

WORKERS, OPPRESSED NATIONS AND PEOPLE OF THE WORLD, UNITE!

RED PATRIOT

AN TÍRGHRÁTHÓIR DEARG

Newsweekly of the
Communist Party of Ireland
(Marxist-Leninist)



Vol. 5 No. 42-43
Dec. 1st & 14th 1976
price 30p

Organise to defeat British imperialist aggression and plunder Organise to defeat the Irish monopoly capitalists north and south

For several years now the British imperialist government have been spreading rumours about their possible withdrawal from northern Ireland. Typical to their propaganda - they first of all float the idea, and then reply to themselves, etc and so lead a 'debate' on the issue. We are continuously being told that the British imperialists are considering withdrawing, and fuel is only added to this by the British spokesmen on the north continuously denying such a possibility.

What is this issue of withdrawal, which is being echoed in some left wing and patriotic circles.

There are two aspects to this issue. First, the British imperialists are raising it straightforwardly because they have no intention whatsoever of stopping their imperialist aggression and plunder of Ireland, north and south, and are trying to disarm the people by making it appear continuously that victory might be just around the corner. This is calculated to instill ideas that it is not necessary to go on fighting into the people and also to cultivate a faith in the idea, that if the people stop their resistance, and hand over initiative to a few 'smart' politicians, victory will be assured.

The second and more fundamental aspect of this issue of withdrawal is that the so-called withdrawal that is being talked about anyway is not a CESSATION OF BRITISH IMPERIALIST DOMINATION OF IRELAND. The British overlords and masters of finance capital are not talking about such an 'extreme' proposal, the only just one for the Irish people.

The hundreds of years of struggle behind us for national independence and the more recent years of struggle can only be answered by a complete defeat of British imperialism's activities in Ireland, this means its right to any kind of

jurisdiction over the north at all, its "Government of Ireland Act" which legalises the annexation of northern Ireland to Britain, total defeat of the British imperialist armed forces, cessation of all British imperialist financial and industrial activities in Ireland north and south and complete halt to all their political interference and back-door dealing. In short British imperialism has to GET OUT OF IRELAND! Nothing short of this will answer the just demands of the people. Nothing short of this will stop exploitation of the Irish people and allow them to establish a workers and small farmers independent state, a People's Republic. All this talk about withdrawal that the British imperialists are carrying on has nothing to do with such a demand. What the demand for withdrawal at best means is either the removal of most of the troops and the reduction of the imperialist forces in the north to a small garrison, the way they were prior to 1968, and/or the establishment of a neo-colonial regime in the north, just like the one in the south. Just as at the time of the Treaty the British imperialists are floating the ideas of withdrawal to try and confuse and divide. In the time of the Treaty the national bourgeoisie divided on the issue, although the De Valera section that were against the Treaty only actually opposed certain parts of it. The determination and inspiration of the Irish workers and small farmers to persist in their just cause resulted in the civil war, with the De Valera section championing the cause of the people.

What is the lesson of this for today - - it is that the British imperialist aggression and plunder of the Irish people will only be defeated through the people organising to carry the struggle through

TABLE OF CONTENTS - see page 40

right to the end, and not being deceived by such talk of 'withdrawal etc. One of the reasons why the working class through its Marxist-Leninist party, and rallying around itself the entire petty bourgeoisie of town and country, must lead the struggle for national independence is because this class alone has the interest to fight on until the end, until the entire system of exploitation, practised by British imperialism and the Irish monopoly capitalist class is eliminated. Petty bourgeois nationalism will always tend to conciliate on questions such as the withdrawal issue, and entertain ideas that the British imperialists might just give up and go home, or that Irish independent capitalism can be established. On this question Red Patriot considers that the Provisional Sinn Fein is entirely incorrect and although playing a militant part in the patriotic struggle, is essentially dominated by petty bourgeois nationalist policies. Their programme is not for establishing a workers and small farmers republic but an Irish capitalist state and they are waging a war not to arouse the people to kick the British imperialists out of Ireland for good, and in the course of this take the necessary action on the Irish monopoly capitalists - i.e. overthrow them..... but to force the British government to make a statement of withdrawal. This is pinning the people's strategic hopes on the British imperialists to get 'fed up' etc. But this is totally against the character of the British imperialists.

A further reflection of this line is the editorial of An Phoblacht calling for the UDA etc to enter into a federal Ireland agreement with the Provisionals. This is entirely in line with the declared policies of the Provisional Sinn Fein in its Eire Nua document i.e. to unite with the Unionist bourgeoisie and 'orange capitalists' in a federal Ireland. As we have said before we consider the Provisional Sinn Fein activities and their efforts against the British imperialists as a revolutionary and militant contribution, and they clearly stand on the opposite side of the divide from the so-called anti-imperialists and left-wing organisations who refuse to support the central struggle in Ireland today.

At the same time it is necessary to criticise the Provisionals programme. The stand of the Provisionals in calling for unity with the 'orange-men' and the 'unionists' and the UDA etc, ignores and confuses the class question involved here, and is a true petty bourgeois and narrow nationalist stand that 'all capitalists who are Irish should get together'. But the historical developments of the last fifty years showed that the major obstruction in Ireland to unity and independence was the UNIONIST SECTION OF THE IRISH BOURGEOISIE (the rest of the bourgeoisie has now firmly joined hands after their earlier 'misguided ways' and waverings). It was and has been to date the Unionist bourgeoisie who came forward, allied with similar strata in Britain to try and prevent the Irish national revolution going through to conclusion and who have been the main force for outright opposition to the Irish revolution, and central to this - the unity of the Irish working class. So unity with the Unionist bourgeoisie because they happen to be Irish means nothing, bec-

ause their entire character and base is ALL OUT SUPPORT FOR BRITISH IMPERIALIST DOMINATION OF IRELAND AND OPPOSITION TO THE PEOPLE. They have provided a source of reaction in Ireland, and as part of this (a most crucial part) a source of creating sectarianism to serve their masters and allies. The fact that some of them are talking about 'negotiated' independence does not mean they are renouncing the crown, any more than the neo-colonial state in the south renounces British imperialism. It just provides it with a respectable face in the south, and lines the pockets of the Irish monopoly capitalists. Any Irish capitalists who are opposed to British imperialism should join in the struggle, but this can only be behind the leadership of the working class, not instead of it. But to talk of unity with the Unionist bourgeoisie is to talk essentially of national betrayal under the appearance of establishing Irish unity. Furthermore the various organisations UWC, UVF, UDA etc, are organisations led and run by both the British imperialists and the Unionist bourgeoisie to serve their class interests. The fact that they incorporate some workers does not mean they represent the workers, or represent the so-called 'protestant' members of the working class. The whole idea in fact of uniting with the 'orange-men' as An Phoblacht puts it, is an idea which covers over the class and national interests. The point is that the workers of all religions must, can and will unite, whereas the Unionist bourgeoisie must be isolated. This is where the petty bourgeois nationalism of the Provisionals causes it to confuse the problem, they are not based on the CLASS INTEREST of the working class, they do not appeal to the revolutionary class interest of the workers but to the patriotic sentiments of the population at large. Of necessity this fails to bring the working class into the struggle and unite them through struggle against their common enemies. Instead it in fact runs parallel with the imperialist propaganda that 'all protestants are reactionary' and that is the problem. Now the petty bourgeois nationalists are saying all protestants are Irish so they are all right. But both views are entirely erroneous. The point is that all workers and small farmers have an interest in opposing British imperialism and the Irish capitalists, whilst all capitalists have an interest in opposing the workers and preserving ties with British imperialism.

The strategy and tactics of the struggle to defeat British imperialist aggression and plunder and to defeat the Irish monopoly capitalists north and south can only be based on the class interest of the working class and can only be expressed consistently through the revolutionary working class Party, and can only succeed by uniting the entire petty bourgeoisie, progressive capitalists (if such should come forward) to defeat British imperialism and throw it out of every aspect of Irish life, north and south.

A comment on An Phoblachts 'Letter to Loyalists'

The editorial in "An Phoblacht", November 30th headed "Letter to Loyalists" was written in response to a full-page advertisement placed by the Ulster Loyalist Central Coordinating Committee in a Belfast paper.

The editorial claimed to be written in the interests of "peace with justice to all our communities in Ireland, reconciliation and the happiness and progress of the entire Irish people". In fact it represents the backward trend in the anti-imperialist movement, a trend which would lead inevitably to the continued national subjugation of Ireland and to the continued class subjugation of the workers and small farmers. The editorial begins by addressing itself to the "Orange paramilitary groups who say they want to break with the crown and establish an "Ulster Republic", and continues from the standpoint of recognising these groups as being somewhat "representative" of the "protestant" community. It goes on to say "we have come to agreements with you" in the past, citing 1798 and 1893, amongst other occasions.

This represents a view of history, and of present-day reality based on negation of class contradictions within Ireland, and acceptance of the imperialist propaganda about "two-nations" or "one nation but two communities". The so-called "Orange paramilitary groups" are fascist organisations representing the Unionist bourgeoisie, the most sold-out and reactionary section of the Irish capitalist class. The organisations comprising the ULCC are basically united on their vicious opposition to the national rights of the Irish people, and vicious opposition to the entire Irish working class and to communism. Through their activities on behalf of their British monopoly capitalist masters, they have earned the just hatred and contempt of the vast majority of Irish people, both in and out of the areas where they enforce their reign of terror. What could such organisations have in common with the United Irishmen, who, it is claimed in the editorial, contained the "ancestors" of these fascists?

The answer is none whatsoever. The United Irishmen was a movement representing the nationalist bourgeoisie, in revolt against English colonialism and against its suppression of the rising Irish capitalist class. This movement was not based on some abstract "unity" of catholic and protestant, but was based on the class interests of the national bourgeoisie, which at that time was the most revolutionary class in Ireland, pledged to do away with foreign domination and the rotten feudal system. In no way did the United Irishmen extend the hand of unity towards people of any religion who supported the colonialists.

What the United Irishmen showed, and what the An Phoblacht editorial denies, is the inevitability of all revolutionary people uniting around their class interest to overthrow foreign domination. An Phoblacht takes a step back, not a step forward, in proposing unity with the representatives of the Unionist bourgeoisie. The editorial actually gives credence to the imperialist

fostered idea that in our country there are "two communities" with different aspirations.

The basic principle to grasp is that the fundamental contradiction in Ireland is not one of religion, and never has been, but is one between the British imperialists and their stooges on the one hand, and the oppressed Irish masses on the other. While the editorial is printed under the guise of wanting unity, the unity advocated is a sham. Genuine unity in the Irish revolution means unity of the small farmers and other oppressed sections around the working class, and maximum isolation of the British imperialists and their allies, including the UVF, UDA etc. This unity in struggle must be built around the working class, because that is the only class with no interests in compromising with imperialism. For many years imperialism has tried to divide and mislead the workers, and to win over the "protestant" workers to its side, but time and again the objective class interests of the workers have asserted themselves as Marx said they would -- "the working class is nothing if it is not revolutionary".

The entire working class is exploited by imperialism and is in antagonistic contradiction with the Unionist bourgeoisie. To negate this and to propose a "deal" with the political representatives of that class is to take the path of conciliation with, and consequently capitulation to the enemy.

This political line of capitulation on the national question has its roots among the petty producers in Ireland, the section of small capitalists, continually driven to the wall by British finance capital, who dream of having their own markets and of becoming big capitalists. The An Phoblacht editorial puts forward the view that Ulster by itself would be too small to survive in a world of "huge economic blocs", and holds out the hope of an independent Ireland in which the Unionist bourgeoisie are allowed to maintain "their" corner. However in the Irish revolution the determining factor as to whether Ireland becomes genuinely independent is not one of size, but of "which class leads".

The achievement and consolidation of Irish independence rests on the working class establishing its hegemony in the national struggle. Without the divisions sowed by imperialism among the workers being overcome, the workers will be unable to assume the leading role. This underlines the necessity of the revolutionary leadership struggling to unite the working class as a precondition to national liberation and overcoming the obstacles to unity in the course of fighting the enemy.

Without the socialist revolution being carried through, a monopoly capitalist Ireland is sure to be subjugated by the strength of foreign capital. Unless the class issue is sorted out, self-determination for our country cannot be guaranteed.

A Red Patriot Commentary

ON THE PRESENT SITUATION IN THE NORTH

The situation in the north of the country after seven years of the latest military campaign by British imperialism against the working people clearly reveals the strategic weakness of imperialism in Ireland and the resilience and will to resist exploitation and oppression on the part of the working people.

The present anti-imperialist upsurge which began in 1968 was met by frantic attempts on the part of the imperialists and the Unionist bourgeoisie to suppress it. Already witnessing the growing unity among the working people manifested so strongly in the 60's, the imperialists and their lackeys had begun to organise fascist gangs to terrorise the working people, carry out divisive activities and strengthen the hand of imperialism in our country. When these fascist mobs were met by staunch resistance by the working people, the imperialists then sent in their regular forces under the hoax of keeping the peace, while all the time carrying out the same fascist activities against the people. In the face of this wanton aggression, the resistance of the people escalated and the revolutionary armed struggle for national liberation began to unfold. As increasing numbers of British troops were wiped out, the imperialists became panic-stricken, and searched frantically for ways out of the corner they had got themselves into.

Using a combination of force and deception, direct rule, internment, power-sharing, Diplock Courts, 'sectarian assassinations' and other means, the imperialists tried over a long period to wear down the resistance of the people, but to this day they have not succeeded in stemming the anti-imperialist tide.

While this state of affairs shows that the Irish people have good reason to be optimistic about the outcome of their struggle strategically, in order to reach the goal of genuine independence the situation has to be developed. For example the campaign by the British army to terrorise the people living in the Turf Lodge area of Belfast has been met with extremely brave and militant resistance by the working people, especially the women there. As well as coming out on the streets to keep the army out of the area, they have dealt telling blows against the proponents of the so-called 'peace-movement' which in fact supports British imperialism's war effort, so that they are now unable to approach the place without being physically thrown out. At the same time of the anniversary of the introduction of internment, many vigorous protests took place, including the storming of the home of the social-democrat and collaborationist Gerry Fitt by members of the so-called 'catholic' community he is supposed to represent in the British Parliament.

These people have met with opposition from some quarters within the anti-imperialist movement for 'going too far'. At the moment the imperialists are carrying out massive propaganda that is designed to confuse the people and lead

them to believe that 'enough' is being done. This is carried out largely through sections of the Unionist bourgeoisie, who are desperate to preserve the economic ties with British capital and the British market upon which they depend, which are coming under strain due to the economic recession and developments in the economy in the north including the decline of traditional manufacturing industries there. However, this propaganda also finds an echo in the anti-imperialist ranks in the form of the line that Britain is 'withdrawing' because it is weary of the present campaign. This is put forward in order to avoid facing up to the conclusions necessary after so many years of struggle that is the necessity to carry the struggle through to the end without let up and to develop revolutionary people's war against the enemy as opposed to the present terrorist methods used by the petty bourgeois nationalists.

The theory of withdrawal is bolstered up by a great deal of flimsy evidence from both its proponents such as closures of factories (one could argue on this basis that Britain is withdrawing from Britain), minor and temporary movements of troops, boosting of the UDR and RUC and the supposed 'lack of will' on the part of imperialism to defeat the national struggle. It is also based on a number of false premises, principally denying that imperialism has an important economic and strategic stake in the north of Ireland and will never pull out. The petty bourgeois nationalists make out that the "economic war" is having the desired effect (i.e. that bombing individual businessmen and mostly small ones, will make the imperialists run out of money), or even that the British government is worried about ordinary soldiers being killed.

