



1977

To take a promise from the past and hand a tradition to the future: The Irish separatist thought of Padraic Pearse and James Connolly

Leo John Jordan
Illinois Wesleyan University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/history_honproj



Part of the [History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Jordan, Leo John, "To take a promise from the past and hand a tradition to the future: The Irish separatist thought of Padraic Pearse and James Connolly" (1977). *Honors Projects*. 40. https://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/history_honproj/40

This Article is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by Digital Commons @ IWU with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this material in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you need to obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/ or on the work itself. This material has been accepted for inclusion by faculty at Illinois Wesleyan University. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@iwu.edu.

©Copyright is owned by the author of this document.

ILLINOIS WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY

TO TAKE A PROMISE FROM THE PAST AND HAND A TRADITION
TO THE FUTURE: THE IRISH SEPARATIST
THOUGHT OF PADRAIC PEARSE AND JAMES CONNOLLY

SPECIAL COLLECTIONS

DA
962
.J676

Prepared under the Direction of Michael B. Young,
as a Requirement for Graduation with Honors in
The Department of History,
May Commencement, 1977

by

LEO JOHN JORDAN

//

INTRODUCTION

Until my four-month stay in London in the Autumn of 1975, I had been ignorant of my Irish past, completely unaware of that nation's rich culture and traditions born from its constant struggle to survive. "I am an American", I said, refusing to see any use for past national references. Yet the constant searching of my packages each time I entered a store in downtown London, for example, or the experience of swiftly passing by a subway station temporarily closed due to a bomb threat in a train seemingly run by its own terror, or seeing a large number of watchful and ever-present British troops guarding state functions and buildings all awakened me from my pre-Roots insensibility. More and more I had become interested in my own Irish national past, hoping to reach, at least in some small way, an understanding of the long and complicated history of discord among Anglo-Irish relations.

This present work was the result of my inquiry, an inquiry which ranged from the heroic Irish legends of the second and third centuries to the current divisions among the Irish Republican Army. Within this broad survey of

Irish history, I became involved in the work of two men whose thoughts and actions I have intensively examined--Padraic Pearse and James Connolly. Separately, Pearse and Connolly had each developed specific programs for the salvation of the Irish people. Together their thoughts, writings, and actions were indispensable to the Easter Rising of 1916.

For Padraic Pearse, this program grew out of a realization that Ireland was no longer Irish. The nation that had refused for so long a time to relinquish its past language, traditions, and sense of being in the presence of relentless British assaults was transformed into a nation whose culture, politics and future now depended upon Britain for their very existence. Pearse had felt the loss of Ireland's national consciousness, here explained by P. S. O'Hegarty, a staunch Irish nationalist: "England was the language of the courts, of the professions, of commerce, the language of preferment, and the newly-emancipated people embraced English with a rush," he wrote, continuing "and with English there came a dimming of their national consciousness, a peaceful penetration of Irish culture by English culture in every particular."¹ Like O'Hegarty, Padraic Pearse had noticed that once a language was lost, other forms of the national being would quickly be eroded--traditions, morals, and a healthy sense of selfhood would all be lost. English culture, then, had silently crept into Ireland, and by the time the Irish had noticed, their national life had almost perished.

Padraic Pearse aimed first, to free Ireland from England's social control, and second, to free Ireland from England's political control. Ireland could become socially and intellectually free, Pearse believed, by looking back and examining her Gaelic past. And in learning the language and values of the nation's forefathers, Ireland would begin to gain back those qualities which had made her the historic Irish nation. Yet in his search for Ireland's noble Gaelic past, Pearse became strongly aware of Ireland's radical separatist past. As a result of learning that Ireland's age-old struggle had been for freedom, Padraic Pearse became a revolutionary separatist who, following the example of those before him, planned, developed, and led the Easter revolution.

James Connolly, on the other hand, struggled against the capitalist element in Ireland's oppression. Born of Irish parents in Edinburgh in 1868, James Connolly moved to Ireland in May of 1896 when the Dublin Socialist Club offered him the position of their organizer. Within days of his arrival he had formed the Irish Socialist Republican Party. From these early days in Ireland, until the Easter Rising, Connolly had fought against economic injustice. He had been the first to stage a protest against the Boer War, for example, on the grounds that it was ". . . enabling an unscrupulous gang of capitalists to get into their hands the immense riches of the diamond fields."² From 1903 to

1910, however, Connolly had lived in the United States, working at what jobs he could find, organizing workers in New Jersey, and helping to found the International Workers of the World, known famously as the "Wobblies". While in America, Connolly had also begun to develop his ideas on industrial unionism which, he believed, would provide the framework for the Socialist Republic.

In the summer of 1910 James Connolly returned to Ireland in order to organize the Socialist Party of Ireland. The resistance to the Home Rule measure in Belfast, and the outbreak of World War I, made Connolly strikingly aware of the need to fight for Ireland's political independence as well as for the freedom of the Irish working class. Thus in the months following the beginning of the war, Connolly allied himself with Padraic Pearse and other radical separatists. In the words of Pearse's biographer, Louis Le Roux, Pearse and Connolly ". . . were to work henceforward for the same purpose, united in mind and heart, as their writings and fraternal collaboration of the last two years of their lives prove. . . . One had learned to know his country in the Ireland of Labour, the other in the Gaelic League and the Irish-speaking West. They had followed two separate paths, but met at last at the crossroads of militant Nationalism."³ Together they proclaimed the Irish Republic.

As thirteen-hundred trained and armed men seized control of the city of Dublin on Easter Monday, April 24,

1916, Pad

the Provisional Government of the Irish Republic. Standing in front of Dublin's General Post Office, already converted into headquarters for the insurgents, Padraic Pearse began to read the historic Proclamation before a small and startled crowd. First in Gaelic, and then in English, Pearse called forth the Irish Nation:

Irishmen and Irishwomen: In the name of God and of the dead generations from which she receives her old tradition of nationhood, Ireland, through us summons her children to her flag and strikes for her freedom.

.
We declare the right of the people of Ireland to the ownership of Ireland, and to the unfettered control of Irish destinies, to be sovereign and indefeasible. The long usurpation of that right by a foreign people and government has not extinguished the right, nor can it ever be extinguished except by the destruction of the Irish people. . . Standing on that fundamental right and again asserting it in arms in the face of the world, we hereby proclaim the Irish Republic as a Sovereign Independent State, and we pledge our lives and the lives of our comrades-in-arms to the cause of its freedom, of its welfare, and of its exaltation among the nations.⁴

The Proclamation continued, yet in these words were found the essential thoughts of Padraic Pearse and of James Connolly.

Pearse--nationalist poet, educator, scholar of the Gaelic language, leader of the most militant Irish Volunteers, and President of the Provisional Government--and Connolly--labor-organizer, socialist, leader of the Irish Citizen Army, and Vice-President of the newly-declared republic--each had spent years developing, redefining, and enouncing their respective programs for the freedom of Ireland. Thus in

this present work, I have analyzed the writings of P earse and Connolly, first, according to the problems that they believed the Irish nation was facing, and second, according to the programs that they offered for the salvation of Ireland. Together and for Ireland, Padraic P earse and James Connolly sought to take a promise from the past and hand a tradition to the future.

CHAPTER I

THE PROMISE OF EDUCATION

I have not gathered gold;
The fame that I won perished;
In love I found but sorrow,
That withered my life.

Of wealth or of glory
I shall leave nothing behind me
(I think it, O God, enough)
But my name in the heart of a child.

. . .Padraic Pearse

Padraic Pearse was a poet, a scholar, and a revolutionary; but above all, he was an educator. By the age of twelve Padraic Pearse had already concluded that what he was taught in school varied quite substantially from the education he had received by listening to the stories and legends of ancient Ireland told to him by his family. Even at this early age he had decided to become a schoolmaster in order to teach as he had been taught by his parents. Pearse realized that something was wrong with Ireland's National System of Education, imposed by the British government, and in later years he sought to remedy this education by exposing its horrors in The Murder Machine.

History had shown Pearse that through all that Ireland was subjected to--the Cromwellian conquest, the Penal Laws, the Irish Famine--Ireland had never lost a sense

of herself. Padriac Pearse saw that his nation had a "stubborn Irish thing" which refused to be crushed, and which he defined as the national consciousness.¹ Unassailed by British aggression, this consciousness was nearly lost by a passive assault upon the Irish nation. This assault came and nearly conquered in the form of education. With detrimental and devious exactness, with a calculated coldness worse than the horrors of the Famine, the National System of Education had brought the Irish to their knees. Against such a machine, resistance was nearly impossible. In Pearse's words, the National System had ". . . estranged three generations from the true culture of Ireland and," he continued, "brought them up so far removed from all national feeling that never would they recover of themselves for the very lack of the will to do so."² This National System, in sum, aimed at the denial of a nation.

Padraic Pearse began his indictment of the English educational system on a damning note, calling this system ". . . the most grotesque and horrible of the English inventions for the debasement of Ireland."³ Like the educational system of some ancient republics in which the children of freemen were taught all that was good, noble and honorable, Irish children were taught, as had been ancient slave children, not to be strong and proud, but rather to be obsequious and feeble. Such a system as this, with the enslavement of Irish children as its purpose, could not

properly be called education. This system was meant to tame, repress, and enervate Irish students, rather than to inspire, foster, or harden them.⁴ Primarily, Pearse complained in The Murder Machine that Ireland's National System produced soulless, indifferent beings. Like a machine, education in Ireland was cold and mechanical; it was vast and ponderous and complicated; it molded and shaped students, not into individuals, but into unusable, void material. Calling this education ". . . a lifeless thing without a soul",⁵ Pearse described the machine as being ". . . devoid of understanding, of sympathy, of imagination, as is another piece of machinery that performs an appointed task."⁶ Such a thing did not teach; it only destroyed.

Incapable of fulfilling its role to educate, the machine was given raw material which it seized, molded, compressed, and then ejected. Those students unable to be refashioned into obedient British slaves emerged crushed which Pearse described as ". . . a bruised and shapeless thing, thereafter accounted waste."⁷ Irish colleges and universities, for example, had a remedial program called the "Fourth Preparatory", but usually referred to as the "scrap heap", a pile of broken bones and torn flesh of former Irish students. For Pearse, this was ". . . --the limbo to which the debris ejected by the machine is relegated."⁸ Irish students became mere things, having no allegiance, up for sale to the highest bidder. But as the raw material seized,

churned, and processed through the educational machine had no inspiration, so too must the machine be void of inspiration and idealism. That idealism which inspired free governments, which inspired an acceptance of good laws according to the will of the Irish people, which inspired a people to search for truth was lacking in the National System of Education. Pearse believed that the essence of the problem in Ireland was that nationality had been lost, and it had been lost because ". . . the English educational system in Ireland has deliberately eliminated the national factor that it has so terrifically succeeded. For it has succeeded--succeeded in making slaves of us. And it has succeeded so well that we no longer realise that we are slaves."⁹ This has happened to a people who once loved freedom so dearly. Pearse asked why?

The Gaelic people have been pacified because their education started with negation, rather than belief. Pearse asserted that the National System was founded on what he called a Nego,¹⁰ a Nego that forced many Irish children to deny their religion, and compelled almost all Irish children to deny their nation. What greater crime could occur than this?, Pearse questioned; yet "This Nego is their credo, this evil their good."¹¹ By establishing a compulsory program which was contrary to the essential idea of education, the National System forced through the nation, a wide-spread denial of Gaelic consciousness. "'Thou shalt not' is half

the law of Ireland", Pearse disgustingly explained, "and the other half is 'Thou must'."¹² There was no room for education, but still the national program had to be followed.

Where freedom should have been most evident, it was most seriously lacking; and although healthy lives were founded on freedom, there was no freedom in the schoolroom. Moreover, this absence of freedom was equally applied to the student, the teacher, and the school. Children could not, according to Pearse, grow up naturally; they had to develop in the Board's way:

When young souls, young minds, young bodies, demanded the largest measure of individual freedom consistent with the common good, freedom to move and grow on their natural lives, freedom to live their own lives--for what is natural life but natural growth? --freedom to bring themselves,. . . to their own perfection, there was a sheer denial of the right of the individual to grow in his own natural way, that is, in God's way. . . . The Board, National or Intermediate,. . . bound him [the student] hand and foot, chained him mind and soul, constricted him morally, mentally, and physically with the involuted folds of its rules and regulations, its reports and special reports, its pains and penalties.¹³

In addition to this lack of freedom, the National System took no recognition of individual, geographical, racial, or historical differences. Under such a system the uniqueness of each child could not be developed, or even discovered. Indeed, the fact that Irish children were only taught geometric axioms or correct English grammar would lead the nation into irreligion and anarchy. Thus, with force and

authority. Padraic Pearse claimed that a life-breath must be infused into the dead soul of Irish education.

From an early age, Pearse had studied child character and concluded that the best and noblest way to educate Irish children was to free them from the Murder Machine and aid in their development toward becoming honorable individuals. Pearse believed that education should take the place of mere instruction, and that this education was best realized through a master-disciple relationship. From such an education, Irish children, Pearse hoped, would discover "their truest Irish individualities",¹⁴ thus becoming good Irish men and women. For the subjection of the Irish, the British authorities had instituted a system of national education aimed at releasing Irish children from their national and patriotic feelings, a system that Pearse felt compelled to react against, as here described by his biographer, Louis Le Roux: "Pearse, like all lovers of Ireland of his day, was too well aware of the blighting results of this co-called [sic] 'education', and that the time had come to react against it, and create a new and practical system of education which would make Irish men and women truly citizens of Ireland--a free and Gaelic people."¹⁵ But for this new sort of education, Pearse did not turn to the new theories of educators on the Continent or in America; instead, he went and found it in ancient Irish history.

True education, Pearse began, did not manufacture things, but rather existed to foster the growth of children.

