

Anarcho-Nationalism and Irish Freedom

Sean Worgan

This essay looks at what I call anarcho-nationalism and its links to the Irish Republican Brotherhood (IRB) newspaper, *Irish Freedom*, which was published between 1910 and 1914. As part of this it examines *Irish Freedom's* links to anarchist thought. This breaks new ground since no previous study has examined the links between the two. Due to constraints of space the essay does not look into the relationship between anarchism and the more militant anarcho-syndicalism of this period,¹ but it does posit the idea that *Irish Freedom* linked anarchism and nationalism.

Anarcho-nationalism drew on anarchism and placed it in the nationalist framework of seeking independence from the British. One can see what is meant by this by examining Peter Marshall's definition of anarchism, which could equally serve as a definition for the kind of nationalist programme *Irish Freedom* was pursuing. Marshall notes:

All anarchists reject the legitimacy of external government and of the state, and condemn imposed political authority, hierarchy and domination. They seek to establish the condition of anarchy, that is to say, a decentralised and self-regulating society consisting of a federation of voluntary associations of free and equal individuals...²

If one substitutes the word nationalists for anarchists it is quite easy to see how an anarchist programme could be applied to Ireland, particularly with regard to its decentralising aspects, including a federation of voluntary associations. Indeed, in a different form such a programme had already been applied in Ireland through the Land League, the radical agrarian society formed in 1879 by Michael Davitt to agitate for tenants' rights, which evolved out of local land league organisations. The American anarchist, Benjamin Tucker had noted in his 1897 work, *Instead of a Book*:

Ireland's true order: the wonderful Land League, the nearest approach on a large scale, to perfect Anarchistic organization that the world has yet seen. An immense number of local groups scattered over large sections of two continents...each group autonomous; each composed of varying numbers of individuals...³

Later on *Irish Freedom's* editor, Bulmer Hobson, in his earlier guise as the Dungannon Clubs' co-founder, also spoke in anarcho-nationalist terms. In his 1909 pamphlet, *Defensive Warfare*, Hobson wrote of the need to create 'a community of interest' against the British state, 'It is necessary to establish a community of interest as well as a community of sentiment. Community of national sentiment will go far, but a community of interest to back it up will be stronger still'.⁴

This idea echoes Tucker, whose self-contained anarchist communities Hobson may or may not have known about. However, Hobson's true inspiration was E.T. Craig, who had written *A History of Ralahine*, which *Irish Freedom* later carried an article on.⁵ The book outlined the fortunes of a short-lived co-operative colony started by County Clare landlord John Scott Vandaleur on his Ralahine Estate in Ireland. Vandaleur had been inspired by a series of lectures given by the originator of the co-operative movement, Robert Owen, in Dublin in 1823. So he invited Craig, an English follower of Owen, to organise the experiment among the tenants on his estate.⁶ Marnie Hay notes Hobson lent Craig's book to Constance Markievicz, his co-founder, who was a socialist and feminist, and who was 'charmed at the idea of an agricultural commune'.⁷ Unfortunately, Hobson's and Markievicz's project failed, but what is interesting about the Craig connection is its socialist element. Though an old man by the time, Craig was an early member of the Socialist League and spoke at a number of their propaganda meetings.⁸ This again puts Hobson in socialist circles, even anarchist

ones since Craig had previously addressed the Dublin Socialist League, which was known for its anarchist sympathies.⁹ Such communal thinking was to become an integral part of Hobson's anarcho-nationalism.

Hobson hoped to construct an anarcho-nationalist community which would exclude the British state. The first step in this was to create what amounted to 'a condition of anarchy', through the reduction of the social economy to its first elements. Hobson outlined how this would work on his 1907 east-coast American tour:

If necessary, in Ireland, to-day, we must reduce the social economy to its first elements; we must break up the system. It is necessary for the further continuance of the Irish people that the system should be broken up, and we are confident that there is enough independent and National spirit in the people of Ireland that they will break it up, and they are starting to break it up at the present time.¹⁰

The idea behind reducing the social economy to its first elements was that this would bypass the government machinery that had grown up around the social economy, by which term Hobson meant the people-centred part of the economy. In this way Hobson aimed to put the Irish people beyond the control of the state by placing them outside its political machinery. This plan was wholly compatible with anarchism through prioritising the social over the political (see below). It also fitted perfectly with Hobson's *Defensive Warfare* strategy to gain independence, parts of which were outlined in the same speech as that in which he addressed 'reducing the social economy to its first elements'. As Charles Townshend has noted of *Defensive Warfare*, which was turned into a book in 1909, 'Hobson's distinctively modern contribution lay in his recognition that the modern state's complex administrative machinery relies on the habit of acquiescence. If that habit were broken, the machinery would immediately be paralysed'.¹¹ *Defensive Warfare* was only half of Hobson's strategy however, one could say the destructive half: the constructive half came in the form of anarcho-nationalism.

Hobson aimed to 'build up... a people self-contained, self-centred, self-reliant', but his means of doing this was socio-economic, an approach which lent itself to anarchism.¹² True, Hobson's interest in the concept of a social economy seems to have come initially from Lalor, but this is only part of the story. In his letters to *The Nation* Lalor had written of the 'social economy' in referring to the pre-Famine people-centred economy and to its social basis. Lalor also mentioned the social economy in the context of his physiocratic belief that other sectors of the economy sprung from husbandry and agriculture. Hobson shared this belief, inherited from Lalor,¹³ but he found the mechanism for realising it in anarchism.¹⁴ The French anarchist, Pierre-Joseph Proudhon 'uses the term l'économie sociale, social economy, in contrast to l'économie politique, political economy. By this term Proudhon meant a new science of the economy of society that would be other than *laissez-faire* capitalism and based on justice and the rights of the individual.'¹⁵ Hobson would try to achieve something similar in 1908 when he called the establishment of an Irish School of Economics in a letter to *The Irish Homestead*, the journal of the co-operative movement in Ireland:

I believe that Irishmen, given the opportunity, would evince an aptitude for dealing with social and economic problems in excess of that of at least some other countries, and while in no way underrating the work of German or American or English Economists, it seems certain that an Irish School of Economics would be better for Ireland than the swallowing of the theories, however good, of any of these.¹⁶

It is no coincidence that Hobson sent his letter to the *Irish Homestead*, which he read at a meeting of Sinn Féin Club No.1 in Philadelphia on 7 April, 1908. Hobson placed the co-operative solution at the heart of his efforts to establish an Irish School of Economics, which he intended to work in conjunction with his alternative social economy. Furthermore, under the editorship of George Russell (Æ) the *Irish Homestead* was also not averse to advocating anarchist solutions to nationalist problems, as Nicholas Allen has noted: 'Russell took up Kropotkin's anarchism with enthusiasm in



the *Irish Homestead*.¹⁷ Hobson too would turn to Kropotkin, especially in conjunction with *Irish Freedom*, but at this stage Proudhon appears to have been the focus of his anarcho-nationalism.

To build up a self-contained, self-centred and self-reliant people Hobson had to create as well as destroy, and in this we find another early example of Hobson borrowing from Proudhon. Hobson had noted in the Dungannon Clubs' newspaper, *The Republic*, that:

Our work must be constructive as well as destructive; we must rebuild as well as destroy. And, though our first need is for a national political organisation to wrest this country from the grip of England, that is not our only need, nor must that organisation be purely political and neglect the many sided life of the nation.¹⁸

While Hobson probably inherited this maxim from the Italian nationalist, Giuseppe Mazzini,¹⁹ it seems likely, in the context of his developing anarcho-nationalism, that Hobson was aware Proudhon also employed it. Mazzini's and Proudhon's programme overlapped, and Mazzini even asserted that the only just and secure form of government was 'the anarchy of Proudhon'.²⁰ Mazzini went beyond Proudhon in arguing that industrial factories should become collective property and the land be collectivised in communes, but it should be remembered the writer Standish O'Grady also advocated the latter in Ireland and that Hobson set up his own co-operative commune in Dublin in 1909.²¹ This was an idea the Russian anarchist Kropotkin had advocated and both O'Grady and Hobson came under his influence (see below). Furthermore, Proudhon and Mazzini advocated People's Banks, something Hobson copied.²² Thus, Hobson could easily accommodate Proudhon in his theoretical framework, the latter having used the maxim *Destruam ut Adificabo* ('I destroy in order to build up') in his *System of Economic Contradictions* (1846), to emphasise the need to create new libertarian institutions to replace existing ones.²³ This was precisely what Hobson wished to encourage, first through the Dungannon Clubs and then through *Irish Freedom*.

