THE IRISH MONTHLY

A Magazine of General Literature.

FOUNDED BY THE REV. MATTHEW RUSSELL, S.J.

FORTY-SEVENTH YEARLY VOLUME

1919.

Dublin:
M. H. GILL & SON, LTD., O'CONNELL STREET.
LONDON: BURNS & OATES; SIMPKIN, MARSHALL & CO.

CONTENTS

THE TEACHINGS OF JAMES CONNOLLY.

By Rev. L. McKenna, S.J.

A YEAR before his death James Connolly had published almost all the writings which he has left to us, he had agitated and worked during more than twenty years for his ideals, and yet he had not then an assured hope of a place in the memory of posterity. He was liked, but not idolised, by the working people of Dublin, whose enthusiasm was nearly all devoted to their hero, Jim Larkin. Outside the working class, people, when they knew of him at all, thought of him as an educated but rather inefficient and fairly moderate labour-leader, a favourable contrast to his irresponsible captain. His name was not one to excite either fierce hatred or fierce enthusiasm. This was all changed when the firing squad shot him on the 12th of May, 1916, while he was suffering from a wound which he had received in the Rising. His writings, which up to that day had not challenged much attention, were now eagerly sought after, and were found to be rich in unexpected wealth of knowledge, thought and eloquence. His teachings were vested with the authority due to the last words of a martyr. At the present time his portrait is frequent everywhere in the working-class houses of Dublin; when Dublin work-folk are questioned as to their aspirations one of their commonest answers is that they hold by the ideals and the methods of James Connolly.

It is important, therefore, to know what Connolly's ideas were, especially if we wish to understand the language of the writers in the Dublin labour-world of to-day.

A fairly complete understanding of his mind is not very difficult to get, for he has left a considerable body of writing behind him. All of this is not yet published in avail-

able form, but his two books and his two best-known pamphlets are easily got. His numerous newspaper articles are not easily procurable, but they are not likely to throw any light on the difficulties which his books and pamphlets present.

The Call to Revolt.

The dominant note in all Connolly's writings is the call to revolt. He does not much indulge in theorising. His aim is always practical. He is ever appealing to the working-class to realise their own misery and enslavement, and to arise from it. Even in his historical works this is always felt to be his purpose. All his heroes are heralds of revolt. He has nothing but praise for them even when their ideals and aims were different from his own. "The true revolutionist," he says, "should ever call into action on his side the entire sum of all the forces of political and social discontent."[1] He did not welcome revolt for revolt's sake, but because, as he held, revolt must ultimately issue forth in good. The differences between the various forms of revolutionary doctrine are to his mind accidental and unimportant, like the changing forms of matter which is fermenting into a new substance. He would, therefore, never analyse the theories of revolutionary economists, or question the validity of their warnings or cast doubt on the wisdom or practicability of their aims. Writing of this kind would have been useless, even harmful to his general purpose, which was to quicken the discontent of the masses and to rouse them to engage in the Class War. He was always willing to work with any individuals or bodies whose aim was the overthrow of any of the established conditions of Capitalist Society.

His avoidance of any—even a friendly—disagreement with revolutionary writers is most remarkable in the case of Marx. For him Marx is "the greatest of modern thinkers, the first of Scientific Socialists"[2]; over and over again he refers to him with enthusiastic admiration[3]; according to him "Marx is the founder of that school of thought which embraces all the militant socialist parties in

[1] *Irish Labour Movement*, by W. P. Ryan, p. 162.
[2] *Labour in Ireland*, p. 15. [3] *ibid*, p. 17.

the world." In one place,[4] where he undertakes to define Socialism, he gives a summary of the chief points in Marx's doctrine. We can hardly find a better way of grasping Connolly's views than by shortly summarising the doctrines of Marx, and, in face of each doctrine, examining how far Connolly agreed with it.

We may then take up Marx's doctrines in the following order: (1) his Philosophic Materialism, (2) his Materialistic Conception of History, (3) the application of this to Social Development shown in (*a*) his theory of "Surplus Value," (*b*) his theory of the "Concentration of Capital," (4) his prophesied Revolution.

Connolly and Marxian Materialism.

It is not necessary or possible at present to go deeply into the philosophic teachings of Marx. Suffice it to say that he was a follower of the evolutionary, or so-called dialectic, method of Fichte and Hegel, but that he wedded this method not to Idealism as they had done, but to the Materialism of Feuerbach. With Feuerbach he held that outside of nature and men there was nothing. Spirit and thought were for him products of matter. But while Feuerbach conceived matter as indeed moving, but always producing the same results, Marx held that it was in a perpetual state of change, of evolution. God and all our moral, religious, philosophical and political concepts are but the products or reflexions of man's material nature, and are changing with the various phases of his material evolution.

Of course, it could be maintained—and is often held by Socialist writers—that the other doctrines of Marx are quite intelligible and defensible in themselves, and do not depend for their validity on his materialistic philosophy. Those who would thus hold the Marxian philosophy separated from its materialistic substructure would be differing very radically from Marx, by whom his whole system was conceived as one consistent whole, each part of which fitted into and necessitated every other part.

Now, Connolly was a professing Catholic, he took care

[4] *The New Evangel*, p. 9.

that his children were brought up in the Catholic faith at St. Enda's College; he often impressed upon his wife his anxiety that they should be trained as good Catholics; though I do not know if he himself practised his religion, he certainly was in sincere communion with the Church when he died. He could not, therefore, with any consistency have held this philosophic materialism of Marx. He does not seem, however, to have had any firm grasp on Catholic principles, or indeed to have thought, except in a very superficial way, of the relations between his socialism and his religion. He had apparently no taste or talent for such matters; he was always more inclined to use his dialectic powers in making debating points in favour of his revolutionary schemes, than in explaining his intellectual position. For instance, in dealing with the charge that Socialism is against religion[5] it was open to him to admit that some Socialist writers were enemies of religion, and to show that others were not. He did not adopt this method of reply; he had apparently bound himself never to admit anything likely to prejudice his readers against any Socialist writer. He, therefore, takes the offensive and says, " So far from Atheism and Socialism being synonymous terms, almost all the prominent propagandists of Freethought have been, and are, most determined enemies of Socialism," and proves this by examples. This statement, which no one would deny, is, of course, quite irrelevant except in so far as it is used as a debating device to suggest the fallacy " Many Atheists are against Socialism; therefore Religion is not against Socialism." This kind of argument is bad enough, but not as bad as what follows, for he goes on to say that the hierarchy, and in particular the Pope, against whose " ill-reasoned and inconclusive Encyclical " he casts a sneer, are " belated camp-followers in the armies marching under the banners raised by the great agnostic exponents of individualistic philosophy " !

