yield to the individuals in their capacity as private citizens; in like manner the ordinances formulated by the Legislative Chamber come to the people invested with a peculiar flavour of pseudo-sanctity which they could never acquire as the mere opinions of the very mediocre gentlemen who usually frame them. Thus the reformer or revolutionist finds the line of least resistance for his party suggested to him by observing this tradition of Law. Since the people almost involuntarily obey the Law let us capture the law-making machinery, and the new ideas – obnoxious, treasonable, or heretical, and therefore looked upon with suspicion today – will appear to them in all the pomp and panoply of Law, and they will then readily conform to the new conditions. So every discontented party in the State strove to capture the law-making machinery of the State. In this manner every class in Society, from the king to the capitalist, has successively captured political power and when enthroned in possession has legalised its own conception of Society. Each class has had a different method of exploiting Labour, and the fight for governmental power has been a contest in which each rising class above the working class has sought to make its own peculiar manner of appropriating the products of the labour of the workers the only lawful manner. In this fight the mechanism of government has been gradually improved and extended, and its franchises broadened down until the means of acquiring power have at last come within reach of the only remaining subject class – the workers. The direction taken by the revolt of this class – the modern Socialist movement – has thus been determined for it by the previous history of the race; frankly confessing its hostility to Law and Order, but supplementing the avowal by the qualification that it is only against Capitalistic Law and Capitalistic Order that its hostility is directed. Like every other revolting class in the past it aims at the capture of the law-making machinery, in order that in possession of that mechanism of government it may proceed to impose its will upon the nations as an all-compelling law. But it also knows that the conquest of political power by the revolutionary working class must of necessity result in the complete transformation of the very nature of government; that the present forms of government are the reflex of a system of society based upon class rule, and presuppose the existence of two separate classes – dominant and subject, coercing

and coerced; that whereas every revolting class in the past upon the successful issue of its struggle had still a subject class below it, and therefore maintained all the coercive machinery of government in order to keep that class in its subject position, the emergence of the working class into the light of power and freedom will leave no class in the darkness of subjection; that, therefore, the coercive functions of government will be no longer necessary, and the first duty of the revolutionary working class after the dethronement of class government, and abolition of class robbery, must be to divest the State of its power of political ruler, and place it upon its true basis of industrial administrator.

Then when Law is the self-imposed ordinances of a free people – ordinances self-imposed in the interest of industrial efficiency and general well-being, when Order comes as a result of the harmonious working of a just social system, then Progress will find its adherents in the friends of Law, and the triumph of its ideas without disturbing the stability of Order.

But while Law remains the conservation of all the worst tyrannies imposed by man upon his fellow-man through all our long and bloody history, while Order is but a synonym for the cringing submission of spiritless slaves, the Socialist will remain an enemy of Law, and a disturber of Order.

**James Connolly**

# **The South African War I**

(1899)

**Workers'**

**Republic,**

19

August,

1899.

At the time of going to press it seems probable that in a few weeks at most the British Government will have declared war against the South African Republic. Ostensibly in pursuance of a chivalrous desire to obtain political concessions in their adopted country for British citizens anxious to renounce their citizenship, but in reality for the purpose of enabling an unscrupulous gang of capitalists to get into their hands the immense riches of the diamond fields. Such a war will undoubtedly take rank as one of the most iniquitous wars of the century. Waged by a mighty empire against a nation entirely incapable of replying in any effective manner, by a government of financiers upon a nation of farmers, by a nation of filibusterers upon a nation of workers, by a capitalist ring, who will never see a shot fired during the war, upon a people defending their homes and liberties – such is the war upon which the people of England are criminally or stupidly, and criminally even if stupidly, allowing their government to enter. No better corroboration of the truth of the socialist maxim that the modern state is but a committee of rich men administering public affairs in the interest of the upper class, has been afforded of late years, than is furnished by this spectacle of a gang of South African speculators setting in motion the whole machinery of the British Empire in furtherance of their own private ends. There is no pretence that the war will benefit the English people, yet it is calmly assumed the people will pay for the war, and, if necessary, fight in it.