Hobson's aim of creating new libertarian institutions fitted with the nationalist aim of using co-operative communes as a means of reviving, or reinventing, Ireland's civilisation. This was very much an idea Standish O'Grady shared and Hobson may have come under O'Grady's anarchist influence while working with him on the *Peasant*. Edward O'Hagan has noted:

O'Grady, under strong and acknowledged influence of the Russian Anarchist, Prince Peter Alekseyevich Kropotkin, proposed an anarchistic programme of commune developments. O'Grady's work appeared in *The Peasant and Irish Ireland* in 1908, in the *Irish Nation and the Peasant* in 1909 and 1910, in the *Irish Review* in 1911 and 1912, in A.R. Orage's progressive *The New Age* in 1913, and in the *Irish Worker* from 1912 to 1913...²⁴

By 1913 Hobson was also well aware of Kropotkin, as an article on the industrial future of Ireland in the *Gaelic American* testifies. In *Ireland Yesterday and Tomorrow* Hobson states that before he was sacked by John Devoy in 1914 (the leader of the American separatist organisation, Clan na Gael),²⁵ he 'had been for a considerable time the Irish correspondent of the *Gaelic American*, the organ of Clan na Gael in America, and sent them at least one article each week.'²⁶ As the article below testifies, Hobson was more than familiar with Kropotkin:

Our correspondent asks whether our theory of a co-operative commonwealth does not require as an ally the production of some sort of mechanical power whose end is more than merely agricultural. He has obviously got that alluring vision of the countryside where agriculture is interspersed with industries, which Kropotkin familiarized us with in his "Fields, Factories and Workshops". Yes that is certainly the ideal, and we agree with our correspondent that it is very desirable for us to discover some cheap source of power.²⁷

In his capacity as the *Gaelic American's* correspondent and editor of *Irish Freedom*, Hobson would have been only too aware of Kropotkin's influence on the co-operative commonwealth debate.²⁸ Indeed, the above writer sounds confident Hobson was *au fait* Kropotkin's ideas. This makes sense in terms of Hobson's own article, on Ireland developing her industries, which appeared on the paper's front page in the same issue. In it Hobson recommends, in common with Kropotkin, the development of home markets.



Kropotkin's critique of the state as an obstacle to social revolution²⁹ was directly relevant to anarcho-nationalism and to Hobson's *Defensive Warfare* approach. Hobson echoes this himself by noting,

Then, again, if it be on any social question that reform is sought, English control of every detail of life hampers all movement...if a rural District Council is to build a labourer's cottage, an act of a foreign parliament has to be obtained and supervision of a nominated board of foreign or semi-foreign incompetents has to be tolerated. And so is the life of the nation.³⁰

Hobson and Kropotkin are at one in rejecting parliamentarianism as a solution to social problems (and in Hobson's case national ones as well).³¹ Instead, both looked to social revolution, Kropotkin noting: '...we must rely for the accomplishment of the Social Revolution ... neither on present parliaments, nor any representative bodies that might be summoned during a more disturbed period than the present.'³² To achieve this Hobson and Kropotkin turned to localism. Building up local agriculture and industries was part of Hobson's constructive approach but on the destructive side he noted the local boards, which had replaced the Grand Juries that ran Ireland, could be made tremendously effective in combating British rule. These local boards had been introduced under the 1898 Local Government Act, the franchise for which was much wider than the parliamentary one: the £50 property qualification had been abolished and every occupier was given the vote irrespective of wealth, religion or sex.³³ Hobson noted:

... the Local Boards, the County and District Councils in Ireland can be made tremendously effective to block the system of government established by England at the present time. Under the pretence of these boards governing the local affairs of the country, they are elected there in reality to administer the decrees of nominated boards in Dublin Castle. Boards nominated by the Lord Lieutenant in the English interest for the further exploitation of the Irish people; and I say that the Local Governing Boards of Ireland, the District Councils and the County Councils can be made tremendously effective to stop the working of these Castle

Boards—to make them non effective.³⁴

What had started off as merely part of the Hungarian Policy to agitate for an Irish Parliament had under Hobson become an effective anarcho-nationalist weapon to help achieve social revolution.³⁵

The similarity of approach with Kropotkin on parliamentarianism and localism did not end here however, in 'Local Action' Kropotkin had linked the two to the resistance of monopolies: 'The abolition of these monopolies will not be done by acts of national Parliaments: it will be done, first, by the people of each locality; and the agreement between different localities will be the result of the accomplished facts.'³⁶ Hobson was similarly concerned about monopolies: on his American trip he had noted one of the chief threats to Ireland was monopoly and he warned of the importance of resisting Britain's 'complete monopoly of the Irish market'.³⁷ He followed this up in *Defensive Warfare* by noting:

'The greatest gains of conquest are...these. It consists in the destruction of the manufactures of the conquered country, and the consequent monopoly of its market for the benefit of the conquerors.'³⁸ Such monopolies were dangerous to the economic health of local producers, so had to be stopped. Interestingly, Hobson does not rule out Kropotkin's local protectionist solution (which could be implemented through the local boards), but where this is not possible he advocates his own voluntary system. Again, this was impeccably decentralised, 'The people must support Irish manufacturers. Where England stands between them and prosperity, where England will not permit them to have a protective system, which would militate against her manufacturers, the people must impose on themselves and their own interests a voluntary protective system ...'³⁹

Kropotkin's appeal to Hobson and others pursuing anarcho-nationalism lay in the fact he provided such valuable material on how to escape the clutches of the state, this was particularly the case with two of Kropotkin's books, *Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution* and *Fields, Factories and*



Workshops.⁴⁰ *Mutual Aid* advocated turning to communes on the lines of those of mediaeval Europe to escape the influence of the state (an idea compatible with Hobson's reducing the social economy to its first elements), *Fields, Factories and Workshops* put the case for the decentralisation of industry and the development of home markets. Essentially, *Fields, Factories and Workshops* outlined the means by which Kropotkin's communes in *Mutual Aid* could function in the modern world. The ideas of both were picked up in Ireland. Kropotkin's anarchist newspaper, *Freedom*, reported approvingly on a meeting in 1908 where the writer Standish O'Grady recommended Irishmen read Sir Henry Maine's *Early Institutions* and *Village Communities* and Kropotkin's *Mutual Aid* as a recipe for developing (or redeveloping) Irish civilisation.⁴¹ Interestingly, the *Peasant* (which Hobson was working alongside O'Grady on at the time) had featured a review of Kropotkin's *Fields, Factories and Workshops* in January, which it commended to its readers; it also outlined how Irishmen should imitate the Kropotkin's prescription for developing full home markets.⁴² Five years later the *Gaelic American* also spoke admiringly of *Fields, Factories and Workshops*.⁴³ However, it was in *Irish Freedom* that Kropotkin's ideas received most exposure, even if this was not overt.