He thus cannot restrain a sneer, and a calumnious one, at the head of the Catholic Church even when the sneer was fatal to the logical value of his own argument. This readiness to attack the Church stands in marked contrast to his

[5] *The New Evangel*, p. 4.

constant praise of all and sundry revolutionary writers, but, I suppose, it need mean nothing more than a certain impatience with the Church's conservative spirit, a certain anger against her preaching a patient hope of future recompense to the suffering poor, instead of devoting herself to the Class War. That, however, Connolly's principles as regards the relations between Socialism and religion—in so far as he ever thought them out—were not compatible with the principles of a Catholic one can gather from what follows. "We find," he says, "that Socialism is based on a series of facts requiring only unassisted human reason to master all their details, whereas Religion of every kind is based on 'faith' in the occurrence in past ages of a series of phenomena inexplicable by any process of human reasoning"; and again, "Modern Socialism as it exists in the minds of its leading exponents has an essentially material matter-of-fact foundation"; and again, "Socialists do not base their Socialism on any interpretation of Scripture, or on the real or supposed intentions of a beneficent Deity. They as a party neither affirm nor deny these things." Apparently, therefore, his idea is that Socialism, like Natural Science, is concerned merely with the discovery of material facts, and with the conclusions to be drawn from them, and that on that account it does not come into contact with religion.

This is very far from being the case. Socialist writers, even those like Connolly who abstract from the foundation of materialistic philosophy on which Marx built up his doctrine, are constantly appealing to the eternal and non-material principles of morality, and in fact desiderate Socialism with a view to the better observance of purity, temperance, honesty and such like virtues. They show that they consider Socialism to have a very intimate connection with moral right and wrong. Connolly as an intelligent Catholic should have recollected that religion does not merely impose belief in certain supernatural facts having no bearing on material things, but that it lays down certain principles of moral conduct according to which men's dealings with and relations to each other will be morally right or morally wrong. I am not now saying that

religion condemns Socialism. I am merely stating what is a truism for all thinking Catholics, namely, that Socialism, inasmuch as it professes to regulate men's relations and dealings with each other, must be either conformable to the moral law or must contravene it; and that the Church as God's authoritative interpreter of the moral law has the right to state whether any given form of Socialism is morally permissible or not. This principle, plain to all thinking Catholics, does not, of course, imply that the Church should direct all men's dealings with each other. Just as a business man, while keeping within the limits of honest dealing, has an enormous field wherein to exercise his freedom of choice, so there is an enormous variety of legitimate ways in which social and economic life may be ordered. To realise this, one has only to recall the variety (and there is no reason for thinking that variety exhausted) of political, social, and economic systems in which the Church has flourished and with which she has lived in harmony.

Connolly and the Marxian Materialistic Conception of History.

A corollary of Marx's philosophic materialism is Economic Materialism, or, to give it its high-sounding name, "The Materialistic Conception of History." Briefly this is expounded in Marx's own words: "In the social production of their means of subsistence men enter on certain necessary relations independent of their will, relations of production corresponding to a certain stage of development in their material productive forces. The sum total of these conditions of production forms the economic structure of society, the real basis on which is raised an ethical and political superstructure, and to which correspond certain forms of social consciousness. The method of production in our material life shapes and determines also our entire social, political and intellectual process of life." In simple terms, this means that all the moral, religious, philosophical, political and artistic ideas of a people are produced and determined by the manner in which wealth is produced and distributed among that people. These ideas

have no independent validity, they are but the reflexion in the human mind of the exterior conditions of production. Marx does not deny—he even asserts—that these ideas have an influence on social development, but he holds that the ultimate cause of all these ideas is the method of production. The course of human history is, therefore, shaped completely by economic conditions; it is influenced by politics, laws, religion, and so on, but these things in their turn are determined by economic conditions, the ultimate underlying cause of all human development.

Whether Connolly held this view or not it is impossible to say. If he did he held a view quite inconsistent with his profession of religious belief. In one place[6] he professes to set forth this part of Marx's teaching, and uses these words: "In every historical epoch the prevailing method of economic production and exchange, and the social organisation necessarily following from it forms the basis upon which alone can be explained the political and intellectual history of that epoch." This is quite ambiguous. It can be understood in the full Marxian sense, but it is also capable of a quite sound and harmless meaning, namely, that the study of economic conditions is quite necessary for a thorough understanding of the political and social life of any period. It is plain common sense that economic conditions may be and often are the chief determinant of much of human ideology, nay, that they are often an important influence on *all* human ideology, not even excluding religion; but the doctrine that they are the *sole* origin of *all* ideology, and, in particular, that there are no eternal principles of right and wrong, principles which have a truth independent of all economic conditions and which have an effect on human conduct in any economic conditions is a doctrine which Connolly—if he held it, which I doubt—would not have dared to expound in clear words to any body of Irish Catholics.

What we know of Connolly's attachment to religion, and the importance which in various places he attaches to patriotism, religious conviction, principles of honesty, justice and purity would rather incline us to read into the

[6] *Labour in Ireland*, p. 15.

above declaration of Marxism an expurgated version of Historic Materialism; we should be inclined to see here another example of the way in which he prefers to misrepresent his Socialist authorities rather than to acknowledge openly his disagreement with them.[7]

There can be no doubt but that Marx's Materialistic Conception of History is largely responsible for the change in the attitude of historians to the economic factor in history. History had previously concerned itself mainly with the political and military side of human life and with the characters of outstanding personalities rather than with the economic state of the common body of the people. Marx, no doubt, exaggerated the importance of this latter factor, but by his very exaggeration drew attention to its exceeding importance.

The phrase "Materialistic Conception of History" (or its variants "Historic Materialism," "Socialist Philosophy of History") is frequent in Connolly's writings. He seems to consider it a magic key with which to open the treasure-house of historical truth. Yet when we see him using this key we find it is to be simply this: "In seeking for the real motive guiding the actions, political or social, of any body of men one should ask oneself how their desire of getting or of keeping the sources of material well-being would naturally have led them."

Connolly and Irish History.