It must be admitted that the English people are at present doing their utmost to justify the low estimate in which their rulers hold them; a people who for centuries have never heard a shot fired in anger upon their shores, yet who encourage their government in its campaign of robbery and murder against an unoffending nation; a people, who, secure in their own homes, permit their rulers

to carry devastation and death into the homes of another people, assuredly deserve little respect no matter how loudly they may boast of their liberty-loving spirit.

For the Irish worker the war will contain some valuable lessons. In the first place it will serve to furnish a commentary upon the hopes of those in our ranks who are so fond of dilating upon the 'peaceful' realisation of the aims of socialism. We do not like to theorise upon the function of force as a midwife to progress – that, as we have ere now pointed out, is a matter to be settled by the enemies of progress – but we cannot afford to remain blind to the signs of the time. If, then, we see a small section of the possessing class prepared to launch two nations into war, to shed oceans of blood and spend millions of treasure, in order to maintain intact a *small portion* of their privileges, how can we expect the entire propertied class to abstain from using the same weapons, and to submit peacefully when called upon to *yield up for ever all their privileges*? Let the working class democracy of Ireland note that lesson, and, whilst working peacefully while they may, keep constantly before their minds the truth that the capitalist class is a beast of prey, and cannot be moralised, converted, or conciliated but must be extirpated.

One other lesson is, that Ireland is apparently a negligible factor in the calculations of the Imperial Government. In certain 'advanced' circles we hear much about the important position of Ireland in international politics. The exact value of such talk may be gauged by the fact that troops are being taken from Ireland to be sent to the Transvaal. The British Government has no fears on the score of Ireland; the Home Rule Party, and their good friends the Constabulary, may be trusted to keep this country quiet. But if the working class of Ireland were only united and understood their power sufficiently well, and had shaken off their backs the Home Rule-Unionist twin brethren – keeping us apart that their class may rob us – they would see in this complication a chance for making a long step forward towards better conditions of life – and, seeing it, act upon it in a manner that would ensure the absence from the Transvaal of a considerable portion of the British army. The class-conscious workers who chafe under our present

impotence, and long to remove it, will find the path pointed out to them in the ranks of the Irish Socialist Republican Party.

## James Connolly

# Home Thrusts

(19 August 1899)

**The Workers' Republic,** 19 August 1899.

Several hundredweight of stones.

To break them with a hammer, until they are small enough to be used for the purposes of macadamised roads.

This is the task at which it is proposed to set the paupers who apply for admission to the North Dublin Union. [\[1\]](#)

Several hundredweight of stones to be broken as a proof that the applicant is not a bloated millionaire, a huckstering politician, a successful publican, a house landlord, or any other sponge upon the community, but a real, bona-fide working man unable to find a fellow countryman willing to make a profit out of him.

And this brutal motion is made by a man elected to the Board of Guardians as a "Labour" man.

Mr Chambers, PLG.

Step this way, Mr Chambers, please.

Look at him, gentle reader, touch him, feel him, listen to him, run your fingers through his hair, observe his expanded chest, reverently contemplate his immaculate shirt front; put your ear to his watch-pocket and try and catch the throbbings of the thing that serves him for a heart; assure yourself that he actually is alive and

A Labour Man.

And then think hard.

What is a Labour man? A Labour man is, or ought to be, a man who seeks to make every public position a weapon in the hands of the workers in their struggle against their oppressors.

A Labour man is a man elected by his fellows to a public position, in order that he may do his utmost to reverse the traditionary practices of our masters, by which the rights of property are held to be superior to the rights of human beings, and to establish instead that reign of Justice in which Humanity will be supreme, and property its servant.

Such is a Labour man.

A Labour man on a Board of Guardians should make it his duty to render the Workhouse as pleasant, bright, and cheerful as possible for the inmates.

He cannot make it too bright and cheerful. If he makes life in the Workhouse so comfortable that men are better off inside than working outside at the present rate of wages, if men are tempted to leave their work and go into the Union, because the conditions of labour are so miserable and the Union so pleasant, then the employers will be compelled to pay higher wages and render life outside more tolerable in order to keep their workmen.

But that would raise the rates, you say. It would, undoubtedly, but who pays the rates?