Interestingly, Hobson's libertarian co-operation also owed a debt to the individualist thinker, Herbert Spencer. Spencer had noted in his *Data of Ethics*: '... the members of a society may give mutual help in the achievement of ends. And if, either indirectly by industrial co-operation, or directly by volunteered aid, fellow citizens can make easier the adjustment of acts to ends, then their conduct assumes a still higher phase of evolution ...'⁴⁴

This idea of employing co-operation to advance to a higher stage of evolution was compatible with both Hobson's nationalist thinking and his anarchist approach. In terms of the former Hobson noted in a speech at Enniscorthy in 1911: 'The first essential for the growth of any living entity is its independence and they [Allen, Larkin and O'Brien⁴⁵] knew that slavery held back the evolution of the individual for generations. How could Ireland develop when she was held bound hand and foot by the English people in the interests of England?'⁴⁶

In terms of Hobson's anarchist approach, evolutionary co-operation chimed with the Russian anarchist, Kropotkin's ideas, who Hobson was definitely under the influence of by the time he was writing for *Irish Freedom*.⁴⁷ Graham Purchase notes that in *Mutual Aid* Kropotkin set out his evolutionary/revolutionary approach (which Hobson employed) which saw human evolution as essentially integrative and social in its orientation.⁴⁸ This chimed with Spencer, who Hobson was also under the influence of. Hobson had read Spencer's *Data of Ethics* and quoted from it approvingly in *Irish Freedom* on the need for the individual to sacrifice his interests to the nation.⁴⁹ This is significant in terms of Hobson's anarcho-nationalist agenda since Spencer was much admired in Irish anarchist circles and in some nationalist ones. Probably Spencer's most notable nationalist admirer was Michael Davitt, the founder of the Land League, which it will be recalled the American anarchist, Benjamin Tucker actually saw as the perfect anarchist organisation: Davitt cited Spencer's views in Land League publications and rhetoric.⁵⁰

Writing of the Saturday Club, an appendage of the Dublin (anarchist) branch of the Socialist League, Fintan Lane quotes the German-Danish anarchist, Fritz Schumann. In a paper he delivered to the Saturday Club on technical education Schumann cited Spencer approvingly: 'with the great living philosopher, the apostle of anarchy or liberty – which is the same thing – with Herbert Spencer, he would say education is closely associated with change, in fitting men for higher things and unfitting them for things as they are'.⁵¹ It should be noted that technical education was a particular area of interest for Hobson, which he linked to co-operation.

In the *Peasant* Hobson stated the importance of technical education to the success of his co-operative tillage scheme:



The [Co-operative tillage] society should place at the service of its members the best expert advice procurable, should in fact be as much educational as financial in its operations, aiming at keeping its members abreast of the latest developments in scientific agriculture. This would ensure that loans would be used to the best possible advantage, and obviate the possibility of money, already too scarce, not being used for the best and greatest possible production.⁵²

Also important to the success of the tillage society was banking. Like Proudhon, who advocated mutual banking through his People's Bank, Hobson linked banking to co-operation. Hobson may also have had in mind Kropotkin's policy of self-help in commerce, which George Russell was to champion when he chaired the newly founded Sinn Féin Co-operative People's Bank in August 1908.⁵³ Writing in the same article Hobson recognised the limitations of the Raiffeisen banking scheme which Father Finlay, who worked for the Irish Agricultural Organisation Society (IAOS), had introduced from Germany to aid co-operative farming and offered an alternative:

... the Raiffeisen (sic) Bank as we know it lends to its members at a fixed rate of interest for productive purposes, without differentiating as to the purpose to which it is to be applied. Considering the National necessity of increasing the tillage land to Ireland, it is highly desirable that loans should be granted at preferential rates where the money is to be used for the breaking up of grass lands, and a scale of rates of interest, having regard to the purpose to which the loan is to be put, giving a preference to those which from the point of view of a broad national economic policy best serve the interests of the nation, must of necessity act in the economic interest of the banks and the people generally.⁵⁴

Making tillage farming viable through co-operative means would help to ensure that 'returning the social economy to its first elements' was economically viable: only in this way could Hobson garner support for his tactics against the British state.

Irish Freedom

Irish Freedom was the first venture of the newly formed Dublin Central Wolfe Tone Clubs Committee (DCWTCC), which had been established as a cover for IRB projects.⁵⁵ It was 'Bulmer Hobson's *Republic* reborn.'⁵⁶ The *Republic* ran from December 1906 to May 1907 and was the journal of the Dungannon Clubs, which Hobson and Denis McCullough founded in Belfast in December 1905 as an IRB ginger group.⁵⁷ The organisation contained a number of Protestants, who Hobson aimed to unite with Catholics under a nationalist banner.⁵⁸ The Dungannon Clubs subsequently spread throughout Ulster by taking over the machinery of Cumann na nGaedheal (another Sinn Féin nationalist organisation seeking independence from the British).⁵⁹ Ostensibly, the Dungannon Clubs aimed to push Arthur Griffith's Hungarian Policy, a prescription for Irish independence based on the 1867 *Ausgleich* (compromise) between imperial Austria and Hungary, which was ruled by the former. The *Ausgleich* was characterised by a joint monarchy, but separate parliaments, an arrangement Griffith thought could be applied to Ireland to achieve independence along the lines of the 1783 Irish Parliament.⁶⁰ However, Hobson and McCullough soon abandoned the Hungarian analogy due to criticisms, and agitated for a republic instead - although still remaining part of the Sinn Féin movement which included Griffith's National Council and Cumann na nGaedheal.⁶¹ This gave the Dungannon Clubs a chance to pursue a more active approach, drawing upon republican thinkers such as Mazzini in the process. It further brought the organisation into line with the IRB, who remained republican at heart. The new line was reflected in the *Republic*, as was it in *Irish Freedom* a few years later.

Yet Hobson's and the IRB's republican approach was thwarted after unification of the two Sinn Féin elements (the Dungannon Clubs and Cumann na nGaedheal had amalgamated into the Sinn Féin League in April, 1907), which took place under Griffith's National Council programme. This happened on 29 August, 1907 with the stipulation at the National Council's convention that unification would be under its programme: this looked not to establish a republic but to re-establish



an Irish Parliament in line with the British Parliament's Renunciation Act of 1783 which according to Griffith abrogated all future claims to legislate for Ireland (despite the Act of Union eighteen years later).⁶² Such a position looked closer to Home Rule than republicanism; however, in the interests of unity Hobson and his colleagues swallowed it for the next few years, but their position became increasingly difficult. As Roy Foster has noted, 'To the separatist mind, Griffith was appearing more and more like the outdated but energetic old agrarian radical and Home Ruler William O'Brien, attempting to put together a feel-good coalition of moderate nationalists across a broad front, and in the process selling the pass as far as any real degree of independence was concerned'.⁶³

Foster goes on to note that attracting defectors from the Irish Parliamentary Party was not Hobson's colleague, PS O'Hegarty's idea of constructing a bridgehead into radical separatism. The same could be said of all the Dungannon Club members; in fact Hobson and some others had dropped out of Sinn Féin. Hobson instead devoted his time to the IRB and Fianna (the Irish boyscouts) and formed a number of Freedom Clubs.⁶⁴ As such, it comes as little surprise that when Griffith's *Sinn Féin* ceased publication in January 1910 (it had become a daily in August 1909),⁶⁵ his IRB opponents decided start a new paper, *Irish Freedom* in November.

Although Hobson and the writers on *Irish Freedom* did more than most to develop anarcho-nationalism they nevertheless inherited the basis for it from the militant left-wing tradition of Irish nationalism. This tradition passed down to *Irish Freedom* through IRB figures like the late John O'Leary and Fred Allan, who moved in socialist circles. Allan looked to combine Fenianism with Dublin labour politics and had links to English radicalism.⁶⁶ He had delivered lectures on 'Socialism' and the 'Russian Revolutionary Movement' to the Dublin Young Ireland Society during 1882-3, and in 1894 he met with various English anarchists.⁶⁷ Hobson may have imbibed Allan's sympathies for socialism from one of his lieutenants in the YIS, Robert Johnston, whose Belfast Pioneer Branch of Cumann na nGaedheal Hobson and his republican associate Denis McCullough had joined in 1901.⁶⁸ Later on, Hobson was a member of its sister branch, the Central London Branch of Sinn Féin, which had contacts with the IRB in London.⁶⁹ Here, John Butler Yeats, a senior IRB man and father of W.B. Yeats, had several anarchist contacts, among whom was Peter Kropotkin.⁷⁰