Unlike the National System, the native Irish education was founded upon a fostering of students: ". . . the teacher was arte, 'fosterer', the pupil was dalta, 'foster-child', the system was aiteachas, 'fosterage'. . .", and that which was fostered was, according to Pearse. ". . . the elements of character native to the soul, [in order] to help to bring these to their full perfection rather [than] to implant exotic excellencies."¹⁶ The ancient ideal of education held that a proper education would bring forth the finest and noblest characteristics in each child. By returning to Gaelic myth, central to this philosophy of education, Pearse hoped to instill within the soulless Irish children a heroic spirit which he described as ". . . knightly courage and strength and truth. . . ."¹⁷ Such an education would return Ireland to her Sagas, and these legends and tales, Pearse reasoned, would be a much greater and more effective factor in education than any Euclidian proposition. Padraic Pearse had realized that racial origins, qualities, and heritage were most important in education, and further, that education ought to be premised upon these elements.

As an illustration of his theory an education, Pearse used these epigrams at St. Edna's, a school for boys he founded in order to put these theories to the test. On the subject of inspiration, Pearse offered the example of Colmcille:¹⁸ "If I die it shall be from the excess of the love that I bear the Gael."¹⁹ For Pearse, Colmcille

illustrated an inspiration so strong and so vivid that it annihilated all thought of self; for the Gael one must be willing to sacrifice, and sacrifice deeply. On the subject of nobleness, Pearse gave his students the example of the Fianna of Fionn,²⁰ a young group of boys of ancient Ireland who dedicated themselves to "Strength in our hearts, truth on our lips and cleanness in our hearts."²¹ Or of the knightly courage and strength of Cuchulainn who desired a short life with honor: "I care not though I were to live but one day and one night, if only my fame and my deeds live after me."²² These were all sayings for the soul, for a dead soul which needed to be revived and then ennobled.

As inspiration was developed and strengthened by heroic tales and legends, Pearse concluded that it must come ". . . finally and chiefly from the humanity and great-heartedness of the teacher."²³ A teacher's true duty, Pearse had inferred, was in helping the student to realize himself at his best and worthiest. From being mere things under the National System, students were now individual souls with unique problems and potentials, each soul begging to be developed, asking to fulfill itself in the highest possible manner. Ancient Irish history offered Pearse the example of a school composed of a few pupils and their teacher, a system which Pearse likened to Christ and the Apostles, asking ". . . was he not the Master and were they not his disciples?"²⁴ And in sharing an intimate relationship, the teacher and his

disciples would come to view each other as members of the same small family, a relationship which Pearse declared to be the greatest ever achieved in the area of education. "It seems to me", he expressed, "that there has been nothing nobler in the history of education than this development of the old Irish plan of fosterage under a Christian rule, when to the pagan ideals of strength and truth there were added the Christian ideals of love and humility."²⁵ But combined with the ancient Sagas of Cuchulainn and the Fianna, Pearse also taught his students the history of radical Irish separatism, from Wolfe Tone, to Robert Emmet, and John Mitchell, all avowed separatists.

Pearse expected that by showing his students Ireland at her worthiest, the Ireland of noble Cuchulainn and of radical separatism, Irish youth would take it upon themselves the task and tradition of saving the soul of Ireland. According to Le Roux, in other words, ". . . Pearse was too far-seeing and enlightened not to teach the natural history to children susceptible of profiting from its lessons and becoming in later years well-disciplined Irishmen and Irish-women fully conscious of their country" and, we might add, the need to fulfill the dream of Ireland's separatist past.²⁶ The major objective in the reinstitution of Ireland's native education, then, was to create a reassertion of the Gaelic national consciousness. But the new education needed to do more than this; Pearse thought that it should also

restore to Ireland the nation's lost manhood. Pearse hoped and believed that through this native Gaelic education, Ireland would ". . . refuse to accomodate herself to a suicidal system; it [also] taught her to prepare for the life and death struggle by freeing her mind. . ." and preparing her body for the seemingly inevitable rising against the British.²⁷

Pearse did not, as some have suggested, train Irish children solely for the coming insurrection. To be sure, his purpose in educating students in the manner of the ancient Gael was to show the children the glories that Ireland had once held. If the young men and women joined in Ireland's struggle for freedom, then this was a testimony to the power of the ideas that Padraic Pearse had brought into the present from the past. These Gaelic children fought because they hated evil, believing as deeply as Pearse had that ". . . fighting is the only noble thing, and that he only is at peace with God who is at war with the powers of evil."²⁸

In his attempt to free Irish education from its rigid structure, to remove it from its foundation of denial, and to break it of its total disregard of the student's physical, mental, and moral being, Padraic Pearse, the educator, had given Ireland an idea of freedom's glory; and as a result, the Irish-Catholic morality of resignation began to crumble and give way to a national morality of a free and Gaelic Ireland. For the children of Ireland, Pearse had succeeded

in fusing an antique faith to a revolutionary hope. That Ireland might learn and follow, a full exposition of the national faith was necessary.

CHAPTER II

THE PROMISE OF THE PAST

[Mitchel and Tone] shall teach you and lead you, O Ireland, if you hearken unto them, and not otherwise than they teach and lead shall you come into the path of national salvation.

. . .Padraic Pearse

Ireland's historic claim was for separation from England; and this was, for Padraic Pearse, the overwhelming truth of Irish history. Pearse had seen within the history of his nation a relentless struggle to rid Ireland of Westminster's control, to free Ireland from the Empire, and then to make Ireland master of her own destiny. For nearly seven hundred years Ireland had sought to regain her freedom and honor lost, and in that time, Ireland's claim to freedom had never been altered nor abated. To be sure, since 1169 when the English landed in Ireland and were immediately opposed, until the late 1890s, Ireland's true leaders and heroes had agitated for freedom. And with certain individuals in almost every generation leading the struggle for freedom, it seemed, to Pearse, as if separation was a national trust and faith passed down from generation to generation. Unlike earlier generations, however, the generation of 1900 was quite satisfied with the Parliamentary promise of Home Rule

for Ireland.¹ Realizing that the national faith of separation had been imperilled, Padraic Pearse turned to the four gospels of the Irish faith--the works of Theobald Wolfe Tone, of Thomas Davis, of James Fintan Lalor, and of John Mitchel. Thus on Christmas Day of 1915, Pearse began his examination of the Irish definition of freedom.

In a series of pamphlets, Pearse enunciated the powerful ideas of these four writers on Irish freedom. Each of these men, Tone, Davis, Lalor, and Mitchel, had all formed and developed this concept which, in Pearse's words, involved ". . . essentially the idea of Independence, separation, a distinct and unfettered national existence."² Theirs were the voices that had spoken most authentically for Ireland, and by listening to these voices, Pearse declared, the languishing soul of Ireland would be strengthened. But if Irish history, as represented by these four voices, was the history of radical separatism, history had an even deeper meaning for Pearse, as explained here by his biographer:

History is a book that must be opened from time to time not only to learn its lessons, but to steep a nation's soul therein, and thus attain new elements of nationality. What is history for patriots like Pearse and his friends if not a handbook of heroism never closed, a book printed on the very soul and territory of the nation? And what land gives better lessons in heroism on its very territory and soil than Ireland.³

For the faithless generation of 1900, for that generation which had all but abandoned the national historic demand for separation from England, to that generation Pearse explained the promise of the past.

Foremost among those who have spoken for Ireland, and whom Pearse considered as the greatest of Irish political thinkers, was Wolfe Tone. In Pearse's words, Wolfe Tone ". . . stands first in point of time, and first in point of greatness. Indeed, [Tone] is, as I believe, the greatest man of our nation; the greatest-hearted and the greatest-minded."⁴ And while Tone displayed his great-mindedness in his writings, his great-heartedness was seen through his actions. As a Northern Irish Protestant, Wolfe Tone co-founded the United Irishmen, and became the greatest proponent of Irish freedom for both Catholics and Protestants. Tone began the work that would later lead to his greatness in 1790, by which time he was already a cautious, though sincere separatist. In "The Spanish War", a pamphlet issued in 1790, Tone declared that England alone ". . . was the radical voice of our Government, . . . ", and that only by severing the connection with England could Ireland gain freedom, happiness and prosperity.⁵ Proving that Ireland was not bound by an English declaration of war, Tone reasoned that Ireland should declare her neutrality. And within these short but strong words of Wolfe Tone, Pearse saw the essence of Irish Nationalism.

Tone had set the alternatives before his nation: either Ireland remained in slavery, subject to foreign rule, or it declared itself free. The issue, concluded Tone, was as clear as this. Almost all of the major problems that Ireland had faced originated because of the nation's connection to Britain; religious disunity, for example, had been perpetuated

by English misrule. Thus Tone worked unceasingly to break the English tyranny and declare a free Irish nation. At this point, Tone realized that the separatist movement had little chance of success unless Ireland abolished ". . .the memory of all past dissensions, and [substituted] the common name of Irishmen in the place of the denominations of Protestant, Catholic, and Dissenter. . . ." ⁷ The following year, in 1791, Wolfe Tone attempted to unite the Irish against their common enemy. Religious dissension could be quelled, he wrote, by showing all Irish sects that their common and implacable enemy was the government of Great Britain. And within weeks Wolfe Tone co-founded the United Irishman in Belfast. Not a nation of disunited loyalties, but one nation of one people united; this was Tone's program for Ireland's future.

In founding the United Irishmen, Wolfe Tone was not yet a republican, but was rather more concerned with the practical business of separation. But if Tone's public pronouncements for this organization were moderate, his intentions were definitely separatist, with a growing desire for republicanism as became clear when, in the summer of 1791, the Friends of Freedom issued their secret manifesto, The Rights of Man in Ireland. This work, attributed to the separatist Tone, ⁸ sought to explain both the rights of a free nation, and of the people in that nation. Yet Tone deftly turned his Rights of Man, defined on utilitarian grounds, into a

definition of the rights of a free nation: "The greatest happiness of the greatest numbers in this island, the inherent and indefeasible claims of every nation to rest in this nation--the will and the power to be happy, to pursue the common weal as an individual pursues his private welfare, and to stand in insulated independence, an imperial people."⁹ Padraic Pearse declared Tone's Rights of Man to be a sufficient declaration of Irish freedom because the vindication of these rights, he noted, would require separation from England.

Wolfe Tone, the first true Irish separatist and leading proponent of the Irish nation in modern times, had left his nation with a multitude of lessons: that the Irish Nation was one; that Ireland had a right to freedom; that national freedom rested upon and guaranteed personal freedom; and that separation from England was necessary for Ireland's survival and sovereignty. But as Tone had desired independence at any cost, his one weakness, if it could be called that, was to have conceived of nationality solely as a physical entity. His disciple, Thomas Davis realized that freedom must be both physical and spiritual. Thus, according to Pearse, the national faith, begun by Wolfe Tone, was taken and refashioned by Thomas Davis.

When Wolfe Tone agitated for the independence of Ireland he spoke in the certain language of practical politics. But this language gave way in Davis to a language of a different

sort. Already given the concept of a nation's physical freedom from Tone, Thomas Davis asserted the other side of freedom, in other words, spiritual and intellectual independence. The Irish nation, declared Davis, was a spiritual, living thing having both a body and a soul. And while the separatist Tone had set the nation moving towards independence, Davis, in the words of Pearse, bade Ireland ". . . in her journey [to] remember her old honour and her old sanctity," ¹⁰

Ireland was made one by her history, taught Davis; a history that made the Gaelic people heir to a common past, a history that knitted the people indissolubly together because of their shared spiritual, emotional, and intellectual experiences. Thus the physical freedom that Tone had offered was incomplete for Davis, who believed that to rest physical freedom on any ground other than spiritual freedom would be to make that freedom unstable, a thing changing according to both time and circumstance. A nation could not live without these elements of spirituality, so that Ireland, while being free, must also be herself; she must continue in that tradition which has made her the authentic Irish nation. Spiritual nationality, then, was nothing less than a body of traditions, and these traditions, for Davis, constituted the soul of the nation. That Ireland was ". . . an ancient land, honoured in the archives of civilisation, traceable into antiquity by its piety, its valour, and its sufferings", ¹¹ was proof enough, for men like Davis and

Pearse, that the Irish nation had a soul. Yet because of his insistence on spirituality and on soul, many regarded Thomas Davis as an "intellectual Nationalist", one who had refused to agitate politically and physically as Wolfe Tone had done. But Pearse's picture of Davis was far from completion.

Although he had taught the gospel of Gaelic love and Irish unity, Thomas Davis became a revolutionary separatist, one who fully realized that Irish Nationality was not only best preserved by a nation's inner, spiritual life, but was safeguarded as well by political agitation. Davis, in this sense, became the most eloquent of Irish separatists. As we have noted, the words that Thomas Davis had spoken to Ireland were words of hope, words of honor, and words of support. But when addressing himself to England, these words of trust and confidence evaporated, and in their place came such an emotional and fiery description of Ireland's desire to be free as this:

And now, Englishmen, listen to us! Though you were to-morrow to give us the best tenures on earth--though you were to equillise Presbyterian, Catholic, and Episcopalian--though you were to give us the amplest representation in your Senate--though you were to restore our absentees, disencumber us of your debt, and redress every one of our fiscal wrongs--and though, in addition to all this, you plundered the treasures of the world to lay gold at our feet, and exhausted the resources of your genius to do us worship and honour--still we tell you, in the name of enthusiastic hearts, thoughtful souls, and fearless spirits--we tell you, by the past, the present, and the future, we would spurn

your gifts, if the condition were that Ireland should remain a province. We tell you, and all whom it may concern, come what may--bribery or deceit, justice, policy, or war--we tell you, in the name of Ireland, that Ireland shall be a nation!¹²

For separation, one must be ready to fight; this Davis knew. So under the guidance of Thomas Davis, the young Irishmen, a nationalist movement, became an armed organization ready to defend Ireland against any English reconquest.

