

James Connolly

**Capitalism and
the Irish Small
Farmers**

(1909)

From **The Harp**, November, 1909.

Internationalism is not an invention of socialists. As socialism itself has sprung out of the combinations of modern society, and as the international organisation of labour and the international scope of commerce are but manifestations of these conditions, so the internationalism of the socialist movement simply reflects the development of society at large.

For example: Certain ignorant people in Ireland, (politicians and such like) claim that Ireland should have no concern with matters other than Home Rule, land reform and taxes, and other matters adjustable within the four seas of Erin. To such people I recommend a study of the following cutting from an American capitalist paper.

Then let him remember that one of the chief industries in Ireland today is the rearing and exportation of cattle for the English market, and that tens of thousands of people are dependent upon that for a livelihood.

The American Beef Trust has taken an important step toward securing complete control of the London refrigerated meat trade. A powerful shipping combination backed by the Beef Trust has been organised here to provide fast steamships to bring refrigerated meat from Argentina carrying only beef controlled by the trust, which hopes to freeze out all independent shippers from Argentina.

Regular weekly service between London and the Plate river will be maintained, for which nine fifteen-knot steamships are to be built.

Owing to the decrease in supplies from the United States, England is becoming daily more dependent on Argentina for her meat supply. The Plate river trade has been controlled hitherto by two independent firms, both English and South American.

In the past few years the trust has been endeavouring to get a foothold in Argentina and has absorbed two important firms here.

The recent enormous issue of new capital by the Chicago 'big Four' is designed to be used to capture the Argentina trade. The trust has enormous holdings here already, owning a large number of stalls in Smithfield market, and some hundreds of shops in different parts of the country.

Now, just as a lesson in economics, figure out how far-reaching will be the effect of that deal when it is completed. It means that there is a capitalist concern in Chicago which has hundreds of stores or shops in Great Britain, large number of stalls in Smithfield market, London, great refrigerators and enormous castles ranges in the Argentine Republic, and will have a complete service of steamships plying between Europe and America solely for its own use. It employs thousands of workers in England, in the United States and South America, it operates under the flags of three independent nations, a monarchy and two republics; and in all

three countries it builds up its trade by underselling and ruining the small merchant.

Now turn to its effect upon Ireland. I have already spoken of the tens of thousands of people who in Ireland are dependent upon the cattle trade. This living is menaced by the competition of the Beef Trust, and nothing within the purview of Irish politicians can save them.

There is another angle from which this situation can be approached. For some time in Ireland there has been an agitation against the huge grazing farms. It has been felt – and rightly – that the land so given up to cattle would be better occupied by human beings. That it were better to see thriving men and women and children, and happy homes than to see sheep and cows.

But sheep and cows paid better than men and women, and hence despite the unpopularity of the grazier he stayed and waxed fat and prosperous, and the Irish men and women came to America, some to spread the Catholic faith, and more to fester and rot in the slums, to populate the brothels and the jails, or to die overworked and miserable among strangers. As long as cattle raising pays better than raising Christian men and women it will flourish in Ireland as elsewhere.

Now comes along the Beef Trust with its elaborately organised machinery of competition to bring the product of Argentine Republic to compete with the grazing farms of Meath and Kildare, and I make the prophecy that if this trust succeeds in its designs cattle raising in Ireland will be unprofitable. And if it becomes unprofitable to raise cattle for the London market then the Irish grazier and his landlord will become convinced of the error of their ways, and the farms will be let for tillage purposes to the people now clamouring in vain for their possession.

Is it not calculated to provide thought, even in a politician, that the chances of some Irish peasants getting farms in Ireland depend upon the success of the Beef Trust in conquering the markets of the Argentine Republic?

In like manner the question of whether Irish peasants are paying too much or too little for their farms under the new Land Acts does not depend upon the quality of their lands so much as it depends upon agricultural prices, and agricultural prices depend upon the development of transatlantic steam service bringing the product of the mammoth farms of the United States and South America to Europe. Every *Lusitania* which shortens the distance between Europe and America hastens the doom of the petty farmers of Ireland under the capitalist system. But to study those things savours of internationalism, and internationalism, according to the *amadán* politicians, is “so un-Irish.”

James Connolly

Ballots, Bullets, Or —

(1909)

From **The International Socialist Review**, October, 1909.