## The master class!

Just so! Thus you could have them both ways. Raise the rates on the employing class in order to make life in the Union so pleasant that the workers might be tempted to give up work and go into the Union, and then the employing class will be compelled to pay higher wages, etc., in order to induce the workers to remain in their employment.

That is good sense, sound policy, wise tactics. Of what other use is your vote to you, ye wage workers?

The master class realise the power of the Board of Guardians. Therefore they fight to get on it, and when on it use their power to make the life of the inmates a hell upon earth.

Thus men die a lingering death in squalor and misery outside, rather than face the degradation put upon them in the Union, and thus an unlimited supply of unemployed is kept at the beck and call of the master class.

A man, who, elected to the Board of Guardians as a "Labour" man, instead of doing his best to break up, or at least oppose and expose this system, deliberately lends all his power to aid this conspiracy against the working class, by putting forward such a motion as that moved by Mr Chambers, is either a fool or a knave.

Now, Mr Chambers, you have the right to choose under which category we will class you.

Have you lacked honesty enough to remain true to the interests of the men who elected you, or have you only lacked intelligence enough to know where those interests lie.

One or the other it must be.

This action of Mr Chambers, coupled with the despicable conduct of his brother Labour Electoral men in the City Hall [\[2\]](#), ought to prove to the

satisfaction of the workers that there can be no good gained for Labour by the action of men who believe in the present property system.

The social system of today is a system based upon the robbery of the working class; the governmental and administrative systems of today are, in all their manifestations, so many instruments in the hands of our masters for keeping down the working class while the aforesaid robbery is being accomplished.

The working man has no right to take part in the work of government or administration, except that he might use his position to smash the machinery of oppression, and stop the work of robbery.

To do this requires a complete reversal of all the theories and precedents established by the class hitherto in possession.

Instead of which, Mr Chambers proceeds to emulate the meanest of the capitalist crew, by insulting those of our class who are so unfortunate as to require Poor Relief.

Chivalrous Mr Chambers!

Any cur can kick the bottom dog. But to take his part, ah, that requires A MAN.

*Spailpín*

## Notes

1. Regional Poor Law Unions, administered by elected Poor Law Guardians, were responsible for running workhouses for the poor.

2. Those elected to Dublin Corporation under the auspices of the Labour Electoral Association had abandoned their independence and done deals with right-wing politicians and parties.

# James Connolly

## The New Evangel

### The Economic Basis of Politics

The Stomach, not the Brain

**Workers' Republic**, 12 August 1899

Nothing more strikingly illustrates the crude and unscientific theories of the ordinary middle class politician than the desperate attempts at present being made to build up a great political party in Ireland on the lines of the late Home Rule movement. Apparently all sections of the Home Rule party are possessed with the belief that great political movements can be constructed at will, and that an effective, aggressive political force may have its origin, not deep down in the daily life of the people, but in the brains of some half dozen gentlemen in parliament. Viewed from this standpoint the toiling multitudes are mere automata, and the really effective national force is to be found in the men whom the Home Rule press and orators point out to the multitude as leaders. The truth that the political movements of a country spring from the pulsations of its economic life; that all political parties are the instruments of a class, and are great and powerful only in the proportion in which the development of the struggle for existence forces their particular class interest upon the majority of the nation as a dominant factor in their daily life – all this seems to a quite unheard of philosophy amongst capitalist politicians.

Yet a slight survey of the history of the world in general, or of Ireland in particular, could not fail to bring the truth of this eminently Socialist doctrine home to the mind of the thoughtful student of events. The great political

organisations which have successfully revolutionised the systems of governments under which they lived, have had their origin, not in the brains of mighty leaders, but in the daily and hourly needs of the multitude, and have acquired force and power only in so far as those needs became sharp and pressing enough to goad that sluggish multitude to action. When at such a crisis there arose a man lucky enough, or astute enough, to make himself the mouthpiece of the discontented multitude; to coin its inarticulate groanings into political phraseology, and give its hunger-inspired desire for change in intelligent formulation, then such a man became a 'great leader', and the organisation following the course he advocated the leading political force. To the minds of the superficial middle class thinkers – always ready to believe that the world turned around their heroes and successful persons as upon its axis – the leaders had created the movement which they led; to the mind of the scientific Socialist the leaders and the movements were both the product of the quickening of intellect caused by social conditions adversely affecting the life of the people at large.