Thomas Davis, then, sternly believed in the political independence of Ireland, and in this he became the true leader of the Irish faith after Tone. Yet Davis carried this faith farther than Tone had. Political independence, Davis declared, meant little in the absence of spiritual and intellectual independence. Davis died in 1845, but he left the nation with these watchwords: "Ireland's aspiration is for unbounded nationality."¹³ Still the national faith of separation continued, and as Thomas Davis filled the void of separatism created by Tone's death, James Fintan Lalor and John Mitchel carried on the work already well developed.

Following the death of Thomas Davis, the young Irishmen had no definite plan of action. They did not know whether to strike for independence or arrange themselves under the constitutional movement for the repeal of the Act of Union of 1801. In this state, the young Irishmen were excited to receive fresh ideas from a previously unknown

separatist, James Fintan Lalor. In a letter to the young Irishmen, Lalor stated that he best knew the thought of the Irish people because he was one of the people. These people, Lalor proclaimed, did not want Repeal because they had neither the strength nor the inclination to fight for it; Repeal, to them, just was not worth the struggle.

However, they could be rallied by the mightier question of independence. Lalor told the Young Irishmen, furthermore, that they must reject Parliamentary or constitutional means since any of these means could be made illegal. The choice of means he left in the hands of the British: "Let England pledge not to argue it [Separation] in any form of physical logic. But dogs tied and stones loose are no bargain. Let the stones be given up; or unmuzzle the wolf-dog. . .!"¹⁴

But it was not Lalor's preparedness to fight for separation that made him a man of merit in Pearse's eyes; a number of Irish men and women had fought and died so that their nation could be free. More precisely Pearse considered Lalor one of the greatest Irish separatist minds because Lalor taught sovereign control over Irish possessions.

In a land beset by realty problems, Lalor taught that land ownership belonged to no one, but was inherent, as was the right to make laws, in all the Sovereign People of Ireland. Lalor explained that separation alone would not solve the hardships of the Irish peasant or tenant farmer unless the entire people of Ireland were put in control of the nation's resources. Writing in the Irish Felon of June, 1848, Lalor

expressed his ideas on sovereign control of national resources in "The Rights of Ireland". The people alone, he declared, and not the gentry, nor the landlords, nor any other group, were the sole owners of the Irish nation, both physically and morally. In asserting the primacy of the sovereign ownership of land. Fintan Lalor maintained that ". . . Ireland her own, and all therein, from the sod to the sky. The soil of Ireland for the people of Ireland, . . . to have and to hold to them and their heirs forever. . . ." ¹⁵ In addition, Lalor held that this right of land ownership was essential to the vigorous enforcement of all other rights in terms of value, possession, and exercise. Those who held land ruled the nation; accordingly, Lalor reasoned, the Sovereign People could rule only if they had complete control of Irish land. Thus only by common consent and by agreement of the nation's people could private land ownership be obtained. And since the Irish peasant had not deeded, consented to, or relinquished their land over to the dour English and Irish gentry, Lalor set forth a program of action to retrieve the land.

For these landlords, Fintan Lalor strongly suggested that either they proclaim their allegiance to Ireland and the titles of land that the Sovereign People might confer, or they suffer irretrievable loss of land, liberty, and perhaps life. In stern language, Lalor told the landlords that if they refused ". . . then I say--away with him--out of this land with him--himself and all his robber rights and all the things himself and his rights have brought into our

island--blood and tears, and famine. . . ." ¹⁶ On the other hand, Lalor advised the Irish tenants and peasants to, first, resist eviction en masse; second, to refuse to pay rent until the entire nation had decided if rents should be paid and to whom. Finally, he vigorously suggested that all rents should be paid to the nation, as Lalor stated ". . . for public purposes, and for behoof and benefit of them, the entire general people." ¹⁷ Such a program might very well lead to an armed insurrection; Lalor hoped that it might.

Noting that over 40,000 British soldiers occupied Ireland, Lalor asked ". . . how best and soonest to kill and capture these 40,000?" ¹⁸ But when these words were published in the Irish Felon of July 22, 1849, Lalor was taken and imprisoned by British authorities. Months later he was released from prison, a weak, sick, and dying man. Yet James Fintan Lalor had still the strength in his heart and the vision in his mind that Ireland must be free. Although he rallied the small number of weary Irish troops, his rising of 1849 failed, and Lalor died a broken man. For Ireland, however, his life and death were not in vain because his words and his actions greatly influenced the heretofore constitutional mind of John Mitchel.

The young Irelander John Mitchel had not been a revolutionary, or one who believed in the use of physical force, or even a democrat. Yet he suddenly became all of these things. "It was as if," Pearse explained, "revolutionary

Ireland, speaking through Lalor, had said to Mitchel 'Follow me', and Mitchel leaving all things followed."¹⁹ At first a moderate nationalist, Mitchel was transformed into the most fiery of separatists whose short gospel of the Irish faith surged with a passionate hate of the British government and flamed with apocalyptic wrath.

John Mitchel urged Ireland to avenge her public enemy, the English government, that government of empire and of putrid commercialism, supported by the harsh hand of English militarism. "Ireland, indeed, needs vengeance;"²⁰ he wrote, and England must be punished for the grievous wrongs it has afflicted upon Ireland and her people. In his own time, Mitchel's critics suggested that his wrath was far too destructive, to which he replied that some forces are meant to be destructive: ". . . have you", he wrote to his critics, "a quarrel with the winds because they fight against the churches, and build them not? In all nature, spiritual and physical, do you not see that some powers and agents have it for their function to abolish and demolish and derange--other some to construct and set in order?"²¹ Mitchel likened himself to the Leveller whose function it was to tear down and destroy so that the creative process of construction could then begin. Death and destruction would bring birth and creation; each being just as necessary as the other. And in support of Mitchel Padraic Pearse stated that a faith must have two sides--a side of goodwill and

peace, and a side directed against the enemies of these. Mitchel's denunciation of the British government was nothing new; all Irish separatists had held this view. Mitchel only most vehemently asserted it.

Tone, Davis, Lalor, and Mitchel--these, as Pearse saw it, were the prophets of the Irish faith, voices that spoke to the present with the promise of the past. Each of these men accepted wholeheartedly and developed skillfully the concept of Irish nationality. "Ireland must be free", their voices roared in unison. But to an Ireland that had not listened, Padraic Pearse brought these voices forth, urging his generation of the early 1900's to fight for freedom as earlier generation had done.

CHAPTER III

THE GAELIC SOUL

The tribune's tongue and the poet's pen
May sow the seed in slavish men;
But 'tis the soldier's sword alone
Can reap the harvest when 'tis grown.

. . . Thomas Davis

As the promise of the past had reacted upon the mind of Padraic Pearse, his duty became clear. History had shown him that Ireland had once had a noble soul, but experience had taught not only that this Gaelic soul had been slowly killed by the spiritual, political, and material devastations of the English government, but that also the Irish themselves seemed to neglect its development. Others before Pearse had noticed that this Gaelic soul had been threatened by external forces, and the writings of Tone, and Davis, Lalor, and Mitchel shouted out in protest. Yet Pearse fully realized that this soul was also being threatened internally. The Irish, it seemed to Pearse, had forgotten that they even had a soul, and as a result, he attempted to save Ireland's spirituality on two fronts. On the one hand, Padraic Pearse, in his writings, had attempted to reconstruct the dying Gaelic soul. But on the other hand, Pearse was firmly

convinced that this reassertion of the national consciousness could not be maintained and fulfilled unless Ireland became a sovereign and independent nation. Thus Pearse worked both unremittingly and militantly to make Ireland free and to bring her back to herself.

Pearse's first major task in saving the Gaelic soul was to stem the process of Anglicization that had infected Ireland for hundreds of years. Once Irish eyes were averted from Britain, he reasoned, then they could look upon Ireland's past honor and nobility, realize that the ever-present problem in Ireland was Britain, and then strive for a freedom strongly desired. First in the Gaelic League, and later in his writings, Pearse awakened parts of his nation to the evils that Ireland faced. The Gaelic League, to be sure, began as an attempt to save the Gaelic language from near-certain extinction, yet it became so influential that Pearse later stated that the Irish Revolution of 1916 had its origins in the Gaelic League. Although the League, founded in 1893, appeared at first to be insignificant, it actually ". . . turned the mind of Ireland away from everything foreign and inwards towards herself and her own concerns" according to P. S. O'Hegarty.¹

Essentially, the League insisted upon all that was Irish as opposed to all that was foreign; and it began this insistence on the matter of language. Out from under the heavy British influence, the Gaelic League declared its battle cry: "Our own language."² To persons such as Pearse

and others in the Gaelic League, it was known that if ". . . [Ireland] lost her language she lost her soul"³, and in reviving and asserting her own language Ireland rejected Anglicization and began the much needed development of the Gaelic soul. In the early 1900's, the Gaelic League, with Padraic Pearse as one of its leaders, asked a generation of Irish men and women to reject their past under foreign domination. It had begun to move this generation, as O'Hegarty reported, ". . . to disregard altogether the whole of Irish evolution since 1800, [and] to realise that when Ireland began to lose her language she began to lose her Nationality, . . ." ⁴

Soon Padraic Pearse became editor of the League's weekly journal, The Sword of Light, and announced his intention of making the League ". . . the organ of militant Gaeldom."⁵ From the attempt to retrieve the dying language, there came the promises, ideas, and values of the past. There grew out of this revival, furthermore, a renewed interest in the use of physical force which created, however small, an opinion in favor of revolting against the British. The League, then, was not strictly a movement for the revival of a language; it was, rather, ". . . a movement for the revival of a Nation. . . ." ⁶ From this influence, Pearse had realized that the broken and crushed Irish civilization needed to be rebuilt, and only through the radical course of separation could this be accomplished. As it had done in

language, then, the Gaelic League sent the Irish people back to their past, back to their native culture, customs and traditions. Most importantly for this work, however, the League had sent Padraic Pearse on his quest to define Irish Nationality.

Nationality connoted, for Pearse, an ancient spiritual tradition felt in the hearts of the people. This tradition made the Irish nation one. Actually, this tradition circumscribed a certain way of life, that certain life-style peculiar to Ireland. Ireland was, in the words of the nationalist poet Keating, ". . . a little world in herself. . .";⁷ a world in which the pomp and glory of appearance mattered less than the inner beauty and sanctity of the soul. Built upon this Gaelic soul, or tradition, was the Irish nation, and here Pearse realized that if the Irish life should die, the Irish nation could not be far behind. A lost nationality can never be retrieved claimed Pearse, giving the examples of the ancient Aztec and Cornish nations. To the Irish nation that was in danger of dying, Pearse warned that "A nation is a stubborn thing, very hard to kill; but a dead nation does not come back to life, any more than a dead man."⁸ The spiritual element that was essential to nationality resided chiefly in a nation's language, the most majestic of a nation's symbols. And as the language came perilously close to extinction, Pearse declared, so too did the Irish nation.

Accepting the beliefs of Thomas Davis as expressed sixty years earlier, Padraic Pearse held that a nation's traditions--in other words, its soul--were best preserved in the language of a nation. By language, which he had called ". . . the main repository of the Irish life. . . ." Pearse accordingly meant literature, folklore, and idioms, all taken together.⁹ A nation's language was fitted for that nation's people; adopted to a nation's history, constitution, climate, and manners, the national language was best suited to express the prevalent thoughts of a nation. Once a nation lost its language, a nation's history, identity, and feeling would be nearly destroyed. Thomas Davis had stated, for example, that the imposition of a foreign language would ". . . send [a people's] history adrift among the accidents of translation--'tis to tear identity from all places--;" and, he continued, "'tis to cut off the entail of feeling and separate the people from their forefathers by a deep gulf--'tis to corrupt their very organs, and abridge their powers of expression."¹⁰ The power and force of a nation's language was overwhelming. It was, for Pearse, the surest guide to a nation's soul.

As nationhood was composed of spirituality, it was completed only by freedom. And freedom, Pearse argued, involved both internal and external sanctions of national sovereignty. He reasoned that a nation held sovereignty not only against all other nations, but also over the people and

things within that nation. Indeed, internal sovereignty concerned the national control of material resources of a nation. As Lalor had asserted earlier, Pearse insisted just as skillfully upon ". . . the divine right of the people. . . , to have and to hold this good green earth."¹¹ In other words, the Irish people, enthroned and sovereign, may ordain that all land be communally owned, as the ancient Irish nation had done. Internal sovereignty then involved the right of private property; and it was an inherent right of the Irish nation ". . . to determine to what extent private property may be held by its members, and in what items of the nation's material resources private property shall be allowed."¹² Never disallowing the right to private property, Pearse stated that all such property was subject to a national sanction. But as the sovereign people may sanction the holding of private property, so too could they revoke this sanction.

Believing that this power over the ownership of land would be especially important during a revolutionary struggle, Pearse declared that "Every man and every woman within the nation has normally equal rights, but a man or woman may forfeit his or her rights by turning recreant to the nation."¹³ Since the coming insurrection would need the backing of the entire nation to succeed, such a program as this, Pearse believed, would force the landlords and other conservative bodies to become Irish patriots rather than British pawns. Thus, at the same time as Pearse was developing the concept

of the Gaelic soul, and all that it entailed--spirituality, sovereignty, and freedom--he had firmly convinced himself that even a passionate assertion of nationality would wither unless it had a firm foundation in political freedom.

Freedom, then, was essential to the survival of a nation's soul. Without it, the foreign influences that had invaded the nation earlier could just as easily invade again. Still, freedom must be properly considered as both a physical and spiritual thing. Past generations have failed to gain freedom, for example, because they have imagined freedom to be merely a material substance. These past generations, Pearse explained, ". . . have made the same mistake that a man would make if he were to forget he has an immortal soul."¹⁴ These generations did not view the Irish nation, as Pearse had viewed it, as a holy, spiritual entity, as a thing which should not be violated and should not be dishonored. Nevertheless, there were some individuals in these earlier generations who had fought to redeem their land and their freedom. Yet there were none of these individuals in his own generation. Pearse believed that his was a generation that had failed to honor the national faith of separation, and it had failed to do so miserably, shamefully, and infamously. His was a generation quite content to live its life in chains; his was a generation almost completely void of the urge for freedom. As a result, Pearse's actions and writings from 1914 to 1916 were intended to incite his generation to struggle for freedom.