Over the last eight years the political consciousness of the people has grown tremendously. One of the main political 'solutions' attempted by the imperialists, the 'power-sharing' brought about by the Sunningdale agreement, was brought crashing down by a massive strike carried through militantly by the workers. The so-called 'representatives' of the so-called "Catholic population" i.e. the SDLP capitalists are afraid to walk around 'their' areas without an armed guard, and as for those on the 'protestant' side i.e. the Unionist bourgeoisie, they too are coming under increasing fire, and are having to more and more adopt the mantle of being pro-worker in order to enable them to keep on parasitising off the working people. Through the movement of the so-called 'peace-people', imperialism hoped to start a 'middle of the road' movement which would isolate the patriotic struggle and further divide the workers, so enabling their struggle to be more easily suppressed. However, like similar movements in the past, this latest one is becoming rapidly more isolated from the people as it attempts to steer a course between pro-imperialism and anti-imperialism in its verbiage. Despite the political acumen of some of its adherents (including Mr

Ciaran McKeown and the widow of the ex-head of British military intelligence in Ireland) it is failing to maintain its credibility, and its marches are dwindling to one tenth and less of what they were initially. Nowadays the imperialists do not expect any of their 'political initiatives' to last more than a few months or weeks. That is why they desperately need a new initiative every few months.

Despite their weaknesses on this front, the imperialists are still able to maintain a certain level of confusion through their use of the so-called 'sectarian' (actually fascist) murder gangs, the UDA, UVF, UFF, RHC, DOW and so on. It is both the theory and the practise of the imperialists to use these 'friendly guerrilla forces' to attack the people where the open use of the army, RUC or UDR would arouse too much antagonism and expose totally their fascist nature. In return for their services to imperialism, these forces, heavily infiltrated by the British army, are allowed to enrich themselves through 'protection', extortion, vice, robbery etc, and even though groups such as the UDA have openly admitted terrorist activities in the north as well as the 'Free State', the imperialists refuse to make them illegal, saying that they are too 'popular' for that to be any good. A token opposition is maintained by the proscribing of the UVF and UFF, which are relatively small, in order to underline the 'impartiality' of the British, but their pro-imperialist nature is basic, any other issues of sectarianism etc are secondary. Further, ever since the UVF was first founded in 1972, the British imperialists have had a direct hand in it.

On this issue there is an influential line in the anti-imperialist camp which serves to assist the confusion-creating of the imperialists, which puts forward that these organisations are 'protestants' and 'sectarian' first of all, and pro-imperialist as a secondary feature. The effect of this line can be seen in the case of the murder by imperialism of the patriotic fighter Maire Drumm. In August she was arrested under a charge of having participated in an 'illegal' demonstration, and this action was met by strong protests by the people, particularly in the north, which was partly responsible for the dropping of charges and her release. However, because her murder was made to look like the activity of some 'protestant' organisation i.e. an organisation of the Unionist bourgeoisie, the opposition was not channelled into comparable anti-imperialist activity. This emphasises the necessity for the political nature of the fascist organisations to be made very clear to the people. It is only in the interests of imperialism for confusion to exist on the issue, and as long as this does exist they will get off scot-free with many anti-people actions.

The economic movement of the working class is moving ahead rapidly, and is striking harder and harder blows at the foundations of imperialism. The strike movement has developed enormously over the last six months, despite the attempts by the government and the labour aristocracy in the trade union leadership to nip it in the bud. In a number of cases the 'leaders' of the workers have come out openly to oppose their just demands, and the

workers are eager to adopt a more revolutionary path to fighting their economic struggles, forming their own new organisations in some cases. Due to the growing attacks on the working class by the imperialists and native capitalists, this resistance will have to be maintained and developed, and the spirit of resistance of the workers will certainly not die down easily. It is necessary to launch serious struggles against the social-democratic tendencies in this movement fostered by the British imperialists, especially the Northern Ireland Labour Party and the 'Communist' Party of Ireland etc which attempts to lead the workers down the path of reforming the capitalist system and of co-existing with imperialist domination, and provide the working class with the ideological guidelines they need in order to develop their struggle. If this is done, the contradiction between the entire working class and imperialism will be greatly exposed and sharpened, and the way will be clear to recruit vastly greater sections to the side of the anti-imperialist struggle, through the recognition by the workers that their class interest as workers is served by carrying through the struggle for national liberation through to the end as part of the struggle to build socialism in Ireland. This struggle can only advance under the leadership of the working class and its Marxist-Leninist Party, who alone can put forward the programme for national liberation and re-unification, as part of the political movement of the workers to overthrow the exploitation imposed on them by foreign imperialism and Irish monopoly capitalists north and south. The workers' movement alone can reject the narrow nationalist ideology of the petty bourgeois nationalists as well as the "two communities" theory of the imperialists, can break through religious divides and reject terrorism as the path of struggle. Only the working class under its Marxist-Leninist Party can elevate the present struggle to that of a common movement directed politically at the common enemies, and use revolutionary violence as a method of uniting the people and hitting at the main enemy.

COMMUNIST PARTY OF IRELAND
(MARXIST - LENINIST)
PAMPHLET No. 4

**Summary of the Report on the
Activity of the Central Committee
of the Party of Labour of Albania**

Submitted by the First Secretary of the Party of Labour of Albania, Enver Hoxha, at the 7th Congress of the Party of Labour of Albania

Available from Progressive Books & Periodicals
10 Uppr. Exchanges St, Dublin 8

Red Patriot Commentary**WHAT IS ALL THIS NONSENSE ABOUT THE SECTARIAN DIVIDE?**

The floating of the "Peace People" in the north by British imperialism has brought with it an intensification of the propaganda that there is a basic division among the people between the catholics and the protestants. The imperialists themselves, who work endlessly to sow divisions, their open supporters on the right, and their not so open supporters on the 'left' all take up this propaganda and echo it in one form or another, and work to institutionalise such divisions, whether from the point of view of supporting them or of "opposing" them. To listen to this chorus would tend to make anyone think that there is a serious issue that some spiritual nonsense is keeping the people of our country apart. The Unionist bourgeoisie, in order to maintain their exploitation of the working class, preach the inherent superiority of the 'protestants' over the 'catholics', as do the Trotskyite British and Irish 'Communist' Organisation. The other trotskyites, while claiming to oppose the B & ICO's 'two nations' theory, actually support it, except for saying that the catholics are inherently superior to the protestants, saying instead that the protestant workers and small farmers are "loyalist fascists". In the middle, we find the avowed opponents of sectarianism, the revisionists, evangelists of "unity" who also firmly believe in the inherent differences between people of two religions, but make the concession of acknowledging these two different communities as being "equal".

All this drivels rest on the absurd notion that the working people are divided permanently on the basis of religion, which is the key factor determining their political views. Well apart from certain pastors conducting their mystical polemics, who has ever fought over religion in Ireland over the last eight years? Certainly not the working class! Certain individual workers may have fought against others on the basis of support for, or opposition to, imperialism,

but under the conditions of bourgeois dictatorship where the ideas of the bourgeoisie are dominant they will always mobilise some workers to support their bourgeois cause.

This happened in Germany in the 30's when the monopoly capitalists recruited a large number of workers for the Nazi Party. Yet this did not lead everyone to complain that there was some mystical, inherent division among the German people. The only ones upholding this view were the Nazis themselves. What then is special about Ireland?

What all the opportunists and other anti-working class and anti-national elements negate is the fact that objective class interests determine the overall stand that the working class will take. They all wring their hands in the face of the fact that certain fascist organisation have based themselves in predominantly protestant areas, and being the bourgeois souls that they are, regard this as being the "will of the people" there, in the same way as any Tory government or Fine Gael government regards itself as being elected by "the people", regardless of whatever real choice the people have in the matter.

In Ireland it is the will of the people to unite and resist the ravages of British monopoly capital, and this basic urge is exercised in a thousand and one ways; in the economic struggles of the workers, in opposition to the British Army, opposition to the fascists and so on. In the past this unity in the class struggle has been brought about under genuine Communist leadership, and since then the working class has not changed its revolutionary nature. In the course of the present economic crisis, ever greater sections are drawn into the heart of the struggle against imperialism. The urge to resist such attacks is bound to be transformed with the leading role of the Marxist-Leninist Party, into actual unity to overthrow imperialism and the capitalist system in Ireland.

WORKS OF ENVER HOXHA

- Selected Works Vol. 1 and 2
- Speeches 1967-68, 1969-70, 1971-73
- Speech delivered October 3rd 1974 at the meeting of electors of the 209 Precinct Tirana
- Our policy is an open policy, the policy of proletarian principles

Notes on studying:

'Opportunism and the collapse of the Second International'

by V.I. Lenin,

and on the struggle against the 2nd International in Ireland

Lenin's essay "Opportunism and the Collapse of the 2nd International" was first published in January 1916. It provided an incisive analysis of the stand of the 2nd International "socialists" and also of the cause and nature of opportunism and social chauvinism.

Lenin's essay above all points to :

- 1) the class collaborationist nature of the opportunists at that time and how they had gone over from being either allies of the workers or a trend in the Marxist camp to outright allies of the bourgeoisie.
- 2) to the fact that opportunism is an objective feature of capitalism at the stage of imperialism. It is not a 'deviation' of certain individuals but a direct and inevitable by-product of imperialism,
- 3) that revolutionary Marxists have to adopt an uncompromising attitude against opportunism and not provide a fig leaf or other excuses for its existence. There is nothing in common between opportunism and Marxism and the working class movement can only grow in struggle against opportunism.

Analysis of the Irish revolutionary movement at the time to which Lenin is referring shows that i) there was an ardent camp of supporters of the 2nd International here - especially represented in the Independent Labour Party (Ramsay MacDonald's, British Party) ii) that other 'labour' leaders came up to harmonise the contradiction with this trend, and in so doing became opportunist and collaborators of the 2nd International line, and iii) that the revolutionary trend in the movement firmly rebutted the stand of the 2nd International and put this opposition to it into practice by developing the revolutionary struggle against British colonialism and the Irish capitalists inside Ireland, opposing conscription and staging the 1916 rebellion. This revolutionary trend failed, however to grasp certain of the basic features of opportunism and the need to oppose it, and this left a serious weakness in their stand.

After the complete collapse of the 2nd International and the end of the First World War these contradictions in the Irish working class movement developed. The outright opportunists, totally exposed as allies of the bourgeoisie, proceeded along the path of participation in the capitalist state. The other 'lesser' opportunists, by continuously using the fig leaf of "politics is unimportant to the working man" and "economic issues are all important and not political ones", consistently refused to take a stand politically against the attacks on the workers and people and subsequently ended up first as an appendage and now as part of the bourgeoisie. Meanwhile the revolutionary Marxist trend also developed and matured and contradictions in it came to the fore. With

the founding of the Communist Party of Ireland in 1922 and its affiliation to the 3rd International, a major victory was gained in the struggle for Marxism against opportunism and for the working class and people against the bourgeoisie.

To elaborate

Lenin says in his essay that by the time of his writing, the 2nd International has virtually ceased to exist, whilst its main champions such as Kautsky and Vanderwelde refuse to accept this.

Lenin points out that from 1871 - 1914, the world had seen a relatively 'peaceful' period which corresponded with the development of capitalism to imperialism. This period had by virtue of its relative peacefulness and by the growth of imperialism and the amassing of super-profits by the imperialist bourgeoisie, given rise first to opportunism as a mood, thence to opportunism as a trend and finally opportunism as a definite group or stratum. This stratum was made up of the labour bureaucracy and petty bourgeois fellow travellers and was created and fed as a stratum by receiving some crumbs of financial privilege from the vast profits the bourgeoisie were making. From then on this stratum had every interest in keeping their alignment with the bourgeoisie and opposing the workers. They became the hand maidens of imperialism - using revolutionary phraseology to win credence amongst the people, but carrying out reactionary policies. Imperialism wanted nothing less but such deception to try and prolong its life.

At the time of writing, the time of the collapse of the 2nd International, Lenin points out that such opportunists had already taken control of the workers' trade unions and that now they were moving to take over the revolutionary parties.

In exposing the basis of opportunism in this way, Lenin clearly points to the fact that to move forward every revolutionary movement must be prepared to oppose opportunism, to deal with it, not as a 'mistake' and 'chance' tendency in the revolutionary movement, but as a phenomenon economically and politically in the service of imperialism and aligned not with the working class movement but against it. This is a serious lesson and to make out that the struggle against opportunism is irrelevant or of very little significance is entirely wrong. Usually the same people make the mistake of calling for the unity of "the left" i.e. of revolutionary Marxism with opportunism, all under the pessimistic guise that -- as there are so few socialist minded workers we should all unite -- they then denounce the Marxist-Leninists as being "highly sectarian" for denouncing opportunism. The failure to denounce the opportunism of the 2nd International is a thoroughgoing way by Irish Marxists earlier this century led to serious set-backs in the

The signal point reflecting the collapse of the 2nd International, was, Lenin stated, the attitude taken on the question of the First World War. He recalls the Manifesto of the Basle Congress - 1912, a manifesto adopted by socialists of the whole world.

The Manifesto refers to the concrete series of economic and political conflicts which for decades prepared conditions leading up to the First imperialist world war.

The Manifesto says that all the conflicts leading up to the present situation have arisen on the basis of "capitalist imperialism" and its predatory and aggressive character.

The war, the Manifesto pointed out, was a war between the big imperialist powers to enslave peoples of other countries, and to redivide the colonies between themselves. The Manifesto points out that under such circumstances it would be a crime for the workers of each country to go out alongside their own bourgeoisie and shoot one another.

The Manifesto analyses that from 1789 to 1871 was the period of "progressive capitalism" - i.e. the period in which the bourgeoisie was struggling against feudalism and absolutism. In these conditions it would have been possible to conceive of the term 'defence of the fatherland', but that now that this period has ended and the period of national wars for the establishment of states has changed into a period of imperialism and a period of wars between a few big imperialist powers for the division and redivision of their control and plunder of the rest of the globe.

The only conditions under which the slogan - "defence of the fatherland", which the sham socialists raised, could be used now was in a war against imperialism; not a war between one imperialist power and another.

The Manifesto of the Basle Congress, says Lenin, exposes the bankruptcy of the 2nd International and shows that all the 2nd International lines of joining in the war on the side of one's "own" bourgeoisie and fighting for 'peace' and the 'fatherland' are a complete travesty of the Basle Manifesto.

Thus the 2nd International's sham socialists had departed totally from the line the world socialist movement had agreed upon and decided. Yet the opportunists tried everything to cover this over; that is both the "open" opportunists and the more revolutionary sounding ones like Kautsky.

The attitude of opportunists on this question is also an important example to Marxist-Leninists in this country, because, as Lenin says in later works - vagueness and the attempts to confuse and blur things over is one of the features of the opportunists. The fact that truth went against them made the opportunists of the 2nd International try to liquidate what had already been achieved, try to pretend there was no line on the war, or just conveniently forget the entire Manifesto. Such is the character of modern day opportunists as well - they conveniently try to negate history; gloss over issues that have already been resolved and make everything into a mish mash and confusion so that their opportunism can grow unopposed.

Lenin points out that the first World War and the stand people took on it, completely differ-

entiated sham from genuine socialists. In this sense he points out that war sorts out a number of problems. The opportunists could not but come out to side with their own governments, join

in the bourgeois propaganda, vote for war credits and accept Ministerial positions in an open attempt to bring the labour movement behind the bourgeois positions. This made them above all social-chauvinists. Chauvinism explains Lenin, is precisely support of one's "own" fatherland at any cost - even when it is striving to enslave other people's fatherlands.

In nearly every country of the world the social chauvinists were those who were the bastions of opportunism on all other questions too. Thus the collapse of the 2nd International occurred when, at the time of the 1914 - 18 war it came out so openly with the bourgeoisie that they could no longer be mistaken as socialists. This capitalation on the question of the war was however not isolated - the 2nd International was characterised by conciliation and collaboration with the bourgeoisie on all other questions too, on economic and industrial struggle, or the question of breathing life into parliamentary democracy and the sham socialists of the 2nd International opposed the rights of nations

to secession but carried all the capitalist propaganda on these issues. In short the period between the 1st and 3rd (both revolutionary Internationals) had seen the development of the most pernicious opportunism and sham socialism. Now, says Lenin, the problem was getting completely exposed - the pus was coming out - and with it also those who wanted to conciliate with the pus at all costs. Lenin points out that Kautsky and others were desperately fighting for unity with the pus, and claiming to support everything the revolutionary Marxists advocated, only postponing acting on it. (!)