Examine the great revolutionary movements of history and you find that in all cases they sprang from unsatisfactory social conditions, and had their origin in a desire for material well being. In other words, the seat of progress and source of revolution is not in the brain, but in the stomach. The fact that this truth has hitherto been obscured, or even denied; that the pioneers of progress uniformly clothed their political demands in the most idealistic language and the most flowery phraseology; or that they constantly appealed for the support of 'all unselfish and generous souls', rather than to commonplace interests, only proves that we are all too prone to hide even from ourselves the real nature of our impelling desires, and, even when most stubbornly following our grossest instincts, to throw around our actions all the glamour of 'spiritual cravings', or 'patriotic hopes'.

The power and unconquerable optimism of the socialist party is due to their recognition of this materialist basis of history, this economic basis of politics. Knowing that their ultimate ideal and immediate demands are in a line with the progress of the human race towards prosperity, and that every scheme for better social conditions at all likely to effect its purpose must be of the nature of a step

in their direction, Socialists cannot lose courage, because even in the midst of temporary defeat they know that the needs of the workers, who are in the majority, will eventually impel them into line with the Social-Revolutionary forces. From this fact our Irish politicians – and revolutionists – may gain, not comfort, perhaps, but wisdom. The history of the American Revolution, the French Revolution, the Irish Volunteers, the risings of 1798, 1848, and the Irish Land League, all bear out our argument upon the economic basis of great political movements.

The American Revolution was a revolt against the action of England in throttling the infant industries of America, and came to a head with a tax upon tea – all ‘base’ material reasons; the French Revolution was the revolt of an oppressed and famished people against outworn, medieval landlordism (feudalism) and the vexatious taxes upon industry imposed by a corrupt Court; the Irish Volunteer movement was, in its anti-English aspect, a revolt of the Irish manufacturing class against the restrictions put upon their trade by England, – “*Free Trade*, or else” was the motto they hung up on their cannon, and when that one point was gained all the ‘patriotic enthusiasm’ of the leaders vanished; Grattan termed the Volunteers, upon whose backs he had climbed to political eminence, ‘an armed rabble’, and the whole movement collapsed as suddenly as it had arisen – the economic basis being gone the patriotism was no longer evident. 1798 was an abortive Irish edition of the French Revolution – despite the lying twaddle of the present day about the society of United Irishmen being a ‘Union of *All Classes*’, there is not in history any record of a movement, except the Paris Commune, in which the classes and the masses were so sharply divided; 1848 found its inspiration in the promptings of famine – and its failure in the total incapacity of the doctrinaire Young Irelanders to understand the difference between revolutionary action and ‘heroic’ posings; the Land League found its inspiration in a partial failure of the crops, and in the newly developed competition of America – and the collapse of the Land League came with reduced rents and partial prosperity.

In every case the social condition of the mass of the people was the determining factor in political activity. Where the mass of the people find existing

conditions intolerable, and imagine they see a way out, there will be a great political movement; where the social conditions are not so abnormally acute no amount of political oratory, nor yet co-operation of leaders, can produce a movement.

The great Labour uprising at the Irish Local Government elections of 1898 sprang up spontaneously without a leader, and despite the political parties; when the men who supported it have realised the futility of trying to effect any great improvement in their condition by the action of local bodies, they will seek for a political party which can express their class interests upon national basis – and seeking it find the Socialist Party, ready and equipped for the task. By our action to-day we are preparing the ground for more aggressive revolutionary action when the working class of Ireland at last recognise in our principles the embodiment of their hopes; firmly grounded upon our knowledge of the economic basis of all political action, we confidently await the day when the ever-increasing pressure of capitalist society shall bring the workers into our ranks and the destinies of the nation into our hands.

**James Connolly**

# **Physical Force in Irish Politics**

**(1899)**

From **Workers' Republic,** July 22, 1899.