In line with Hobson's and the IRB's radical separatist approach *Irish Freedom* sought to engage with the labour movement from the outset. The paper filled the gap Hobson had intended the labour journal to plug when he petitioned the Dublin Trades Council to set one up in 1909. As part of this Hobson pleaded before the Committee two schemes, the first 'a special edition of the "Observer" with a guaranteed circulation' and second an edition 'of the comal with a guaranteed circulation of 3500'.⁷¹ The "Observer" was the *County Dublin Observer*, 'a short-lived weekly newspaper with a Sinn Féin editorial policy' which Hobson established in 1908 and which was issued from the *Peasant* office.⁷² It is interesting that the *County Dublin Observer* was issued from the *Peasant's* office and that it was to play a part in Hobson's agreement with the Dublin Trades Council. Hobson was sub-editor of the *Peasant* in 1908, which Roy Foster describes as socialist,⁷³ which suggests, in conjunction with his comal, or agreement, with the Trades Council that Hobson was pursuing a very definite socialist line of action at this point.⁷⁴

This view stands in contrast to the writer and socialist, Sean O'Casey's view of Hobson, outlined in *The Story of the Irish Citizen Army*, which portrays Hobson as being anti-socialist. O'Casey stated that Hobson's 'warmest appreciation of all things appertaining to labour was a sneer' and he accused him of doing his best to prevent an understanding between the forces of labour and nationalism. He also accused *Irish Freedom* of bias against labour.⁷⁵ The first accusation does not seem credible given that the Dungannon Clubs' Manifesto had previously noted: 'Irish Trades Unionism, now a mean tail to an English Democracy, must be recognised and nationalised, and made to play its great



and proper part in the upbuilding of the country.⁷⁶ Furthermore, the Marxist James Connolly had once urged Hobson to ‘give up Sinn Féin propaganda and devote himself to a left wing Labour movement’, something which would suggest he saw Hobson as a friend, rather than enemy, of labour.⁷⁷ The second accusation was based on a general meeting of the IRB during the 1913 Lockout, at which Hobson was supposed to have taken an anti-labour stance. Here, Hobson convinced the audience that, as a democratic organisation supportive of all Irish citizens regardless of class, the IRB should not intervene on the side of the workers.⁷⁸ For O’Casey this demonstrated Hobson’s hostility toward the labour cause and socialism in general. Yet Hobson’s position was not anti-worker or anti-socialist, and he did not take the employers’ side. It was simply that Hobson’s anarcho-nationalism relied on bringing workers and employers together. This was in line with his earlier co-operative approach, which he still adhered to, even if it was not suited to the immediate situation of the Lockout. Finally, *Irish Freedom* was not biased against labour, rather it was wary of state socialism in line with Hobson’s anarcho-nationalist approach. This may have been the reason for Hobson’s, Seamus O’Connor’s, Seamus Deakin’s and Peadar Kearney’s apparent snub of the IRB committee formed at the instigation of Sean O’Casey to explore how the IRB and the labour movement might help one another.⁷⁹ As part of the 1913 agreement, O’Casey and Sean MacDermott (MacDiarmada) were delegated to meet with James Larkin, the ITGWU leader, in order to get the Labour newspaper, the *Irish Worker*, to cover IRB influenced activities. Larkin agreed and in turn requested that *Irish Freedom* do the same for the labour movement.⁸⁰ But O’Casey was bitterly disappointed when only Tom Clarke turned up for the committee meeting designated for discussion of this request. Hobson, Seamus O’Connor, Seamus Deakin and Peadar Kearney were all absent. In the event, O’Casey suspected that Clarke had known all along that the others would not turn up.⁸¹ But what was the reason? It could not have been lack of interest on Hobson’s part since Hobson had made the running in 1909 on his similar project with the Dublin Trades Council. Rather, it was due to Hobson realising that the 1913 newspaper project was only the first step, and that if O’Casey had his way over the IRB-labour alliance it could take the former in a state socialist direction. Another consideration was O’Casey’s militant approach (O’Casey actually uses the term ‘the militant Labour Movement’);⁸² this did not fit with Hobson’s more moderate co-operative approach between labour and employer.⁸³ Hobson’s apparent lack of interest was no such thing, he was simply preventing his own programme being blown off course.⁸⁴

Hobson’s Editorship

As editor of *Irish Freedom*, Bulmer Hobson played a crucial role in facilitating anarcho-nationalism. Hobson’s former Dungannon Club colleague, Patrick McCartan was nominal editor but by Hobson’s own admission he carried out most of the work.⁸⁵ This would have given Hobson editorial control over the content. Along with another Dungannon Club colleague, P.S. O’Hegarty, Hobson ‘wrote all the editorials and a good many of the articles’.⁸⁶ This further meant he could control the content of the paper, which included among its writers a number of former Dungannon Club men.⁸⁷ Their presence also ensured *Irish Freedom* supported an anarcho-nationalist line, which the Dungannon Clubs and its successor, the Sinn Féin League, had been moving toward before being subsumed by Arthur Griffith’s National Council in the form of Sinn Féin. True, there was a dispute at the end of 1911 over control of *Irish Freedom*, Hobson noting: ‘This was a recurring one between an older generation, who wished to go slowly and quietly, and the younger generation eager to get things done’.⁸⁸ However, Hobson and his colleagues won that particular contest, his opponents, Fred Allan and Jack O’Hanlon, resigning from the IRB’s Supreme Council, leaving the way clear for Hobson and his supporters to dominate.⁸⁹ Apart from McCartan and O’Hegarty there was Sean MacDermott, who managed the paper (though he didn’t write for it), and J.W. Good, who had worked with Hobson on *Uladh*, the journal of the Ulster Literary Theatre, the Dungannon Clubs’ sister organisation.⁹⁰



There was also Ernest Blythe, who joined the Belfast Dungannon Club after moving to Ulster (although he was actually born in Magheraliskmisk, Maghaberry, Co. Antrim) and transferring to the Belfast circle of the IRB.⁹¹

As with Hobson Blythe's article, 'The Co-operative Commonwealth' bridges the gap between anarchism and nationalism. By the 'co-operative commonwealth' Blythe referred to all those industries in which co-operation could be achieved, in the workshop, manufacturing, shop-keeping and agriculture. For Blythe the last was a special case since 'The agricultural co-operator, assisted and advised by Nationalists who consider the whole community, will as time goes on lengthen his arm and multiply his activities until all industry is federated with him in a harmonious, symmetrical co-operative commonwealth'.⁹² It is notable that Blythe talks of agriculture federating itself into other industries: this is a far more anarchist friendly solution than state ownership. Blythe also writes of 'upbuilding the nation' through the co-operative commonwealth, as an alternative to both 'the present system of competitive profiteering' and "Social Reform", which would lead to the 'servile State, when the masses, in name and in fact, will be slaves, with every detail of their lives carefully and hygienically regulated by their owners, the capitalists, who by virtue of their wealth will in reality be the state'.⁹³ Anarchists have long noted the dangers of the 'servile state' and reject 'State Socialism' for precisely this reason, as does Blythe who notes:⁹⁴ 'Whatever the State Socialists may aim at (and all honest men will admit that their intentions are good) they have so far only brought us social reform, the prelude to the servile state'.⁹⁵ Both Blythe and the anarchists (and the rest of the Dungannon Club men) were looking to achieve not social reform, but social revolution. This is why Blythe objected so much to social reform, 'that is, that body of legislation which tends to deprive the working class of responsibility, initiative and dependence', qualities that would be much needed in driving the social revolution and independence.⁹⁶

Blythe's article would not be out of place in an anarchist publication such as Kropotkin's *Freedom*, which is the point since, as we shall see, there was substantial crossover between *Irish Freedom* and its anarchist namesake. The key figure in this is the anarchist 'Northman', who I shall treat in a separate section. 'Northman' wrote for both publications and his links to the labour movement in Ireland made him a key figure in pushing anarcho-nationalism, not least because of his work in the Dublin Trades Council, a body Hobson envisaged working alongside nationalists for independence.⁹⁷ Hobson himself noted, '*Irish Freedom*' represented the militant left wing of the Irish national movement, and advocated the independence of Ireland by every practicable means, including the use of physical force.⁹⁸ This included some anarchist strains of thought, but mainly the more peaceful ones of Peter Kropotkin. Kropotkin lived in Western Europe for more than forty years, between his escape from Tsarist Russia in 1876 and his return to revolutionary Russia in 1917; he settled in Britain in 1886 where he set up Freedom Press.⁹⁹ *Irish Freedom* would be characterised by a certain amount of crossover with Kropotkin's *Freedom*. This comes as little surprise given that the pages of *Freedom* already testified to the presence of Irish nationalists writing for Kropotkin's paper. In its April 1912 edition *Freedom* noted *The Daily Chronicle's* report on 'suspicious Irish and German names in *Freedom's* membership', and its June, 1908 edition contained the article 'The Failure and Farce of Parliamentarianism', by 'An Irish Rebel'.¹⁰⁰ Irish Rebel's rejection of parliamentarianism clearly fitted with Sinn Féin and the IRB's policy, and even his take on the use of the general strike as a political weapon in Ireland tallied with some *Irish Freedom's* writers' approaches, although not Hobson's.¹⁰¹