Not the least of the services our comrade, Victor Berger, has rendered to the socialist cause must be accounted the writing and publishing of that now famous article in which he draws the attention of his readers to the possibility that the ballot will yet be stricken from the hands of the socialist party, and raises the question of the action our party must take in such an emergency.

It must be confessed, however, that the question has not been faced at all squarely by the majority of the critics who have unburdened themselves upon the matter. We have had much astonishment expressed, a great deal of deprecation of the introduction of the question at the present time, and not a little sly fun poked at our comrade. But one would have thought that a question of such a character brought up for discussion by a comrade noted for his moderation – a moderation by some thought to be akin to compromise – would have induced in socialists a desire to seriously consider the elements of fact and probability behind and inspiring the question. What are these facts?

Briefly stated, the facts as they are known to us all are that all over the United States the capitalist class is even now busily devising ways and means by which the working class can be disfranchised. In California it is being done by exacting an enormous sum for the right to place a ticket upon the ballot; in Minnesota the same end is sought by a new primary law; in the south by an educational (?) test to be imposed only upon those who possess no property; in some States by imposing a property qualification upon candidates; and all over by wholesale counting out of socialist ballots, and wholesale counting in of fraudulent votes. In addition to this we have had in Colorado and elsewhere many cases where the hired thugs of the capitalists forcibly occupied the polling booths, drove away the real voters and themselves voted in the name of every citizen on the list.

These are a few of the facts. Now what are the probabilities? One is that the capitalist class will not wait until we get a majority at the ballot box, but will precipitate a fight upon some fake issue whilst the mass of the workers are still undecided as to the claims of capitalism and socialism.

Another is that even if the capitalist class were law-abiding enough, or had miscalculated public opinion enough, to wait until the socialists had got a majority at the ballot box in some presidential election, they would then refuse to vacate their offices, or to recognise the election, and with the Senate and the military in their hands would calmly proceed to seat those candidates for President, etc., who had received the highest votes from the capitalistic electorate. As to the first of these probabilities, the issue upon which a socialist

success at the ballot box can be averted from the capitalist class is already here, and I expect at any time to see it quietly but effectually materialise. It is this: we have often seen the capitalist class invoke the aid of the Supreme Court in order to save it some petty annoyance by declaring unconstitutional some so-called labour or other legislation. Now I can conceive of no reason why this same Supreme Court cannot be invoked to declare unconstitutional any or all electoral victories of the socialist party. Some may consider this farfetched. I do not consider it nearly as far-fetched as the decision which applied the antitrust laws solely to trade unions, or used the Inter-State Commerce Acts to prevent strikes upon railways.

I consider that if the capitalist class appealed to the Supreme Court and interrogated it to declare whether a political party which aimed at overthrowing the constitution of the United States could legally operate to that end within the constitution of the United States the answer in the negative which that Court would undoubtedly give would not only be entirely logical, but would also be extremely likely to satisfy every shallow thinker and fanatical ancestor-worshipper in the country.

And if such an eventuality arose, and the ballot was, in comrade Berger's words, stricken out of our hands, it would be too late then to propound the query which our comrade propounds now, and ask our friends and supporters: what are you going to do about it?

But even while admitting, nay, urging all this on behalf of the pertinency of our comrade's query, it does not follow that I therefore endorse or recommend his alternative. The rifle is, of course, a useful weapon under certain circumstances, but these circumstances are little likely to occur. This is an age of complicated machinery in war as in industry, and confronted with machine guns, and artillery which kill at seven miles distance, rifles are not likely to be of much material value in assisting in the solution of the labour question in a proletarian manner. It would do comrade Berger good to read a little of the conquests of his countryman, Count Zeppelin, over the domain of the air, and thus think of the futility of opposing even an armed working class to such a power as the airship. Americans have been so enamoured of the achievements of the Wright brothers