It is beyond question that Connolly's historical works, especially "Labour in Irish History," are extremely valuable. They are fresh, illuminating, and, for the most part, compelling. Nor is there any doubt that these qualities are

[7] In using philosophical terms Connolly is hardly ever very precise. Perhaps, therefore, a passage of his, precise enough in its phraseology, need not be understood in its plain meaning. In *Labour in Ireland*, p. 121, he quotes with apparent approval what he calls an example of "Economic Determinism," or, as he correctly explains the term, "the teaching that morality is a thing of social growth." We find it hard to believe that he was an Economic Determinist in this sense, and in point of fact the passage he quotes as an example of economic determinism means—or at least may be taken quite naturally to mean—no more than that moral action is influenced by economic and social conditions.

chiefly owing to the steady gaze which he always kept on the economic state of the common folk of the Irish nation. Perhaps, too, this close attention to the economic factor was due in part to his enthusiasm for the Marxian Materialistic Conception of History—in whatever sense he understood it. We should, however, be inclined to think that Connolly's interest in the economic side of our history was due, above all, to his deep love for the common folk of Ireland, and not to the inspiration of German philosophy. Mrs. Green and John McNeill in their researches make just as much account of the material conditions of the true Irish people, and these writers would not consider that they owed anything to Marxian illumination.

If Connolly is fresh and original in his account of Irish history it is not that he possessed in any extraordinary degree the power of visualising the life of the past or of synthetising its complex details; it is rather owing to the fact that he brought to the study of his period a mind and spirit better prepared than those of his predecessors. The Irishmen who had written about the period had been historians of the old literary school as Haverty, or men who had spent their lives in political strife as Mitchel, or men who had not Connolly's deep sympathy with the common Irish folk. Loving the Irish people with a strong love, Connolly devoted most of his attention to their state, and in consequence has given us a true and more instructive story of the time. To hold this is, we think, to do more credit to his heart as well as to his judgment than to attribute his insight to his having read—or misread—some German philosophy.

Connolly and Nationalism.

Here we may say a word as to another point where Connolly seems to differ from his master, Marx. As economic conditions were for Marx the ultimate cause of all ideas, patriotism had not for him any moral validity. In several places one might infer that Connolly subscribed to this view, that he is an Internationalist in the extreme sense[8];

[8] Cf. *The New Evangel*, p. 18; *Socialism Made Easy*, pp. 7, 8-9.

but such an inference would, we imagine, be quite wrong. Political freedom apart from a social revolution had no attraction for Connolly, simply because in his mind such a change would be of small benefit to the real Irish nation, the people of the country. He had, as all right-minded folk should have, a deep sympathy for the dispossessed classes in other countries besides Ireland, but this did not prevent him from having a love of preference for those of his own land. This seems clear from his articles in the *Sean Bhean Bhocht*, *The Labour Leader*, *The Harp*: it is shown by many incidents in his life, above all by his death, and by his words to his daughter before his execution: "The Socialists will never understand why I am here. They forget I am an Irishman." His method of reconciling the duties of International brotherhood and those of Nationalism is revealed to us in his approval of a passage in the United Irishmen's *Address*, 1792[9]: "Our union (*i.e.*, of England and Ireland) rests on our mutual independence. We shall love each other if we are left to ourselves." This indeed is the true view. As each individual loves himself without being thereby forced to hate his neighbour, so should it be with each nation. Love of one's country does not imply hatred of those outside it.

Through fear, we presume, of prejudicing the repute of his masters, Connolly does not tell us of Marx's view that "it is silly to imagine the Christian form of marriage or any other form to be absolute and unchangeable," or of the shameful doctrines of Bebel and many other Socialist writers as to the marriage-bond. The personal integrity of James Connolly's life has never been questioned. No one could, either in his life or in his writings, find anything to justify the attributing to him of the monstrous views on moral questions held by some of those to whom he refers with honour.

---

[9] *Labour in Ireland*, p. 86.

(To be continued.)

THE TEACHINGS OF JAMES CONNOLLY.

(*Continued.*)

By Rev. L. McKenna, s.j.

Marx's Theory of "Surplus Value."

IT is strange that though Connolly extols Marx for his Materialistic Conception of History and for his idea of the Class War, two concepts which Marx did not invent, he does not expressly mention the theory of which Marx alone can claim the parentage, the theory of surplus-value.

Long before Marx, the English Liberals had propounded the view that labour is the source of all value, and that, therefore, the only measure of exchange-value in an article

is the amount of labour that has gone to its production. This theory has against it the common sense of mankind. There are commodities which have value and yet cost no labour; there are others that have cost labour and yet have no value, or lose it; equal labour often produces articles of unequal value and vice versâ. Besides, as a measure of value labour avails little; the amount of it can often not be ascertained, and the different kinds of it cannot be measured by any practical standard.

William Thompson, a Cork man, and in many points a forerunner of Marx, in adopting this theory of value, established as a standard whereby to measure labour, the amount of socially useful labour done in a given time and with average skill and diligence. In this form Marx adapted the "crystallised labour" theory of value. He then deduced from it the conclusion (by no means a necessary conclusion, and one which Thompson was careful not to deduce) that, when an article is produced, its total value belongs to the labourer who has worked on it. The way in which Marx presents this doctrine is as follows. The labouring class was in past ages despoiled of their property by force and fraud. At present, having no means of subsistence except their labour-capacity, they hire this out to the capitalist. As the exchange-value of any commodity is the amount of labour that has gone to its production, the exchange-value of labour-capacity (which is a commodity like any other) is the amount of wealth sufficient to keep it in continued existence. But the commodity, labour-capacity, differs from other commodities in this, that besides having an exchange-value, it has a use-value too; that is, it has the power of producing value much greater than its exchange-value. The capitalist gives the labourer by way of wages the exchange-value of his labour-capacity, and in return gets control over the use-value of that labour-capacity. Thus the labourer in a few hours of his work produce value equal to his wages; for the rest of the day he is producing value for the capitalist, value which Marx terms "surplus-value." Evidently it is the capitalist's aim to increase as much as possible this surplus-value by lengthening working-hours, reducing wages, employing

woman labour and child labour, etc. The surplus-value which the capitalist thus receives is transformed by him into machinery, buildings, etc., forms of wealth which are called "capital." Capital is, therefore, merely past labour crystallised or embodied in an external and permanent form. Owing to modern industrial inventions the capitalist can use this capital to enable a few labourers to produce in a given time values which formerly it would have required scores of them to produce. He, therefore, uses more and more machinery, fewer and fewer labourers in proportion to his machinery, thus getting more and more surplus-value, which in its turn is transformed into new capital. Machinery and raw materials, then, according to Marx, though having value themselves, the value namely which past labour has enshrined in them, do not of themselves produce new value. In the process of manufacture they themselves lose whatever value is transferred from them to the finished article; all new value comes from labour.