Irish Freedom's anarchist approach is reflected in its appearance among other things: side by side, *Irish Freedom* and Kropotkin's anarchist newspaper *Freedom* certainly look the same, barring the addition of the word Irish. This is reflected in the general layouts of the papers, from the title page to the editorial, and it seems *Irish Freedom* took its cue from *Freedom*. This 'coincidence' could just be down to similar type face and the like; however, in *Irish Freedom* there are a number of articles



which share a common title - and occasionally a common theme - with those in Kropotkin's paper, *Freedom*. Among these articles are 'Today and To-Morrow' which first appeared in *Freedom* in July 1908 and in *Irish Freedom* in July 1913; 'The Work Before Us' in *Freedom*, May 1913 and in *Irish Freedom*, January 1911; 'Under Which Flag' in *Freedom* in July 1908 and *Irish Freedom*, May 1912; and 'The Coming Storm' in *Freedom*, September 1925 and *Irish Freedom*, May 1911.¹⁰² While some of the articles in *Irish Freedom* predate those in *Freedom*, this is only because the *Freedom* articles had already appeared in some of Kropotkin's earlier publications. Walter and Becker note that Kropotkin's book, *The Conquest of Bread*, was not published in English until 1906, but that English translations of several of its chapters appeared as articles or pamphlets in the late 1880s and the 1890s and were frequently reprinted.¹⁰³ An example of this was 'Rocks Ahead', which appeared in *Freedom* in 1888 and was later taken as the title for an article in *Irish Freedom* on Ulster's plans to opt out of Home Rule.¹⁰⁴ A list of the original *Freedom* articles with their dates and the subsequent *Irish Freedom* articles are footnoted below.¹⁰⁵

Northman

Perhaps the most interesting example of the crossover between *Freedom* and *Irish Freedom* is the case of Northman. Northman wrote for *Freedom* at the end of 1901 and for *Irish Freedom* in 1912 and 1913.¹⁰⁶ The writer W.B. Yeats' cultural critique of October 1903 had helped to convince radical separatists of the value of such an alliance. In it Yeats observed: 'I would see in every branch of our propaganda, young men who would have the sincerity and the precision of those Russian revolutionaries that Kropotkin and Stepniak tell of.'¹⁰⁷ Hobson's Dungannon Clubs had been one such example of this sincerity and with Hobson exhibiting interest in Kropotkin it comes as little surprise Northman was attracted to *Irish Freedom*. I have only been able to trace four articles by Northman in *Freedom*, in which he discussed the Boer War, the death of the Empress Frederick, the slump in trade and the housing problem, but this is also roughly true of Northman's writing for *Irish Freedom*.¹⁰⁸ In any case, Northman may have written under other pseudonyms as well. Northman's identity is interesting since he was probably John Lawlor, the former handball player from Pennsylvania and future Vice President of the Dublin Trades Council and Labour League.¹⁰⁹ We only know this because years later Northman doubly signed one of his articles in *Irish Freedom* as Northman and Seaghan Mac An Learlah, a gaelicised version of John Lawlor.¹¹⁰ On its own this doesn't prove the case decisively that Northman was John Lawlor but it seems likely given that he was one of three Dublin Trades Council members on the Funeral Committee of the veteran Fenian, O'Donovan Rossa in 1915.¹¹¹ Interestingly, "Northman" wrote the tribute article, 'Rossa in the Dock' for the souvenir booklet of the public funeral.¹¹² Since Hobson was Honorary Secretary of the Funeral Committee and in charge of arrangements (until Tom Clarke took a more active role) the two would definitely have crossed paths. However, Hobson must have known Northman from at least 1912, when Northman seems to have written his first article for *Irish Freedom*.

Social Policy

Northman wrote on a number of nationalist related subjects in his articles for *Irish Freedom*; however the clearest enunciation of his views was over the labour upheaval in Dublin of 1913. In his notes column he echoes *Irish Freedom*'s line that industrial strife had been imported as a product of the 'English occupation'. Northman also echoes Hobson in stating the 'existing economic society is lopsided'; it has a rotten foundation built on the bodies and souls that are crushed by industrialism.¹¹³ This tallies with Hobson's idea of a co-operative society based around communes, built on the physiocratic principle of constructing from the agricultural base as the most important element. Hobson had stated in the *Republic*: '... the first consideration is the application of co-operation to



agriculture. Start here and you start to build from the foundation up, and if the work is not started here we may find when a noble edifice is erected that it has been built on sand.¹¹⁴ Northman is also at one with Hobson in suggesting that the solution of the issue between capital and labour is the co-operative solution.¹¹⁵

Northman's longest article, which sets out his views in most detail, is 'The Economic Basis of a Revolutionary Movement: An Address to Nationalists'. In it Northman surveys a broad historical spread, covering the French Revolution, Wolfe Tone, Young Ireland, and Parnell among other topics.¹¹⁶ Northman treats them in terms of being revolutions, noting the importance of the land question in shoring up Parnell's political nationalism. This is in line with Northman's overall view that: 'The hopes of the people to secure a better and happier way of life have been one of the chief factors in every revolution.'¹¹⁷ Being an anarchist Northman envisages that change in terms of social revolution. As he notes: 'A general survey of the last century convinces me that a social policy would add greatly to the strength of the separatist movement.' He goes on, 'If we take a definite step in propounding our social ideal, in stating quite clearly that the establishment of an Irish Republic will be followed by an equable social re-organisation, then we shall give impetus and strength to the movement which will hasten the day when English domination will be overthrown'.¹¹⁸

Northman's point about propounding a social ideal was in line with *Irish Freedom's* call for a social policy, which it called for over the railway strike. This was the second and more serious of two railway strikes which broke out in August and September 1911. It started on 15 September, when two carriers employed by the Great Southern and Western Railway (GS&WR) at Kingsbridge Station, Dublin, refused to handle 'blackened' goods from a timber merchant who was involved in a lockout with members of the Irish Transport and General Workers' Union (ITGWU). The men were dismissed, leading to an escalation of the strike along the GS&WR, as well as on other rail networks with termini in Dublin, mainly the Great Northern Railway (GNR) and Midland Great Western Railway (MGWR).¹¹⁹ *Irish Freedom* stated:

Last month in these columns reference was made to the urgent need of a coherent and well thought out social policy if nation building in Ireland was to mean anything more than a high-sounding phrase. The justification of that argument has come much sooner and more dramatically than anyone expected. The railway strike, hurtling like a bolt out of the blue, has shaken the country to its foundations ...¹²⁰

Northman went on to note that the power of capital had to be dealt with due to its influence in modern international relations and in the national life. This was necessary if the social ideal he propounded was to succeed. It was also compatible with Hobson's earlier view in the *Peasant* on the struggle between nations. Viewing this struggle in social-Darwinian terms, Hobson stated in *The Peasant*:

The modern fight for existence is a fight for markets, whether it be waged with the sword or by using your stronger economic position and the economic conditions existing, against more poorly equipped opponents. England's war with Ireland is for the markets of Ireland—and in order to keep Ireland supplying her with raw materials and foodstuffs and taking manufactured goods in turn.¹²¹

It is noteworthy that Northman went on to observe: 'In our work we should not now shirk the choice that will eventually be thrust upon us. We must not leave a powerful garrison of our enemy in our country.'¹²² This too was exactly the line Hobson took in his autobiographical work *Ireland Yesterday and Tomorrow* in criticising the independent Irish state:

The economic concepts and practices which had grown up in Britain to suit British conditions had proved ruinous for Ireland. I expected that they would be reviewed and changed to suit our own conditions and meet our urgent needs. I had wanted to end the British government of Ireland and get an Irish government established precisely with this object in view...Instead we had protracted and barren conflicts over verbal differences...the problems remained.¹²³



Hobson's above comments were a response to the Irish state's failure to develop the kind of civilisation, compatible with anarcho-nationalism, that he, Standish O'Grady and Northman had earlier tried to outline in *the Peasant* and *Irish Freedom*.