Ireland occupies a position among the nations of the earth unique in a great variety of its aspects, but in no one particular is this singularity more marked than in the possession of what is known as a 'physical force party' – a party, that is to say, whose members are united upon no one point, and agree upon no single principle, except upon the use of physical force as the sole means of settling the dispute between the people of this country and the governing power of Great Britain.

Other countries and other peoples have, from time to time, appealed to what the first French Revolutionists picturesquely described as the "sacred right of insurrection," but in so appealing they acted under the inspiration of, and combated for, some great governing principle of political or social life upon which they, to a man, were in absolute agreement. The latter-day high falutin 'hillside' man, on the other hand, exalts into a principle that which the revolutionists of other countries have looked upon as a weapon, and in his gatherings prohibits all discussion of those principles which formed the main strength of his prototypes elsewhere and made the successful use of that weapon possible. Our people have glided at different periods of the past century from moral force agitation, so-called, into physical force rebellion, from constitutionalism into insurrectionism, meeting in each the same failure and the same disaster and yet seem as far as ever from learning the great truth that neither method is ever likely to be successful until they first insist that a perfect agreement upon the end to be attained should be arrived at as a starting-point of all our efforts.

To the reader unfamiliar with Irish political history such a remark seems to savour almost of foolishness, its truth is so apparent; but to the reader acquainted with the inner workings of the political movements of this country the remark is pregnant with the deepest meaning. Every revolutionary effort in Ireland has drawn the bulk of its adherents from the ranks of the disappointed followers of defeated constitutional movements. After having exhausted their constitutional efforts in striving to secure such a modicum of political power as would justify them to their own consciences in taking a place as loyal subjects of the British Empire, they, in despair, turned to thoughts of physical force as a means of attaining their ends. Their conception of what constitutes freedom was in no

sense changed or revolutionised; they still believed in the political form of freedom which had been their ideal in their constitutional days; but no longer hoping for it from the acts of the British Parliament, they swung over into the ranks of the 'physical force' men as the only means of attaining it.

The so-called physical force movement of today in like manner bases its hopes upon the disgust of the people over the failure of the Home Rule movement; it seeks to enlist the people under its banners, not so much by pointing out the base ideals of the constitutionalists or the total inadequacy of their pet measures to remedy the evils under which the people suffer, as by emphasising the greater efficacy of physical force as a national weapon. Thus, the one test of an advanced Nationalist is, in their opinion, one who believes in physical force. It may be the persons so professing to believe are Republicans; it may be they are believers in monarchy; it may be that Home Rule would satisfy them; it may be that they despise Home Rule. No matter what their political faith may be, if only they are prepared to express belief in the saving grace of physical force, they are acclaimed as advanced Nationalists - worthy descendants of 'the men of '98.' The '98 Executive, organised in the commencement by professed believers in the physical force doctrine, started by proclaiming its adherence to the principle of national independence "as understood by Wolfe Tone and the United Irishmen," and in less than twelve months from doing so, deliberately rejected a similar resolution and elected on its governing body men notorious for their Royalist proclivities. As the '98 Executive represents the advanced Nationalists of Ireland, this repudiation of the Republican faith of the United Irishmen is an interesting corroboration of the truth of our statement that the advanced Nationalists of our day are utterly regardless of principle and only attach importance to methods – an instance of putting the cart before the horse, absolutely unique in its imbecility and unparalleled in the history of the world.

It may be interesting, then, to place before our readers the Socialist Republican conception of the functions and uses of physical force in a popular movement. We neither exalt it into a principle nor repudiate it as something not to be thought of. Our position towards it is that the use or non-use of force for the realisation of the ideas of progress always has been and always will be

determined by the attitude, not of the party of progress, but of the governing class opposed to that party. If the time should arrive when the party of progress finds its way to freedom barred by the stubborn greed of a possessing class entrenched behind the barriers of law and order; if the party of progress has indoctrinated the people at large with the new revolutionary conception of society and is therefore representative of the will of a majority of the nation, if it has exhausted all the peaceful means at its disposal for the purpose of demonstrating to the people and their enemies that the new revolutionary ideas do possess the suffrage of the majority; then, but not till then, the party which represents the revolutionary idea is justified in taking steps to assume the powers of government, and in using the weapons of force to dislodge the usurping class or government in possession, and treating its members and supporters as usurpers and rebels against the constituted authorities always have been created. In other words, Socialists believe that the question of force is of very minor importance; the really important question is of the principles upon which is based the movement that may or may not need the use of force to realise its object.