Both of these theories, that of value and that of surplus-value, are open to innumerable difficulties, and are not now generally defended by serious scientific writers even of the Socialist school. Their presentation, however, in formulae such as "All value comes from labour, therefore to the labouring man should all profits be given," are very effective and very common on popular platforms. Connolly uses sometimes phrases such as "The capital of the master-class is not their property. It is the unpaid labour of the working class, the hire of the labourer kept back by fraud,"[1] and quotes with approval[2] a passage of Thompson to much the same effect. It is strange that if he really held these theories he does not oftener appeal to them, for they would have been very effective for his purpose. It is not strange, however, that he nowhere explains them in detail or gives his precise views on them. He may have felt their difficulties, and on that account have fought shy of them; or he may have considered any explanation of them to be too theoretical for the people; or—likeliest of all—he may have considered that they were of little consequence compared with the fact they were invented to ex-

[1] *Socialism Made Easy*, p. 6. [2] *Labour in Ireland*, p. 115.

plain, namely, that only a small proportion of the world's wealth is owned by the workers.

For this is a fact, the big fact in modern society, and Connolly is ever insisting on it. Though the wage-system as a system is not inherently unjust, and consequently the capitalist is justified, while the system lasts, in receiving a certain interest on his capital, it is certain that the capitalists have got and are getting much more than their equitable interest. Partly owing to the general decay of the old religious spirit, partly owing to the grabbing individualism introduced and authorised by the Reformation, and partly owing to the nature of modern industrialism, capital has managed to appropriate a preposterously large amount of the world's wealth, and in the words of Pope Leo XIII. "A few men have reduced to a condition little better than slavery the teeming masses of the poor."

Marx's "Concentration of Capital."

The next stage in Marx's analysis of the development of society is what he calls "the Concentration of Capital." Capitalists' profits depend on sales, that is, on the receiving for their products more value than it has cost to produce them. As the public will always buy the cheaper article, capitalists are forced to compete with each other in cheap production. Each capitalist, surrounded by his rivals, is forced to use more and more capital so as to increase the number of his small-profit sales; in his productive processes he will increase as far as he can the proportion of "constant capital" (*i.e.*, machinery, etc.) to "variable capital" (*i.e.*, labourers); he will insist on as long working-hours as he can, and will keep down his wages to the lowest possible level. All this entails, of course, constant anxiety, extraordinary watchfulness, increasing quarrelling with his labourers, above all, heavy expenses in advertising, trade-pushing, etc. The weaker capitalists will go under in great numbers, the others will find it their interest to unite so as not to waste their profits in destructive competition. (It is to be noted that in this prognosis Marx foresaw the great *Trusts* and *Cartels* which in his day had not yet appeared.) In consequence, he held

that the time was coming (he thought it would come before the end of the 19th century) when the world would consist roughly of two classes, on the one hand a handful of preposterously wealthy millionaires mostly united in federations of some kind, and, on the other, the rest of mankind, the people who had produced all the wealth, and who would only have small pittances to enable them to live and to continue working. When this state of affairs would have come about the hour of the Revolutionary Act would have sounded. Then the masses of the nation would arise, and without any trouble take over the wealth of the nation to be thenceforward owned and administered by and for the nation. On the one hand the intolerable slavery of the masses would force them to break the bonds of capitalism; while, on the other hand, the unification of industry and the gigantic-scale production developed under capitalism would have taught the people organised democratically to employ their re-won property for the interests of all.

Such roughly was Marx's prophecy as to the development of modern industry. Based on an incorrect reading of the facts of history it has not been verified in the progress of time. There is some concentration of capital, but it is slow. Moreover, it does not seem to be preparing the way for a Marxian revolution, but rather for the Servile State; in the United States, where concentration in Trusts has gone furthest, Socialism is certainly farther off than in Europe. Indeed, as regards land the movement is not towards concentration but towards diffusion. Most of Marx's ardent disciples have ceased to insist on this part of his teaching, and it is no wonder, therefore, that Connolly mentions it only once.[3]

What Connolly, however, does insist on is that the means of production have been appropriated by the capitalist class. After all, this is the important fact about modern society, and Connolly was apparently more concerned to find some way in which this appropriation could be undone than to prove with Marx that capitalistic appropriation would necessarily lead to the abolition of

[3] *The New Evangel*, p. 10.

capitalism itself. Opponents of Socialism seem, indeed, to show too much jubilation in destroying Marx's theory of progressive pauperisation. It matters little whether the capitalist class in the world consists of thousands or of millions, or whether it is growing in numbers or is decreasing. The important thing, and the thing calling for a remedy, is the fact that the owners of the world's sources of wealth, whether they are absolutely numerous or not, or whether they are increasing in number or declining, have been for long, and are yet, a comparatively small proportion of the population.

As Connolly seems to have discarded this doctrine of the Concentration of Capital, he probably, therefore, did not believe that the Revolutionary Act for which he longed and fought was to come as a result of such a concentration.

How then did he expect it was to come or be brought about? His answer is "by the union of the workers for the waging of the Class War." In preaching this crusade of the Class War he is following Marx.

It will naturally be asked how this can be? As Marx held that Capitalism was inevitably preparing its own overthrow why should he have preached a war against it? Capitalism was doomed. The proletariat had the consolation of knowing this. Why should they not then peacefully await its ruin. The inevitable evolution of capitalism to another and better order ought to inspire not war but patience and peace. This objection has often been brought against Marx, nor has any valid logical answer ever been advanced by his disciples. Yet, though it was quite inconsistent in Marx, having taught Evolution to preach Revolution (violent or peaceful—it is not clear which he meant), never has any man preached Revolution to greater effect. His success was owing to his contention, reinforced with infinite display of facts and statistics and ingenious argument, that the workers, the real producers of the world's wealth, had been deprived and were kept deprived of that wealth by a small number of capitalists. *Das Kapitel*, the Bible of his Crusade, derives all its revolutionary strength from his masterly exposure of this capitalistic monopoly of the world's wealth.

Connolly and the Class War.

The preaching, then, of the Class War is the burden of most of Connolly's writings. What is to be thought of its morality?