Freedom, Pearse told his generation, was given only to those who deserved it, and Ireland, if she remained under the influence of parliamentarians, surely would never deserve freedom. Padraic Pearse had discovered his mission, and that mission according to his biographer, Le Roux, was ". . . to free Ireland, or to weaken the Conquest at least, and to die if need be alone, or the first in accomplishing that mission."¹⁵ Great events were coming to Ireland, and Pearse meant to meet those events, and then lead them. But when the radical separatist declared "If one man must die for the freedom of Ireland that man shall be me", the Irish nation did not know what to say.¹⁶ To the shock and frustration of Pearse, the Irish nation had lost its age-old militancy, and Pearse responded by mocking the passive nationalists of his time: "A citizen who cannot vindicate his citizenship is a contradiction in terms."¹⁷ Or, as he proclaimed even more forcefully: "Ireland unarmed will attain just as much freedom as England will give her; Ireland armed will attain ultimately just as much freedom as she wants. . . . There are things more horrible than bloodshed; and slavery is one of them."¹⁸

Ireland must realize that no nationalist movement had ever succeeded without the use of arms. The nation remained degraded as long as she remained unarmed, and Pearse grimly told the Irish people that "Until you have armed yourself and made yourself skillful in the use of your arms you have

no right to a voice in any concern of the Irish nation, no right to consider yourself a member of the Irish Nation or any other Nation; no right to raise your head among any body of decent men."¹⁹ Even Christ could not save a people wanting to be damned, he declared. Pearse saw that Ireland had lost her manhood in refusing to demonstrate against the British forces on Irish land, and in feeling no reproach against this British presence. Calling this British power ". . . the most arrogant tyranny that there has ever been in the world; . . .", Pearse implored Ireland to fight against this evil thing.²⁰ Stirred by a patriotism renewed in the voice of the past, Pearse urged Ireland to take a militant stance. And with the beginning of World War I, Pearse loudly proclaimed that the time for revolutionary action was rotten-ripe.

Telling the nation that the road to freedom would be long and bloody, Pearse prevailed upon the nation to fight for freedom while the opportunity was present. "A European war has brought about a crisis which may contain, as yet hidden within it, the moment for which the generations have been waiting. It remains to be seen whether, if the moment reveals itself, we shall have the sight to see and the courage to do, . . ."²¹ Yet Pearse's uncertainty, as seen in the above statement, was not long-lived; for, finally, the nation was responding. Because of World War I, and because of the

founding of the Ulster Volunteers in Belfast,²² the nationalist movement came out in force. A monstrous meeting was held to form the Irish Volunteers, and within weeks, the Irish Volunteers numbered 150,000 members. This Irish Volunteer movement was definitely nationalist and separatist, and had arranged itself under the leadership of Pearse, agreeing with him that as long as Ireland remained in subjection, there could be only one possible attitude for the Gaelic people, and that was an attitude of revolt. It would be base and degrading, Pearse explained, for the nation to react in any other way. "We believe that England has no business in this country at all--", he asserted, and declared "that Ireland from the centre to the zenith, belongs to the Irish. . . . We believe, then, that it is the duty of Irishmen to struggle always, never giving in or growing weary, until they have won back their country again."²³ Yet the Volunteers did give in, and their membership shrank from 150,000 to 10,000 as many enlisted in the National Volunteers for the defense of Britain, not of Ireland.

With the remaining 10,000 Irish Volunteers behind him, Padraic Pearse, poet, schoolmaster, radical separatist and revolutionary leader, asserted Ireland's age-old claim for freedom as he rose up, along with James Connolly and others, against British forces on Easter Monday of 1916. And as a result of his dedication to Ireland and his ability to rally

and lead, Padraic Pearse was honored by being elected the first President of the Provisional Government of the Irish Republic. Within days, however, the Provisional Government was crushed by British forces which outnumbered the insurgents 20 to 1. And feeling that his and the revolution's deaths were at hand, Padraic Pearse addressed the rebel soldiers, emotionally telling them "I am satisfied that we have saved Ireland's honour. . . For my part, as to anything I have done in this, I am not afraid to face either the judgement of God, or the judgement of posterity."²⁴ Yet Pearse did have to face the swift judgement of a British military court operating in secrecy. Pearse had been found guilty to the charge of "Rebellion with the intent of assisting the enemy", and on May 3rd, 1916 Padraic Pearse, along with Thomas Clarke and Thomas MacDonagh, also organizers of the Easter Rebellion, was executed by a firing squad.

But although he had failed in his struggle to separate Ireland from England, Padraic Pearse had succeeded in reawakening a dying national consciousness. He had made his, and following generations aware, that Ireland had a noble soul and that this soul demanded freedom. Thus in showing Ireland as the nation it had once been, Padraic Pearse brought Ireland back to herself, back to her past valor, honor, and history, and away from the foreign influences that had ruled her for so long.

CHAPTER IV

THE SUBJECT NATION

What is Freedom? Ye can tell
That which slavery is too well,
For its very name has grown
To an echo of your own.

'Tis to work, and have such pay,
As just keeps life, from day to day,
In your limbs as in a cell
For the tyrants' use to dwell.

. . .Percy Bysshe Shelley

While Padraic Pearse declared that the root of Ireland's misery originated in foreign domination, James Connolly wholeheartedly accepted Pearse's declaration, and added to it his seering indictment of capitalism. Both an Irish nationalist and an international socialist, James Connolly boldly reasoned that before Ireland became a socialist nation, she would have to be a free nation. Thus in his own right, James Connolly struggled to free Ireland from the encumbering binds of British imperialism as well as the heavy chains of capitalism. Yet perhaps his hardest struggle was in convincing the working class of Ireland that they did indeed live in a subject nation.

Connolly realized that the working class in Ireland lacked a firm knowledge of socialism. If it ever was to develop itself as a respectable movement, it would have to better understand its past in all its evils and horrors

before the workers could reach a proper insight into their current situation. Accordingly, James Connolly began his denunciation of British imperialism by explaining Ireland's working class history under hundreds of years of British domination. Ireland had once been a free and noble nation, a nation in which the people elected their own rulers, determined their own progress, and mastered their own destiny. Ireland, then, was also a just nation ". . . in which", as Connolly described, "the highest could not infringe upon the rights of the lowest--those rights being as firmly fixed and assured as the powers of the highest, . . ."¹ As a free clansman, the Irish peasant shared in the development of his unassuming nation. Yet within a matter of days, this native communal society was nearly obliterated by the Conquest of Oliver Cromwell and his troops.

Cromwell imposed an alien rule and an even more abhorrent foreign social system upon the Irish. To be sure, this was both a conquest of land and liberty; Gaelic society, law, and tradition were all ruptured as a result. "Never before and never again", James Connolly attested, "were the lives and liberties of the people of Ireland so completely at the mercy of foreign masters. . ."² So extensive, indeed, was the Cromwellian conquest of 1653-54 that the Irish nation almost ceased to exist. With Cromwell's forces and English governors harshly presiding over Ireland, the British Parliament proclaimed the death of the Irish social system,

here detailed by Pendergast in his Cromwellian Settlement of Ireland: ". . . all the ancient estates and farms of the people of Ireland were to belong to the adventures and the army of England, and that Parliament had assigned Connaught³ for the habitation of the Irish nation, whither they must transplant their wives and daughters and children before the First of May following (1654) under penalty of death. . ."⁴

The assault on the nation continued: Irish girls, women, and boys were captured and sold as slaves in the West Indies; land was taken as its owners were deported. In all, over 100,000 members of the Irish population were enslaved, while fully nine-tenths of the Irish land was confiscated.

Even though Ireland and its people had been inflicted with social and political slavery, had been subjected to the imposition of foreign rule, and in the process had been imperilled with loss of their lands, liberties, and lives, the Irish had not been totally conquered, and the Conquest had not been fully accomplished. These British interlopers, for example, had not succeeded in relegating the Irish to the province of Connaught. In fact, that plan had come into direct opposition to the British land-thieves who discovered that they could not grow rich unless Irish labourers worked the confiscated land. Within months, then, the workers were slaves on the land they had once owned. James Connolly had been giving the Irish workers a picture of the subject nation at its worst; Ireland then was a nation controlled and

mastered ". . . by forces outside of and irresponsible and unresponsive to the people of Ireland. . .!"⁵ The evils inflicted upon the working class, then, continued to affect the working class in later centuries.

Because of these continuing effects of a nation enslaved both politically and socially, the Irish mind, in essence, ceased to develop. With the forced imposition of an English social system, Connolly argued, Irish leaders lost contact with their people; the Irish political leaders, now virtually required to use the English language, were almost completely shut off from the thought and the heritage of the Irish commoner. Thus from the seventeenth on into the nineteenth century, the Irish nation, Connolly observed, ". . . suffered socially, nationally, and intellectually from a prolonged arrested development."⁶ More importantly for Connolly, however, the Irish peasant was thoroughly beaten in almost every important way: "Politically he was non-existent, legally he had no rights, intellectually he sank under the weight of his social absement, and surrendered to the downward drag of his poverty."⁷ Many had left Ireland filled with a passionate hate for their masters, but returned, usually after having been schooled in Italy, or France, or Germany, urging the Irish to forget their dream of freedom, and asking them instead to accept the feudal advancement of the Continent. These people had returned to teach Ireland, but wherever they came from they taught Irish children, in Connolly's words,

". . . to deny the language and traditions of their fathers."⁸ Essentially, ". . . the Irish Gael sank out of sight," Connolly regrettably declared, "and in his place the middle-class politicians, capitalists, and ecclesiastics labored to produce a hybrid Irishman, assimilating a foreign social system, a foreign speech, and a foreign character."⁹

The British Empire marched into Ireland, disrupted Ireland's natural order, and proceeded to set the Irish Catholic against the Irish Protestant. And while these two sects quarrelled, Britain abolished trial by jury, denied the freedom of the press, and crushed individual liberties by enforcing military rule. Ireland's ancient liberties as well as her noble instincts were all threatened and nearly destroyed. As it had been for Padraic Pearse, this was for James Connolly an assault upon the soul of the nation. And as Ireland's soul nearly perished in its miserable subjection, other areas of the nation were just as terribly infected. Connolly argued that slavery ". . . is a thing of the soul before it embodies itself in the material things of the world."¹⁰ By this he meant that Ireland's inner part had been first intimidated, corrupted, or besieged by the English government before the material part of the nation fell into the wage-slavery of modern capitalism. Once the soul of the nation succumbed, then, the outer part of the nation offered little resistance.

The Irish capitalist class, aided by fellow capitalists in Britain, grew up quickly, healthily, and strongly.

Indeed, Connolly remarked that ". . . , the Irish propertied classes became more English than the English. . . ." ¹¹

The major fault of capitalism, Connolly proclaimed, was that it had made the worker an outcast in the world that he had created. Houses, shops, and factories, all built by the working class now belonged to capitalists. The land that the worker tilled, and the crops that he raised, and the rents that he paid, all belonged to the capitalist class, a class, which according to Connolly, ". . . never contributed an ounce of sweat to their erecting [yet] will continue to draw rent and profit from [the workers] while the system lasts." ¹² Thus the only truly indispensable class in Ireland was forced to sell its services to a master capitalist in order to live. Only by selling his energies could the worker survive; and only by producing a profit was he allowed to.

Yet even in survival, the condition of the working class in Ireland was miserable. Fully eighty-seven per cent of the Irish working class in the early 1900's, for example, earned less than thirteen shillings per week. ¹³ The slums of Dublin, furthermore, were among the worst in the world; over 23,000 families in Dublin, for example, lived in one room per family, as Connolly expressed "--living, sleeping, eating and drinking, and dying in the narrow compass of the four walls of one room." ¹⁴ The Dublin working man and his

family never had enough to eat, never had more than one tattered remnant of a blanket when he really needed three, and was now required to pay rent on the land that his father or grandfather had once owned. Even when the workers were fed, or warmed, or clothed, it was only because some individual capitalist had made a profit by providing these services; and when the capitalist's profit margin shrank, he withdrew his services and found some other ware or service to peddle. "How can a person, or a class, be free when its means of life are in the grasp of another?" Connolly rhetorically asked,¹⁵ and answered that the working class most certainly was not free but rather lived under the illusion of freedom.

Upset because the working class had succumbed to the bourgeois doctrine of the Rights of Man, Connolly declared that the worker's theoretical freedom was transformed into actual dependence upon the capitalist and landlord classes. There were no rights under capitalism, Connolly explained, because capitalists and landlords have flourished by denying rights to the worker. These two groups have continued to exist, he wrote, ". . . by perpetually confiscating the property which the worker has in the fruits of his toil, and [have established] property for the capitalist by denying it to the labourer."¹⁶ Capitalism, moreover, had taught the Irish nation the morality of social cannibalism--the weak devoured by the strong; hence Connolly likened capitalism to

". . . a glorified pig-trough where the biggest swine gets the most swill."¹⁹ And as competition reduced the working class to the status of a slave, so too did it imperil Ireland in Britain's wars.

The capitalism impelled nations to war became its most immediate danger for James Connolly during the years 1912 to 1914. Capitalism needed war to survive, explained Connolly, as he told the working class that all of Britain's major wars from its war with Spain in the 1590's, to the just completed struggle in China, to the impending war with Germany, were commercial wars. Since capitalism needed to search out and conquer new markets, competition between capitalist nations had inevitably led to war. And the British especially had acted in such a way as to bring war about. Through its swift and powerful fleet, the British government, Connolly explained to the workers, ". . . watches and works to isolate its competitors from the comity of nations, to ring it around with hostile foes."¹⁸ Soon Britain's allies strike the nation while the British fleet swiftly floats in to gain commercial control. But while Connolly warned the working class about the dangers it would soon face, they were still reluctant to join the movement, and thus make it viable, The working class at this point remained skeptical to socialism, due mainly to the influence of the Catholic Church.