Today the parties of the 2nd International have become renowned imperialist circle of friends known as the Socialist International - which includes all the "labour parties" - such as the Irish Labour Party, the British Labour Party and Golda Meir's party etc. The statements by Lenin have more than been born out by historical fact. - the fact that the step from opportunism to social chauvinism meant a vulgar, open alliance of the opportunist 'socialists' with the bourgeoisie in their countries. Today, the parties descended from the 2nd International are no longer outside the bourgeoisie and merely helpers, but decades of development of this

ALBANIAN PERIODICALS

New Albania

A POLITICAL AND SOCIAL ILLUSTRATED
BI-MONTHLY MAGAZINE

"Albania Today"

A POLITICAL INFORMATIVE REVIEW

Available from:
Progressive Books & Periodicals
10 Uppr. Exchange St. Dublin 8

strata, of labour aristocrats and fellow travellers has surely turned them into actual bourgeois and monopoly capitalists themselves. It is now considered quite plausible to have millionaire monopoly capitalists in these "Labour Parties". To attempt to "breathe life" into such parties or unite the left inside and take over - is to cater to illusions. The working class needs an independent party and not appendages of the bourgeoisie.

Lenin's famous quotes on 'cleaning out the pus' and the good it will do the world revolutionary movement shows people clearly that the attitude to adopt to the rise of opportunism is not to try and make alliances with it for the sake of unity. Modern day opportunists are always very verbose sounding about 'unity', the 'need not to be sectarian', and not to be too "pure" ideologically or not to 'criticise everyone on your side'. However this is all hot air of the opportunists being raised as a smoke-screen for opportunism. Marxist-Leninists have to struggle for the correct, i.e. scientific, historically correct analysis and line and have to repudiate other positions. Only by a continuous striving for clarity of Marxist-Leninist line inside the Marxist-Leninist Party, and a continuous repudiation of opportunism can the Marxist-Leninist party lead the working class movement steadfastly. The opportunists always call for less concern about political line and make compromises on this front in favour of short term strivings for "immediate results" and winning over large numbers of people quickly. The opportunists will always come a cropper - and either end up chasing short term benefits as a whole (i.e. like the ILP going into Coalition in order to line its own pockets) -- or will collapse. When Larkin returned to Ireland in the 30's he refused to join the Communist Party of Ireland, calling them a group of wasps and proceeded to form a new group. Whilst the first meeting of the group had thousands present, that meant nothing in the long term. The group got nowhere, whereas the party developed and all Larkin achieved by this was causing some confusion amongst the workers - and perhaps exposing some of his own negative side.

The Basle Manifesto not only called the war an inter-imperialist war but also pointed to the fact that such a war would greatly sharpen the political and economic crisis in the imperialist world and heighten the revolutionary movement. It was the duty of Marxists therefore to use the war to rouse the masses and hasten the collapse of capitalism. In other words to turn the war into civil war at home. Lenin says very clearly that revolution could break out in connection with the war, and that the bourgeoisie were actually very afraid of the way their wars intensified contradictions at home.

As is clear, the 1917 revolution occurred in the course of the first imperialist world war. Lenin's observations on this Manifesto are very relevant today. Chairman Mao pointed out that in this era, either world war will give rise to revolution or revolution will prevent war. i.e. that as the imperialists' political crisis intensify, they are more driven to go to war between themselves (especially the two superpowers - U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism) and at the same time the crisis also intensifies the possibility of revolution. If the imperialist powers go to

war, the factors for revolution will increase.

It is interesting to note that modern day Kautskyites - like Teng Hsiao-ping - advocate theories similar to Kautsky, saying that either there will be war or revolution - both completely separate possibilities. One can only conclude from this that if there is war that would be a disaster and, as revolution will not be possible therefore people should rally and take sides with one capitalist power or another. Teng Hsiao-ping's international opportunist line actually calls for unity with the U.S. imperialists against the Soviet social-imperialists. Following Teng Hsiao-ping's line, if there is revolution, this will mean relaxing vigilance against the possibility of inter-imperialist war. Clearly the bourgeoisie inside the workers movement has not given up.

Another point Lenin makes is that these opportunists gained the upperhand in the revolutionary movement promising revolutionary action and claiming that all the work for peace was preparation for real revolution. (The latter theory is exactly the logic of the now social-democratic Official Sinn Fein - i.e. to fight for peace under imperialist domination, and to promise that they will deliver the revolutionary goods after this peace is achieved - a promise on the end of a pipe dream). This overall point of Lenin's merits attention in the present day because the world today has also seen a period of nearly 30 years with no world scale war, and this has contributed to the developing and strengthening of the revisionist trend and their dominance over all kinds of things. However the ongoing crisis at present and the intensifying contradictions are rapidly creating conditions not just for the exposure of the present day opportunists, but also for the fact that the next rebellion of the people will not only occur despite the opportunists leaders but against them as well. The opportunists of various hues and colours (e.g. the Labour Parties, Trotskyites etc) may have had a long rope - but only to hang themselves more thoroughly.

Lenin pointed out that :

"Opportunism and social chauvinism have the same political content, namely, class collaboration, repudiation of revolutionary action, unconditional recognition of bourgeois legality, lack of confidence in the proletariat, confidence in the bourgeoisie".

He points out from 1899 - 1914, there had been a fierce struggle in all the main countries in the world between sham opportunism and Marxism. Lenin talks about the various countries and the sharp issues concerned, including in Britain. This is some significance in looking at the stand of Connolly and the early revolutionary socialists in Ireland. Connolly said in his writings that there was no opposition to the stand of the 2nd International or the war from the British revolutionary movement and confused the fact that there was in fact a very sharp struggle going on against the 2nd International.

Lenin goes on to point out how the bourgeoisie are only too conscious of the invaluable contribution of the opportunists and were quite open to offering them full facilities - ministerial posts, an individual legal existence, ability to monopolise the literary and propaganda fronts and unlimited funds.

Lenin deals with the various twists and turns of 2nd International opportunists, which again is relevant today because modern day opportunists present

the same arguments e.g. Axelrod said the crux of the matter was better labour protection and insurance legislation-how many opportunists do you hear today calling for programmes centred on such reforms. Also Axelrod excels himself by claiming he would support a revolutionary upsurge if it was the real thing and about to lead to revolution. Apart from the ludicrousness of this position (he needs the benefit of a super sense of perception of the future) this is another of the common opportunist aspects - i.e. they will not support such and such a struggle because it isn't the real thing (such as they may have read about in a book or seen on T.V.), or they will wait to see if other support it, or excuse their bogusness by saying that the Party is not the "real" Party. All of these arguments, as Lenin points out, are those of opportunists who do not want to support the struggle of the present, but cover this over with a declaration of support for the future. Lenin pointed out how the Manifesto called for the Marxists to turn the war into civil wars. He pointed out the precise measures proposed and adopted by the Bolsheviks -

- 1) refusal to vote for credits
- 2) breaking of the class truce
- 3) formation of independent organisation
- 4) support of manifestations of solidarity in the trenches
- 5) support of all revolutionary mass action

Lenin also pointed out how in 1901, with the disorder in Russia the Bolsheviks called on the workers to persist in and deepen their struggles and to throw the opportunists out, whilst the opportunists called for an immediate offensive. The significance of these 2 points centres on the question that the opportunists always call serious preparation for action "useless" and "not practical" and always themselves demand immediate action and complete overthrow in a second, or - the complete opposite - short term measures alone, hanging on to collaboration with the bourgeoisie.

The betrayal of the 2nd International is now clear to us, having the benefit of history and hindsight. But it is important to be able to see the differences between the programmes of the Marxists and opportunists at that time, in order to carry out the struggle against opportunism today. Lenin ends up his essay with the 2 following very relevant statements:

"To strengthen, develop, widen sharpen revolutionary action, to create underground organisation - without which it is impossible even in "free" countries to tell the truth to the masses of the people - this is the sum and substance of the practical programme of social democracy (Communism) in the war. Everything else is either lies or phrases, no matter what opportunist or pacifist theories it is embellished with" and,

"The workers are already demanding "illegal" pamphlets, "prohibited" meetings - i.e. a secret organisation to support the revolutionary mass movement. Only when "war against war" is conducted on these lines does it become Social Democratic work and not a phrase. And in spite of all difficulties, temporary defeats, mistakes, going astray, interruptions, this work will lead humanity to the victorious proletarian revolution."

The same basic spirit is undoubtedly true today, and modern day opportunists and their fig leaf bearers should beware of the day when the abcess will break!

The Irish working class movement was also a part of the struggle between the 2nd International opportunists and revolutionary Marxists.

Before going further it is important to point out that the Irish working class had begun to organise in unions etc. in the 1700's and had held militant and class conscious activities during the 1700's and 1800's and then emerged in the early part of the 1900's to take up the challenge of leading the revolution of the entire Irish people. Because of the dominance of bourgeois propaganda, various people sometimes make out that the Irish working class is very weak and feeble and has no history of militant trade unionism and communism. Nothing could be farther from the truth and it is a reflection of tailing behind the lines of the petty bourgeois nationalists to suggest that there is a history of national rebellion, but none of working class organisation. This is important because various brands of Irish chauvinism have also tried to confuse the history of the socialist movement in the country and prevent workers learning the historical lesson from it. They make out that the weaknesses and mistakes of the socialists should be glossed over by virtue of the so-called 'weakness', 'isolation' and general feableness of the Irish revolution and working class. In this way a good number of the opportunists try and "protect Connolly" from criticism and make out that he was to Ireland what Marx and Engels, Lenin or Stalin or Chairman Mao Tsetung were to their countries and the world proletariat. Connolly was a revolutionary socialist but not a Marxist on all questions, including the decisive role of the Party.

In the early part of the century there was one very direct camp of the 2nd International here. It was centred (though by no means exclusively) in Belfast around William Walker and was organised in the British Independent Labour Party of Ramsay MacDonald. Their line was all round opportunism - the Irish labour movement should be an appendage of the British one, Ireland should not have the right to self-determination, the workers should not rise up in revolutionary political struggle and industrial battles should always be waged with great concern for the employers. Needless to say this trend fully supported the stand of the 2nd International on the war and advocated unity with the British bourgeoisie, forced conscription etc. The Belfast Independent Labour Party split over the war. These opportunists later came to support the partitioning of Ireland.

Apart from this rank opportunist trend, was the trend which went for the middle path i.e. they opposed the revolutionary socialist line of Connolly, the call to arms against the British government etc but also opposed the actively pro-imperialist line of William Walker and Co. They supported the call for an all Ireland labour movement but could bring themselves only to the vague socialism of the Labour Party, not to the direct and consistent position of the Irish Socialist Republican Party.

The position this trend developed was one of trying to ignore politics under the guise that the economic struggle is more important for the workers. Here they started the idea of the so-called "all for labour" line, a line which actually effectively sooner or later ends up siding with the British imperialist domination of the country - the so-called "labour" line of national subjugation.

The Irish Labour Party National Executive split over the 1914-18 war with Thomas Johnson supporting the "allies"; the National Executive passed various resolutions against the war as a war for the engrandisement of the capitalists, and against economic conscription (Larkin proposed this resolution) but this is as far as they would go. When the Irish Citizens Army organised and the 1916 rebellion occurred the National Executive declined to support this active implementation of the policy of the Basle Manifesto on the war - i.e. to create civil war.

This is epitomised in Thomas Johnson's letter to the reactionary socialist Henderson in England asking for release of labour leaders rounded up in 1916 but not for the release of James Connolly. Also in August 1916, Johnson said:

"This is not a place to enter into discussion as to the right or wrong, the wisdom or folly of the revolt As a trade union movement we are of varied minds on matters of historical and political development".

He called for a minute's silence for all who died making most of those who died for the allies "for liberty, democracy and for love of their country". This position of the ILP i.e. of being so-called above politics, developed concretely to bring forth the ILP and NILP - both as avid supporters and representatives of the Irish capitalists north and south.

In opposition to these two trends was that of the revolutionary socialists. Led by Connolly this trend spoke out unhesitatingly against the war, against all conscription and for an intensification of the class and national struggle at home, and actually practised what they preached.

Again here the bourgeoisie have re-written history to suggest that the Irish working class had 2 heroes - Connolly and Larkin but no movement and organisation. (This is why they erect statues and plaques of them in order to oppose them). It is important to realise therefore that Connolly spoke for a trend developing for several decades - since the formation of branches of the First International in Dublin and Cork in 1872, the founding of the ISRP with Edward Aveling (Marx's son in law) and others in 1896, out of several already existing socialist groups, also the formation in 1889 of the "National Union of Gas Workers and General Labourers of Great Britain and Ireland" which was a militant class union of unskilled with revolutionary policies (Eleanor Aveling was Education Officer). In the whole early part of this century the Irish working class fought revolutionary battles leading up to the Dublin 1913 struggles and then 1916. Connolly and his allies represented all that was positive and developing when he finally came out against the war and laid down his life in 1916.

However Connolly was mistaken on certain aspects of his political line:

- 1) Although raising the slogan "Neither King nor Kaiser" he also put forward that Germany was a better country than Britain and that if Germany recruited in Ireland it would be OK to recruit into their army. That a blow with German imperialism against British imperialism would be a good thing. Clearly this is departing from the slogan "defence of the fatherland" only to end up fighting for another fatherland. It is a somewhat chauvinist view, considering the situation only from the standpoint of Ireland and not the entire European proletariat and is in contradiction with Connolly's basic internationalism which he displayed.
- 2) Connolly, although opposing the frank social chauvinists, did not hold a thoroughly Marxist view of what the character of opportunism was and made various statements about especially the British "socialist" leaders which expressed disagreement with them but failed to show their real character. This together with the fact that Connolly also claimed there was no opposition to the 2nd International in Britain suggested that although he saw in the issue of the war itself clearly, he did not grasp the inevitableness of opportunism developing with imperialism and the necessity for all genuine Marxists to get involved in the two line struggle for the good of the whole movement.
- 3) He put industrial syndicalism in command (the theory that the workers can achieve socialism through the trade unions and by building up economic organisation and at the place of work, as opposed to the Marxist theory of the necessity for the workers to take political action through their own independent Party and to overthrow the state in order to be able to establish the economic system of socialism). Using this he claimed this was the 'reason' why there was 'no opposition' to the defence of the fatherland line in Britain. This both let the 2nd International people off the hook and confused the issue.

After the 1916 rebellion and the murder of Connolly and others, the Socialist Party of Ireland was revived in 1917 by O'Shannon and O'Brien -- (the ISRP had changed its name to SPI). SPI continued on the revolutionary trend in the Irish working class and led eventually to the founding of the Communist Party of Ireland in 1922 and its application to join the 3rd International. During this period some of these weaknesses expressed in Connolly's policies became very manifest. For example the SPI sent delegates to the Berne Socialist Conference in 1919, which Lenin pointed out was an attempt to breathe life into the 2nd International. The Bolsheviks declined to send delegates as they had already seen years before that a complete break with the opportunists was needed. The participation of the SPI in the Berne Conference (the ILP and TUC were also there - one would have expected this) is recorded in a booklet produced by them, showed that the Irish revolutionary leaders at that time contented themselves with opposing the war and calling for Ireland's right to self-determination and they recognised and supported the

Soviet Union, but failed to hold out all along the line against opportunism. At the conference they militantly upheld the Soviet Union and Bolshevik democracy against the opportunists, but compromised on certain questions on Ireland's right to self-determination in the face of the Home Rule line of Ramsay MacDonald.

The Berne Conference was a total failure trying as it did to unite the old and dying 2nd International with some elements of the new. When the 3rd International was formed by Lenin late in 1919 the SPI declined to join this one or the 2nd International - a position of sitting on the fence. This was rectified in 1922 when the Communist Party of Ireland was founded. It is not a place to talk about CPI history, but it does mark the starting point of CPI, which right from the very start had to fight against right opportunism - as echoes of the 2nd International line eg tailism to the ILP & ICTU and relegating the struggle for national independence to a subordinate position. to the industrial movement, and to the "economist" lines of the ILP & ICTU.