Now it is a fact not to be denied that the working class has been deprived of what should be its property, and that it is being kept out of it. The world's wealth, meant for the benefit of men in general, has been monopolised in great part by a few. We can hardly hold that the union of the whole working class for the recovery of its property is wrong if we admit, as everyone does admit, that a Trade Union, the object of which is to win a juster share in the products of its member's work, is not wrong. Moreover, if it be a fact—and it is a fact—that Capital is binding itself in huge federations there can be no moral difficulty against the workers binding themselves together, too, against the encroachments of capital, or even against the claims of capital to keep all it has got. This is true, and does not in the least imply the acceptance of the principles on which Marx bases his doctrine of the Class War.

We may even go further. The present wage-system is not a necessary form of society; it is not the only possible form in which human beings can organise themselves. Time was when it did not exist. Though it is not an inherently unjust system of society, it undeniably at present is fruitful of untold evils; it is extremely liable to abuse. In the present state of the world, religion and moral sense having little influence, and industrial conditions presenting special dangers, the evils of the wage system, though not a necessary outcome of the system, are a frequent, natural, and almost inevitable outcome of it. If, therefore, the workers, mental and manual, who almost exclusively suffer from the system and who form the vast majority of the people, unite and aim at the abolition of the wage-system by insisting on progressively higher claims for their share in the world's wealth there can be nothing morally wrong in such a union.

The creation, however, of such a solidarity among the workers, mental and manual, of the world is not the Class-war as this term is usually understood. In the first place,

popular agitators sometimes make a distinction between wages and salaries, and in recruiting for the Class War they address themselves to the wage-earners alone, that is, the manual workers. Connolly, by the way, is not open to this reproach. In the second place, for popular agitators the Class War means too often much more than striving by legitimate means. It consists too often in the employment of all kinds of speech, true and false, foul and fair, so as to rouse the workers to a frenzy of personal hatred against employers. This plainly is indefensible. Such hatred is often in individual cases quite unmerited, and is always likely to lead to violent outbursts of unconscious passion. Such a crusade of hatred is wrong, very wrong. However, when we remember the very terrible causes of just discontent that exist, and especially when we remember the way in which lately the nations of the world, and even the more thoughtful and juster spirits in every nation, indulged in frantic abuse of their opponents, we cannot but make large allowance for the champions of the labouring classes when they outstep the bounds of reasoned agitation.

Industrial Unionism.

The particular form of solidarity which Connolly preached to the workers is not Trades Unionism as we understand the term. Trades Unionism he describes as the second of three stages in the progress of the workers to emancipation. The first of these stages was the period following their spoliation. With the memory of a happier past still in their minds, they strove to bring back their past by violent attacks on their expropriators. The second (that of Trades Unionism) was characterised by a resignation to their unfair status coupled with efforts, peaceful for the most part, for the improvement of their material condition. The third stage is reached when after they have improved their material condition they go on progressively to secure—in fact though not in name—all the economic power of the nation. When they have got a firm hold on all the economic resources, the sources of all power in their country, they are on the eve of emancipation. They then can easily change the form of society into one that will suit the new

conditions they have brought about. Trades Unionism, or Craft Unionism, now tending to disappear, is the second of these stages.[4] It is being supplanted by a more developed form of working-class union, the Industrial Union, organised according to industries and not according to crafts. Such Industrial Unions Connolly urgently pleads for. By their very bigness they will be better fitted for forcing the hands of Capital; including all the employees of an industry, they will not allow—as the Trade Unions did—the capitalist to attack labour in detail. Being here on familiar and practical ground, Connolly shows very brilliantly how a Craft Union often fights at one and the same time both for and against its fellow Craft Union. Lastly, the Industrial Union protects the weakest as well as the strongest of the workers, the women as well as the men, whereas Trade Unions have hardly ever been successful except among the economically stronger artizans.

The labouring classes, then, according to Connolly, thus organised in Industrial Unions, are to carry on vigorously the class struggle. In this struggle their action is to be predominantly economic, not political; that is, they are to strive above all at the perfecting of their own organisation, the improvement of their material conditions, the acquiring of control over the various industries.

In a secondary way, however, they may, and ought, to use political action. They may not merely use the opportunities of the present political system for the promotion of their interests, but they may lend their aid to those persons who, within or outside the Unions, are striving for political changes—such as women's suffrage and the like—which are likely to benefit the working-class movement. Also, they can lend their influence to any movement by which the present territorial system of government may be made more conformable to the principles of true democracy, though the ultimate realisation of Connolly's programme implies the abolition of territorial divisions as being unsuited to modern conditions. Thus, for instance, the working class should support movements in favour of the Republican and against any autocratic form of government, though Connolly shows

[4] *Socialism Made Easy*, p. 22.

quite clearly that Republicanism of itself is capable of being —as it is in the United States and in France—just as capitalistic in effect and spirit as any other form of territorial government.[5]

Similarly Connolly would wish his Industrial Unions to favour as wide an extension of municipalisation as possible. Municipalisation of water, trams, telephones, light and such like is, however, he points out, only a very short step in the direction of an ideal society, in fact it is clamoured for most ardently by people of the middle and upper classes, who find it more convenient for themselves. Still, it is a useful method of accustoming the masses to the idea of corporate ownership and corporate management of property.[6] In this connection he points out what he considers the very illogical position of the owning classes, who approve of common ownership in some things and refuse to approve of it in all others.

The Sympathetic Strike.

The great weapon to be used by the labouring class in the Class War is the Strike, and especially the Sympathetic Strike.[7] Connolly states its principle thus: "When any body of workers is in conflict with their employers all other workers should co-operate with them in attempting to bring that particular employer to reason by refusing to handle his goods. An employer who will not treat his work people on a civilised basis should be treated as an enemy of civilisation." Connolly's justification of it, therefore, is that the working class being essentially one, an injury to any one member is an injury to the whole body, and may, therefore, be avenged by the whole body.

It is needless to point out that this principle is only true within certain limits. There are many acts good, even praiseworthy, in themselves, but which, when they entail evil consequences out of all proportion to their good results, cease to be legitimate. Instances of such acts occur in everyone's daily life. Accordingly it is quite lawful, it may be even praiseworthy, for an individual labourer, or for a

[5] ibid, pp. 10-25; *An tSean Bhean Bhocht*, 1897. [6] *The New Evangel*, p. 1.
[7] *Lecture in Ireland*, p. 271-273.

body of labourers, to cease to work for an employer who insists on treating a fellow labourer unjustly, but the turmoil and misery inflicted on the whole body of society might be in many cases so enormous that it could not reasonably be considered as compensated for by the success of the strike. Every reasonable man must admit that it is not any or every pretext which will justify a strike causing misery to vast numbers of individuals. It can be justified only when less drastic measures have been tried in vain, and only when the injustice to be redressed is a grave injustice (though an injury trivial in itself may sometimes be the occasion of a struggle for a big principle).