From as early as 1319 when Irish peasants united to drive the English forces out of Ireland, and the English king

appealed to Pope John XXII who responded ". . . by at once excommunicating all the Irish who were against the English", the Catholic Church was supportive of British imperialism and capitalism."¹⁹ In more recent times, the church again showed its intense dislike of any working-class movement. During the Irish famine of 1845-49 when hundreds of thousands of Irish men and women starved, and just as many died, the clergy of the Catholic Church commanded the Irish peasants to pay their rents to their landlords or risk the loss of their immortal souls. And again in the 1890's the Church intervened in Irish affairs when the Pope denounced the Irish Land League and ". . . issued a Receipt condemning disaffection to the English Government, . . . "²⁰ Especially during the years after 1900 the Church in Ireland lashed out against socialist doctrine solely because, as Connolly had asserted, capitalism had asked the Church to defend it; and the Church did defend capitalism using all of its power particularly by having its clergy denounce socialism from the pulpit. But whenever the Church had meddled in the internal political affairs of a nation, the result, Connolly declared, ". . . had been disastrous to the interests of religion and inimical to the progress of humanity."²¹ The labor movement in Ireland had little support because the Church gave it no support. Thus Connolly sought to convince the largely-Catholic working class of Ireland that the essence of socialist doctrine had once been mainstream Catholic teaching.

Connolly proclaimed to the working class that socialism and Catholicism were not incompatible nor mutually exclusive. To be sure, Connolly had perceived, in the words of Owen Dudley Edwards, ". . . the essential interdependence of Catholicism and Socialism."²² Connolly's words and actions, Edwards continued, were ". . . God's works, but its language, its definitions and its expressions had to be put in terms that his audience would be fired by, . . ."²³ Was it not socialist doctrine, as well as Catholic doctrine, that all men and women, regardless of their race or nationality, were united in their common humanity?, Connolly asked. He told the workers to listen to the Catholic doctrine of the past, and then notice its socialist intentions, giving them first the example of St. Clement:

The use of all things that are found in this world ought to be common to all men. Only the most manifest iniquity makes one say to another, "This belongs to me, that to you." Hence the origin of contention among men.²⁴

And, taken from St. Ambrose: "It is Nature itself that has given birth to the right of the community, whilst it is only unjust usurpation that has created the right of private property."²⁵ Or, quite succinctly by St. Chrysostom:

"The rich man is a thief."²⁶ Connolly, here, was showing that socialism had been historically acceptable in past Catholic doctrine, and that the working class of Ireland had no longer any reason to reject socialist teachings. He had attempted to release the working class of Ireland from their

socially-narrow Catholic view-point. And in freeing the working class, Connolly hoped that they, too, would accept the belief that socialism was the one certain solution to the dual problems that plagued Ireland.

Ireland was a subject nation; it was subject to the conquest, to the political and social slavery of England, and to the death of its Gaelic culture that imperialism had wrought; and it was as well, subject to the high rents and low wages, the diseased and infested tenements, and the impending danger of war that capitalism had caused. Only through a strong and viable working class movement, Connolly declared, could the workers free themselves both from the oppressive empire and from capitalism. Finally getting some amount of working class attention, Connolly announced that "The times are ripe for a forward movement!", and set down a program designed for labor's re-conquest of Ireland.²⁷

CHAPTER V

PEACEFULLY IF POSSIBLE;
FORCIBLY IF NECESSARY

Some men, faint-hearted, ever seek
Our programme to retouch,
And will insist, whene'er they speak
That we demand too much.
'Tis passing strange, yet I declare
Such statements give me mirth,
For our demands most moderate are
We only want the earth.

. . .James Connolly

As the subject nation had been crushed by the strong and ever-present forces of capitalism and imperialism, and as the soul of this once gallant nation approached nearer and nearer to its final destruction, the Irish nation had no future save death or militancy. Ireland could be saved, according to the brilliant socialist and labor-organiser James Connolly, only if the working class took an active and aggressive interest in the nation's future. Declaring that ". . . the only hope for Ireland. . . lies in a revolutionary reconstruction of society, and that the working class is the only one historically fitted for that great achievement, . . ." ¹ James Connolly pushed forth a program for the Irish labor movement. His program, involving the concepts of industrial unionism, economic conscription, and social republicanism, aimed for a working-class re-conquest of the Irish nation.

Nowhere in the history of Western Europe have the forces of capitalism and organized labor more seriously confronted each other than in the Great Dublin Lock-Out of 1913-1914. The Lock-Out began as an attempt by William Murphy, chairman of the Dublin Employers' Federation, to break the Irish Transport and General Workers Union (ITGWU), founded by James Larkin in 1911. In the summer of 1913, Murphy told the workers of his newspaper, the Irish Independent that they must either resign from the ITGWU or would be dismissed from their positions. Larkin's union thereupon blacklisted Murphy's paper, and Murphy, as a result, locked out the workers belonging to the ITGWU. Murphy also owned the Dublin Tramways Company, and Larkin's organization prepared to retaliate against this industry. Thus on August 26, 1913, at precisely 9:40 in the morning, seven-hundred tram operators, who were also members of the ITGWU, walked off their jobs. Dublin during the week of August 26th was full of visitors,² and the walk-out was certainly intended to embarrass William Murphy; but Murphy remained undaunted. Summoning the four hundred members of the Employers' Federation, Murphy intended to crush Larkin's union once and for all. His Federation declared that if the Dublin workers did not retract their membership in the ITGWU, they would all be released from their employment positions. Within three weeks, the Employers' Federation had locked-out 25,000 Dublin workers.

It was Murphy's and the Federation's intent to starve the workers into submission. AE decried Murphy's action as "a devilish policy of starvation",³ while W. B. Yeats concluded "Romantic Ireland's dead and gone," in his poem concerning the Lock-Out, "September, 1913".⁴ Indeed, all thought of an idyllic romanticism quickly perished in Ireland as the police wantonly and brutally batoned the helpless workers on August 31, thereafter known as "Bloody Sunday". For months the Lock-Out continued. Class war had come to Ireland, and James Connolly resolved to come out on top. The ". . . employers propose to make general war", he wrote, asserting "shall we shrink from it; cower before their onset? A thousand times no! Shall we crawl back into slums, abase our hearts, bow our knees, and crawl once more to lick the hand that would smite us? . . . Let them declare their lock-out; . . . "⁵ Yet as Connolly was prepared for endless strikes to dispose of capitalism, the Irish workers could starve for only some time, and in February of 1914 the great strike perished.⁶

The Great Dublin Lock-Out, in the eyes of James Connolly, had been a compelling example of united industrial action in which, as he wrote, "Trade unionists, socialists of all kinds, anarchists, industrialists, syndicalists, [in short,] all the varying and hitherto discordant elements of the labor movement found a common platform, were joined together in pursuit of a common object. . . ." ⁷ For years,

James Connolly had preached syndicalism, a policy of trade unionism whereby the means of production fell under the control of labor federations, but shortly after the Lock-Out he questioned that policy. It was not so much that the Lock-Out had failed--to be sure, labor had clearly indicated its strength, and the employers realized that they could never again abridge their workers' right to free association. To Connolly, it mattered more that the Lock-Out had not produced its intended results. Accordingly, he searched through his earlier work in the Industrial Workers of the World (I.W.W.) to analyze the shortcomings of syndicalism. Connolly helped to found the I.W.W. of America in 1905-07, having in purpose the merging of numerous industrial unions into one great body. The I.W.W. intended upon organizing together and then seizing economic machinery. Connolly came to understand, however, that the syndicalist policy of labor union amalgamation led to what Connolly called ". . . a freezing up of the fraternal spirit."⁸

This amalgamation, it seemed to Connolly, resulted in sectionalism, meaning that the workers were still unable to view themselves merely as workers, for political purposes, and continued to view themselves instead as plumbers, or carpenters, and so on. As long as the working class viewed itself in this narrow manner, its energies remained divided. At this point Connolly likened the problems inherent in syndicalism to his critical analysis of the American Federation of Labor (A.F.L.).

Connolly claimed that the A.F.L. was a disorganized scattering of various craft members. Since the workers of the A.F.L. were arranged on the industrial plane as members of mutually exclusive craft unions--namely, as masons, as dock-yard workers, as factory workers, and the like--their economic, political, and social power was limited. Connolly deplored craft unionism, as evidenced by the A.F.L., because it was totally disruptive of any major labor movement.⁹ Noting that anything which divided or disorganized the labor movement strengthened the forces of capitalism, Connolly declared that "The most dispersive and isolating force at work in the labour movement to-day is craft unionism, . . ."¹⁰ Opposed to craft unionism, then, Connolly offered the concept of industrial unionism.

That labor might survive and become the salvation of Ireland, it must unite, Connolly believed, adding that by so doing it could definitely accomplish the re-conquest of Ireland. For all of this, Connolly still had a certain theoretical problem to solve. The working class movement had become a divided trilogy, as Connolly's biographer explained: "trade unions for 'direct action', a Labour party for organising votes, and a socialist party for propaganda. But the socialist party was relegated to third place. Connolly needed and was feeling for the missing link, the socialist party of a new type which would provide the working-class movement with its incorruptible cadre."¹¹ And

Connolly found this framework by calling for a new political party. He believed that the Irish Trade Unions, the Labour Council of Dublin, and socialists should form a party

". . . distinct from all others, and entirely guided by the interests of labour."¹² Thus once the working class movement set up a political party in the interests of the entire class, the ends of labor could be secured "peacefully if possible, forcibly if necessary."¹³

Connolly defined industrial unionism as ". . . the amalgamation of all forces of labor into one union, capable of concentrating all forces upon any one issue in any one fight. . . ."¹⁴ Industrialism required that all workers recognize their common interests, and then seek achievement of those interests through a proper utilization of the workers' energies. Without one main body, labor's thought remained ambiguous and its energies divided. Hence the importance of a unified socialist party operating in one forceful direction. Connolly was actually describing a society in which, according to Greaves ". . . all workers elected their foremen, these in turn their managers, and where supreme administrative responsibility rested in committee elected from constituencies representing various industries."¹⁵ For Connolly, then, working class power sprang from organization, and through this arrangement labor could dictate the terms of its employment.

Under the concept of industrialism, Connolly asserted that any labor dispute could be immediately solved. Since

all workers were to be governed by one body that they had elected, the entire mass of labor would be directed to support those workers having labor difficulties. If, for example, the Irish dock-yard workers were involved in a labor dispute, their employer would no longer be able to lock-out these people while others, scabs, filled in to take their places. In the first place, no Irish worker true to the cause of labor would engage in the operations of a now-tainted workshop while his fellow workers were on strike. In the second place, that body of labor even remotely connected to the tainted business would have had already been shut down in support of the strikers. Thus leaving master capitalist entirely without support. In his article "A Lesson from Dublin", Connolly explained his doctrine of the tainted work-shop:

[We] in Dublin had realised that the capitalist cannot be successfully fought upon the industrial field unless we recognise that all classes of workers should recognise their common interests, that such recognition implied that an employer engaged in a struggle with his workpeople should be made taboo or tainted, that no other workers should co-operate in helping to keep his business growing, that no goods coming from his works should be handled by organised workers, and no goods going to his works should be conveyed by organised workers. That he should, in effect,¹⁶ be put outside the pale of civilisation, . . .

Such a doctrine, Connolly believed, would put the nation, especially the capitalist class, at the mercy of organised labor. In other words, the socialist party would affirm ". . . that labour is not on trial; it is civilisation that

is on trial--and all the elements of civilisation in Ireland, as elsewhere, must stand or fall as they are true or not to the cause of labour."¹⁷ And once labor had arrived at this point, Connolly triumphantly proclaimed, ". . . neither gods nor men can stop its onward march to victory."¹⁸

The next step in the workers' re-conquest would be the conscription of the economic resources of the nation. Thus as industrialism was a method of organization, it was also "a science of fighting", and the war, of course, was against capitalism. Yet capitalism could not have been successfully fought, Connolly reasoned, unless the workers were organized on the industrial field under his program of industrialism. Once arranged in this manner, the workers could conscript any and all of the nation's resources to assist it in the class struggle. "All the materials of distribution", Connolly declared, "--the railways, the canals, and all their equipment will at once become the national property of the Irish state."¹⁹ Advancing the concept of economic conscription even further, Connolly asserted that Ireland's shipping industry, and all of her factories, and all of the nation's land would have to be conscripted for the benefit and salvation of the working class, as he stated: "All factories and workshops owned by people who do not yeild allegiance to the Irish Government immediately upon its proclamation should at once be confiscated, and their productive powers applied to the service of the community

loyal to Ireland, and to the Army in its service."²⁰ In short, James Connolly concluded, "Let there be conscription all around."²¹

As the poor have been conscripted to fight the battles of the rich, the economic resources of the rich would have been conscripted to fight the battles of the poor. "If it is right to take the manhood", Connolly reasoned, then "it is doubly right to take the necessary property in order to strengthen the manhood in its warfare."²² He stated that land especially would have to be conscripted. Ireland in the years preceding World War I was again in danger of a threatening famine. Too much of Ireland's land had lain idle, while too much of her food was exported to Britain. As a result, armies abroad ate well, but the Irish peasants starved. In order to correct this mean and miserable situation, the enormous amount of idle land which belonged to the gentry would have to be immediately confiscated, and laborers would, according to Connolly, be put upon the land ". . . to grow crops to feed the multitude now in danger of starvation during the coming year."²³ As this land had been stolen from its rightful Irish owners generations ago, the Irish working class would have been able to retrieve this land, ". . . without compensation and without apology."²⁴ James Connolly fully realized that such a radical program as this was necessary in the interest of the working class. But for some time he was uncertain whether the tactics of industrialism

and economic conscription alone would be sufficient for the political and economic independence of the Irish nation.