Here, then, is the immense difference between the Socialist Republicans and our friends the physical force men. The latter, by stifling all discussions of principles, earn the passive and fleeting commendation of the unthinking multitude; the former, by insisting upon a thorough understanding of their basic principles, do not so readily attract the multitude, but do attract and hold the more thoughtful amongst them. It is the difference betwixt a mob in revolt and an army in preparation. The mob who cheer a speaker referring to the hopes of a physical force movement would, in the very hour of apparent success, be utterly disorganised and divided by the passage through the British Legislature of any trumpery Home Rule Bill. The army of class-conscious workers organising under the banner of the Socialist Republican Party, strong in their knowledge of economic truth and firmly grounded in their revolutionary principles, would remain entirely unaffected by any such manoeuvre and, knowing it would not change their position as a subject class, would still press forward, resolute and undivided, with their faces set towards their only hope of emancipation – the complete control by the working-class democracy of all the powers of National Government.

Thus the policy of the Socialist Republicans is seen to be the only wise one. “Educate that you may be free”; principles first, methods afterwards. If the advocacy of physical force failed to achieve success or even to effect an uprising when the majority were unenfranchised and the secret ballot unknown, how can it be expected to succeed now that the majority are in possession of voting power and the secret ballot safeguards the voter?

The ballot-box was given us by our masters for their purpose; let us use it for our own. Let us demonstrate at that ballot-box the strength and intelligence of the revolutionary idea; let us make the hustings a rostrum from which to promulgate our principles; let us grasp the public powers in the interest of the disinherited class; let us emulate our fathers and, like the ‘true men of ’98,’ place ourselves in line with the most advanced thought of our age and drawing inspiration and hope from the spectacle presented by the world-wide revolt of the workers, prepare for the coming of the day when the Socialist working-class of Ireland will, through its elected representatives, present its demand for freedom from the yoke of a governing master class or nation – the day on which the question of moral or physical force shall be finally decided.

**James Connolly**

**‘Soldiers of the  
Queen’**

**(1899)**

The opprobrious epithet 'hired assassins', so often applied to the Army by Socialist propagandists, seems to many people in Ireland – accustomed as they are to the double-dealing of the Home Rule press – as a somewhat harsh characterisation of the military forces of the Crown. We have been so long accustomed to see our capitalist patriots playing fast and loose in this matter, so long been inured to seeing and hearing the journalists and politicians who profess to hate our English masters, devoting whole columns of space in their newspapers to 'Garrison Gossip', and other tittle tattle relative to the Army, so often seen our Home Rule Corporations petition the British Government to allow the permanent establishment of a military force in their towns, are so familiarised with the strange spectacle of Irish MPs rising in the British Parliament to demand better treatment for those British soldiers to whom Ireland had the misfortune to give birth, that the public mind of this country has almost lost sight of the grim and ugly fact that the British Army in Ireland has only one reason for existence – that reason being the desire of the governing and oppressing classes to possess ready for use a body of highly disciplined armed men, who, on the first sign of an active desire on the part of the oppressed to get rid of their governors and oppressors, can be relied upon to proceed without asking questions to cut the throat of, or otherwise destroy, every man so aspiring to freedom. In other words, the Army is, in plain matter-of-fact language, what the Socialists so bluntly describe it to be, viz., a body of hired assassins, creatures in the shape of men, who, upon enlisting as 'soldiers of the Queen' agree in exchange for the sum of 8d or 1/- per day to take the life of any person, be it man, woman or child, whom our rulers desire to get rid of. Of course, unlike private assassins who only murder under the influence of passion, the Army performs its work under the approval of a Christian hierarchy – bishops bless its banners, churches pray that the army of their particular nation may cut enough throats to secure a victory, and each battalion carries upon its payroll a clergyman whose especial function it is to assure the delights of Heaven to such of the gallant

heroes as fall in the course of the work of murder. We admit the presence of clergymen amid such surroundings, although in glaring contrast to the teaching of the Master they profess to serve – “Thou shalt not kill” – is not without precedent. The brigands of the Middle Ages usually had attached to their bands some disfrocked priest, who also, like his modern prototype in the Army, issued absolution to the wounded members of his band of marauders.