"Strike and strike often, as often as you can consistently with your own interests," is the spirit of Connolly's exhortations to the workers. Of moral limitations he takes no account. In this, however, he is not more immoral than the statesman who plunges his country into war without regard to its ethical justifiability or to the great misery which, successful or not, it is certain to entail, and yet such a statesman is not nowadays thought too hardly of by his people!

In *Labour in Irish History* (p. 270) we find Connolly stating that the sympathetic strike is "justifiable historically." This is another example of his very loose use of terms. A thing is not justified by the fact of its having been done before. Yet he points in a tone of triumph to past instances of the sympathetic strike, while with inconceivable inconsistency he refers to some of those instances in words implying condemnation!

The Revolution.

When the Industrial Unions by constant strikes, "vigorous shock tactics," have succeeded in lessening the value of capital in the capitalists' hands and have won a large control over the management of production and over distribution, when in fact it is no longer worth while for the capitalists to fight for the diminished value of their capital, the carrying out of the Revolution will be an easy affair. As Connolly puts it: "The function of Industrial Unionism . . . is to build up an industrial republic within the

shell of the political State, in order that, when that industrial republic is fully organised, it may crack the shell of the political state."[8] Their capital will then be taken, and quite easily, from the capitalists.

It will be noticed that Connolly anticipates no opposition from the middle classes. In this he is following Marx, who expected that the middle classes would have practically ceased to exist by the end of the 19th century. Connolly's Industrial Unions, if they could be established, would include a very large proportion of the middle class, namely all those who are in receipt of salaries from the capitalists. It will, however, be always difficult, especially in view of the general tone of modern Socialist speakers, to weld together in one compact body the receivers of salaries and the wage-earners, and until this is done the salaried classes will be more or less in sympathy with capital, and will prove a formidable obstacle to the achievement of the Socialist revolution.

According to Connolly the capitalists are to get no compensation for the capital taken from them. The labourers will be merely re-entering into possession of what had been robbed from them. He defends this confiscation from the charge of cruelty in the following strange way. Every capitalist, he says, will be in a Trust or will not. If he is in one his property will have ceased to be his, it will have become the property of the Trust. We hardly think that Connolly, had he been attacking a large Dublin soap-manufacturer belonging to the soap-trust, would have shown towards him the pity due to a pauper! As for the capitalists who will belong to no Trust, he says they have a choice of two alternatives, either to have their property confiscated by a Trust in the interests of the Trust, or to have it confiscated by the nation in the interests of all. It is strange how he could have addressed such an argument to people who have before their eyes thousands of small capitalists who belong to no Trust and who are plainly not being forced into any.

(To be continued.)

[8] *Socialism made Easy*, p. 26.

THE TEACHINGS OF JAMES CONNOLLY.

(Continued.)

By Rev. L. McKenna, S.J.

The Co-operative Republic.

THE form in which Connolly would wish that Society be reconstituted after the Revolutionary Act is what he styles the "Co-operative Commonwealth." The present system, directed and ruled by a body of men "elected from an indiscriminate mass of residents within given districts, said residents working at a heterogeneous collection of trades and industries," is to be swept away, as "a survival from a time when territorial influences were more potent in the world than industrial influences, and, for that reason, totally unsuited to the needs of the new social order which must be based on industry."[1] The new Society is to be ordered on Industrial lines. He thus describes it: "The administration of affairs will be in the hands of representatives of the various industries of the nation; the workers in the shops and factories will organise themselves in unions, each union comprising all the workers in a given industry; said union will democratically control the workshop life of its own industry, electing foremen, etc., and regulating the routine of labour in that industry in subordination to the needs of society in general, to the needs of its allied trades and to the department of industry to which it belongs. Representatives elected from these various departments of industry will meet and form the industrial administration or national government of the country."[2] Something similar, too, we find in the programme of the Irish Socialist Republican Party drawn up by Connolly, "Agriculture to be administered as a public function under boards of management elected by the agri-

[1] *Socialism Made Easy*, p. 16. [2] *Socialism Made Easy*, p. 17.

cultural population and responsible to them and to the nation at large. All other forms of labour necessary to the well-being of the community to be conducted on the same principles."

Connolly's picture of the future Co-operative Republic is, we see, very vague. From a couple of places, however, we gather that it is not to be what we generally know as "State Socialism," that is, a form of Society in which a central government is to control and direct the activities of all the people. After the above vague sketch of his ideal State Connolly proceeds, "It will be seen that this conception of Socialism destroys at one blow all the fears of a bureaucratic State ruling and ordering the lives of every individual from above"; in another place[3] he seems to admit that Devin Reilly was right in condemning "the crude Communism of 1848"; and again he writes in the *Workers' Republic*, "Socialism implies co-operative control by the workers of the machinery of production; in the absence of such control we have naught but State Capitalism, as the Post Office at present."

Private Property.

It may here be considered what room Connolly leaves in his ideal State for private property. In scores of places he seems to refer to private property as the very root of all the present social evils. On the other hand, in one place he says that private property will not be abolished under the Socialist regime.[4] This passage is one in which he answers Father T. A. Finlay, S.J., who had given as a definition of Socialism "the absolute abolition of private capital, by taking capital, or the *material instruments of wealth production*, out of the hands of individuals and classes and making it the property of the community, vesting it in the State." After finding fault with this definition, chiefly on the ground of its representing Socialism as a system invented by human brains for the better ordering of Society, and not as an inevitable process

[3] *Ibid*, p. 184.
[4] *The New Evangel*, p. 10.

of human development, Connolly proceeds: "The private property which the worker should possess in the fruits of his toil is confiscated to-day by the Capitalist process of industry, and . . . Socialism, by making all citizens—Society—joint heirs and owners of the tools of production, will restore to the workers that private property of which Capitalism deprived them." Given by way of an answer to Father Finlay's statement, this passage is not very clear. It can scarcely mean that the worker will have *private ownership* of the "tools of production" which will be *held in common* by the State.[5] Neither can it mean that the State will be content with a general overlordship, merely seeing that private property does not work any social evil. There are indeed some latter-day leaders of Socialism who would have the State confiscate only certain forms of productive capital (generally the larger forms), leaving in private hands any other forms of capital which private ownership could work more advantageously. The Irish Labour Party, it has been said (I know not with what truth), would be in favour of sanctioning, and even of extending, peasant proprietorship in Ireland. Connolly, however, never whittles down his Socialism in this way. Though he does not state it expressly anywhere, one would gather from his writings that he would not have approved of any private property in the instruments of production. On the other hand, if Connolly means that the labourer will have private ownership of the *non-productive fruits* of his labour he is not contravening Father Finlay, who had defined Socialism as the abolition of private ownership of the "*instruments of wealth-production.*"