Soon Connolly recognized that these peaceful yet demanding, tactics could not ensure a working-class control of Ireland. Hence his call for socialist republicanism, which he defined as ". . . the politics of labour, of freedom from all tyrants, foreign and native."²⁵ The emancipation of the working class, Connolly believed, would bring Ireland's national, political, and social tyranny to an end. Yet this emancipation must come through a militant working-class movement prepared to defend its intentions and assert its right through the use of arms. Unlike the revolutionary nationalists, such as Arthur Griffith, who cared little if any for the emancipation of the working class, and unlike the narrow-minded socialists of the British-backed Independent Labour Party, which rejected national independence as being a setback to the required international socialist tasks, Connolly believed socialist republicanism to be a middle course. In his well-reasoned view, Connolly stated that Ireland's proper course would be one which combined the movements of socialism and nationalism. Thus Connolly hoped that the working-class movement would adhere to the revolutionary nationalist past of Ireland, but go beyond this to express the fuller ideal of socialist republicanism.

In sum, for a nation subject both to the injustices of capitalism and of British imperialism, James Connolly

strongly maintained that the working class Re-Conquest of Ireland would have to involve the concepts of industrial unionism, economic conscription and socialist republicanism. Only through labor and nationalism united could Ireland gain its long-desired freedom, as Connolly concluded:

We can only hope to carry our flag to victory
by securing the aid of all those workers
everywhere who desire to see an effective force
carrying the green flag of an Irish regiment
whilst unconditionally under the red flag of
the proletarian army.²⁶

CHAPTER VI

SOCIALIST THOUGHT FOR AN INTERNATIONAL WAR

The world hath conquered, the wind hath
scattered like dust
Alexander, Caesar, and all that shared their
sway,
Tara is grass, and behold how Troy lieth
low,--
And even the English, perchance their hour
will come!

. . . Author unknown

With the menace of war threatening the Continent, socialists all throughout Europe had promised to unite and stage a general strike in order to avert the war. And if war should come, these socialists believed, the workers of Britain, France, and Germany would combine in their refusal to fight. Certain events, however, disrupted this socialist program, and the possibility of war became even more imminent. As the social democrats in the German Reichstag voted for war bonds, and as the worker's Second International collapsed, the socialist machinery of internationalism toppled in 1914, and was forever lost after the death of James Kier Hardie, and the assassination of the eloquent socialist leader Jean Jaures.¹ Socialists were unable to prevent World War I, and it burst upon them in the summer of 1914. Dublin, in the

pre-war months of 1913 to 1914, was not immune to the deadly horrors of the coming war. Indeed, Ireland, as an unwilling partner to the British Empire, was dragged directly into the conflict, a war which, to the passionate socialist James Connolly, was both a major setback to the socialist cause, but also a glorious and long-awaited opportunity for Ireland to strike for freedom.

Fighting for Ireland's freedom was Connolly's first thought when he heard the news about the start of the European conflict. "This means war" he shouted, and immediately asked to speak with the leaders of the Irish Republican Brotherhood, a secret separatist society, to discuss plans for a sudden insurrection against British forces in Ireland. Yet even in his excitement to strike a blow for Ireland's independence, James Connolly had more on his mind than the current war and Ireland's opportunity. As his biographer C. Desmond Greaves explained, Connolly ". . . was a man in touch with socialist thought on an international scale."² Connolly had deeply believed in socialist internationalism, and as a result, he felt the shock of war just as powerfully as other socialist leaders had. For all that, Connolly was an intense Irish nationalist, and the presence of war moved him to the very depths of his soul. Thus he tried to enunciate what he considered to be the proper position of the Irish labor movement vis-a-vis this international war, making clear that position in The Irish Worker:

What should be the attitude of the working-class democracy of Ireland in the face of the present crisis? . . . Should a German army land in Ireland tomorrow, we should be perfectly justified in joining it, if by so doing we could rid this country once and for all from its connection with the Brigand Empire that drags us unwillingly to war. Should the working class of Europe, rather than slaughter each other for the benefit of kings and financiers, proceed tomorrow to erect barricades all over Europe. . . that war might be abolished, we should be perfectly justified in following such a glorious example, and contributing over aid to the final dethronement of the vulture classes that rule and rob the world.³

Hence Connolly emphasized Ireland's necessity to gather aid wherever she could find it, including aid from the German army, and he appealed to the working class to turn this war into the bandishment of capitalism. But Connolly's quick enthusiasm for war soon gave way to a cold analysis of socialism's failures.

Could this war have been prevented? Connolly asked, as he sought out the reasons for the failure of socialism to halt the war. Essentially, the cause of socialist internationalism had been defeated, he reasoned, because of labor's political weakness, which he described as ". . . the divorce between the industrial and political movements of labour."⁴ Connolly concluded that the working class movement, although having enormous power at industrial sites, was unable to capture and utilize this power politically. Labor's actual strength, in other words, existed only at the points of production--the docks, or farms, or factories--and the labor movement as a whole was unable to convert this strength into

other areas. The working class did vote for independent candidates having an interest in the labor movement, but once in office, these representatives of labor were transformed into capitalist apologists, usually rejecting the hopes, wishes, and ideas of the working class movement. And without political power and influence, moreover, the labor movement could not bring about its socialist republic. Thus even though labor, through a general strike, could shut down the wheels of commerce, it could not accomplish less drastic programs in a more constitutional manner.

Politically, labor had failed and the war had come; now the working class desperately needed to correct its past mistakes. Properly the working class should have refused to aid the war-profiteers in any way. Thus in the same act of preventing the international war, labor would have been in a unique position to wage civil war against the capitalist class. And while Lenin instructed the workers to ". . . turn the imperialist war into a civil war. . ." ⁵, James Connolly proclaimed that the ". . . signal of war ought also to have been the signal for rebellion. . .", as he urged the working class to stage a social revolution. ⁶ Sincerely believing that such a civil insurrection surely could not have involved the large loss of life that an international war would have caused, James Connolly explained the duty of working class socialists: ". . . to intervene in favour of [the war's] speedy termination and with all their powers to utilise the

economic and political crisis created by the war to rouse the masses and thereby hasten the downfall of capitalist class rule."⁷ The labor movement, however, had failed to heed Connolly's advice, and they were now slaughtering each other instead of fighting together, in the international army of the working class, against capitalism.

Socialists were killing each other in a war caused by capitalist greed, Connolly declared to the workers. And as long as the war continued, the cause of labor slowly perished. Every lethal shell that fell on a German brigade, or every charge of the Austrian calvary, or any advance of the French, Russian or English armies surely killed some fellow socialists. "If these men must die", Connolly cried out, "would it not be better to die in their own country fighting for freedom for their class, and for the abolition of war. . . , than go . . . and die slaughtering and slaughtered by their brothers that tyrants and profiteers might live."⁸ Still the working class had little choice: either it enlisted in the capitalist army or it faced certain starvation at home.

Ireland provided a great deal of Britain's war materials ranging from crops to men. Because of this, the Irish workers sank in misery; perhaps one day the workers would do without clothing, the next day they would do without food. "From being citizens with rights the workers were being driven and betrayed into the position of slaves with duties" Connolly roared,⁹ attesting that conscription was

this slavery. Conscription of Irish men threatened individual liberty, and that alone made it brutal enough. But the Irish workers were conscripted by starvation, a situation Connolly labelled ". . . foul with the foulness of Hell."¹⁰ Irish workers who refused to be conscripted were released from their jobs and faced nothing in their future but enforced unemployment. Without money, and without food, the Irish worker seemed to forget all of the past and present honors, crimes, and evil deeds imposed upon him by the British government. Starved into submission, the worker enlisted. The falling British Empire, then, could not even fight its own wars; it required Irishmen to die for an imperial cause, for a cause and an empire that they most certainly did not believe in.¹¹ So the Irish worker, now stripped of his tattered rags and dressed in crisp khaki, was led off to war.

By 1915, especially in Dublin and Belfast, the hysteria of war had taken over the nation. Wherever he went, Connolly was shouted down from preaching his socialist doctrine as ". . . jingoism became more rampant. . ."¹² Past indifference to the cause of labor now became open hostility. In describing these feverish times, Connolly wrote "Then followed a very difficult time for all who stood for an independent Ireland."¹³ Nationalists were now viewed as traitors, and Connolly's small band of committed socialists was viewed in an even worse light. The nation had not kept pace with the advanced opinion of both the socialist Connolly and of the staunchly nationalist movement of the Irish Volunteers.¹⁴

In the meantime, John Redmond, then leader of the Irish Parliamentary Party, together with Herbert Asquith, Prime Minister of Great Britain, pledged the assistance of the Irish Volunteers to the British forces involved in the European conflict. Redmond had been promised by Asquith that if the Volunteer assistance was forthcoming, Home Rule would come to Ireland; and the nation wildly succumbed to this plan.¹⁵ But after forty members of Connolly's Citizen Army and numerous members of the Irish Volunteers stormed the headquarters of the Parliamentary Party, Redmond and Asquith abandoned their idea. Nonetheless daunted, John Redmond then formed the National Volunteers to assist the British, and the number of Irish Volunteers, as a result, was seriously reduced. Having a total of over 150,000 troops before Redmond's announcement, the Irish Volunteers shrank to a mere 12,000 members. James Connolly was incensed at Redmond's actions and bitterly criticized the leaders of the Volunteer movement since they could have prevented Ireland's involvement in the war. If the leaders of the then Irish Volunteers had quietly yet forcefully refused the British at the outset of the war, then the British government would have been prevented from conscripting Irish men, would have been stopped from abridging Irish liberties, and would have been halted from taking Irish lives. But as a result of Redmond's pledge, the Irish Volunteers became a dedicated and ardent group of militant nationalists.

At this point the causes of labor and of radical separatism joined forces to prepare for the insurrection against British tyrants. Declaring that the best men in Ireland ". . . have decided long ago that if they must fight they will fight in Ireland, for Ireland; and under Ireland's flag",¹⁶ Connolly pushed the national question of independence to the forefront of his actions. The cause of labor became the cause of Ireland; and the cause of both was freedom. With this, James Connolly and Padraic Pearse, military leader of the Irish Volunteers, urged the Irish to enlist either in the Volunteers or Connolly's Citizen Army rather than to join the imperial army of Britain. Still, Connolly had a difficult time of gaining support; already the British military recruiters had told the Irish nation that the trenches in Belgium were safer than the streets of Dublin. To this, Connolly quickly retorted: "But you can die honourably in a Dublin slum. If you die of fever, or even of want, because you preferred to face fever and want, rather than sell your soul to the enemies of your class and country, such death is an honourable death, . . ."¹⁷ Or as he told the recruiters in ominous warning: "The trenches safer than the Dublin slums! We may yet see the day that the trenches will be safer for these gentry than any part of Dublin."¹⁸ Connolly was certain that that day was not far off, and he grew visibly upset the longer his collaborators in the Irish Volunteers delayed.

As early as mid-1915, James Connolly and his two-hundred-and-fifty man Irish Citizen Army were ready to strike. Connolly was openly prepared to rally the Irish people and lead them in a democratic revolution. Yet the Irish Volunteers, still under the leadership of the moderate Eoin MacNeill, told Connolly to wait. "Week by week Connolly made his appeal to the rank and file.", his biographer wrote, adding, "Every article breathed warnings on the danger of delay."¹⁹ Connolly, to be sure, went over the heads of the Irish Volunteer leaders, and in his article "Trust Your Leaders" of December 4, 1915, observed "In Ireland we have ever seized upon mediocrities and made them our leaders." And finished by proclaiming that these leaders ". . . essayed to grapple a revolutionary situation with the weapons of a constitutional agitation."²⁰ Connolly prepared his army for action, declaring his advocacy in his newspaper The Worker's Republic. Individually, he met with each member of the Citizen Army explaining to them that the time to rise up was at hand, telling the rest of the nation, especially the Irish Volunteers: "However it may be for others, for us of the Citizen Army there is but one ideal--an Ireland ruled, and owned, by Irish men and women, sovereign and independent from the centre to the sea, and flying its own flag outward over all the oceans."²¹ In fact, Connolly had proposed to mobilize the Irish Citizen Army in order to force the Irish Volunteers to take some sort of action. And indeed, they did respond.

In early January of 1916, James Connolly disappeared for a week. During this time, the Irish Republican Brotherhood, who had detained him, attempted to reconcile his views to theirs. Connolly was told that the Brotherhood had already begun their preparations for an insurrection, and that his Citizen Army must not act prematurely. As a result of his reaching complete agreement with the I.R.B., Connolly became part of its Military Council, and was promised to be made vice-president of the provisional government after the rising. Two weeks later, James Connolly sent a representative, Sir Roger Casement, to Germany in order to secure weapons and assistance for the Irish separatist cause. But when Casement returned on a German U-Boat, and landed in Ireland on Good Friday afternoon, he was immediately arrested, and the German arms shipment never reached the Brotherhood. In the meantime, Connolly foreshadowed the revolution: "To us a great opportunity has come. Have we been wise? The future alone can tell. . . let us remember that generations, like individuals, will find their ultimate justification or condemnation not in what they accomplished but rather in what they aspired and dared to accomplish. . . ." ²² Yet from the beginning, the Irish rising of 1916 met the problems of ill-preparedness.