that too little attention has been paid to the development of the balloon by Zeppelin. Yet in his hands it has evolved into the most perfect and formidable fighting machine ever dreamt of. The words 'dirigible balloon' seem scarcely applicable to his creation. It is a balloon, and more. It is a floating ship, divided into a large number of separate compartments, so that the piercing of one even by a shell leaves the others intact and the machine still floating. Nothing less than fire can menace it with immediate destruction. It can carry seventeen tons and with that weight on board can be guided at will, perform all sorts of figures and evolutions, rise or descend, travel fast or remain stationary. It has already been equipped with a quick-firing Krupp gun and shells made for its own special use, and at the tests of the German army has proven itself capable of keeping up a rapid and sustained fire without interfering with its floating or manoeuvring powers. No army on earth, even of highly trained and disciplined men, could withstand an attack from ten of those monsters for as many minutes. It is more than probable that the development of these machines will eventuate in an armed truce from military conquest by the international capitalist class, the consecration of the flying machine to the cold task of holding in check the working class, and the making safe and profitable all sorts of attacks upon social and political rights. In facing such a weapon in the hands of our remorseless and unscrupulous masters the gun of comrade Victor Berger will be as ineffective as the paper ballot in the hands of a reformer.

Is the outlook, then, hopeless? No! We still have the opportunity to forge a weapon capable of winning the fight for us against political usurpation and all the military powers of earth, sea or air. That weapon is to be forged in the furnace of the struggle in the workshop, mine, factory or railroad, and its name is industrial unionism.

A working class organised on the lines on which the capitalist class has built its industrial plants today, regarding every such plant as the true unit of organisation and society as a whole as the sum total of those units, and ever patiently indoctrinated with the idea that the mission of unionism is to take hold of the industrial equipment of society, and erect itself into the real holding and administrative force of the world; such a revolutionary working class would have

a power at its command greater than all the achievements of science can put in the hands of the master class. An injunction forbidding the workers of an industrial union to do a certain thing in the interest of labour would be followed by every member of the union doing that thing until jails became eagerly sought as places of honour, and the fact of having been in one would be as proudly vaunted as is now service on the field of Gettysburg; a Supreme Court decision declaring invalid a socialist victory in a certain district could be met by a general strike of all the workers in that district, supported by the organisation all over the country, and by a relentless boycott extending into the private life of all who supported the fraudulently elected officials. Such a union would revive and apply to the class war of the workers the methods and principles so successfully applied by the peasants of Germany in the Vehmgericht, and by those of the Land League in the land war in Ireland in the eighties.

And eventually, in case of a Supreme Court decision rendering illegal the political activities of the socialist party, or instructing the capitalist officials to refuse to vacate their offices after a national victory by that party, the industrially organised workers would give the usurping government a Roland for its Oliver by refusing to recognise its officers, to transport or feed its troops, to transmit its messages, to print its notices, or to chronicle its doings by working in any newspaper which upheld it. Finally, after having thus demonstrated the helplessness of capitalist officialdom in the face of united action by the producers (by attacking said officialdom with economic paralysis instead of rifle bullets) the industrially organised working class could proceed to take possession of the industries of the country after informing the military and other coercive forces of capitalism that they could procure the necessaries of life by surrendering themselves to the lawfully elected government and renouncing the usurpers at Washington. Otherwise they would have to try and feed and maintain themselves. In the face of such organisation the airships would be as helpless as pirates without a port of call, and military power a broken reed.

The discipline of the military forces before which comrade Berger's rifles would break like glass would dissolve, and the authority of officers would be non-

effectual if the soldiery were required to turn into uniformed banditti scouring the country for provisions.

Ireland during the Land League, Paris during the strike of the postmen and telegraphers, the south of France during the strike of the wine growers, the strike of the peasants at Parma, Italy, all were miniature demonstrations of the effectiveness of this method of warfare, all were so many rehearsals in part for this great drama of social revolution, all were object lessons teaching the workers how to extract the virtue from the guns of the political masters.

James Connolly

Learning Their Lesson

(1909)

The Harp, September, 1909.
From the collection: **Ireland Upon the Dissecting Table**, Cork Workers' Club 1975.

Our Socialist friends in the North of Ireland are learning their lesson. As readers of **The Harp** are aware, there is in Belfast and its neighbourhood a strong Socialist movement, born out of the advanced industrial conditions which prevail in that district. But, as was perhaps natural under the historical circumstances,