It also had to fight the tailism of petty bourgeois nationalism and attempts to turn CPI into an appendage of Sinn Fein - a tendency which would lead to the workers not leading the petty bourgeois nationalists, but vice versa.

Struggle against these various lines has continued in various forms right up to date. Today in brief, we have the ILP and NILP as descendants of the 2nd International and totally part of the bourgeois superstructure and economy. Since then the CPI has become revisionist travelling on very similar lines to those of the 2nd International - the lines of Khrushchevite revisionism - calls for peace, unity and postponing of revolutionary action and subordination of the working class movement to trade unionism and to the bourgeois, are its watchwords.

INTERNATIONAL NEWS

SUPPORT GROWS FOR PALESTINIAN PEOPLE'S STRUGGLE

The question of the national rights of the Palestinian people was discussed at the United Nations from November 15th to 24th. At the debate, representatives of many countries re-affirmed their support for the just struggle of the Palestinian people.

The debate emphasised the fact that despite opposition from the superpowers and the vicious suppression carried out by the Israeli Zionist regime, the Palestinian revolution is moving ahead and is gaining increasing support internationally. The Palestinian Liberation Organisation representative pointed out that the Palestinian people were "waging a common struggle with the militant peoples in Africa, Asia and Latin America against imperialism colonialism and against racist doctrines and practices." He expressed support for the "right of the peoples to struggle by all means, including armed struggle, in order to attain

In recent years the British and Irish 'Communist' Organisation have developed a fully Kautskyite position - under the signboard of 'Internationalism' - supporting British imperialism and declaring the national independence struggle as the worst enemies of the working class.

The Official Sinn Fein, under the leadership of the 'Revisionist' Party of Ireland have moved over effectively to the same position but under a signboard of "unity of the working class first" - "revolution second".

The Irish trade union aristocracy has become social chauvinist in the extreme, siding always with the Irish bourgeoisie and they, the ILP and the B&ITO and Officials all echo the bourgeoisies call for more imperialist investment to make Irish workers happier (!)

Meanwhile more fig leaves are growing - one of them is to claim we should ignore the struggle of the last 10 years to rebuild the revolutionary socialist headquarters in Ireland in the Communist Party of Ireland (Marxist-Leninist) and that CPI(M-L) is not the "real" party. Other arguments such as we should have unity with these outright opportunists (i.e. ILP, CPI, B&ITO and ICTU) all for the sake of numbers, or that the Irish working class can discard building its own independent party in favour of having left republican organisation, or moving the ILP or of the others to the left are also diversions from the central task - to oppose British imperialism and the Irish monopoly capitalists - necessitates a consistent battle against opportunism and the concentration of the revolutionary interests of the workers in an independent Marxist-Leninist party - which alone can succeed in winning over the vast majority - including genuine elements in all other movements.

Firm support was expressed by the delegates from China and Albania, as well as by many Asian and African countries. The Albanian representative pointed out that the cause of the tragedy of the Palestinian people was the contention of the superpowers for spheres of influence in the Middle East. He pointed out that both wanted to maintain a situation of "no war, no peace" and to establish a status which was profitable to themselves.

At the end of the debate, the draft resolution including support for their return to their homeland of the Palestinians displaced by the Israeli Zionists occupation, support for their national rights and withdrawal of Israel from the occupied territories of Jordan, Syria and Egypt by June 1977, was adopted by 90 votes to 16.

Within the areas under Israeli occupation, resistance has been developing too to the Zionist regime, and such activities as its

further occupation of Arab lands. The Zionists have been forced to carry out mass arrests and have mounted aggressive manoeuvres involving 450,000 troops. However, such demonstrations of strength do nothing to win sympathy for their cause. Recently even their number one backer, the U.S. imperialists have taken to

adopting an 'anti-Israel' stance, in order to enable them better to meddle and create splits among the Arab countries. However, the cause of the Palestinian people is just, and is bound to overcome all the schemes of the reactionaries and reach total victory.

Lysenko, great scientist of the Russian and world's people, dies

Trofim Lysenko, the great Russian agronomist died on November 20th. Hated by the bourgeoisie throughout the world, including the modern Soviet revisionists, Lysenko was a dialectical materialist who performed great service for the Russian people in the field of biology and agricultural science and contributed immensely to genuine scientific discovery in the world, especially in the field of natural science.

accepted theories of "genes" and "spontaneous" mutations. The latter, being based on idealism, and disregarding facts, served the world's bourgeoisie, whereas Lysenko's theories showed that people could solve many problems of science. Lysenko's contribution to natural science was fundamental.

Responding to the nutritional needs of the Russian workers and peasants in the new socialist Russia, Lysenko in the 1930's amongst other things, developed strains of wheat that could grow in very cold regions (sub-zero). He showed how, through careful organisation of the environment, one could bring about a change in the organism - a change in its genetic make-up - where previously bourgeois scientists had claimed that new strains (or breeds) could only come about by some 'mystical genetics' 'mutation'. Lysenko's theories on heredity and environment completely demolished the common ly

Lysenko was able to make these breakthroughs on account of this grasp of dialectical materialist philosophy. He became president of the Soviet Academy of Agricultural Science in 1938. His close links with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and deep concern for the Russian workers and peasants however were the reasons he was hated by the bourgeoisie who still vilify his brilliant theories in all their universities and centres of 'learning' to this day.

We mourn the death of a man who was a source of inspiration to intellectuals, scientific workers and to all revolutionaries throughout the world.

Mass resistance in Spain to fascist attacks increases

On October 1st, a general strike was called in Spain to protest against the murder by fascist elements of Carlos Gonzalez, a 21 year old student, during a political demonstration. The strike paralysed large areas of Madrid and other cities and provided a militant example of the mounting upsurge to the U.S. backed fascist dictatorship in Spain. On the previous day, students had also held protest demonstrations which were attacked by the police while other riot police were at the same time harassing striking post office workers. The post office workers have been on strike since September 22nd after several of them had been arrested during a 2,000 strong demonstration. The strike has since spread over 30 of Spain's 51 provinces crippling the postal service.

These are but two of the latest events which show the mounting resistance in Spain to the attacks of the regime on the rising mass movement and demonstrated that if anything, repression has increased since the so-called 'liberalisation' undertaken by the monarcho-fascist, King Carlos. For example, earlier in September, a factory worker was shot by police during a demonstration in the Basque country. This was followed by a one-day general strike of 300,000 workers on September 13th, while 50,000 workers continued the strike beyond the first day. Spain is the scene of mounting upsurge against fascist rule and for a Republic as well as massive strikes by hundreds of thousands of workers on economic issues. The mass activities of the working class in Spain takes place

largely outside the legal trade unions which are under the thumb of the regime and have proven useless for waging struggles. In the first half of April 1976, there were 150,000 workers on strike in Spain and this reached 300,000 by the beginning of May. In addition 200,000 people demonstrated on the first of May in 44 cities and towns throughout Spain. Over 50,000 participated in demonstrations in Madrid alone in the month of June. Demonstrators have consistently fought police in many areas and the slogan "Down with the crowned dictatorship" was paraded at numerous demonstrations. In response to this the fascist regime has instigated mass firings of tens of thousands of workers, political arrests of thousands of workers, deportations, attacks on bookstores, wholesale assaults on demonstrations and numerous murders by police and fascist elements. All these events are taking place in a Spain where fascist rule has remained unchanged since 1939 and where U.S. imperialism has subjugated Spain and turned it into almost a colony since the 1950's.

There are 30 U.S. bases in Spain with over 30,000 troops stationed there. Investment by U.S. interests represent three quarters of all foreign investment and the same proportion of current foreign capital flowing into Spain. Fifteen hundred large enterprises in Spain are either U.S. subsidiaries, or under the control of U.S. monopolies. These include all the large enterprises in almost every major branch of the economy, while the regime supplies

all kinds of facilities to aid the U.S imperialists companies. As a result, the economy has been in a state of chronic crisis for 9 years and the foreign debt, also largely to the U.S. is soaring, with 3 billion dollars added to the debt last year. Agriculture is also deteriorating in the latifundia which are controlled by the big landowners and consequently the country is forced to import food thus further bleeding the population. One and a half million Spanish workers are unemployed, production is declining while inflation is soaring and speculation and big-time robbery and fraud is rampant. This is Spain dominated by U.S. imperialism where the regime carries on its heritage of 37 years of fascist rule and is

attempting to suppress the mass upsurge of the people. (Inflation this year jumped to 25% and unemployment officially by 6%)

The so-called liberalisation of Francoism carried out by Juan Carlos is nothing but a cover to maintain the U.S. backed fascist regime and suppress the great upsurge of the Spanish people against fascist terror and capitalist wage slavery. The spectre of this movement haunts the U.S. imperialists and the fascists and in the not too distant future the heroic struggle of the people will realise the cherished goals of establishing the republic and ending its imperialist domination.

Spanish people protest against death sentences passed on Noel and Marie Murray

At the Irish Embassy in Madrid on Tuesday, November 2nd, hundreds of demonstrators gathered to protest against the death sentences passed on Noel and Marie Murray. The demonstration was attacked by the riot police of the monarcho -fascist regime in Spain, who fired smoke bombs amongst the demonstrators in an attempt to break up the militant protest. The protest of the Spanish people against the death sentences is a great sign of international solidarity with the Irish people struggle.

Last year and subsequently, the people of Ireland held a number of demonstrations in support of the struggles of the Spanish people, particularly at the time when the regime in Spain was executing the 5 revolutionaries last year. The support

of the Spanish and Irish peoples for one another struggles is bound to grow and isolate even further our common enemies - imperialism and their native henchmen.

Protests against the death sentences have spread around many countries. In Switzerland demonstrators occupied the Aer Lingus offices, while in Germany a petition has been launched and has gathered more than 18,000 signatures to date. Protests have also occurred in Britain, USA and France, Australia and other countries. This great international solidarity with the Irish peoples struggle shows the great wave of support which the peoples struggles throughout the world have with one another's struggles against imperialism and all reactionaries.

End Item

Notes on studying

'MARX, ENGELS AND LENIN ON THE IRISH REVOLUTION'

by Ralph Fox

This book was written by Ralph Fox and published in 1932 by Modern Books Ltd. of London. Ralph Fox was himself a British Communist, a member of the Communist Party of Great Britain (which was then a genuine Communist Party). He lived and worked a good part of his life in Battersea, London, one of the Communist strongholds at that time, and one in which a Communist M.P. was elected - that was Saktlatvala. Fox wrote a number of other books, including a three volume work entitled "Class Struggle in Britain" on the development of the class struggle of the British workers and the development of the British monopoly capitalist class. A fourth volume of this work was prevented from being produced by the fact that Fox was killed, fighting for the world proletariat in the Spanish Civil War. He was in his early thirties when he was killed. His books show that he was a keen pupil of the class struggle and applied Marxism-Leninism in a scientific manner, and his analyses of Britain and of Ireland are valid and correct to date! Fox also wrote a book on the Irish Citizen Army

Marx, Engels and Lenin, whose writings on Ireland he summarised in this particular book, were the great leaders and teachers of the world proletariat in their time, whose works remain

immortalised as Marxism-Leninism - the sole scientific guide for the proletarians of every country in the struggle against capital. Fox takes pains to show that Marx and Engels, and Lenin in his time were both theoretical and practical leaders. They carried out scientific analysis of Ireland, as of other countries, and allowed not only the Irish people but all people over the world to benefit from their study of the class contradictions in the globe. They also fought and organised in their own situations, Marx and Engels being the founders and leaders of the First International of Working Men, as well as the contributors to many other organisations and movements. Lenin, who inherited Marxism, applied it to the conditions in the world at the stage of development called imperialism; that is the highest and last stage of capitalism; that stage that is inherently the eve of the proletarian socialist revolution. Lenin led the first ever successful proletarian revolution in the world, and was the leader of workers of all countries in his day. He developed the analysis of imperialism and of its right-arm -- opportunism, and he succeeded in leading the workers of Russia to victory through their own class party, the Bolshevik Party.

Fox points out that Marx, Engels and Lenin all

attached great significance to the Irish revolution and supported it actively, Marx and Engels upholding the cause of the Irish people in Britain, America and other European countries, fought against the 'treatment' of Fenian prisoners and fought for the movement of the British working class to support the Irish people. He fought against the reactionary chauvinist and 'great nation' prejudices of the British trade unions, and correctly analysed that no people could be free that oppressed another. Engels was closely allied with Marx in all of these activities, visited Ireland twice himself and married an Irish woman. Fox points out that Engels provided considerable help to the Irish revolution financially and by giving shelter to people. Lenin also paid specific attention to the Irish revolution and actively paid tribute to Connolly and the 1916 Rebellion when this was being attacked by all the 'sensible' socialists of the Second (reactionary) International, as well as by the 'Left' socialists. Trotsky was one of those who called 1916 a putsch, and Larkin one of those who said that Connolly had made a mistake to lead the 1916 Uprising.

The fact that Marx, Engels and Lenin all wrote about the Irish revolution and supported it brings out one of the most important themes in Fox's book - that is that the Irish revolution is part of the world revolution, and that the general features of the world revolutionary movement therefore apply to the Irish struggle. This, Fox points out, is one of the reasons for Marx and Engels' interest, because they recognised the importance of the Irish revolution not only to the Irish people themselves but to struggling people everywhere. Fox points out that Marx, Engels and Lenin were international leaders, their writings were not just relevant to their own countries but to countries all round the world. That Marxism was the science for the successful waging of the class struggle by the workers against the capitalists in the era of industrial and developing capitalism, and that Marxism is the basic exposition of the nature of capitalist society. Leninism is the science for the class struggle in the period of imperialism. This is why Fox stresses throughout his book that the future of the Irish revolution lies with the working class, and with the universal science of Marxism, Leninism and with the Communist Party as the only way in which these truths can be applied.

The fact that Fox, a British communist, wrote this book on Ireland also highlights another important issue which he brings out, and gives Marx and Engels' views on. That is the close relation between the revolutionary struggle of the British proletariat and that of the Irish people. He shows how the 1913 struggles in Dublin greatly inspired the British workers, to the extent that had not occurred since the Chartist movement in England he says. He points out that in 1798 (a time when the working class was growing up in both countries) the Irish were more advanced, from a revolutionary standpoint, than the English workers, who were at the stage where they were not yet awakened to themselves as a class. Also how throughout history the great revolutionary struggles which the Irish workers and people

launched so militantly against British imperialism (English colonialism, earlier on) against the Irish capitalists and against the imperialist world war in 1916, were a very strong source of revolutionary inspiration to the British workers. He also points out that the British workers tended towards chauvinism and to narrow trade unionism, but that the British and Irish bourgeoisie realised full well the implications of the two uniting. Thus Fox points out from Lenin's writings, that as the Irish workers began to come forward as an independent force in the Irish revolution for the first time, at the beginning of this century, the bourgeoisie of both countries realised that this force, if unchecked, would mean the unification and liberation of Ireland, and the establishment of a workers and small farmers republic, and that this could only incite the British workers to revolution too, meaning the total defeat of British imperialism. Fox also brings out that Marx, Engels and Lenin saw that for the Irish revolution to be successful it required a weakening of a distraction in some other struggle of the British government, and its army, this also being a very important reason for the British workers and Irish workers to strike at the British monopoly capitalists in conjunction with one another. The British army was trained and maintained through its activities in Ireland, Fox says; and the British army which is used one day against the Irish people is used the next day against the British workers - yet another close bond and reason for close alliance.

The main content of Fox's book is taken up with tracing in a microcosm the development of Ireland from the English invasions and the response of the people to their treatment, and the characteristics of the revolutionary movement at the various times. Fox begins and ends this analysis by pointing out that the present (then... and now) success of the Irish revolution depends on the ability of the Irish working class to come forward as an independent force and to win leadership of the national struggle, uniting all progressive elements around itself and that it is by these means and these alone that the Irish people will be able to achieve unification and national independence, and through this alone will the workers be able to achieve socialism.