Padraic Pearse, as military commandment of the Irish Volunteers, and James Connolly issued orders for the mobilization of their respective armies on Easter Sunday. Few were aware that these army maneuvers were actually intended to be

contingencies for the insurrection. Pearse had instructed brigade leaders of the Volunteers to march to certain strategic locations in Dublin on Easter Sunday, and once there, he would instruct their troops when to fight. But word of the intended insurrection had been received by Eoin MacNeill who immediately countermanded the Volunteer's mobilization, and by the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, who accordingly ordered the arrest of over a hundred Irish insurgents. From all of this, "Pearse and Connolly", wrote Ellis, "knew the insurrection would have to move or be crushed for another generation."²³ Thus with only 1500 passionate insurgents left in the Irish Volunteers, and with the men of Connolly's Citizen Army, the insurgents' assault on Dublin began Easter Monday morning, April 24, 1916.

The actual events of the insurrection have been well-detailed by others.²⁴ The importance of Padraic Pearse and of James Connolly came in their attempt, an attempt to take a promise of the past, and hand a tradition to the future. To them, it did not matter that they failed in their Easter uprising; to them, it mattered that they offered their lives in trying, as Connolly told his friend and disciple William O'Brien: "We are going out to be slaughtered." To which O'Brien asked: "Is there no chance of success?" "None whatever", Connolly replied.²⁵ Finally, Connolly's last words attested to the intense belief in the cause of Irish freedom that he shared with Padraic Pearse:

We went out to break the connection between this country and the British Empire, and to establish an Irish Republic. We believed that the call we then issued to the people of Ireland, was a nobler call, in a holier cause, than any call issued to them during this war, having any connection with this war.²⁶

With these words James Connolly declared the rightness of his position, a position which led him away from the shock of World War I to join in with the nationalist insurgents in their struggle to keep alive the soul of the Irish nation. For his substantial part in the uprising, James Connolly was secretly tried by a British military tribunal, and executed on May 12, 1916.

CHAPTER VII
THE INSURRECTION: IMAGINATION
OR FULFILLMENT?

I set my face
 To the roads here before me,
To the work that I see,
 To the death I shall meet.
 . . . Padraic Pearse

Six months before the Easter Rising, Padraic Pearse had expressed his belief that his actions would bring him certain death. And, as we have already noted, on the eve of the insurrection James Connolly had told a close friend that the separatist forces had no chance for success. But if failure was certain for the insurgents, as these two leaders had expressed, what meaning did the insurrection hold for them?

William Thompson, in his work concerning the ideology of the Easter Rising, The Imagination of the Insurrection stated that both Pearse and Connolly were driven beyond reality by an irrational consciousness of failure. Their own imaginations, he claimed, led them past what the Irish people were capable of. Indeed, Thompson claimed that "The imagination of the poet-rebels had been so far beyond the reality of the nation that it took the nation three years

to catch up."¹ In addition to this general analysis, Thompson also considered Pearse and Connolly individually. Thompson found in Padraic Pearse a "fear of complexity".² According to this view, then, Padraic Pearse turned to the past solely because it was uncomplicated. Pearse, Thompson reasoned, returned to the Ireland of Cuchulainn because that was an Ireland free from the decadence of industrialism, and free, as well, from the cultural and political slavery of England. James Connolly, on the other hand, while more of a realist and a soldier than Pearse, still operated irrationally. This irrationality, Thompson explained, came from Connolly's belief ". . . that no capitalist army would ever shell capitalist buildings, . . . "³ In essence, Thompson asserted that both Pearse and Connolly along with the other insurgent leaders, shared the futility of being nationalists.

However, those who claim that the role of Pearse and Connolly in the Easter Rising was an exercise in national futility have failed to understand the minds of these two men and the circumstances behind the insurrection. Ireland, in the developed judgement of Pearse and Connolly had lost its identity. Their nation, in essence, had become little more than a British province. For nearly twenty years Padraic Pearse had struggled to reverse the process of Anglicization. First in the Gaelic League, where he had joined in the attempt to save Ireland's Gaelic language from obliteration, at later at St. Edna's, where he had taught students to be good Irish men and women, Padraic Pearse

desired to make the Irish people aware of their nation's noble past. . Pearse had turned to this past, not because it was uncomplicated, but rather because it offered numerous examples of a heroic spirit desperately needed in Ireland's present. The legends of Cuchulainn and the separatist writings of earlier Irish nationalists were intended as handbooks of action, as guides for a struggle yet to begin. And once Ireland had gained her freedom, Pearse did not want to restore Ireland's ancient social order, but intended upon instilling the ancient heroic spirit of truth, nobility and courage into a society lacking any type of order.

James Connolly had also struggled for twenty years to free Ireland from the economic slavery of capitalism while realizing that Ireland must first be freed from the British Empire. Once the nation had asserted its independence, a democratic consciousness could be strengthened. At first Connolly believed that the national struggle was identified with the socialist revolution. Later he identified these as aspects of one process in which the Irish Volunteers and the Irish Citizen Army represented the political movement, while industrial unionism and economic conscription represented the economic movement. Beginning with a national struggle, the Irish nation, Connolly hoped, would dramatically reorganize itself into the Worker's Republic. Believing that this process was historically inevitable, James Connolly, then, joined in the nationalist's struggle in order to speed up the coming of a democratic socialist republic.

Together Pearse and Connolly recognized that reform was not possible; thus they attempted revolution. Twenty years of attempted reform had not successfully opened the eyes of the Irish to their nation's crisis, nor had it improved in any way the plight of Ireland's working class. The nationalist and the socialist united to assert that Ireland's miserable situation was just as much the fault of the Irish people as it was the fault of the British government. Thus when Connolly declared that Ireland's condition as a subject nation was a direct result of "British crime and Irish folly",⁴ or when Pearse uneasily questioned ". . . may it not be said with entire truth that the reason Ireland is not free is that Ireland has not deserved to be free?"⁵, both were expressing their sincere and definite beliefs that Ireland's past course of Parliamentarianism must give way to the militant course of radical separatism. Only in freedom could the true historic Irish nation reassert itself, and only in freedom could the Irish nation become the Workers' Republic. Joined in objectives, Pearse and Connolly struggled to free their nation.

The circumstances of the insurrection were such that it could never have been militarily successful, and Pearse and Connolly, as President and Vice-President of the Provisional Government surely were aware of these difficulties. From the start, the military plans of the rising collapsed. The arrest of Sir Roger Casement and the seizure of the German

arms shipment has already been mentioned. This alone almost certainly doomed the insurrection to failure, yet even more damaging was the split between Pearse and Eoin MacNeill in the Irish Volunteers. Pearse, as military commander of the Volunteers had intended upon turning the Easter-week maneuvers of the Volunteers into a full scale rebellion. But when MacNeill had discovered Pearse's intentions he rescinded the Volunteer orders to mobilize. As a result of MacNeill's countermand on Easter Sunday, the Volunteers were outwardly confused and internally split. Indeed, as George Dangerfield has pointed out, few of the Volunteer troops were even aware of the Pearse-MacNeill dissension and many followed MacNeill's orders because they had not heard yet of the Irish Republican Brotherhood's plan for the insurrection.⁶ Perhaps here Pearse and Connolly had been too cautious in their plans for the rebellion. Yet they were each fully aware of the fact that all of Ireland's major insurrections, from Wolfe Tone's in 1798 to the Fenian Revolt in 1867, had failed because of infiltration. In addition, Pearse and Connolly had been notified of Lord-Lieutenant Winborne's intentions to arrest known separatist leaders. The insurgents realized that they either struck on Easter Monday, or would have watched their opportunity forever slip away.

While Pearse and Connolly recognized that their rising would be militarily defeated, they hoped only to preserve Ireland's honor. And in timing the insurrection as they had,

Pearse and Connolly expected to achieve a moral victory against the English government, which at this same time was meeting to discuss its own crisis. During the Easter weekend the British Cabinet was in session to discuss whether to involve the English nation in peace or total war. Also during this same weekend, the British Socialist Party decided to abandon its constitutional program in favor of a revolutionary struggle. To be sure, Connolly could not have known what these groups had decided, but had rather intended upon making England's current crisis an opportunity for Ireland.

In response to William Thompson's criticisms, Padraic Pearse and James Connolly hoped to awaken Ireland's passive national consciousness. While they were aware of the consequences of a military defeat, these two leaders of the rebel forces desired to leave the Irish nation with a renewed tradition, a tradition to free the Irish nation or die trying. For five days the insurgents had held off the powerful British Army, and in the minds of Pearse and Connolly, Ireland had been redeemed from its former shame. "If we accomplish no more than we have accomplished," Pearse had written to his troops and to posterity, "I am satisfied. I am satisfied that we have saved Ireland's honour. . ."⁷ Within hours of this release, Pearse and Connolly unconditionally surrendered on Saturday, April 29, 1916 declaring that they had done their duty and that further bloodshed could accomplish nothing more.

Ireland today is neither entirely Gaelic and united, as Pearse had hoped it would be, nor is it the Workers'

Republic that Connolly had struggled for. But Ireland today is a sovereign and independent nation owing much of its free status to Padraic Pearse, James Connolly, and the men and women of 1916. Within weeks after the executions of Pearse and Connolly, the Irish national consciousness had been reawakened. Thus what Conor Cruise O'Brien has claimed about Pearse can be applied equally well to Connolly: ". . . such men do not die in vain."⁷ The Irish nation, as a result of the actions and the deaths of Pearse and Connolly, first became sympathetic to the separatist pleas, and soon treated them as national martyrs. From Padraic Pearse and James Connolly, the Irish nation had been handed a tradition, a tradition to complete the unfinished revolution of 1916, a tradition which the nation accepted and fulfilled by declaring the Irish Free State in 1922.

NOTES

INTRODUCTION

¹P. S. O'Hegarty, Sinn Fein; An Illumination (Dublin, London: Maunsel & Company Ltd., 1919), p. 3.

²James Connolly, quoted by P. Berrsford Ellis, etd., James Connolly: Selected Writings (New York, London: Monthly Review Press, 1973), p. 14.

³Louis N. LeRoux, Patrick H. Pearse, trans. Desmond Ryan (Dublin: The Talbot Press Limited, 1932), pp. 251-52.

⁴James Connolly and Padraic Pearse, quoted by George Dangerfield, The Damnable Question: A Study in Anglo-Irish Relations (Boston, Toronto: Little, Brown and Company, 1976), pp. 179-80. The Proclamation was a joint work of Connolly and Pearse.

CHAPTER ONE

¹Padraic Pearse, Political Writings and Speeches (Dublin: The Talbot Press Limited, reprinted 1966), p. 40.

²Padraic Pearse, quoted by Le Roux, Pearse, p. 107.

³Pearse, Political Writings, p. 6.

⁴Pearse, Political Writings, pp. 7-8.

⁵Pearse, Political Writings, p. 10.

⁶Pearse, Political Writings, p. 11.

⁷Pearse, Political Writings, p. 11.

⁸Padraic Pearse, quoted by Le Roux, Pearse, p. 106.

⁹Pearse, Political Writings, p. 40.

¹⁰Apparently, by Nego, Pearse meant just the opposite of a Credo. In other words, a Nego was a system aimed at negating certain beliefs rather than at fostering and improving those beliefs.

¹¹Padraic Pearse, quoted by Le Roux, Pearse, pp. 107-08.

¹²Pearse, Political Writings, p. 31.

¹³Pearse, Political Writings, pp. 31-32.

¹⁴Padraic Pearse, quoted by Le Roux, Pearse, p. 126.

¹⁵Le Roux, Pearse, p. 99.

¹⁶Pearse, Political Writings, p. 21.

¹⁷Pearse, Political Writings, p. 38.

¹⁸Colmcille was a legendary Irish figure.

¹⁹Colmcille, quoted by Pearse, Political Writings, p. 25.

²⁰The Fianna of Fionn was a knightly society of Irish boys who rallied to guard Ireland's coastline against foreign invaders.

²¹The Fianna, quoted by Pearse, Political Writings, p. 25.

²²Cuchulainn, quoted by Pearse, Political Writings, p. 39. Cuchulainn and the boy-troops of Ulster defended their country from foreign invaders approximately in the year 2 A.D. For a detailed study of the myth of Cuchulainn and its effect upon Pearse's Ireland, see Walter Irwin Thompson, The Imagination of an Insurrection: Dublin, Easter 1916 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967).

²³Pearse, Political Writings, p. 41.

²⁴Pearse, Political Writings, p. 22.

²⁵Pearse, Political Writings, p. 26.

²⁶Le Roux, Pearse, pp. 119-20.

²⁷Le Roux, Pearse, p. 135.

²⁸Pearse, Political Writings, p. 14.

CHAPTER TWO

¹The Irish Home Rule Association was founded in 1870 by an Irish M.P., Isaac Butt. Home Rule essentially involved the formation of an Irish Parliament, although this Parliament would have been subordinate to the Parliament of Great Britain, as stated in the first cause of the Home Rule Act of 1914: ". . . the supreme power and authority of the Parliament of the United Kingdom shall remain unaffected and undiminished over all persons, matters and things in Ireland, and every part thereof." (Quoted by Pearse, Political Writings, p. 322). Nevertheless, the promise of Home Rule excited the Irish people, with the exception of the northern Irish, especially during the era of Charles Stewart Parnell and W. E. Gladstone. Although the Home Rule Act was defeated in 1886, and also in 1893, the Irish people hoped for Home Rule as at least a beginning to eventual national sovereignty.

²Pearse, Political Writings, p. 239.

³Le Roux, Pearse, p. 264.

⁴Pearse, Political Writings, pp. 263-64.

⁵Wolfe Tone, quoted by Pearse, Political Writings, p. 267.

⁶In calling for Irish neutrality, Tone attempted to disprove the Parliamentary work of Henry Grattan who had proposed an Irish Constitution in which the English and Irish Parliaments would co-exist. The neutrality issue discredited Grattan's plan because, as Tone had suggested, any amount of constitutional connections with Great Britain denied a sovereign Irish Parliament.

⁷Wolfe Tone, quoted by Pearse, Political Writings, p. 247.