Hobson's distrust of the state also manifested itself at the time in attitude toward the National Health Insurance Act (1911), which he saw as imposing unnecessary and unhelpful costs on Ireland's businesses. Through the state, employers and the workers themselves this compulsorily insured all manual and non-manual workers earning less than £160 a year (£250 after 1919) against sickness. It also provided a minimal scheme of unemployment insurance.¹²⁴ Hobson naturally objected to the government scheme, not least because it stood in opposition to his own, An Cumann Coranta, which was 'started in order to protect Irish Nationalists against loss of their employment on account of their activity in the national cause.'¹²⁵ It should be noted anarchists, like Proudhon, ran a similar insurance schemes outside the state.¹²⁶ Hobson perceived the net effect of the National Health Insurance Act as standing in contrast to the Industrial Development Associations, which he saw as kick-starting the Industrial Revival.¹²⁷ Along with his advocacy of co-operatives, the IDAs harked back to Hobson's Dungannon Club days, the Dungannon Clubs' Manifesto stating, 'Societies for the protection of our trading interests on the lines of some existing Industrial Development Associations can be started through the length and breadth of the land, and would band our manufacturers individual or co-operative, and our whole people together for their mutual advantage'.¹²⁸ What this proves is that Hobson was essentially trying to continue what the Dungannon Clubs' had begun through *Irish Freedom* and other outlets sympathetic to the IRB. Yet he had also moved beyond this by developing co-operation as part of an anarcho-nationalist approach. Building on Ernest Blythe's article, 'The Co-operative Commonwealth', Hobson noted in the *Gaelic American*: 'Co-operation is a policy of freedom and of free voluntary association, the antithesis of State Socialism—the remedy proposed by economists of the Imperial Races.'¹²⁹ It was the key to economic and social independence, not just political independence. As Hobson went on to note, 'The full significance of the connection between Nationalism as a social theory and Co-operation as an economic theory is not of course widely understood here yet and won't be for many a long day, but the future of Ireland is in no small measure dependent upon the growth side by side and the application together of these cognate principles'.¹³⁰ Hobson and his colleagues on *Irish Freedom* would undoubtedly have explored this relationship further had Hobson not been fired from both the *Gaelic American* and *Irish Freedom* for accepting the addition of twenty-five of the Irish Parliamentary Party leader, John Redmond's nominees onto the Provisional Committee of the Irish Volunteers in June 1914.¹³¹

Hobson was never forgiven by the IRB Supreme Council for his part in accepting Redmond's nominees onto the Provisional Committee and was henceforward excluded from the inner circle of the Volunteers that were linked to the IRB leadership; he was also excluded from the inner circle of the IRB itself.¹³² In any case, plans were put into place for the Easter Rising of 1916 behind his back, which signalled the IRB's break with Hobson's and his colleagues' thinking, of developing a social policy. Hobson was caught off guard by the rebellion (one of the leaders of the Rising, Patrick Pearse, having previously denied at a meeting of Volunteer headquarters staff on 5 April 1916 that any insurrection was planned).¹³³

With Hobson removed as *Irish Freedom's* editorial facilitator of anarcho-nationalist ideas, and *Irish Freedom* being closed down during the First World War, there was no longer any focal point from which anarcho-nationalism could develop. This was a shame since Hobson had done most to develop it. Hobson was a brilliant distiller of ideas, drawing on anarchist and libertarian figures such as Proudhon, Kropotkin especially, and Herbert Spencer for the national cause. He then moulded anarchism and nationalism together seamlessly into anarcho-nationalism. Equally important was Hobson's practical organisation of the project. Although other nationalist figures had flirted with



anarchism, Hobson's sheer organisational ability was what brought anarchist ideas into the mainstream of separatism. Initially, Hobson took anarchist ideas and grafted them on to the Dungannon Clubs' separatist programme, building in particular on the social side of the clubs' programme. He then transferred these ideas to *Irish Freedom*, building on them as he went along. Hobson not only did this with ideas but also with personnel, taking figures like P.S. O'Hegarty and Ernest Blythe with him. While these figures might not, strictly speaking, have described themselves as anarcho-nationalists, their Dungannon Club approach was sufficient to keep Hobson's project moving, Blythe in particular was an important bridge. In any case, Hobson brought in other figures such as John Lawlor, who helped him build up the anarchist side. Hobson also brokered an alliance with the Dublin Trades Council, which would have helped him to construct a wider anarcho-nationalist base. This would have worked in conjunction with the IRB, whose ear Hobson had until the Redmond Volunteer episode in 1914. Anarcho-nationalism could have been achieved locally through those local branches of Sinn Féin the IRB controlled and through the Wolfe Tone and Freedom Clubs. Through Hobson and his colleagues anarcho-nationalism was a very real movement in Irish separatism up to 1914.

Notes

- 1 For a discussion of anarcho-syndicalism see the Pluto Press reprint of Rocker's classic work, with preface by Noam Chomsky, Rudolf Rocker, *Anarcho-Syndicalism* (London, 1998). Also, see section on anarcho-syndicalism in Peter Marshall, *Demanding the Impossible: A History of Anarchism* (London, 2008), pp 8-10 and pp 491 and 495. For a discussion of syndicalism in Ireland and in particular its anarchist aspects see Emmet O'Connor, *Syndicalism in Ireland 1917-1923* (Cork, 1998), pp 2-5.
- 2 Marshall, *Demanding the Impossible*, p 3.
- 3 Benjamin R. Tucker, *Instead of a Book: By a Man Too Busy to Write One, A Fragmentary Exposition of Philosophical Anarchism* (New York, 1969) (first published 1897), p 414.
- 4 Bulmer Hobson, *Defensive Warfare: A Handbook for Nationalists* (Belfast, 1909), p 28.
- 5 'A History of Ralahine', *Irish Freedom*, Oct. 1912.
- 6 Fintan Lane, *The Origins of Modern Irish Socialism, 1881-1896* (Cork, 1997), p 12.
- 7 Marnie Hay, *Bulmer Hobson and the Nationalist Movement in Twentieth-Century Ireland* (Manchester, 2009), p 79.
- 8 Lane, *The Origins of Modern Irish Socialism*, p 109.
- 9 *Ibid.*, p 123.
- 10 'Bulmer Hobson's Speech: Aims, Methods and Workings of the Sinn Féin Movement', *The Gaelic American*, 23 Feb. 1907.
- 11 Charles Townshend, *Easter 1916: The Irish Rebellion* (London, 2005), pp 20-21.
- 12 'To The Whole People of Ireland: The Manifesto of the Dungannon Club, Belfast, 1905', taken from Bulmer Hobson, *Ireland Yesterday and Tomorrow* (Tralee, 1968), p 95.
- 13 See footnote 114 and accompanying text, p 27.
- 14 John Kelly (ed.), *James Fintan Lalor, Collected Writings* (Poole, 1997), pp 10, 22 and 24.
- 15 Stuart Edwards (ed.), *Selected Writings of Pierre-Joseph Proudhon* (London, 1970), p54
- 16 'The Future of Sinn Féin: Bulmer Hobson Discusses the Question of the Necessity for an Irish School of Economics in Papers Read to Philadelphia Sinn Féiners', *The Gaelic American*, 25 April, 1908.
- 17 Nicholas Allen, *George Russell (Æ) and the New Ireland, 1905-30* (Dublin, 2003), p 43.
- 18 Curoi MacDare [Hobson], 'On Organisation', *The Republic*, 25 April 1907, pp. 6-7. Hobson used this penname in *Irish Freedom* as well, along with Fergus MacLeda. Hay, *Bulmer Hobson*, p 97.
- 19 Joseph Mazzini, 'Thoughts Addressed to the Priests of Italy upon the Evangelical Letter of Gregory XVI' (1834), in Mazzini, *Life and Writings*, Vol. I, p. 259. *Hobson was a disciple of Mazzini. See Sean Worgan, Bulmer Hobson 1905-1907: Mazzini's Ulster Disciple, Ex Historia*, pp 56-95, (https://humanities.exeter.ac.uk/media/.../history/.../Worgan-Bulmer_Hobson.pdf) (7 Mar. 2018).
- 20 Marshall, *Demanding the Impossible*, p 446.
- 21 See Edward A. Hagan, "High Nonsensical Words": *A Study of the Works of Standish James O'Grady* (Troy, New York, 1986), pp 155 and 174 and Edward A. Hagan (ed.), *Standish James O'Grady, To the Leaders of Our Working People* (Dublin, 2003), p74.
- 22 See Sean Worgan, *Bulmer Hobson 1905-1907, Ex Historia*, p 84.