The way in which Marx, Engels and Lenin's analyses point out the problems and the issues of the past, and how Irish society has evolved, and how it can go forward is a clear testimony to the fact that the Irish situation does not defy class analysis, or need a special form of Marxism, or is not a struggle separate and superior to that of the 'profane' struggles of the European proletariat, but rather that class struggle and Marxist-Leninist analysis, and the strategy and tactics based on these, are the hope for the Irish revolution, just as they are for any other country.

Fox elaborates Marx's analyses of Ireland mainly in the 1800's. In this period, Marx says, the Irish were robbed for the second time over, that is that in the initial colonisation of Ireland the Irish people had their land taken from them, in the sense that it was seized by foreigners and the Irish were made

tenants on their own land. The second robbery occurred in the 1800's when the Irish people were thrown in enormous numbers off the land altogether.

Marx refers to the subjugation of Ireland in various stages, in works from which Fox has drawn his writings. The first stage according to Marx was from 1100-1500 when the initial wars of invasion and colonisation took place, speeding up the development of feudalism in Ireland; but Marx points out that despite the bloody wars waged and the oppression of the peasantry, right up to 1500 the colonisation was never complete or made permanent.

Then in the second stage of the colonisation from 1500-1800, and the Act of Union in 1801, the colonisation was made permanent and total by the most vicious and savage wars and political and economic measures taken against the Irish. In this period, beginning with Elizabeth 1st and carried on by Cromwell massacres occurred with well known savagery serving their clear cut economic and political interests. Both of them followed the policy of clearing the Irish farmers off their land and forced them to either emigrate or become tenants. Elizabeth gave land she 'cleared' to soldiers she wished to reward (or get rid off) and Cromwell gave land to the nobles whom he wished out of the way in order to have a freer hand to develop capitalism in England. Thus the true 'colonisation' of Ireland took place. This period led up to the 1798 rebellion of the United Irishmen, the establishment of Grattan's Parliament and finally the Act of Union with crushing of the rebellion and the dissolution of the parliament.

The 1700's, as with every subsequent century, bore out the truth of the one famous statement by Marx in which he said that: "England has destroyed the conditions of Irish society. First of all, she has confiscated the lands of the Irish; then by 'parliamentary decrees' she has suppressed Irish industry; finally by armed force she broken the activity and energy of the Irish people."

Marx points out that in the 1700's the peasants organised spontaneous resistance to the landlords, in the form of secret societies. This was one of the two main trends in the Irish national movement; the other being the liberal national one, which became more marked in the 1800's. Marx and Engels point out how the peasant societies whilst providing very militant resistance in isolated examples, revealed the weakness of the peasantry to organise a rebellion without the assistance of another class. The peasants are scattered and isolated and their resistance whilst very militant, bitter and fearless could only achieve, when left to itself, what in fact the secret societies, like the Ribbonboys, did achieve. The revisionists and social-democrats could learn more than a lesson or two from the peasants militancy however.

As Fox points out there was a bitter battle with England throughout the 1700's and towards the end of that century (Marx refers to this elsewhere) England was forced by the changing conditions in the world, e.g. the American War of Independence and the French Revolution to grant some concessions to the Irish. One of these was the Irish Parliament. Although this parliament was totally tied to Britain, because of the developing conditions inherent in Irish society, industry was beginning to

develop and through the last 20 years of the 1700's it began to flourish in many forms. This in turn strengthened the national bourgeoisie, who at last staged a rebellion of the United Irishmen for the control of their own markets. This was probably the first and last time that the national bourgeoisie fought a genuine battle through to the end with the British government, every struggle in which the national bourgeoisie has participated in since then has ended in their compromising, vacillating and conciliation. The 1798 rebellion was brutally crushed, the Act of Union declared and the British proceeded to introduce tariffs to suppress all industry except the linen industry, which served their interests at that time. This analysis made by Marx puts paid to the imperialist logic that the Irish are not industrial and that this is why we are weak and need British imperialist 'help'. It is important also that these imperialist notions are also echoed by the Irish bourgeoisie to justify their dependence on British and other imperialist capital and by the revisionists and Trotskyites alike who bleat that we need more capital brought in, to provide employment, etc., etc.. The B&ICO promote the lie that the southern bourgeoisie never managed to develop any industry as their basis for saying that there are two races in Ireland, because they claim the protestants were 'industrious' and therefore able to develop their own industry. Fox points out that in talking about the 1798 Rebellion Marx and Engels claimed that was the highest point the Irish revolution had seen at that time (i.e. at the time when they were writing) because it was linked with the revolution in other countries and because the proletariat was spontaneously linking with the peasantry and their struggles.

After the defeat of this rebellion and all that went with it, the English government intensified their suppression of the Irish people to try and stop them rising again, whilst the Irish bourgeoisie starting with O'Connell, found their niche in history (from which they are still to be dislodged) by developing the tactics of blowing hot against the English colonisation whilst actually going along with the English government in order to reap their own rewards.

So the 1800's open up with tariffs being set up to destroy nascent Irish industry. Consequently, the natural motion in Irish society for agricultural production to give rise to capitalist accumulation and thence to the development of industry, was interfered with. This is crucial to the whole pattern of British imperialist domination to date. Some people make narrow assessments of British control based on looking at some government statistics and saying how the British monopoly capitalist control such and such an amount. But the extent of British control and domination goes back to this period in which the industrial revolution was suppressed in Ireland, which in turn suppressed the development of the indigenous strength and wealth of the Irish economy and left Ireland at a permanent disadvantage with a lack of development of industrial and scientific resources, a justification for British imperialism's continued bullying.

Marx points out that there are two periods within the 1800's (the third stage of the colonisation of

Ireland). First from the Act of Union to the 1830's and then from 1846 on.

In the first period the peasants were small tenants on the land. They had no tenant right, and suffered every form of exploitation; for example any improvement they made to their land, they immediately paid interest on, in the sense that the landlord would rate their land more dearly and put up their rent. The peasants were suffering from severe over-division of the land and had a very miserable existence - many of the men being forced to work in England for the summers while their families roamed the land, and rents were exorbitant, much higher than those in England. In this period evictions did occur but were not the rule, as the peasants were being fleeced for their labour and produce.

Then things began to change for the worse again, if such was possible, (which it was) and as Marx pointed out this process would be carried on until the English government had got exactly what they wanted from Ireland. They were bent, he pointed out, on the extermination of the Irish as a nationality -- a course which imperialism has adopted all over the world, and which they still follow out, being prevented only by resistance. But the logic that being Irish means your 'guilty' is still the British imperialist creed. The famine occurred in 1846-47, a situation where the peasants were thrown off the land (like the clearance of Scotland) and from which the British government benefitted and the Irish people were made to pay dearly with over one million people dying and a subsequent further million being forced to emigrate to the U.S. or Australia. In 1848, the Young Irelanders staged a rebellion, largely Marx pointed out as a result of the terrible conditions. Then having suffered all this, the Irish people were forced to accept the 'revolution' imposed on them by the British government, that is the 'revolution' in agriculture brought about by the Repeal of the Corn Laws. This changed the situation drastically once again, and further suppressed the development of Irish industry. It is important to note that from 1841 - 1866 the population declined from 8.2 million to 5.2 million. This is a reflection of the fact that (whereas in England at that time, the concentration of the means of production was occurring and industry growing, and these new means of production were able to sustain a much greater population) in Ireland, because of the English colonial suppression of these contradictions, the development of the means of production that did come about could not sustain a greater population because they were directly geared to colonialist needs. In approximately the same period the British population started from something like 9 million and grew very quickly.

What happened with the Repeal of the Corn Laws, Fox points out, was that with the rise of the new industrial bourgeoisie in England, the 'Manchester School' of Bright and Cobden especially wanted to expand British industry by having free trade and free markets, as opposed to the old restricted set up which favoured the old aristocracy and merchant class. With the Repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846 the indust-

rial bourgeoisie decisively gained the upper hand in England once and for all. In Ireland this meant that Ireland no longer had a monopoly of the English market for corn and had to compete with the U.S. and Europe where farming had been able to develop unfettered by colonial domination. The Irish farmers could not compete and started going to the wall - needless to say the landlords were intent on not suffering themselves so they threw the people off the land themselves, 'consolidated' their farms into larger holdings and turned the tillage over to pasture to become a sheep and cattle grazing pasture for England. This forced a massive number of people into the towns to emigrate. The Irish peasants were forced to emigrate because whereas in most countries when depopulation of the land occurred the dispossessed peasantry could be absorbed into industry (indeed this was one of the reasons for dispossessing them), in Ireland because the British had suppressed industry there was no industry (but linen) to absorb them and so they were forced to emigrate or starve. Through this the landlords grew fatter and the plight of the people was desperately worsened. And Marx points out that this marked a complete revolution in Irish agriculture and concentration of the means of production but all done to serve colonial ends.

The English government followed this up very rapidly with the Encumbered Estates Act, which sought to replace the Irish native landlords who were not sufficiently vicious for the likes of the English government with representatives of the industrial classes or from English landlords who had no ties whatever to peasantry. They used this act to auction the estates of those landlords and nobility who were in debt (which most were) and made hated middlemen and rent collectors into landlords.

All this further illustrates the point that the industrial revolution was suppressed and, as Fox points out, because so many had to emigrate the home market went down, so small businessmen and artisans lost money in incomes, and more goods had to be exported to England. This was a vicious circle and is the pattern of English suppression... prevent the people from developing the means of production, prevent the development of industry, prevent the improvement of agriculture..... thus make Ireland dependent on Britain and at the same time complain always against the ignorant and unindustrious Irish. The same logic is used daily in the north - the British imperialists organise sectarian assassinations as they call them with one hand, whilst berating the Irish for being sectarian with the other.

The consolidation of this process, Marx pointed out, contributed to the development of Fenianism as a revolutionary movement with agrarian socialist tendencies, that is enjoying the support of the lower classes against the financial -landlord oligarchy monopolising the land. The Fenians developed a mass movement of support throughout Ireland, in the United States and in England. They contributed to the mass mover

leading to the 1913 lockout and the 1916 rebellion he pointed out, in defiance of those who said that Connolly had no support and no movement behind him. Lenin was proved correct in the development of the War of Independence.

Marx and Engels exposed the hypocritical double dealing tactics of O'Connell and his followers who having no unity with the peasants, used their issues simply as a way of getting support. Thus O'Connell used the Catholic Emancipation and the Repeal issues, but had no intention of fighting for the Repeal as he had already made a deal with the English bourgeoisie in the Lichfield House Agreement of 1835 this was to fight the Tories for repeal but to drop the issues when the Whigs came to power. This Marx and Engels said were the parliamentary tricks that these bourgeois politicians played for their own ends, and the Irish people would never succeed until they overthrew their influence.

Marx himself advocated the programme for the Irish revolution of independence and self-government, agrarian revolution and a system of protective tariffs. This he said was a radical bourgeois democratic reform programme. The Land League, led by Davitt, took up the militant economic platform of Marx for nationalisation of the land, but relied on the bourgeois nationalists like Parnell for political policies and hence failed to become a strong force. Throughout this century Marx agitated in various ways for tenant right for the Irish peasants, whilst the so-called 'liberators' like O'Connell paid little attention to this, and it was only because of the Fenians' revolutionary activity that this issue was brought before the Parliament. Tenant right was fought for and won by the Ulster peasantry, and this definitely helped the Ulster peasantry to establish a better life for themselves, and aided the process of capital accumulation there. This came about however, when the large mass of peasantry in the south had not yet won tenant right, and came about not because the Ulster peasants were part of a better and superior race, but as a direct result of the gains in the class struggle in that area, gains which the Irish peasantry as a whole later won from the English bourgeoisie, who feared the revolutionary consequences of further denying the people this right.

The passing of various land acts, did not change the situation of the peasantry in the sense of giving them all their rightful land, or allowing them to be masters of it; they still had to pay annuities to England, they still only owned a proportion of land whilst landed estates made up the rest, and their markets were still totally dominated by British control. The situation is still basically the same and the numerous small Irish farmers still have the legitimate need for equalisation of the land with the seizure of foreign held or large estates, and the Irish small farmers can never survive whilst imperialist control of the market still exists; this is why they are still today allies of the Irish working class.

With the passing of the land acts and the granting of various reforms, the agrarian question as the central question in the Irish revolution began to

recede. The Irish working class was quickly growing and gaining strength numerically and in organisation. Branches of the First International had been established in Ireland in Cork and Dublin the Irish Republican Socialist Party was founded in 1896 by Connolly and Aveling (Marx's daughter) and the first unskilled (and therefore much more proletarian) union was formed at the end of the century also with the assistance and leadership of the Avelings. Connolly and Larkin began organising the unions, and Connolly especially developed the political consciousness of the Irish workers. The Irish working class emerged defiantly on the scene of history with the 1913 lockout and, under Connolly and the Irish Citizen Army, fought many battles.

Fox shows the attention Lenin paid to these developments, and how he pointed out that the big issue for the Irish workers was to establish independence which destroyed the Irish bourgeoisie and the armed forces of the pogromists in the north who were out for counter revolution. The beginning of the century saw all the class contradictions develop sharply as the Irish workers came forward, and Lenin clearly pointed out that their future was to liberate and unify Ireland and establish a workers and small farmers republic. Lenin opposed the 2nd International sham socialists who claimed that the national question could be side-stepped under the banner of 'international struggle' and pointed out clearly that only by nations achieving liberation could anyone talk of proletarian internationalism. With this he actively supported the need for national independence and Connolly's basic strategy of organising the workers as an independent force into the Irish national revolution.

Connolly, as Fox points out, was a militant revolutionary patriot and a socialist in sentiment but not consistent in his policies. He was to a certain extent a revolutionary syndicalist, and underestimated the need of the working class for a party as the sole path to victory. Thus when Connolly was killed, the working class was left with no party, for a while.

In the book Fox clearly points out that the reaction of Carson and Co. in the north was based on trying to divide the Irish working class and prevent national liberation and socialism. This is still true today and puts pay to the revisionists' notions, and notions of the bourgeois nationalists that the Unionist bourgeoisie are Irish, and on the Irish side, or that the protestant working class is the enemy of the Irish people. It is class policy to divide the workers and prevent victory, so it is the task of the revolutionaries to unite the workers in the course of struggle.

Fox concluded that the Irish revolution is on the last and glorious stage of its path to victory, and that the Irish workers and progressives must pay attention to the experience of the world proletariat and follow the Marxist-Leninist path.

There are many ramifications and important conclusions from this brief but concentrated book.

The main ones could be said to be:

- 1) that the line of the 2nd International followed today by the Irish Labour Party, the present day Socialist Party of Ireland, the Official Sinn Fein, the 'Communist' Party of Ireland and the British & Irish 'Comm-

unist' Organisation is totally counter-revolutionary. It is a policy of opposing the struggle for national independence putting forward that socialism can be brought about in an Ireland which is dominated and annexed by a foreign power.

2) that republicanism, including "left republicanism" will not succeed today. That the slogan, "Sinn Fein" i.e. ourselves alone, was outdated and incorrect as the Irish revolution became part of the world rev-

olution.

3) that the future of the Irish working class is that of leading the Irish revolution, which it can only do as a class, and not through individual workers participating in organisations which are not the class organisations of the proletariat - e.g. the Irish Labour Party or republican movement. The working class can act as a class only through its Marxist-Leninist party.

FOR YOUR REFERENCE

THE TOP MONOPOLY CAPITALISTS IN BRITAIN PART 1

Workers' Weekly, Newsweekly of the Communist Party of England (Marxist-Leninist) recently carried an article entitled "For Your Reference - The Top Monopoly Capitalists in Britain, Part 1" in their No 43 issue. Red Patriot is printing this article because it gives valuable information on the British monopoly capitalist class, the exploiters and oppressors of the British working class and people and of the Irish people through the neo-colonial state in the south and the colonial apparatus in the north.