The soldier then is, no matter in what light we examine his position, a ‘hired assassin’ – his first duty, he is told, is to ‘obey’. To obey whom? His superior officers, who in turn must obey the Government. When the mandate goes forth, ‘Kill’, he must kill and dare not ask the reason why. The government under whose orders he serves may have been elected to power on some question of internal administration in England, Local Option [\[1\]](#), Franchise, or Disestablishment [\[2\]](#), but as soon as it is in power it has the right to launch all the military and naval forces of the Crown into a war of aggression in the interest of the possessing class, even if it should be upon a people with whom the vast majority of its constituents desire to live in peace. It has also the legal right to use its power against the working class in its own land should they become restless under the system of wage slavery. Whatever be the excuse for ordering out the Army, the soldier has no option but to obey. Whether it be Egyptians revolting against oppression, Boers defending their independence, Indians maddened with famine, or Irishmen hungering for freedom; whether the human being coming within his line of sight be stranger or friend, father, mother, sister, brother or sweetheart, the soldier has no option but to press the trigger, and send the death-dealing instrument on its errand of murder. He is only a ‘hired assassin’, and must earn the wages of his hire. What is a hired assassin, properly defined? One who engages to take human life without having personal injury to avenge, at the command of whoever pays him for doing so. Does not this description suit the soldier exactly?

The demoralising effect of this occupation is further exemplified in the life and language of the soldier himself. The moral atmosphere of a barrack room is of the most revolting character, as is the ordinary language of the soldier the most bestial conceivable. The Army is a veritable moral cesspool corrupting all within

its bounds, and exuding forth a miasma of pestilence upon every spot so unfortunate as to be cursed by its presence. The most degraded races within the wide-spreading British Empire sink lower in the scale of humanity after peaceful contact with the British Army; indeed it may be truthfully averred that a desolating war would inflict upon a country less injury than a peaceful occupation by the 'Soldiers of the Queen'. Do our Irish mothers, who see their sons enlist in this sink of corruption without erasing their names from the family roll, do the Irish maidens who give themselves up to the embraces of this hireling soldiery, realise the awful depravity hidden beneath the gaudy uniforms and dazzling trappings of the British garrison? A standing army anywhere, in any country, is first of all unnecessary; secondly, a tool in the hands of oppressors of the people; thirdly, a generator of prostitution, but the British Army is in the last particular the most odious on the face of the earth. Witness the OFFICIAL STATISTICS, which tell us that the rate per 1,000 of admissions to hospital for venereal diseases is

In the Prussian Army	26.7
... .. French ...	43.8
... .. Austrian ...	65.4
And	
British in India	458.3

or nearly every second man; ten times as many as in the French Army.

'Soldiers of the Queen'. Gallant Army, noble Queen.

Many people will, no doubt, question the propriety of our action in dragging this unsavoury subject into the light of day in this manner, but our action is prompted by the desire to awaken in the minds of our Irish workers such a real and abiding hatred of this instrument of tyranny, mingled with loathing of its character, as will serve in the first place to destroy the prospects of recruiting in Ireland, and in the second place to fire their brains and nerve their arms against the day when we will wipe the foul stain of its presence from our midst. This is

our purpose, and to place within reach of our Irish girls a knowledge of the constituent parts that go to the make-up of a British soldier, that they might flee from his polluting embraces as from a thing accursed.

Should we succeed in planting in the breasts of our fellow wage slaves a tenth part of the hatred we ourselves feel for this blood be-decked tool of our tyrants, we shall feel confident that the day is not far distant when the long standing account between the Irish worker and his exploiters will be paid in full.

## Notes

1. The right of local areas to legislate for themselves, especially in regard to licensing laws.
2. Disestablishment of the Anglican Church, that is.