that Socialist movement keeps itself apart from the life of the rest of Ireland. Its associations are with England, its chief speakers are imported from England, and its methods are distinctly those of the English Labour Party. Indeed, it is a part of the English movement known as the Independent Labour Party. As a result, it has never yet run a candidate as a Socialist Party distinctly and avowedly with a revolutionary purpose and aim, differing in this from the Socialist movement in Dublin, which has on four or five different occasions contested municipal elections as an avowedly Socialist Party separate and distinct from all others. The different tactics employed were characteristic of the religious thought dominant at either part of the country. Protestantism is essentially of the nature of a compromise between the spirit of authority and the spirit of free inquiry, and when a Protestant breaks with any tradition he does so in a halting and tentative manner, perpetually retreating to his starting-point, and as he disavows allegiance to one idol, hastens to create another. On the other hand, the Catholic is positive and dogmatic, and ever inclined, when he swings from his moorings at one point of the compass, to scorn all intermediate stages between that point and its opposite pole. Out of this curious anomaly arose the fact that even while the Belfast Socialists were proclaiming that the Irish Catholics were too much under the heel of priests to be Socialists, these same Irish Catholics in Dublin were proudly nailing to the mast those Socialist colours which their Northern brethren were furtively seeking to hide at every election. This was not the least puzzling and disconcerting feature of the situation. The Belfast Socialists are, as we have said, affiliated to the Independent Labour Party in Great Britain, and while they have had their faces set towards that country have at all times kept out of touch with the toilers of the rest of Ireland, never at any time making any effort to understand their point of view. This attitude of theirs has ever been destructive to the hopes of a real revolutionary labour movement in Ireland; indeed, the Northern men have never, apparently, understood that the Socialist movement is a revolutionary labour movement. Their standpoint and intellectual bias has ever been towards the Fabian opportunism of England, while the Irish Socialists of Catholic training have been most attracted by the Revolutionary Social-Democracy of the Continent of Europe. This problem does not arise out of any distinction of race; indeed, despite the prevalent opinion to the contrary, the Irish Protestants of the North are as purely Celtic as the Catholics of any part of

Ireland. The parts of Scotland from whence their forefathers re-emigrated into Ireland were and are as Celtic in the make-up of their population as any part of Munster, and a deal more so than many parts of Leinster. But from whatever source it arises, this attitude of the Northerners has frustrated the hopes of those who longed for a Socialist Party in Ireland of national scope and reach. In a Socialist Party embracing all the toilers of Ireland, resting upon Irish conditions, and shaping itself to reflect Irish needs, the sturdy men of the Northern capital would be a force of incalculable value, but they have up to the present been singularly blind to realise their opportunity. They failed to see, what a moment's reflection should have shown them, that they would be the backbone and dominating element in an Irish Socialist Party, whereas they can never be anything but the insignificant tail of a Socialist Party in England. And we say this without any feeling of hostility towards the Socialists of England. We are sure that the latter would have no objection to the Belfast branches throwing in their lot with the rest of Ireland in a distinct party, if the result of such action was to build up a Socialist Party in Ireland strong enough to contest the field with the Home Rulers. For the Labour Party of England is, after all, primarily a vote-gathering party. It recognizes that the Irish vote is a strong factor in English cities, and it seeks to conciliate the Home Rule Party as an essential towards having an Irish representative on its side when it appeals to that Irish vote during an election. It would just as soon, indeed much rather, have a representative of a strong Irish Socialist and Labour movement on its platform at such a time to appeal to the Irish workers in English cities. But such an Irish Labour representative is of no value to them if he comes as the Irish member of an English Party. Hence they court the assistance of the Home Rulers, despite the protests of Irish Socialists. Were the Belfast Socialists to withdraw in a body from the Independent Labour Party and throw in their lot with the organization of Irish Socialists recently formed in Dublin, their action would be of incalculable service not only to the cause of Socialism in Ireland, but also to the Socialists and Labour Party in England. It would help to save the latter from all the dangers of a Home Rule alliance by bringing into relief the reactionary attitude and policies of the Home Rulers as opposed to the Socialist movement of the Irish working class. We believe such a move would be welcomed by the most astute and farseeing of the Labour Party, since it would enable them to appeal to the Irish voters of Great

Britain on their class interests as well as through their national bias. But even if it failed to arouse the sympathetic appreciation of English Labour leaders, the move ought to be taken. We have long ago given up all hopes of making Englishmen understand the Irish character. The English Socialists have failed utterly to fathom the character of the capitalist Home Rulers of Ireland. Their failure arises from their inability to understand the difference between 'rebelly' talk and serious revolutionary purpose. The Home Rulers are adepts at 'rebelly' talk, but of serious revolutionary purpose, even in a Nationalist sense, they are absolutely lacking. They easily succeed in fooling the so-called hard-headed English working man, but they never succeed in fooling the Socialists of Ireland. The latter know their men too well; they know in what an inferno of reaction they have succeeded in keeping the domestic affairs of Ireland, such as education and municipal housing and sanitation, and they see them ever in league with the most merciless exploiters of labour on the island.