Future issues of Red Patriot will be carrying articles on the Irish monopoly capitalist class and giving analysis of the way it operates and its main members and components. Readers will find this article from Workers' Weekly particularly useful when correlated with the future Red Patriot articles on the Irish economy. The article reads :

The following article is the first in a series of "For Your Reference" articles reporting investigation carried out on various aspects of the monopoly capitalist economy. This particular article entitled "The Top Monopoly Capitalists in Britain," which is being printed in two parts, looks at some of the main monopoly capitalists in Britain in 1974/5 and what industrial and financial interests (i.e. directorships) they have. The investigation has categorised the top monopoly capitalists as those who have two or more directorships in the Top 100 companies (and also listing those who have two or more directorships in the top 50 companies). This method of categorising means that not all of the monopoly capitalists are included, such as those which have mainly financial connections or those who have industrial connections outside the Top 100. But the investigation provides a guide to who are some of the main members of the monopoly capitalist class in Britain.

The investigation clearly reveals the existence, if proof be needed, of a small but extremely powerful and wealthy class of monopoly capitalists that control all the main industries, financial institutions and in fact the entire economy. It is this class that daily exploits the working class to gain its vast superprofits. While at this time, together with its Government, it is trying to make the workers pay for the crisis, in order to preserve its massive wealth. The bourgeois economists continually try to hood-

wink the people by concocting bogus statistics that this class does not exist, and that wealth and control of the economy being increasingly concentrated into fewer and fewer hands. The investigation reveals only the tip of the iceberg, for these members of the monopoly capitalist class, who each receive huge 'salaries' for every company they are a director of, together with the massive returns on their investment in that company, also control and gain superprofits from many other industries and financial institutions not listed. This they do through such methods as "holding systems", subsidiaries, issuing of loans, direct investment, buying of shares, etc. Comrade Lenin pointed out in "Imperialism, the highest Stage of Capitalism" - "Finance capital, concentrated in a few hands and exercising a virtual monopoly, extracts enormous and ever-increasing profits from the floating of companies, issue of stock, state loans, etc. strengthens the domination of the financial oligarchy and levies tribute upon the whole of society for the benefit of the monopolists". Furthermore he describes how with the development of monopoly capitalism "... scattered capitalists are transformed into a single collective capitalist a handful of monopolists subordinate to their will all the operations, both commercial, and industrial, of the whole of capitalist society"

The investigation also completely exposes the revisionist and social-democratic theory that the problem in the economy is the financiers, who "have no 'responsibility' to the country and who keep on 'refusing' to loan capital to the industrialists". The investigation shows that the main monopoly capitalists are the financiers and the industrialists. With the development of capitalist into monopoly capitalism there has been a fusion of the two, a fusion of finance and industrial capital with the whole of the economy, industry and every other aspect of society being dominated by a financial oligarchy. As Comrade Lenin explained :- "A personal union, so to speak, is established between the banks and the biggest and industrial and commercial enterprises, the merging of one with another through the acquisition of shares, through the appointment of bank directors to the Supervisory Boards (or Boards of Directors) of industrial and commercial enterprises, and vice versa". Also "... Under

the general conditions of commodity production and private property, the "business operations" of capitalist monopolies inevitably become the domination of a financial oligarchy".

In this particular investigation, there are a total of 54 members (listed in alphabetical order) of the monopoly capitalist class who have two or more directorships in the top 100 companies. In this edition of Workers Weekly, the first 17 are being printed.

1. **SIR DAVID HAVEN BARRAN** (top 50) : Shell Petroleum Co. Ltd; BICC Ltd; British Leyland Motor Corp Ltd; Burton Group Ltd; Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce; City Investing Company; General Accident, Fire and Life Assurance Corp. Ltd; Glaxo Holdings Ltd; Hampton Gold Mining Areas Ltd (chmn); International Marine Banking Co. Ltd; Marine Midland Bank; Midland Bank Ltd; Samuel Montague & Co Ltd; Shell Transport and Trading Co. Ltd.
2. **BAXENDELL, PETER BRIAN** (Top 50): Shell Transport and Trading Co Ltd; Shell Chemicals UK Ltd; Shell International Chemical Co Ltd; Shell International Gas Ltd; Shell International Petroleum Co Ltd; Shell-Mex & BP Ltd; Shell Petroleum Co Ltd (Mngr); Shell Refining and Marketing UK LTD; Shell UK Exploration and Production Ltd (chmn); Shell UK Ltd (chmn, mng)
3. **BEXON, MICHAEL LAWRENCE** (top 50) : Dunlop Holdings Ltd; Dunlop Japan Ltd (Japan); Dunlop Iberica SA (Spain); Dunlop AG Germany; Dunlop Belgium; Dunlop (European Holdings); Dunlop Ltd; SDunlop SA France; Industrial Pirelli SpA (Italy); International Synthetic Rubber Co; Lastex Yarn & Lactron Thread Ltd; Sumitomo Rubber Industries Ltd Japan.
4. **BINNY, JOHN ANTHONY FRANCIS** (Top 100) National Westminster Bank Ltd (dep chmn); Alpha Cement Ltd (chmn); Associated Portland Cement Manufacturers Ltd (Chmn); Beagle Nominees Ltd; Britannia Tankers; British Portland Cement Manufacturer Ltd; County Bank Ltd; BTR Ltd; Fulmer Securities Ltd; Hongkong & Shanghai Banking Corp (Lon Comm); International Westminster Bank Ltd -; Law Debenture Corp Ltd (chmn); Tube Investments Ltd (dep chmn); National Westminster Unit Trust Managers Ltd
5. **BOYD OF MERTON, VISCOUNT** (Top 100) Arthur Guinness, Son & Co Ltd (also Viscountess Boyd of Merton); Imperial Chemical Industries Ltd.
6. **BURMAN, SIR STEPHEN FRANCE** (Inst. of Dir) (Top 50) : Midland Bank Ltd; Lucas; Imperial Metal Industries Ltd - Imperial Chemical Industries Ltd.
7. **CALDECOTE, THE RT HON VISCOUNT** (top 100) Alcan Enfield Alloys Ltd (chmn); Delta Metal Co Ltd (chmn); Consolidated Gold Fields Ltd; Lloyds Bank Ltd.
8. **CARROL, DONAL SHEMUS ALLINGHAM** (Top 50) P.J. Carroll and Co Ltd (Chmn); Bank of Ireland (Governor 1964-1970); Carreras Rothmans Ltd (chmn); Central Bank of Ireland; Dunlop Holdings Ltd; Irish Times Holdings; Irish Times Trust; Lloyds Bank Ltd; Rothmans International Ltd.

9. **CARTER, EDWARD ROBERT ERSKINE** (Top 100) Advocate Mines Ltd; Bank of Montreal; Foodex Systems Ltd; Gibraltar Pari-Mutuel Inc; Hambros Ltd; Westroc Industries Ltd; Hambro Canada Ltd (pres & chief exec); Altna Goldale Investments Ltd; Amalgamated Metal Corp; Anglo Scandanavian Securities Ltd; Bank Ruegg Switzerland; Bishopsgate Platinum Ltd; British Amalgamated Metal Investments Ltd; British Metal Corp-Canadian Tokar Ltd; Consolidated Tin Smelters; Hambro Occidental Locmin Ltd; Noctin Securities; Rio Tinto Putno;

10. **CATTO OF CAIRNCATTO, THE RT HON LORD** (top 100); Morgan Grenfell Holding Ltd (vice-chmn) Andrew Yule and Co Ltd Calcutta; Anglo-American Securities Corp Ltd; Australia Mutual Provident Society (London based) (chmn); Australian United Corp Ltd Melbourne; Diploma Investments Ltd; General Electric Co Ltd; London Australia Investment Co Ltd (Sydney); Morgan Grenfell and Co Ltd (chmn) News International Ltd; North Atlantic Securities Corp Ltd; UAL Industrial and Commercial Investment Trust Ltd; Yule Catto & Co Ltd (chmn).

11. **CHAPPELL, EDWIN PHILLIP** (Inst of Dir) (top 100); Morgan Grenfell Holdings Ltd; Bank of New Zealand (Lnsd); Equity and Law Life Assurance Society Ltd; Equity & Law (Managed Funds) Ltd; Fisons Ltd; Guest, Keen Nettlefolds Ltd; International Computers (Holdings) Ltd; Law Reversionary Interest Society; Morgan Grenfell and Co Ltd (Exec); National Ports Council (chmn); Viking Oil Ltd.

12. **CLARKE, SIR RICHARD** (Top 50) Stothert & Pitt Ltd (chmn); Guest Keen & Nettlefolds Ltd; Courtaulds Ltd; EMI Ltd; Orlon Insurance Co

13. **CROMER, THE RT HON EARL OF** (Top 50); Campagnes Financiere de Suez, France; Daily Mail and General Trust Ltd; IBM United Kingdom (chmn) IBM United Kingdom Rentals (chmn) Imperial Group Ltd; London Multinational Bank Ltd (chmn); Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Co; Shell Transport & Trading Co. Ltd.

14. **DAVIS, SIR JOHN HENRY** (Inst of Dir), (Top 100); Rank Organisation Ltd and subsidiaries (chmn); A. Kershaw & Sons Ltd (chmn); Butlins Ltd (chmn); City Wall Properties Ltd (chmn); Eagle Star Insurance Co. Ltd; English Numbering Machines Ltd (chmn); Fuji Xerox Ltd Japan; Irish Cinemas Ltd Ireland (chmn); Pinewood Studios Ltd (chmn); Rank Audio Visual Ltd (chmn); Rank City Wall Ltd (chmn) Visual Ltds (chmn); Rank Advertising Films Ltd (chmn); Odeon Ireland Ltd, Ireland (chmn); Rank Credit Facilities Ltd (chmn); Rank Film Distributors Ltd (chmn); Rank Film Laboratories Ltd (chmn); Rank Hotels Ltd (chmn); Rank Leisure Ltd Services Ltd (chmn); Rank Overseas Holdings Ltd (chmn); Rank Precision Industries (Holdings) Ltd (chmn); Rank Radio International Ltd (chmn); Rank RX Holdings Ltd (chmn); Rank Strand Electric (chmn)

15. **DAWNAY, LT COL CHRISTOPHER RAYEN** (Inst of Dir.) (Top 100) Dalgety Ltd; EMI Ltd

16. **DENT, JOHN** (Inst. of Dir.,) (Top 50) : Dunlop Ltd; Dunlop Holdings Ltd; Moulton Developments Ltd; Redditch Mouldings Ltd.

17. DOWSON GRAHAM RANDALL (Inst of Dir.) (Top 100) : Rank Organisation Ltd (chief Exec); Adam Hilger Ltd; Athenaeum Hotel (Oddenino's) Ltd; Baron Instruments Ltd; Bush (Ireland) Ltd; Bush-Murphy Export Ltd; Butlins Ltd; Charles Berkelev Supply Co Ltd; Choiceview (Holdings) Ltd; Choiceview Ltd; City Wall Properties Ltd; Elmerwise Ltd; English Numbering Machines Ltd; Eshtec Securities Ltd; Hotelvision Ltd; Hotel Medano SA; Irish Cinemas Ltd (dep chmn); Knox-Johnston Marine Ltd; Luke Brothers Ltd; Mercury Yacht Harbours seas Holdings Ltd; Rank Precision Industries (Holdings); Rank Properties Developments Ltd; Rank Radio International Ltd; Rank Research Laboratories Ltd; Rank RX Holdings Ltd; Rank Strand Electric Ltd; Rank Tuschinski Bener BV Holland; Rank Wharfedale Ltd; Rank Xerox Ltd; Ren Tel Ltd; R. O. Exploration Ltd;

Royal Garden Hotel (Oddenino's) Ltd; Solent Yachts Ltd; Southern Television Ltd; Top Rank Bowling Ltd; Tbp Rank Tenpin Bowling Ltd; Tonway Holdings Ltd; Tuschinski Theatres BV; Tuschinski Vast Goed BV; White House (Regents Park) Ltd; Wiltshire Hotel (Oddenino's) Ltd; Murphy Radio (Ireland) Ltd; Oddenino's Hotels & Restaurants Ltd; Oddenino's Property & Investment Co Ltd; Odeon Holdings (Canada) Ltd; Pinewood Studios Ltd; Port Hamble Ltd; Rank Advertising Films Ltd; Rank Audio Visual Ltd; Rank Bush Murphy Ltd; Rank (Choiceview) Ltd; Rank City Wall Ltd; Rank City Wall Overseas Ltd; Rank Credit Facilities Ltd; Rank Estates Ltd; Rank Explorations Ltd; Rank Film Distributors Ltd; Rank Film Laboratories Ltd; Rank hotels Ltd; Rank Leisure Services Ltd; Rank Marine International Ltd; Rank (North Sea) Ltd; Rank Odeon (Northern Ireland) Ltd; Rank Overseas Film Distributors Ltd; Rank Over-

PROFITS SOAR

On September 2nd, the Financial Times stated in a monthly profits survey that the pre-tax profits of the 137 industrial companies that published full accounts in August, were 21% higher than in August 1975, while in July, the profits of the companies that published their accounts in that month, were 15.4% higher than the previous years and in June 10.8% higher. Companies that had above average increases, in their profits included Rothman's International, up 89%, Distillers, up 24%, and Cavenham, up 28%. While companies that have announced their half year accounts in recent months have shown similar increases in

pre-tax profits for example with Shell's rising from £410million in the first half of last year to £658 million in the first half of this year (a 60.4% increase); National Westminster Bank; £53.33 million to £80.13 million (a 50.2% increase); Unilever £102.2 million to £255.3 million (a 150% increase); Royal Insurance Company £16.8 million to £34.5 million (a 105% increase); British Leyland from a £76 million loss to £44.3 million profit (a 90% increase); and the National Coal Board from £12 million to £52.2 million (a 300% increase)

The above news item was reprinted from a British workers industrial paper.

NATIONALISATION IS NOT THE PATH TO ECONOMIC INDEPENDENCE

THE THIRD AND FINAL PART OF THE RED PATRIOT COMMENTARY ON THE PROGRAMME OF THE "LEFT ALTERNATIVE"

The present economic crisis is the most serious in the imperialist system since the crisis in the 1930's, which gave rise to the 2nd World War.

It is hitting the Irish economy particularly hard because this is a neo-colonial state dominated by imperialism. It is on such countries that the imperialists strive to unload the main burden of the crisis so as to avoid confrontation with their own working class at home. Consequently the Irish working class have suffered an extremely high rate of inflation and great reduction of living standards.

It is a law of history that where there is oppression there is resistance and the Irish workers are fighting back to defend and improve their living standards. The old Irish Labour Party has become particularly exposed as the Coalition partner of the Fine Gael (descended from the fascist Blueshirts). It has lost all authority amongst the working class and can no longer charm the working class into accepting cuts through promises of a long-term share in the spoils of capitalism. A new social-democratic grouping has emerged to serve the interests of the bourgeoisie and imperialism called the Left-Alternative"

It is composed of Official Sinn Fein, Liaison Committee of the Labour Left (a ginger group within the ILP) and the sham "Communist" (actually revisionist) Party of Ireland.

This new Coalition of social-democrats made a whole series of promises in their blatantly opportunist document "The Economic Crisis - The Left-Alternative. Amongst these were promises to end unemployment and to put the profits of industry back into the pockets of the people. Previous articles have dealt with those two bogus promises. On a longer term, Left-Alternative also claims their strategy is a means of advancing towards socialism and making the country self-sufficient. This article is to examine the question - would the Left-Alternative's programme of nationalisation establish economic independence? Opportunist to the last, Left-Alternative never actually spell out the target of self-sufficiency, but try to catch the sentiment of the ordinary voter with vague attacks on "foreign ownership", "international monopolies and big financiers" and the mining and export of war materials by foreign companies. Left-Alternative's programme then is to "reduce" foreign dependence by nationalising the banks because "over 50% of the equity..... is in foreign

ownership" and by nationalising the mines and oil wells. On these twin pillars would rest a new basis to develop industry in Ireland - including processing plants and manufacture of finished products. By turning Ireland into an industrial country Left-Alternative imagines they will solve the problems of existing dependence, which they clearly assume stems from the predominance of agriculture in the Irish economy.

This line of Left-Alternative's (originating as it does with the "Communist" Party of Ireland) is simply a rehash of the old Kautskyite formula that imperialism means domination of agricultural nations by industrialised nations. i.e. How to solve Ireland's problem of dependence? Industrialise. Kautskyism is no more science today than it was in the days when Lenin thoroughly demolished the opportunist and bourgeois economic theory in his pamphlet "Imperialism - the Highest Stage of Capitalism".