⁸Although Tone made no mention of this work in his autobiography, Pearse definitely believed that The Rights of Man was penned by Tone. Indeed, Tone had referred to this work in a letter to his friend and collaborator, Thomas Russell. In this letter, Tone stated that "The foregoing [declaration] contains my true and sincere opinion of the state of this country, so far as in the present juncture it may be advisable to publish it." (Quoted with italics by Pearse, Political Writings, p. 276).

⁹Wolfe Tone, quoted by Pearse, Political Writings, pp. 274-75.

¹⁰Pearse, Political Writings, p. 304.

¹¹Pearse, Political Writings, p. 304.

¹²Thomas Davis, quoted by Pearse, Political Writings p. 314.

¹³Thomas Davis, quoted by Pearse, Political Writings, p. 320.

¹⁴James Fintan Lalor, quoted by Pearse, Political Writings, p. 349.

¹⁵James Fintan Lalor, quoted by Pearse, Political Writings, pp. 352-53.

¹⁶James Fintan Lalor, quoted by Pearse, Political Writings, p. 357.

¹⁷James Fintan Lalor, quoted by Pearse, Political Writings, p. 360.

¹⁸James Fintan Lalor, quoted by Pearse, Political Writings, p. 363.

¹⁹Pearse, Political Writings, p. 364.

²⁰John Mitchel, quoted by Pearse, Political Writings, p. 369.

²¹John Mitchel, quoted by Pearse, Political Writings, p. 367.

CHAPTER THREE

¹O'Hegarty, Sinn Fein, p. 9.

²"An aCeanea Fein"

³O'Hegarty, Sinn Fein, p. 10.

⁴O'Hegarty, Sinn Fein, p. 11.

⁵Padraic Colum, ed., Poems of the Irish Revolutionary Brotherhood (Boston: Small, Maynard & Company, 1916), p. xii.

⁶O'Hegarty, Sinn Fein, p. 10.

⁷Keating, quoted by Pearse, Political Writings, p. 228.

⁸Pearse, Political Writings, p. 303.

⁹Pearse, Political Writings, p. 304.

¹⁰Thomas Davis, quoted by Pearse, Political Writings, p. 307.

¹¹Pearse, Political Writings, p. 343.

¹²Pearse, Political Writings, p. 339.

¹³Pearse, Political Writings, p. 338.

¹⁴Pearse, Political Writings, p. 224.

¹⁵Le Roux, Pearse, p. 13.

¹⁶Padraic Pearse, quoted by Le Roux, Pearse, p. 33. Le Roux reported that the nation was far from unanimous concerning Irish independence. The mass of labor was, in 1914, almost completely indifferent to the aims of the separatists, while organized labor was both socialist and internationalist, not yet quite prepared to accept the program of national militancy.

¹⁷Pearse, Political Writings, p. 196.

¹⁸Padraic Pease, quoted by Le Roux, Pearse, pp. 248-49.

¹⁹Pearse, Political Writings, p. 216.

²⁰Pearse, Political Writings, p. 216.

²¹Padraic Pearse, quoted by Le Roux, Pearse, pp. 26-27.

²²The Ulster Volunteers were formed in Belfast in 1913 by Sir Edward Carson to oppose the spread of Home Rule to northern Ireland.

²³Pearse, Political Writings, p. 112.

²⁴Padraic Pearse, quoted by Charles Duff, Six Days to Shake an Empire (New York: Modern Literary Editions Publishing Company, 1966), p. 171.

CHAPTER FOUR

¹James Connolly, Labour in Ireland, with an Introduction by Cathal O'Shannon (Dublin: At the Sign of the Three Candles, 1950), p. 172.

²Connolly, Labour in Ireland, p. 171.

³Connaught was the largest and westernmost province of Ireland.

⁴Pendergast, quoted by Connolly, Labour in Ireland, p. 172.

⁵Connolly, Labour in Ireland, p. 179.

⁶Connolly, Labour in Ireland, p. 2.

⁷Connolly, Labour in Ireland, p. 3.

⁸Connolly, Labour in Ireland, p. 4.

⁹Connolly, Labour in Ireland, p. 5.

¹⁰James Connolly, Labour and Easter Week, with an Introduction by William O'Brien, ed. Desmond Ryan (Dublin: At the Sign of the Three Candles, 1949, reprinted 1966), p. 69.

¹¹Connolly, Labour in Ireland, p. 6.

¹²James Connolly, The Worker's Republic, ed. Desmond Ryan (Dublin: At the Sign of the Three Candles, 1951), p. 44.

¹³Approximately three dollars.

¹⁴Connolly, Worker's Republic, p. 216.

¹⁵Connolly, Worker's Republic, p. 230.

¹⁶Connolly, Worker's Republic, pp. 215-16.

¹⁷Connolly, Worker's Republic, p. 72.

¹⁸Connolly, Worker's Republic, p. 90.

¹⁹Quoted with italics, Connolly, Worker's Republic, p. 197.

²⁰Quoted with italics, Connolly, Worker's Republic, p. 202.

²¹Connolly, Worker's Republic, p. 194.

²²Owen Dudley Edwards, The Mind of an Activist--James Connolly (Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1971), p. 29.

²³Edwards, Mind of an Activist, p. 31.

²⁴St. Clement, quoted by Connolly, Worker's Republic, p. 223.

²⁵St. Ambrose, quoted with italics by Connolly, Worker's Republic, p. 227.

²⁶St. Chrysostom, quoted by Connolly, Worker's Republic, p. 224.

²⁷Connolly, Worker's Republic, p. 90.

CHAPTER FIVE

¹Connolly, Worker's Republic, p. 70.

²This was National Horse Show Week in Dublin.

³AE (George Russell), quoted by Dangerfield, The Damnable Question, p. 102.

⁴William Butler Yeats, quoted by William Irwin Thompson, The Imagination of an Insurrection: Dublin Easter, 1916 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967), p. 84.

⁵Connolly, Worker's Republic, pp. 112-13.

⁶For months the Dublin strikers had been given support and funds from the British Trade Unions Congress (T.U.C.). However, leaders of the T.U.C. soon regretted having involved themselves in an essentially domestic affair. Larkin viewed the T.U.C. leaders' reluctance as an act of industrial treachery; Connolly viewed it as ". . . an aspect of the parliamentary opportunism of British Labour." (Greaves, Life and Times, p. 314). Nevertheless, soon after the T.U.C. withdrew its support, the strike collapsed because the workers had been starved into submission.

⁷Connolly, Worker's Republic, p. 140.

⁸James Connolly, quoted by C. Desmond Greaves; The Life and Times of James Connolly (New York: International Publishers, 1971), p. 338.

⁹To be sure, Connolly, today especially, could not deny the immense power of the A.F.L. His point was that given the then-current set-up of that organization, its power would remain limited. However, if the A.F.L. had adopted Connolly's program of industrial unionism, its power would have been enormously large and practically unstoppable.

¹⁰Connolly, Worker's Republic, p. 85. Italics in the original.

¹¹Greaves, Life and Times, p. 339.

¹²Connolly, Worker's Republic, p. 91.

¹³Connolly, Labour and Easter Week, p. 137.

¹⁴Connolly, Worker's Republic, pp. 148-49.

¹⁵Greaves, Life and Times, pp. 216-17.

¹⁶Connolly, Worker's Republic, p. 147.

¹⁷Connolly, Worker's Republic, p. 92.

¹⁸Connolly, Worker's Republic, p. 161.

¹⁹Connolly, Labour and Easter Week, pp. 126-27.

²⁰Connolly, Labour and Easter Week, p. 127.

²¹Connolly, Labour and Easter Week, p. 126.

²²Connolly, Labour and Easter Week, p. 125.

²³Connolly, Labour and Easter Week, p. 126.

²⁴Connolly, Labour and Easter Week, p. 125.

²⁵Connolly, Worker's Republic, p. 47.

²⁶Connolly, Worker's Republic, p. 166.

CHAPTER SIX

¹William McMullen, Introduction to Connolly, Worker's Republic, p. 27.

²Greaves, Life and Times, p. 351.

³James Connolly, quoted by Greaves, Life and Times, p. 351.

⁴Connolly, Labour and Easter Week, p. 60.

⁵V. I. Lenin, quoted by Greaves, Life and Times, p. 353.

⁶Connolly, Labour and Easter Week, p. 55.

⁷James Connolly, quoted by Greaves, Life and Times, p. 353.

⁸Connolly, Labour and Easter Week, p. 40.

⁹Connolly, Labour and Easter Week, p. 90.

¹⁰Connolly, Labour and Easter Week, p. 66.

¹¹Connolly made it clear in his article "The Slackers" that Ireland's men were fighting the Empire's wars. British and Scotch men, for example, fled in large numbers to Dublin in order to avoid the war. Once there, these slackers were given the jobs of Irish men and women. And in this, Connolly declared. ". . . the loyal capitalists are weeding out Irishmen and slyly substituting [Brittish and Scotch] workers in their places." (Connolly, Easter Week, p. 159, Note 1.)

¹²William McMullen, Introduction Connolly. Worker's Republic, p. 27.

¹³Connolly, Easter Week, p. 7.

¹⁴The Irish Volunteers, a military separatist organization, was founded in November, 1913 as a reaction against the existing, and armed, Ulster Volunteers of Sir Edward Carson. The Ulster Volunteers were prepared to fight against Home Rule, fearing that it would easily become Rome Rule. The Irish Volunteers were prepared to defend the Home Rule measure after Eoin MacNeill, then president of the Gaelic League, formed the group. At this time, the Irish Volunteers had both the blessing and the support of the Irish Parliamentary Party; thus, the Volunteers' membership quickly grew to 150,000.

¹⁵To which Connolly replied:

Full steam ahead John Redmond said
that everything was well chum;
Home Rule will come when we are dead
and buried out in Belgium.

Quoted in Ellis, James Connolly, p. 25.

¹⁶Connolly, Labour and Easter Week, p. 147.

¹⁷Connolly, Labour and Easter Week, pp. 147-48.

¹⁸Connolly, Labour and Easter Week, pp. 150-51.

¹⁹Greaves, Life and Times, p. 382.

²⁰Connolly, Labour and Easter Week, pp. 116-17.

²¹Connolly, Labour and Easter Week, p. 93.

²²Connolly, Labour and Easter Week, p. 154.

²³Ellis, James Connolly, p. 29.

²⁴See, for example, George Dangerfield, The Damnable Question, or Charles Duff, Six Days to Shake an Empire.

²⁵Connolly, quoted by Ellis, James Connolly, p. 30.

²⁶Connolly, Labour and Easter Week, p. 177.

CHAPTER VII

¹Thompson, Imagination of the Insurrection, pp. 102-03.

²Thompson, Imagination of the Insurrection, p. 95.

³Thompson, Imagination of the Insurrection, p. 86. Connolly, however, realized that the condition of private property was founded upon capitalist class power. To maintain their power, capitalists might very well have to destroy their own property. Connolly was well aware of this, and as a result, Thompson's criticism has no basis. See Graves, Life and Times, p. 414.

⁴Connolly, Labour and Easter Week, p. 159, note 1.

⁵Pearse, Political Writings, p. 194.

⁶Dangerfield, The Damnable Question, p. 205.

⁷Conor Cruise O'Brien, quoted by Dangerfield, The Damnable Question, p. 218.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Clarkson, J. Dunsmore. Labour and Nationalism in Ireland. New York: Columbia University Press, 1926; reprint ed., New York: AMS Press, 1970.
- Colum, Padraic, ed. Poems of the Irish Revolutionary Brotherhood. Boston: Small, Maynard and Company, 1916.
- Connolly, James. Labour and Easter Week 1916. Edited by Desmond Ryan. Introduction by William O'Brien. Dublin: At the Sign of the Three Candles, 1949; reprint ed., 1966.
- Connolly, James. Labour in Ireland. Introduction by Cathal O'Shannon. Dublin: At the Sign of the Three Candles, 1950.
- Connolly, James. Selected Writings. Edited by P. Berresford Ellis. London, New York: Monthly Review Press, 1973.
- Connolly, James. Socialism and Nationalism. Introduction by Desmond Ryan. Dublin: At the Sign of the Three Candles, 1948.
- Connolly, James. The Workers' Republic. Edited by Desmond Ryan. Introduction by William McMullen. Dublin: At the Sign of the Three Candles, 1951.
- Coogan, Tim Pat. The I.R.A. London: Pall Mall Press Ltd., 1970; Fontana Books, 1971.
- Dangerfield, George. The Damnable Question: A Study in Anglo-Irish Relations. Boston, Toronto: Little, Brown and Company, 1976.
- Duff, Charles. Six Days to Shake an Empire. New York: Modern Literary Editions Publishing Company, 1966.
- Edwards, Owen Dudley. The Mind of an Activist--James Connolly. Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1971.
- Ellis, P. Berresford. A History of the Irish Working Class. London: Victor Gollancz Ltd., 1972.
- Greaves, C. Desmond. The Life and Times of James Connolly. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1961; reprint ed., New York: International Publishers, 1971.

- Henry, R. M. The Evolution of Sinn Fein. Port Washington, New York: Kennikat Press, 1970.
- Le Roux, Louis. Patrick H. Pearse. Translated by Desmond Ryan. Dublin: The Talbot Press Limited, 1932.
- Martin, F. X. "Eoin MacNeill on the 1916 Rising." Irish Historical Studies. 47 (March 1961):226-71.
- Martin, F. X., ed. Leaders and Men of the Easter Rising: Dublin 1916. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1967.
- O'Hegarty, P. S. Sinn Fein, An Illumination. Dublin, London: Maunsel & Company Ltd., 1919.
- Pearse, Padraic. Poets of the Insurrection. Dublin, London: Maunsel & Company Ltd., 1918.
- Pearse, Padraic. Political Writings and Speeches. Dublin: The Talbot Press Limited, 1966.
- Thompson, William Irwin. The Imagination of An Insurrection: Dublin, Easter 1916. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.
- Willson, David Harris. A History of England. 2nd ed. Hinsdale, Illinois: The Dryden Press Inc., 1972.