Hence the Catholic masses regard the Catholic (?) Home Rule leaders with ill-concealed distrust, and if the Protestant working men would only throw off their senseless distrust of their Catholic fellows, realize that class interests are stronger in political warfare than religious bias, and so realizing, unite with their Catholic fellow-workers of the rest of Ireland on the basis of those class interests, they would find the latter not only willing, but madly anxious to receive them.

We have been moved to make these comments by reading in the **Labour Leader**, of London, England, two articles, or rather letters, upon the subject of the attitude of the Labour Party of England towards the Land Question in Ireland. The first was written by Mr. Walker, of Belfast, a Socialist member of the Belfast branch of the Independent Labour Party, and twice Labour candidate for a parliamentary seat in Belfast. Mr. Walker complains that the Labour Party is apparently influenced by the Home Rulers, and voted along with them on the recent Land Bill, which, he says, and truly, tends to make the farming class more conservative and anti-Socialistic. He cites the case of one constituency, in which the Protestant farmers who have hitherto been Liberal, for the first time voted Conservative at a recent election. He then goes on to say some very severe things about the Home Rule crowd in Parliament. The second letter was from an English

labour leader, a Mr. Clynes, and he, of course, tells Mr. Walker that there was no use to talk in Parliament about Land Nationalisation, because a bill on such lines would not pass at present. He thus lays down the axiom that a parliamentary minority must not talk about a measure in Parliament unless it has an immediate chance to pass; quite a new conception of Parliamentary activity! He then goes on to chide Mr. Walker for saying hard things about the Home Rulers – those dear friends of Labour – and in general is serenely indifferent to the Belfast man's protest. It is an old story. Some years ago, when editing the **Workers' Republic** in Dublin, we also protested against the fulsome praise of Home Rule leaders by English Socialists at a time when these same capitalist gentry were bitterly antagonizing the Labour candidates of the Irish trade unions in the Local Government elections of 1899. We, under direction of the Irish Socialist Republican Party, drew up a statement of the case, containing specific citations of the anti-Labour record in Ireland of the Irish capitalist politicians, and we informed our English comrades that their senseless praise of the Home Rule Party in England was being used in Ireland against the Labour candidates who were opposing capitalist Home Rulers. But the leaders of the Independent Labour Party in England paid no attention to our protests, and went joyously on supplying ammunition to our enemies, although a paper so far away as **Vorwaerts**, of Berlin, Germany, the organ of the German Social Democratic Party, quoted our manifesto and expressly approved of our position.

Now it is the turn of the Belfast men! We hope that our Dublin comrades will send them a copy of that earlier manifesto, and that they will learn the lesson of both incidents and join where they belong – in a militant Irish movement of Labour.

James Connolly

Sinn Fein,

Socialism and the Nation

(1909)

From **Irish Nation**, January 23, 1909.

In a recent issue of **The Peasant**, a correspondent, 'Cairbre,' in the midst of a very fair and reasonable article on *Sinn Fein and Socialism*, says: "*A rapprochement between Sinn Feinism and Socialism is highly desirable.*" To this I desire to say a fervent "*Amen*," and to follow up in my prayer with a suggestion which may help in realising such a desirable consummation. Always presupposing that the rapprochement is desired between Sinn Feiners who sympathise with Socialism and not merely with those who see no further than "the Constitution of '82," on the one hand, and Socialists who realise that a Socialist movement must rest upon and draw its inspiration from the historical and actual conditions of the country in which it functions and not merely lose themselves in an abstract 'internationalism' (which has no relation to the real internationalism of the Socialist movement), on the other.

But, first, it would be as well to state some of the difficulties in the way in order that we may shape our course in order to avoid them.