- 23 Marshall, *Demanding the Impossible*, p 630.
- 24 Edward A. Hagan (ed.), *To the Leaders of Our Working People*, (Dublin, 2002), p ix.
- 25 See p 31.
- 26 Hobson, *Ireland Yesterday and Tomorrow*, p 53.
- 27 'The Industrial Future of Ireland', *The Gaelic American*, New York, August 23, 1913.
- 28 Bulmer Hobson, 'Ireland Developing Her Own Industries', *The Gaelic American*, New York, 23 Aug. 1913.
- 29 See the reprint Peter Kropotkin, *The State: Its Historical Role* (London, 1997), p 9.
- 30 Hobson, *Defensive Warfare*, pp 11-12.
- 31 See also Peter Kropotkin, 'Parliamentary Rule' (published in Freedom 5, Feb. 1887) in Kropotkin, *Act For Yourselves*, pp 37-41.
- 32 Peter Kropotkin, 'Local Action' (published in Freedom 8, May 1887) in Kropotkin, *Act For Yourselves*, p 42.
- 33 Andrew Gailey, *Ireland and the Death of Kindness: The Experience of Constructive Unionism 1890-1905* (Cork, 1907), p 41.
- 34 'Bulmer Hobson's Speech: Aims, Methods and Workings of the Sinn Féin Movement' *The Gaelic American*, 23 Feb. 1907.
- 35 For a fuller definition of the Hungarian Policy and its role in Irish nationalist politics see pp15 and 16. See also Griffith, *The Resurrection of Hungary*, pp 16-17.
- 36 Peter Kropotkin, 'Local Action' in Kropotkin, *Act For Yourselves*, p 46.
- 37 'Bulmer Hobson's Speech: Aims, Methods and Workings of the Sinn Féin Movement'.
- 38 Bulmer Hobson, *Defensive Warfare*, p 37.
- 39 'Bulmer Hobson's Speech: Aims, Methods and Workings of the Sinn Féin Movement', *The Gaelic American*, 23 Feb. 1907.
- 40 Peter Kropotkin, *Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution* (London, 1998), first published 1902 and Peter Kropotkin, *Fields, Factories and Workshops: Or Industry Combined With Agriculture and Brain in Work With Manual Work* (London, 1912). First published in 1898.
- 41 'A Lesson from Ireland: Old Irish Socialism' (taken from *The Peasant* March 7), *Freedom*, March 1908. See Sir Henry Maine, *Lectures on the Early History of Institutions* [1875] (Cornell, 2010) and the reprint Sir Henry Maine, *Village-Communities in the East and West: Six Lectures Delivered at Oxford to Which Are Added Other Lectures, Addresses and Essays – Primary Source Edition* (Charleston, 2013).
- 42 Fear o'ntuait, 'National Home Markets' *The Peasant*, 18 Jan. 1908.
- 43 See footnote 27 and accompanying text.
- 44 Herbert Spencer, *The Data of Ethics* (London, 1879), p 19.
- 45 The Manchester Martyrs. These three attempted to rescue Fenian prisoners from a police van in Manchester in 1867, a fracas in which two policemen were killed. The would-be rescuers were executed, and elevated to the pantheon of separatist heroes: their memory lived on. See *History Ireland* website (<https://www.historyireland.com/18th-19th-century-history/who-were-the-manchester-martyrs/>), (13 Sept. 2018).
- 46 'Bulmer Hobson speaks at Enniscorthy', *The Gaelic American*, 16 Dec. 1911.
- 47 See pp 30-31.
- 48 Graham Purchase, *Evolution and Revolution: An Introduction to the Life and Thought of Peter Kropotkin* (Petersham, Australia, 1996), p 59.
- 49 Fergus MacLeda (Bulmer Hobson), 'The Confession of Faith of an Irish Nationalist V', *Irish Freedom*, May 1911.
- 50 Eugenio F. Biagini, *British Democracy and Irish Nationalism 1876-1906* (Cambridge, 2007), p 109.
- 51 Lane, *The Origins of Modern Irish Socialism*, p 123.
- 52 Bulmer Hobson, 'On Tillage Societies', *The Peasant*, 15 June 1907.
- 53 For readers interested in Proudhon's writing see Stuart Edwards (ed.), *Selected Writings of Pierre-Joseph Proudhon* (London, 1970). For a biography see Edward Hyams, *Pierre-Joseph Proudhon: His Revolutionary Life, Mind and Work* (London, 1979). Allen, *George Russell (Æ)*, p 43.
- 54 Hobson, 'On Tillage Societies', *The Peasant*, 15 June 1907.
- 55 Hay, *Bulmer Hobson*, p 96.
- 56 Roy Foster, *Vivid Faces: The Revolutionary Generation in Ireland 1890-1923* (London, 2015), p 170.
- 57 *Ibid.*, p 68.
- 58 Hobson, *Ireland and Yesterday and Tomorrow*, pp 21-2.
- 59 See my unpublished thesis, Sean Worgan, 'Bulmer Hobson: an Ulster Nationalist 1902-1908', (Ph.D. thesis, Keele University, 2010), pp134-137.
- 60 See the re-print Arthur Griffith, *The Resurrection of Hungary* (Dublin, 2003), p A-xii.
- 61 Hobson, *Ireland Yesterday and Tomorrow*, p 9.
- 62 'Irish Ireland, The National Council: Third Annual Congress', *Sinn Féin*, 7 Sept. 1907 and *The Resurrection of Hungary*, p A-xii.
- 63 Foster, *Vivid Faces*, p 170.
- 64 Hobson, *Ireland Yesterday and Tomorrow*, p 13.