What he probably meant is that in the Socialistic State

[5] It is very much to be regretted that there are some writers of the present day who describe "Communal Ownership" as a kind of "private ownership." The two terms are mutually exclusive. Private ownership always implies a real (though often a limited) control over the thing owned. Communal ownership implies no such real control. A man has a real control over, and, consequently, private ownership in, the house which he owns or rents; over his furniture and such like objects, and over the money which he invests in a Stock Company or in a Co-operative Society. On the other hand, the citizen of a nation consisting of a million individuals, though he is part owner of the nation's navy, has no control, or a practically negligible control over it, and therefore has no private property either in the navy as a whole or the millionth part of it.

the labourer, getting the full products of his labour (minus the portion taken by the State for further production), would have and could use for every purpose he pleased (except that of further production), more of the world's wealth than he can get under the present system. With the wealth created by his work he could buy and hold as his very own his house and garden and all things necessary for his sustenance, comfort, and pleasure, with the single limitation that he could not use things for the production of more wealth.

The Old Irish System.

In connection with this question of private property it may be of interest to refer to the old Irish system often spoken of by Connolly as a system not of private property in land,[6] but one of common ownership. "Our fathers,"[7] he says, "not only owned their land in common but in many ways practised a common ownership of the things produced. In short, tribal communism was the universally existent order."

Only by a misuse of words could the old Irish system be styled Communism. Owing to the exaggerated individualism of modern times the notion of property has come to imply an almost unlimited license to acquire and to use wealth. It is not, therefore, surprising that the Celtic system is now often called Communistic. Communism, however, it was not. There were indeed commonages everywhere in Ireland as there were everywhere under even the Feudal system down into the 17th century, but the old Irish State was based on private property, though the transmission and the use of this private property was so limited by law and custom as to prevent excessive accumulation in the hands of individuals, and to secure the interests of the weaker members of the community. The redistribution of the land of a *Deirbhfhine* (a kind of family group) on the death of one of its members has caused many writers to imagine that the land of the tribe was on the death of every tribesman redistributed by some kind of democratically elected governing body.

[6] *Labour in Ireland*, pp. 4, 222. [7] *Socialism Made Easy*, p. 20.

THE CO-OPERATIVE REPUBLIC: WOULD IT WORK?

The few passages I have referred to are, I think, the only ones in which Connolly attempts any forecast of the state of society which he spent his life in striving to bring about. We can get from his writings no clear idea as to the details of its constitution. He nowhere attempts to explain how the general interests of the State, as distinguished from the specific interests of the Industrial Unions, are to be provided for. He is certainly not a State Socialist. He is more akin to the Syndicalists and other Political Anarchists, though he differs from the former inasmuch as he does not discard political action, and from the latter inasmuch as he seems to lay greater stress on the necessity of a central governing body. He does not, strange to say, even mention the Guild Socialists who have been trying to elaborate a scheme by which the interests of men as economic beings and their interests as citizens may be harmonised.

This refusal to give any description of Socialism in the working is at once the strength and the weakness of Connolly, as it was of Marx before him.

It is his strength, for it is easy to rouse the indignation and the discontent of suffering men. Men in a Land of Captivity will always follow the leader who points out a Land of Promise flowing with milk and honey, but which they can see only from afar wreathed with the enchantment which distance lends. In other words, it is easy to promote a movement, difficult to formulate and defend a practical policy. Anyone can invent and win applause for a Utopia.

On the other hand, there will always be many men who in spite of—or rather because of—their eager desire for the happiness of their fellows will be cautious in embracing any of the many schemes of social regeneration propounded so lightly every other day. They will be afraid—and reasonably afraid—that these schemes may make the world not better but worse. To Irishmen of this mind Connolly's writings though illuminating suggestive and inspiriting, will also bring many misgivings.

Connolly is satisfied with his conviction that the world owing to some strange evolutionary power must inevitably

become a happier and better place. Few reflecting men will share this consoling conviction. The world in the past has undergone many changes, but except in so far as one influence, the Church, has consistently inclined it to good, it has changed from one form of social misery to another. Why must its latest evolution be for good? May it not be for evil?

Again, supposing that Connolly's Industrial Unions can be formed (and this seems by no means certain); supposing that his Class War end in peace and not in universal starvation and misery; and supposing that his Co-operative Republic be once established, how will it work?

Reasonable and cautious men will insist on examining very closely any scheme they are asked to embrace. If an inventor comes to them with a new scheme for lighting a house they will not be satisfied with hearing the scientific principle of the scheme; they will insist on seeing it at work. Social schemes in particular have a way of not working according to their theoretic excellence. If an inhabitant of Mars were told that the people of England elect their rulers by secret and universal suffrage he would conclude that no large class of the English people is being kept in a state of oppression; yet such a conclusion would be false. At one time popular representation was thought to promise perfect social content; afterwards, the secret ballot; and these promises have turned out to be illusory. Therefore, even if Connolly's Co-operative Republic were shown to be theoretically perfect it would be well to act with caution. How much more so when he gives us no clear idea of it at all!

Nay, Connolly himself may well be suspected of having had doubts. In one place[8] he betrays some feeling of disappointment when he admits that the Irish municipalities managed on a system of universal suffrage show but little civic sense. Doubtless he would deny any parity between his Industrial Unions and Municipalities, but some parity there certainly is, for his Industrial Unions or Guilds would be almost as heterogeneous as Municipalities in their char-

[8] *Labour in Ireland*, p. 248.

acter, and would be just as much exposed to the rotting influences of chicane.

If among the democratically organised bodies existing to-day we seek out those which function in the most favourable circumstances, those, namely, which are not unmanageably big, and especially those which consist of well-educated men and of men with the independence of character which the private possession of stable property gives, we find that even these democratic institutions are not free from cliquism, favouritism, tyranny, and corruption. Is there any conceivable reason for thinking that such vices will not be rife in the projected Industrial Unions containing, as they will, vast multitudes of individuals with heterogeneous characters and interests, each individual being absolutely dependent on the collective will for his means of existence and all his mental satisfaction, and, on the other hand, having no means of influence or power except the futile one of a vote? The only security for the individual's comfort or content will be in the representative character of the Union. What a frail security this is we see from everyday experience. Elected persons get elected mostly through qualities other than those which fit them for management; and in spite of all theories as to their revocability and their dependence they are, as we know too well, often not very different from tyrants and are often almost impossible to dethrone.