Sinn Fein has two sides – its economic teaching and its philosophy of self-reliance. With its economic teaching, as expounded by my friend Mr. Arthur Griffith in his adoption of the doctrines of Frederick List, Socialists have no sympathy, as it appeals only to those who measure a nation's prosperity by the volume of wealth produced in a country, instead of by the distribution of that

wealth amongst the inhabitants. According to that definition, Ireland in 1847 was a prosperous country because it exported food, whereas Denmark was comparatively unprosperous because it exported little. But with that part of Sinn Fein which teaches that Ireland must rely upon itself, respect her own traditions, know her own history, preserve her own language and literature without prejudice to, or denial of, the worth in the language or literature of other people, stand erect in her own worth and claim to be appraised for her own intrinsic value, and not as part of the wheels and cogs of the imperial system of another people – with that side of Sinn Fein Socialists may sympathise; and, indeed, as a cold matter of fact, those doctrines were preached in Dublin by the Irish Socialist Republican Party from 1896 onward, before the Sinn Fein movement was founded.

The first side of Sinn Fein necessarily excludes the Socialists; the second does not. The first rests upon a capitalist conception of progress; the second is a gateway by which Ireland may enter into the intellectual domain which Socialism has made its own by its spiritual affinity with all the world-wide forces making for social freedom.

Socialists are also somewhat divided in their ideas as to what is a proper course in a country like Ireland. One set, observing that those who talk loudest about 'Ireland a Nation' are often the most merciless grinders of the faces of the poor, fly off to the extreme limit of hostility to Nationalism and, whilst opposed to oppression at all times, are also opposed to national revolt for national independence.

Another, principally recruited amongst the workers in the towns of North-East Ulster have been weaned by Socialist ideas and industrial disputes from the leadership of Tory and Orange landlords and capitalists; but as they are offered practical measures of relief from capitalist oppression by the English Independent Labour Party, and offered nothing but a green flag by Irish Nationalism, they naturally go where they imagine relief will come from. Thus their social discontent is lost to the Irish cause. These men see that the workers shot down last winter in Belfast were not shot down in the interests of the Legislative Union; they were shot down in the interests of Irish capitalists. Hence,

when a Sinn Feiner waxes eloquent about restoring the Constitution of '82, but remains silent about the increasing industrial despotism of the capitalist; when the Sinn Feiner speaks to men who are fighting against low wages and tells them that the Sinn Fein body has promised lots of Irish labour at low wages to any foreign capitalist who wishes to establish in Ireland, what wonder if they come to believe that a change from Toryism to Sinn Feinism would simply be a change from the devil they do know to the devil they do not know!

The other section of Socialists in Ireland are those who inscribe their banners with the watchword 'Irish Socialist Republic,' who teach that Socialism will mean in Ireland the common ownership by Irish people of the land and everything else necessary to feed, clothe, house and maintain life in Ireland and that therefore Socialism in its application to Ireland means and requires the fullest trust of the Irish people as the arbiters of their own destinies in conformity with the laws of progress and humanity.

This section of Socialists were so Irish that they organised and led the great anti-Jubilee procession of 1897 in Dublin, which completely destroyed all the carefully-prepared British preparations to represent Irish as loyal; and yet their position was so correct from their standpoint that at the International Congress of 1900 at Paris they were granted, in the name of Ireland, separate representation from England and treated and acted as a separate nation.

Now the problem is to find a basis of union on which all these sections who owe allegiance to one or other conception Socialism may unite. My position is that this union, or rapprochement, cannot be arrived at by discussing our differences. Let us rather find out and unite upon the things upon which we agree. Once we get together, we will find that our differences are not so insuperable as they appear whilst we are separated. What is necessary first is a simple platform around which to gather, with the understanding that as much as possible shall be left to future conditions to dictate and as little as possible settled now by rules or theories. As each section has complete confidence in their own doctrines, let them show their confidence by entering an organisation with those who differ from them in methods, and depend upon the development of events to prove the correctness of their position. Each person to have complete freedom of

speech in conformity with the common object; the lecture platform to be common to all, and every lecture to be followed by questions and discussion. With mutual toleration on both sides, the Protestant worker may learn that the co-operation of the Catholic who works, suffers, votes and fights alongside him is more immediately vital to his cause and victory day by day than the co-operation of workers on the other side of the Channel; and that Socialists outside of Ireland are all in favour of that national independence which he rejects for the sake of a few worthless votes.

And the Catholic Sinn Feiners may learn that love of freedom beats strongly in the breasts of Protestant peasants and workmen who, because they have approached it from a different historical standpoint, regard the Nationalist conception with suspicion or even hostility.