- 65 Ibid, p 169.
- 66 Matthew Kelly, *The Fenian Ideal and Irish Nationalism, 1882-1916* (Woodbridge, 2006), p 60.
- 67 Owen McGee, *The IRB: The Irish Republican Brotherhood From the Land League to Sinn Féin* (Dublin, 2005), pp 109 and 216.
- 68 Hay, *Bulmer Hobson*, p 47.
- 69 Tom Garvin (ed.), P.S. O'Hegarty, *The Victory of Sinn Féin: How it Won it and How it Used it* (Dublin, 1998), p viii. Garvin notes that Hobson's Dungannon Club colleagues, P.S. O'Hegarty – the London IRB's Secretary – and Robert Lynd, were also members, along with Padraig O'Conaire.
- 70 Ben Levitas, *The Theatre of the Nation: Irish Drama and Cultural Nationalism 1890-1916* (Oxford, 2005), p 76.
- 71 Dublin Trades Council Minutes, 25 Feb. 1909 (NLI, MS 12,780).
- 72 Hay, *Bulmer Hobson*, p 74. Hobson was sub-editor of the *Peasant* in 1908.
- 73 Foster, *Vivid Faces*, p 160.
- 74 In Irish *comal* can mean compact or agreement or alternatively bond or union.
- 75 Sean O'Casey, *The Story of the Irish Citizen Army*, Journeyman, 1980 (reprint from 1919), pp 31 and 25.
- 76 'A More Vigorous National Policy', *The Gaelic American*, 14 Oct. 1905. N.B. This passage is omitted from Hobson's copy of the Dungannon Club Manifesto reprinted in *Ireland Yesterday and Tomorrow*.
- 77 Desmond Ryan, *The Rising* (Dublin, 1949), p 26.
- 78 Léon Ó Broin, *Revolutionary Underground: The Story of the IRB, 1884-1924* (Dublin, 1984), p 157.
- 79 Sean O'Casey, *Drums Under the Windows* (London, 1945), p 191.
- 80 Hay, *Bulmer Hobson*, p 105.
- 81 Sean O'Casey, *Drums Under the Windows*, pp 191-92.
- 82 Ibid, p 191.
- 83 See section below on Social Policy.
- 84 In a way the whole dispute between Hobson and O'Casey parallels in miniature that between Bakunin and Marx, socialist libertarianism versus socialist centralism, which led to the break-up of the First International in 1872. For a discussion of the First International's split and subsequent break-up see James Joll, *Europe Since 1870* (London, 1990), p 54.
- 85 Hobson, *Ireland Yesterday and Tomorrow*, p 38.
- 86 Ibid, p 39.
- 87 Other writers who Hobson could recollect were Padraig Pearse, Piarus Beaslai, Pat Devlin, Fred Cogley and Roger Casement. Ibid.
- 88 Ibid.
- 89 Ibid.
- 90 Ibid.
- 91 Statement by Mr Ernest Blythe (Earnan de Blagd), 12 April 1954 (NLI, Witness Statement 939, Bureau of Military History, pp 4a-5), (<http://www.bureauofmilitaryhistory.ie/reels/bmh/BMH.WS0939.pdf#page>), (6 Sept., 2018).
- 92 Earnan de Blagd (Ernest Blythe), 'The Co-operative Commonwealth', *Irish Freedom*, Feb. 1913.
- 93 Ibid.
- 94 Marshall, *Demanding the Impossible*, p 24.
- 95 Earnan de Blagd (Ernest Blythe), 'The Co-operative Commonwealth', *Irish Freedom*, Feb. 1913.
- 96 Earnan de Blagd (Ernest Blythe), 'The Co-operative Commonwealth', *Irish Freedom*, Feb. 1913.
- 97 See section headed Northman.
- 98 Statement by Bulmer Hobson on I.R.B. and Irish Freedom, Witness Statement 30, Bureau of Military History, Dublin, 17 Oct. 1947, p 6.
- 99 Nicholas Walter and Heiner Becker (eds.), Peter Kropotkin, *Act for Yourselves: Articles From Freedom 1886-1907* (London, 1998), pp 7 and 8.
- 100 'Freedom Reports', *Freedom*, April 1912. The Irish Rebel, 'The Failure and Farce of Parliamentarianism', *Freedom*, June 1908.
- 101 The Irish Rebel, Correspondence: 'Can a General Strike Be Successful', *Freedom*, July, 1909.
- 102 'The Coming Storm' was written much earlier as were the other articles; they only appeared in Kropotkin's London paper on these dates.
- 103 Walter and Becker (eds.), Kropotkin, *Act For Yourselves* (London, 1998), p 12.
- 104 Ibid., pp 71-74. 'Rocks Ahead', *Irish Freedom*, May 1914.
- 105 Elysee Reclus, 'Today and Tomorrow', *Freedom*, July 1908, 'The Work Before Us', *Freedom*, May 1913, 'Under Which Flag', *Freedom*, July 1908, WCO, 'The Coming Storm', *Freedom*, September, 1925.
- 106 Fergus MacLeda (Bulmer Hobson), 'Today and Tomorrow', *Irish Freedom*, July 1913, 'The Work Before Us', *Irish Freedom*, January 1911; Bulmer Hobson, 'Under Which Flag', *Irish Freedom* January 1911; 'The Coming Storm', *Irish Freedom*, May 1911. N.B Hobson did not sign 'Under Which Flag' but has signed his name to the article in the National Library of Ireland's copy of *The Voice of Freedom*, an anthology of articles in *Irish Freedom*. Hobson also signed his name against some articles in this by Fergus MacLeda, author of 'Today and Tomorrow'.
- 107 Northman, 'Brevities', Supplement to *Freedom*, Sep, Oct, Nov 1901, 'Brevities', *Freedom*, Dec, 1901. North Man, ""We



- Cannot Have Peace”, *Irish Freedom*, May 1912, Seaghan Mac An Learlah (“North Man”), ‘One Passionate Purpose’ *Irish Freedom*, June 1912, Northman, ‘The Economic Basis of a Revolutionary Movement: An Address to Nationalists’, *Irish Freedom*, Jan. 1913, Northman, ‘To the Young Men of Ireland’, *Irish Freedom*, Oct. 1913. NB Northman sometimes signs his Articles North Man, sometimes Northman.
- 108 Levitas, *The Theatre of the Nation*, p 75.
- 109 See footnote 106.
- 110 Andrew O’Brien and Linde Lunney, ‘Lawlor, John’ in James McGuire and James Quinn (eds.), *Dictionary of Irish Biography*, Vol.5, Royal Irish Academy, Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- 111 Seaghan Mac An Learlah (“Northman”), *Irish Freedom*, June 1912.
- 112 The three were William O’Brien, John Farren and John Lawlor. Owen McGee, ‘Who Were the “Fenian Dead”? The IRB and the Background to the 1916 Rising’ in Gabriel Doherty and Dermot Keogh (eds), *1916: The Long Revolution* (Cork, 2007), pp 114-15 and p 424 (footnote 70).
- 113 ‘Diarmuid O Donnabáin Rossa 1831 – ’15: Souvenir of Public Funeral to Glasnevin Cemetery Dublin, Aug 1st, 1915’, MS 13174 (xii), Hobson Papers. Local and District News, ‘Funeral of O’Donovan Rossa’, *The Sligo Champion*, July 17 1915.
- 114 ‘Notes: Labour Upheaval in Dublin’, *Irish Freedom*, Dec. 1913.
- 115 B.H., ‘On Co-operation’, *The Republic*, 9 May 1907. See also my unpublished thesis, Sean Worgan, ‘*Bulmer Hobson: an Ulster Nationalist 1902-1908*’, (Ph.D. thesis, Keele University, 2010), pp 330-31.
- 116 ‘Notes: Labour Upheaval in Dublin’, *Irish Freedom*, December 1913.
- 117 In his article Northman singles out the Young Irelander James Fintan Lalor in terms of his socio-economic approach as Hobson did in America and after.
- 118 Northman, ‘The Economic Basis of a Revolutionary Movement: An Address to Nationalists’, *Irish Freedom*, Jan. 1913.
- 119 Ibid.
- 120 Conor McCabe, *Saothar*, Vol. 30 (2005), pp. 21-31,
- 121 (https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/23199796.pdf?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents), (9 Sept.,2018).
- 122 ‘Notes’, *Irish Freedom*, Oct. 1911.
- 123 Bulmer Hobson, ‘On the National Necessity of the Study of Economics’, *The Peasant*, 23 Nov. 1907.
- 124 Northman, ‘The Economic Basis of a Revolutionary Movement: An Address to Nationalists’, *Irish Freedom*, Jan 1913.
- 125 Hobson, *Ireland Yesterday and Tomorrow*, p 111.
- 126 F.S.L. Lyons, *Ireland Since the Famine* (London, 1975), p 668.
- 127 Hobson, *Defensive Warfare*, p59.
- 128 Edwards, *Selected Writings of Pierre-Joseph Proudhon*, p 34.
- 129 Bulmer Hobson, ‘Ireland Developing Her Own Industries’, *The Gaelic American*, 23 Aug., 1913.
- 130 ‘To The Whole People of Ireland: The Manifesto of the Dungannon Club, Belfast, 1905’, taken from Bulmer Hobson, *Ireland Yesterday and Tomorrow* (Tralee, 1968), p 95.
- 131 ‘Bulmer Hobson, ‘Ireland Cherishes the Martyrs’ Memory’, *The Gaelic American*, 7 Dec., 1912.
- 132 ‘Ibid.
- 133 ‘Hobson, *Ireland Yesterday and Tomorrow*, p 53.
- 134 ‘Foster, *Vivid Faces*, p 223 and Hay, *Bulmer Hobson*, pp138-139.
- 135 ‘Townshend, *Easter 1916*, p 134.