The basic flaw in the Left-Alternative's programme stems from the revisionist theory that it is possible to gradually reduce foreign dependence and use "foreign investment" to establish self-sufficiency. In fact, a country is either foreign dependent or not. According to Left-Alternative industrialisation in Ireland would necessitate the import of foreign capital to fund new enterprise - "A Foreign Industries Division which will endeavour to attract investment from abroad as the IDA presently does" But this means dependence on foreign capital and Lenin quite categorically states that finance capital and monopolies "introduce everywhere the striving for domination not freedom. The result of these tendencies is reaction all along the line, whatever the political system, and an extreme intensification of existing antagonisms in this domain also. Particularly intensified becomes the yoke of national oppression and the striving for annexation i.e the violation of national independence (for annexation is nothing but the violation of the right of nations to self-determination)". (Our emphasis -Ed.) (V.I Lenin Imperialism, Highest Stage of Capitalism, Foreign Languages Press, Peking 1965, p146). For this reason Lenin explains that imperialism is not limited to the domination of industrialised over agricultural countries, but also over other industrialised states.

In all sorts of other ways, Left -Alternative's programme and the policies of Official Sinn Fein, its most verbose member, violate the Leninist principles which are essential to make a country self-reliant and free of imperialist domination. One example is their desire to "compete" on the "global market of capitalist and socialist (actually social-fascist - Ed.) ... countries". But it is in dependence on finance capital to industrialise that Left Alternative commits their most crucial opportunist error. After all is said, it is this theory which has already guided Free-State government's to date, especially since the go-ahead to total financial dependence in 1958 under the Whittaker proposals. We have only to ask: has the consequence of that policy been to reduce or increase foreign dependence to test the programme of Left-Alternative. Clearly, Ireland is

now labouring under the consequences of a massive invasion of capital. Like a drug addict who has had his supply cut, Ireland is suffering a massive economic depression. Left -Alternative is simply proposing more of the same drug to alleviate the problem, but this will only lead to greater dependence.

While it is true that economic self-sufficiency is crucial to consolidate the socialist system, all Marxists are agreed that seizure of political power is the essential precursor to nationalisation and economic advance. As Marx and Engels said in the Manifesto of the Communist Party: p.57 Foreign Languages Press, Peking 1968):

".... the first step in the revolution by the working class, is to raise the proletariat to the position of the ruling class, to win the battle of democracy".

"The proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralise all instruments of production into the hands of the state i.e. of the proletariat organised as the ruling class; and to increase the total of productive forces as rapidly as possible". It is this fact: the necessity in Ireland to overthrow imperialism and seize state power from British imperialism in the north and the Irish monopoly capitalist lackeys in the south which Left-Alternative is trying to avoid.

The consequences of foreign dependence are clear. Economic dependence has deepened since 1958 and the British imperialists are trying to consolidate enforcement policy in tandem with the southern regime (The Criminal Law (Jurisdiction) Act) and the new acts under the State of Emergency. The emergence of the neo-Kautskyite clique - Left-Alternative - is simply another bourgeois attempt to subvert and side track the revolutionary path of the Irish working class and must be vigorously repudiated. Only people's war to establish national independence and re-unification i.e. the seizure of state power and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat can form the basis of state economic self-sufficiency. To lead this struggle is the sacred destiny of the working class already outlined by James Connolly as well as all genuine Marxist-Leninists. Left-Alternative's rehash of Kautsky's treacherous theories will never divert the Irish working class from its destiny as the leading force in the Irish revolution.

PUBLICATIONS FROM CANADA

Support the 2nd Anti-Colonial struggle of the Angolan people ---- 25p

A Basic Understanding of the Communist Party of China (translated by Norman Bethune Institute - from Chinese edition 1974)

What is the Issue? by Hardial Bains

Available - Progressive Books & Periodicals

ENGLISH PAPER: Workers' Weekly reports demonstration in London to denounce the so-called 'peace' movement

Workers' Weekly, Newsweekly of the Communist Party of England (Marxist-Leninist) carried a report in its recent issue (Nov. 29th) of a demonstration organised by the Party against British imperialist domination of Ireland, and especially against the so-called peace movement. The article is reprinted below. It follows an article in the previous issue of Workers' Weekly labelling the Peace Movement as a war movement against the Irish people. Whilst the so-called Peace Movement was occurring in Trafalgar square with all the lackeys of the British state coming out to express their concern to stop the national independence struggle, demonstrations and protests were held in a number of places against British imperialism and this sham peace movement. At Trafalgar square itself large numbers of people protested against the peace movement as they did all along the route. The police, the arm of the British state, brazenly arrested or accosted any demonstrators they could, and promoted the line that it was a crime to protest against the peace demonstration. This shows the inter-relationship between the so-called peace movement and British imperialist interests --- Jane Ewart Biggs the wife of the executed British ambassador to Ireland (a faithful member of the British monopoly capitalists class and member of the British intelligence network) has become a front piece for the peace people, Trafalgar square was opened for an Irish demonstration for the first time in years, all clearly showing that the British monopoly capitalists are going over-board to use the peace movement to smash the resistance of the Irish people, and to force on the people a continuation of war, exploitation and persecution. The Communist Party of England (Marxist-Leninist) having opposed the peace movement consistently and having upheld consistently that British workers must oppose British imperialist rule in Ireland, and link arms with their Irish class brothers and sisters in the common struggle against British imperialism, called a militant demonstration on the other side of London as well, reflecting the revolutionary class sentiments of workers in Britain.

As opposed to the British bourgeoisie's propaganda in the media that the British people are "fed up" with Ireland, the recent demonstration and counter-demonstration reveal once again that there is no such unity of all people in Britain. The interests of the British monopoly capitalists and those of the workers stand in sharp antagonism on every issue as on the Irish question. The British monopoly capitalists are not fed up with Ireland, they are not fed up with all the massive profits they amass yearly from the sweat of the Irish workers and small farmers north and south; they are 'fed up' (read mortally scared!) of the Irish people's opposition to them however. Whilst the British working class, under the lead-

ership of its Marxist-Leninist Party is coming out more and more to express its deep class solidarity with the Irish working class, and support for the Irish people's national independence struggle.

British and Irish workers together will surely bring the total defeat of the British bourgeoisie, common enemy of the two peoples.

The article entitled "Militant Demonstration organised by the Party to Denounce the so-called Peace Movement", reads:

On Saturday morning, November 27th, the London Branch of the Communist Party of England (Marxist-Leninist) organised a militant march through the middle of Barking to denounce the so-called "Peace" Movement, which has organised various demonstrations throughout the country and was holding a demonstration in central London that afternoon. The militant march raised widespread interest and much support for its condemnation of the phony "peace" movement in the crowded streets. A large green banner headed the march with the slogan "The 'Peace' Movement is a War Movement Against the Irish People!", and the marchers shouted throughout the march the slogans "British imperialism Get Out of Ireland!" "Long Live the Unity of the British Working Class and Irish People" and "Long Live the Communist Party of Ireland (Marxist-Leninist)."

This vigorous march in support of the Irish people was in direct contrast to the much heralded "Peace" march itself from Hyde Park to Trafalgar Square, which in fact despite massive publicity and Government assistance was a complete flop. It was attended in the main only by organised religious groups and met with vigorous opposition from patriotic Irish people and British workers and progressive people in the face of outright fascist action by the police, who arrested or attempted to arrest anyone opposing the march, either by placards or even vocally!

The demonstration in Barking and the opposition that the "Peace" Movement received ref-

WORKERS' WEEKLY

Newsweekly of the
Communist Party of England
(Marxist-Leninist)

Vol. 4. No. 43 - November 29th
now available from

Progressive Books & Periodicals
10 Uppr. Exchange st, Dublin 8

Articles include

Break the Social Contract - Make the
Social Revolution

Organise to Destroy the Nazi Movement

lects the growing movement developing in Britain to support the Irish people and oppose British imperialism's colonial and neo-colonial rule in the country.

At the end of the march in front of Barking Station, a Party comrade made a short speech. He pointed out that the "peace" movement had nothing to do with peace, but was a complete sham backed and assisted on a massive scale by the British government and was nothing more than a cover to liquidate the just struggle of the Irish people to free themselves from Brit-

ish imperialist domination. The movement, he said, was openly in favour of the security forces in Ireland for unity and independence, and its leaders were hypocrites and stooges of the British government. Peace could only come to Ireland through ridding it of the rule of those forces causing all the problems -- British imperialism and its main ally, the Unionist bourgeoisie.

At the conclusion of the speech the marchers moved into the crowd and vigorous discussions took place with the local people.

THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT IN IRELAND IN THE LAST TEN YEAR Part 1 'The anti-revisionist miscarriage'

The 'Irish Communist Group', formed around May 1964, was an unholy alliance of neo-Trotskyites and Trotskyites whose sole aim was to keep Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought away from the working people of Ireland and deprive them in this way of a vanguard Party of the Proletariat. Ever since the betrayal of Marxism-Leninism by the leaders of the Communist Party of Ireland (this had occurred by the mid 1950's decisively) the working people of Ireland had been starved of Marxism, and had been kept in the ideological stranglehold of Modern Revisionism. The Modern Revisionists in Ireland, who looked to the new revisionist tsars of the Soviet Union for their guidance, preached the politics of capitulation and class collaboration. On account of the proletarian revolutionary work done by the Communist Party in the 1920's and 1930's, the revisionists put forward seemingly 'correct' views on the situation in Ireland at the present time (i.e. they said that the north of the country was colonially dominated in the north and neo-colonially dominated in the south by British imperialism) and they used this to give revolutionary credibility to their actual bankrupt programme of peaceful parliamentary reform and merely acted as the agents of the Irish capitalist class in vigorously opposing revolution and the mass struggles of the Irish people under the hoax that "people in Ireland are too conservative", 'anti-communist', 'too imbued with religion' etc. With the sharp struggle internationally to expose modern Soviet Revisionism, spearheaded by the Communist Party of China and the Party of Labour of Albania, a great anti-revisionist movement developed throughout the world in the 1960's to re-establish Marxist-Leninist centres in each country and propel revolution forwards.

In Ireland, as elsewhere, there was a crying need for a vanguard Party of the Proletariat, and a trend came into being in the 1960's claiming that its intention was to build such a Party. This trend was the "Irish Communist Group"; history has since proven, however, that this group was, right from its very inception, the complete opposite of what it claimed itself to be. Differences in political line between the Irish Communist Group and the Internationalists (forerunner of the CPI(M-L)) existed at that time,

but were not the main feature of the relations in the 1960's. The fact that these differences have grown since that time, to such an extent that one of the organisations formed from the Irish Communist Group (i.e. the Irish Communist Organisation and later the British and Irish Communist Organisation), more accurately called the British and Irish Trotskyite Organisation because of its avowed trotskyite line) has degenerated over the last three or four years into a small clique of trotskyite thugs and agents of British imperialism masquerading under a Marxist-Leninist signboard, shows the importance of those differences. This historical experience merits attention today, because it is significant to see what the 'left republicanism' of the Irish Communist Group incorporating the non-Marxist and chauvinistic analysis of recent history and events with the 'left' trotskyite line, has led to today. This history provides us with clear experience to be consistently vigilant against left republicanism and trotskyism and the national chauvinist interpretation of Irish history.

ORIGIN OF THE IRISH COMMUNIST GROUP

The ICG was formed from a split in the 'Committee to Defeat Revisionism and for Communist Unity' (CDRCU) which had been founded by the Marxist-Leninist Michael McCreery to defeat the Modern Revisionists in Britain. One of the leaders of the ICG was a neo-trotskyite by the name of Brendan Clifford, and it was Clifford who launched a vicious attack on Comrade McCreery following the latter's death because "they imagined that they could simply base themselves theoretically on a number of documents published by the Chinese Communist Party, and that the task was merely an organisational one of party building through applying these documents to the British situation, and they discouraged any thinking that went beyond that view. Since the theoretical position of the Communist Party of China was very inadequate, this approach suffocated the main parts of the anti-revisionist movement" (Irish 'Communist' No. 100). This shows that Clifford's clique were never Marxist-Leninists, they have opposed the position of the CPC and have done so to date, and have used hindsight to blame Michael McCreery for not solving every problem whilst they themselves sat on the sidelines with detached arguments and splittist sentiments.

The two main neo-trotskyites in the Clifford clique were Brendan Clifford himself and Angela Clifford (his wife). It was at the instigation of the CDRCU that Clifford began to work to set up a n anti-revisionist alternative to the Communist Party of Great Britain-led 'Connolly Association', but instead of carrying out this work under the guidance of the CDRCU, Clifford led his clique into unity with a bunch of open-Trotskyites led by Gery Lawless and split from CDRCU. As Clifford himself says "The latter decided to make the front organisation independent of the mother, and did so with the support of the Trotskyists". Such splittist activity was to become the modus operandi of Clifford, who was to show that he would stop at nothing to pursue his counter-revolutionary objectives. Although the Irish Communist Group was founded in May 1964, it did not publish any literature until February 1965 when the first issue of 'An Solas' (meaning 'The Light') appeared. 'An Solas' appeared monthly from then on until the split within the ICG between Clifford's clique and the open Trotskyites which occurred in September/October 1965.

As mentioned earlier, the main task of all genuine proletarian revolutionaries in the 1960's was to launch an offensive against the Modern Revisionists and work to build a genuine Marxist-Leninist Party to lead the revolution; it was in this spirit that the Internationalists attempted to unite with the Irish Communist Organisation (the neo trotskyite clique led by Clifford following the split within the ICG) in 1967/68. (See Editors note at end of article) This attempt made by the Internationalists in the interests of proletarian revolution in Ireland was not successful because

- 1) Clifford and his clique showed that they were not interested in the Irish people and in revolution, but rather that they were interested in self-promotion, splittism and disruption of the revolutionary ranks.
- 2) Clifford and his clique showed that they were working class chauvinists and also national chauvinists (for example, they used to denounce the Internationalists for being 'petty bourgeois' and 'composed of students'; they took not one iota of notice of the facts that i) the Internationalists had its origins in the universities in the revolutionary student movement in the late 1960's, and so it was bound to be at that stage mainly composed of cadres from petty bourgeois origin, and ii) the line of the Internationalists was proletarian revolutionary in its content, and the Internationalists were openly stating that without the defeat of British imperialist domination of Ireland there was no future for the working masses of Ireland, they paid not the slightest attention to political line and to the concrete analysis of the concrete conditions of Ireland in the late 1960's but chose to ignore these with other 'Marxist' attacks on students and their defence of imperialism and revisionism in the form of an entire world outlook. Clifford claimed that all culture in the working class was working class because the working class were such true revolutionaries. No bourgeois culture passed off the working class they said, and it was unnecessary for working class revolutionaries to struggle against self and revisionism. This was a flimsy attempt by Clifford and co. to defend

revisionist /trotskyite political line and method they were part of. They used the smokescreen of attacking students and intellectuals as being "bourgeois", whilst they themselves were "genuine working class" to promote not only the anti-Marxist views on students, but also to cover over the fact that under the hoax of being "working class" they were clinging to bourgeois politics and rejecting genuine revolutionary politics.