Private Property for all the Real Need.

Of course we do not mean to decry democracy as such. It is one of the only hopes of the world, but by itself it is not an all-sufficient hope. The well-being of the individual —the object which we all desire—cannot be assured—we have proof in plenty before our eyes—by any representative machinery however perfectly contrived. Individual welfare will not be born into the world until Democracy be wedded, not as now to almost universal pauperism, nor—as Connolly would wish—to an universal deprivation of stable property, but to an universal possession of real substantial property. Not until the individual human wills of a nation have some power of asserting themselves to real effect will there be

any chance of individual welfare. Now, nothing on earth can impart this personal independence, this power of self-assertion, except the possession of property, and by property we mean permanent productive property such as a house, land, shares in co-operative societies or in industrial companies, not the unsubstantial form of property which Socialism would leave to the individual, property which would not produce anything besides itself. Were the multitudinous individuals of the propertyless class converted into property-owners, not necessarily all at once—for a sudden transition would be harmful rather than beneficial and would not be permanent; were they accustomed to taste of the pleasures of proprietorship and to appreciate its advantages, then each of them would act as a strong man and not as a helpless sheep, and the State democratically composed of such individuals would very easily devise laws for ensuring that never again would the world's wealth be monopolised by a few to the detriment of the many.

The bringing about of such a universal diffusion of property would mean indeed a revolution (in a good sense of the word) for it would have to be carried out against the opposition of the present monopolists of the country's wealth. It would be, however, a revolution easier to accomplish than the Socialistic one, for it would have behind it the driving power of one of men's strongest instincts, the desire of ownership. It would be a beneficent revolution for it would satisfy the desires and the pride of every individual and it would assure him some defence against the worst of all tyrannies, that of majority rule.

This belief that a people consisting of propertyless individuals would be happy and comfortable if only they were organised in a different manner from the present is a fatal fault in Connolly's teaching.

How would Industries Fare?

Another fault, scarcely less serious, is that he suggests no means whereby the whole people is to be prepared and trained for the absolutely essential work of carrying on the industries of their country. He shows how the Co-operative

Republic is to be fought for, but he does not show how its successful administration is to be ensured. He is always the general planning to conquer a new country; not the statesman arranging how the new land is to be governed.

To this objection he would, I suppose, have answered that there was no necessity for his preparing the people, or rather that his Class War was sufficient as a preparation; after the Revolution, which would possibly be a peaceful one, or at most a short period of violence, the industries of the country would go on pretty much as before; the salaried officials and managers would merely transfer their allegiance to the State from their former paymasters; the workfolk, made comfortable and happy, would go on working as usual.

It is hard to see that this happy result would be secured by his Class War, a war of constant strikes and turmoil and bitterness.

The salaried officials, mostly staid and peace-loving middle-class folk, would not easily be induced to join his militant Industrial Unions, especially with the prospect of having their rights to permanent property taken from them for ever. Yet Connolly lays it down that these salaried folk should be drawn into his Industrial Unions, for he sees, of course, that the labourers themselves, excellent as they are in "shock-tactics," would not be able to undertake the vital responsibilities of management. He would have said perhaps that the abstention of the salaried people might delay but could not prevent the Revolution, and that they would then be forced to take up again their old work for their new masters, nay, be glad to do so, receiving good reward for it from the State. Even if this were so there remains the much more serious difficulty of the labourers themselves, the general body of the people. Led on by false hopes of a millenium, excited by constant strikes and battling, exalted by victory they would be in no humour to continue the work on which they and the whole world depend for very existence. Cruel disillusionment, fierce anarchy, universal distress would be the inevitable outcome of a Revolution brought about by the Class War such as Connolly preached. A mere change in the mutual relations

of the individuals forming Society will not secure the harmony of Society as a whole or the happiness of its individual members; and, least of all, when the change is brought about by appeals to hatred and envy, the passions which disintegrate Society instead of binding it together. To be beneficent, a Revolution must comprise, not merely a change in the relations of individuals one to another, but a training of these individuals to adapt themselves to their new relations. Of such a training Connolly makes nowhere any mention. Co-operation is the only conceivable means by which men may be trained to harmonise their individual interests with the common good. It alone appeals to the desire deep in every human heart of personal ownership, and at the same time it urges each individual to interest himself in and to promote his neighbour's welfare. It alone gives any hope of large numbers of men conducting their affairs in prosperity and harmony to the advantage of all and the detriment of none. Yet, except when Connolly calls his ideal State a Co-operative Republic and when he speaks of it as including co-operative control of industry by the workers (in both of which cases he uses the word in a sense different from the usual one) he finds not place for Co-operation in his scheme of Social reform. We believe that to some small extent he did promote co-operative enterprise in Dublin, but in his spoken words he made but little account of it, while in his writings it is hardly ever mentioned.

Very striking is the contrast between Connolly, on the one hand, who pays so little attention to the one principle which gives reasonable and cautious men some hope of future social peace, and the Italian labour-leaders, on the other, who are training their men to build up what may be, in reality and not merely in name, a Co-operative Republic. It is a contrast which brings out the defects of Connolly, who, for all his unselfish love of the people, his energy, his organising ability, his learning, was always a brilliant general of the army of labour, not a statesmanlike and constructive reformer of Society.

The indignation of Socialists like Connolly at the glaring injustices of Society to-day, their wish to right those injus-

tices must command our sympathy; but must also cause us fear. The tremendous importance of the issues involved demand the greatest caution, the deepest thinking, the slowest action. In particular, when, without reeking of God's wishes or help, such men lightly undertake to arrange the proper working of God's world we may well tremble for the result. God knows more than any man about the things that will make for the welfare of the world which He has made; and when through His Church He has laid down certain principles for the ordering of the world it is for Catholics madness to ignore these principles.

It is a pity that James Connolly with his heroic spirit, his great love of the Irish people, and his intimate knowledge of their history allowed himself to be obfuscated by German philosophical doctrines which he either misunderstood or interpreted in a sense different from their authors'. A more intimate acquaintance with Catholic doctrine would, so far from hindering him, have helped him in what was after all the chief object of his life, the redemption of the suffering masses of the Irish people; while at the same time it would have saved him from the glaring inconsistencies which mar his work, and from the errors and unpleasant things which tend to discredit it.