Although the Internationalists attempted to unite with the ICO in 1967/68, right from the earliest times there was clearly a divergence between the lines of the Clifford clique and those of the Internationalists and the significance of that divergence was to become clearer as time went by. However, further analysis of the writings of the Clifford clique show that throughout the entire writings; there is a national chauvinist view of Irish history -- bourgeois history of Ireland with a little bit of 'Marxism' tagged on to give it the appearance of being a profound Marxist analysis of Ireland. The writings of this clique (and even different articles written by Clifford personally) alternated between two apparent opposites, i.e. narrow nationalism (in which Clifford and his clique laud the Republican Movement to the skies and imply that British imperialism can be defeated through struggle led by the Republican organisation) and the so-called 'labour' line (i.e. the line that the economic struggles of the working class are the most important, coupled with point blank refusal to bring out to the working class the relation between these economic struggles and the national question thus attempting to detach the Irish working class from the struggle for national independence and self-determination. This line and standpoint is ultimately that of classical trotskyism i.e. that the only real struggle is that of the working class against the bourgeoisie; that the struggle is 'bourgeois' and should either be opposed as such, or participated in as a "tactic" to get people on their side. The clique therefore vacillated between the national chauvinist line that the national struggle is everything and that it has no class content, and the trotskyite or "labour" line that the national struggle is nothing or bourgeois. Both of them totally reject the Marxist-Leninist theory of the necessity to build the proletarian party to lead the working class, and to lead the working class to gain leadership of the national struggle. The Clifford clique only manage to harmonise these opposite positions through the peddling of 'left' republicanism which is the bankrupt, national chauvinist line of 'pushing the Republican Movement to the left' as an alternative to making an entirely clean break with the politics of other classes and building the Party of the Proletariat, based on Marxism-Leninism, entirely anew by organising the proletariat around issues it faces as a class. On international affairs, about which it had virtually nothing to say on account of its national chauvinism, Clifford and his clique pushed the entirely rightist line on the Second World War, which advocated that the working class unite with the bourgeoisie of its own country, and this line is entirely consistent with the line that they pushed on Irish affairs.

The line of the open Trotskyites in the ICG (led by Gery Lawless and backed by such opportunists

as Eamonn McCann -- Michael Farrell and others who later became prominent in the People's Democracy organisation were also members of the ICG but did not write in 'An Solas') was different from that of Clifford and his clique. While united with the neotrotskyites, the open trotskyites did not talk of Trotsky himself, but wrote entirely in the style of the Trotskyites, took up the same nonsense issues as the Trotskyists always take up and did all but talk about Trotsky

As soon as the split occurred, these self-same characters openly lauded the dog Trotsky to the skies, thus showing that they were conscious Trotskyites from the beginning. (It also shows the deviousness of the Clifford clique, because it indicates that they made a pact with Lawless and his gang that the latter would not openly support Trotsky himself so long as the unity remained). The Trotskyites promoted openly the counter-revolutionary line of one stage revolution for Ireland with the working class as the only revolutionary class (even going to the extent of pretending that small farmers are really working class in order to "justify" why they should be upholding an interest in revolution". Both in the national context and in the international context, these Trotskyites upheld the reactionary theory of isolating the working class by claiming that at no time and under no circumstances could the working class of any country unite with any section of the capitalist class, and under this hoax they opposed the International Anti-Fascist Front formed during the Second World War to defend the bastion of world socialist revolution at that time ---- the USSR.

As, according to Clifford himself, the period up till the first publication of 'An Solas' was taken up with "Laying a theoretical groundwork" for the Irish revolution (Irish Communist No 100) we could justifiably expect a concerted attempt to apply the science of Marxism-Leninism to the concrete conditions of Ireland. This article will attempt to show, through the pages of 'An Solas' that nothing of the sort was forthcoming, but that the Clifford clique had merely used the period of time to concoct the most outrageous Marxist trappings for promoting all the old national chauvinist analysis of Irish history.

THE LINE OF THE NEO TROTSKYITE CLIFFORD CLIQUE ON THE IRISH REVOLUTION

After all the time of 'laying the theoretical groundwork' the Clifford clique had merely attempted to resuscitate the old 'left' Republican line of Paeder O'Donnell, George Gilmore and the Republican Congress. That line in its open form is to call for the completion of the anti-imperialist revolution under the leadership of the IRA and the Republican Movement, followed by a socialist revolution under the leadership of the Irish working class and its Party the Communist Party. These 'left' Republicans lure the working class into the Republican organisation by covering the national petty bourgeois political line of the movement up with revolutionary 'socialist' and 'pro-working class phraseology'. What was put forward by the Clifford clique was not, of course, as simple and as crude as this openly bourgeois 'left' republican political line, because Clifford owed everything to the fact that he promoted himself as a Marxist-

Leninist and used to walk around with a Mao badge on him. One can only conclude that 'laying the theoretical groundwork' actually meant developing a sophisticated method for putting forward this line while still maintaining some sort of credibility as part of the "anti-revisionist" camp. Basically what his clique has come out with is to promote the 'left' republican position in a cloaked form in one breath, while paying lip service to the need for a genuine Marxist-Leninist Party to lead the Irish revolution with the very next breath. However, as we shall see, this dog was unable to properly cover up his counter-revolutionary tracks and today these can be unearthed and used to assist genuine Marxist-Leninists to be able to differentiate between sham Marxism and genuine Marxism

THE CLIFFORD CLIQUE PUSHED RIGHT OPPORTUNISM ON THE NATURE OF THE IRISH REVOLUTION

Part of their promotion of this right opportunist line on the Irish revolution lies in deliberately putting the wrong emphasis on the question of the relation between the struggle to win independence and reunification of the country and the struggle for socialism. Consequently they stress the SEPERATENESS of the struggles, and make use of the counter-revolutionary theories of the Trotskyites (i.e. that the struggles merge into just one struggle for socialism in Ireland) to make their own brand of opportunism look reasonable.

In an article entitled 'Is there a need for an Irish Communist Party', the leaders of the clique, Brendan Clifford says, "though it may be argued that the achieving of national independence is merely the completing of the Irish bourgeois revolution, and is not the establishing of socialism, the fact remains that the completing of the bourgeois revolution in Ireland will lead to the loss of state power by the Irish bourgeoisie. At the end of the national revolution, Ireland will not be socialist, but the necessary prerequisite for the building of socialism will have been achieved -- state power will have been transferred to the working class and whatever allies it has had in the struggle against imperialism" (An Solas No 5, June 1965) The central issue here is that the Clifford clique use a mechanical "two stage" theory to totally separate the working class from the national independence struggle and therefore the question of the national independence struggle from the struggle for socialism. Having done this they at one time promote the working class struggle for socialism as everything divorced from the struggle for national independence and at another promote the struggle for national independence totally over and above the issue of the working class and its leadership of the struggle. In other words they vacillate between 'leftism' and Trotskyism - the stage of struggle is against the Irish capitalists only, and petty bourgeois nationalist line that the national independence struggle today is independent of the working class, The position of the clique is further clarified in an article by Angela Clifford which is pretentiously entitled 'On two kinds of Mistakes in the Irish Marxist-Leninist Movement' (this article, together with one by Brendan Clifford entitled 'Irish

Revolution and the United Front', both produced in August 1965 issue of 'An Solas', are given as the major reasons for the split with the Trotskyites in subsequent issues of 'An Solas' and later in 'Workers Republic', the paper which the Trotskyites produced following the split). Following is a series of lengthy quotes from this article by Angela Clifford,

"One weakness that runs through most of the Policy Statements (of the ICG. . . . Ed) concerns the nature of the Irish revolution. The statements are vague on this question. They leave it uncertain whether we are working towards a socialist revolution or towards a national, that is to say an essentially bourgeois one. "

"At this particular time Ireland stands in need of a Communist Party , not to lead a socialist revolution, but to lead an anti-imperialist revolution. The leaders of the Connolly Association believe that because the next stage of the Irish revolution will not be socialist , Ireland does not need a Communist Party. But Ireland needs a Communist Party because the anti-imperialist struggle in Ireland can only be lead to a successful conclusion by a revolutionary party of the working class. It is true that an independent Ireland could only be socialist. But this does not mean that the stage of the revolution towards which we are heading is socialist . It is anti-imperialist."

"The anti-imperialist revolution must be followed by a socialist revolution, otherwise it will degenerate and imperialism will re-establish itself. But the fact that the anti-imperialist revolution will have to become a socialist revolution in order to maintain itself does not mean that it will be a socialist revolution to begin with. It will be anti-imperialist, and any attempt to make it socialist would be disruptive, and would harm the development of the socialist revolution".

This position is anti-Marxist, and is in fact 'left' republican. In present day Ireland, only the working class organised as a class force under its Marxist-Leninist Party can lead the national independence struggle. And it will do this as the first item on the agenda for the proletarian socialist revolution. How then can the two revolutions be so totally separate and then juggled about. Defeat British imperialist aggressive domination and its Irish monopoly capitalist allies - is the slogan of the workers - to free Ireland and to liberate the working class. This is neither trotskyite - i.e. that the national struggle is "bourgeois" and "irrelevant". Nor is it petty bourgeois nationalism that the working class has nothing to do with the national independence struggle. Nor left republicanism - that by individual workers and Marxists and "pressurising" and "changing from within" the Republican movement and maybe forming some left wing splits from it, the interests of the working class will be looked after. It is clear to see that petty bourgeois nationalism and "left" thinking of the trotskyites go hand in glove - both attack the necessity of the working class as a class leading the national revolution but from different sides .

The articles all stress that the anti-imperialist revolution will not be socialist, and talk about the anti-imperialist revolution as being a 'bourgeois

revolution'. Although it is correct to say that the first task of the Irish revolution will not be to establish socialism, let us look at what Chairman Mao Tsetung has to say in his work "On New Democracy". He says , referring to the era subsequent to the First World War and to the establishing of the first socialist state in the USSR, "In this era, any revolution in a colony or semi-colony that is directed against imperialism i.e. against the international bourgeoisie or international capitalism, no longer comes within the old category of the bourgeois-democratic world revolution, but within the new category. It is no longer part of the old bourgeois, or capitalist, world revolution, but is part of the new world revolution, the proletarian-socialist world revolution. Such revolutionary colonies and semi-colonies can no longer be regarded as allies of the counter-revolutionary front of world capitalism ; they have become allies of the revolutionary front of world socialism".

Ireland is just such a colony struggling against imperialism, and that struggle is part of the proletarian-socialist world revolution although the immediate programme of that struggle may not be socialist as such -- it is not part of the old, bourgeois democratic world revolution. Why is it that Clifford and his clique emphasise the side of the issue that the Irish revolution is not a socialist revolution and completely ignore the basic characteristic of the struggle in its world context? Taking a look now at some other aspects of the writings of the Clifford clique on the national situation indicate that, in spite of the 'Marxist' protestations throughout the articles that the working class must lead through its party, etc the real reason for this one-sided emphasis lies in the fact that Clifford and his clique were working full time to try to prevent the working class being organised as a class to take up its historical responsibility of leading all the other revolutionary classes in the battle against British imperialist domination of the country ; promoting these wrong emphases is merely a reflection of the 'left' Republicanism of the Clifford clique who were mobilising the working class to participate in non-proletarian organisations under the hoax that the 'day of the working class ' will come later.

The articles all stress a very mechanical relation between the 'anti-imperialist revolution' and the 'socialist revolution' i.e. they claim that the latter will follow the former. This is just like the line of De Valera who put forward the same point of view under the slogan "labour must wait".

The point is, as is clearly stressed in the Editorial of Red Patriot Vol 4 No 41 , that the working class must be mobilised to lead the revolutionary anti-imperialist struggle as part of the proletarian socialist revolution. Comrades Marx and Engels stressed that the working class gravitated towards socialism , and that the working class is nothing if it is not revolutionary. The revolutionary enthusiasm of the working class can only be unleashed around the goal of socialism, and it is with this goal in mind and nothing else that this class can then take upon itself the task of leading the anti-imperialist struggle . Around what other

issues could this class, which has nothing to lose but the chains of exploitation, be mobilised to lead the anti-imperialist struggle? The goal of an independent, capitalist Ireland - that petty bourgeois dreamland? But this is really what Clifford and his clique are saying by making such a mechanical distinction between the anti-imperialist stage and the stage of actually socialising the means of production, etc. As we look at more aspects of his clique's line on Irish affairs we shall see that this was no accident on his part, no 'slip of the pen', no 'misplaced emphasis', but a whole line which was thoroughly confusing what it meant to apply Marxism-Leninism to the Irish conditions.

This line of the Clifford clique on the two stages of the Irish revolution was opposed by the Lawless Trotskyites. True to the trotskyite nonsense that national struggle is irrelevant and even counter-revolutionary, these counter revolutionaries propounded the theory that the struggle had no stages but that the struggle was for socialism immediately - i.e. against the Irish capitalists but not against the British imperialist interference. They claimed that the working class was the only revolutionary class, going to the extent of trying to prove that the small farmers were really working class (and not part of the rural petty bourgeoisie, which most of them are); (there are relatively few farm labourers in Ireland) to justify their revolutionary character. Thus 'An Solas' reflects a struggle between 2 counter-revolutionary trotskyite lines - one opposing Marxism from the right (i.e. the 'left' republican line of Clifford) and the other opposing it from the 'left' (i.e. the 'left' deviationist and liquidationist line of Lawless).

CLIFFORD CLIQUES'S RIGHT OPPORTUNISM LEADS TO PRAISE FOR FIANNA FAIL

The line with the right opportunism described above the Clifford clique churned out anti-Marxist trash about De Valera and the Fianna Fail government until the time of Lemass. They claim that De Valera was a progressive and that the Fianna Fail government which was elected in 1932 represented the Irish petty bourgeoisie which initially promoted that interests of the Irish working class, but only later swung towards the interests of the big bourgeoisie. An article entitled "The Development of Free State Capitalism (Part 1)", describes the petty bourgeoisie like this, "For this reason their loyalties (class) tend to fluctuate between the proletariat and bourgeoisie. At any given time they will support the stronger of the two classes. When, however, neither of these classes is able to dominate the other the petty bourgeoisie comes into its own right, with a particular class interest of its own (which is neither proletarian nor bourgeois, but which often begins with a bias towards the former, and as it develops moves towards the latter and finally becomes identical with it) to seek political power" (An Solas No 1 Feb, 1965).

In order to rationalise this distortion of Irish history they concoct the theory that, as well as proletarian power and bourgeois power, there is a third type of society where there is a petty bourgeois political power. They say, "The

political movement occurs when a politico/ economic crisis finds neither of the two main classes strong enough to take power and hold it, and such a situation often occurs when a crisis hits an under-developed economy: when neither of the two main classes has had a long enough period to consolidate itself. Such a situation occurred in Ireland in 1932, when the Fine Gael bourgeoisie lost power" (ibid). This is anti-Marxist nonsense. According to Marxism, either the capitalist class or the working class holds state power in a country where capitalist relations exist. There is no question of such an intermediary class holding such power. But further, let us look at the situation in Ireland at the time the Clifford clique is describing. The Cumann na nGael government of Cosgrave was in trouble with the working people who ardently desired independence from the colonial yoke. The Fianna Fail government promised various trappings of independence and used the desire of the people for independence to hoist themselves into power. But, once in power, they never did any of the crucial things that would have been necessary to destroy the economic stranglehold that British imperialism held on the 'Republic', and the domination of the country by British finance capital continued unabated. Secondly, this government went about destroying the anti-imperialist movement with no holds barred - but doing with a finer balance of deception and for what the Cumann na nGael government had not been able to do -- i.e. stabilise the rule of the Irish capitalist class in that part of Ireland where the British imperialists had given some trappings of independence while giving actually not a shred of independence. This is the same old trotskyite ideology - i.e. according to the ICO, the petty bourgeoisie - i.e. small farmers, small business, shopkeepers, intellectuals etc have no revolutionary interests and leaning. They always come to support the bourgeoisie according to the ICO. At the same time as calling the petty bourgeoisie reactionary, they claim that De Valera's government was progressive (as a government of the petty bourgeoisie) and further claim that the working class should rely on the IRA.

What a contradictory mess! The point here is that the ICO are wrong on both counts -:

- 1) the petty bourgeoisie have an interest in opposing imperialist domination, and the large majority can be won over to revolution.
- 2) the petty bourgeoisie can only be won over under the leadership of the working class and its Marxist-Leninist Party - there can be no question of the petty bourgeoisie leading the working class - this is class betrayal.
- 3) The idea that De Valera and his government were "better" than the Fine Gael section of the capitalists is a reactionary line promoted continuously by the bourgeoisie. It is taught in schools and is a narrow nationalist ideology - not based on class analysis, but centring on the difference between different sections of the capitalists. The bourgeoisie use it to 'explain' Irish history, not as a struggle between the working class and small farmers against the British imperialists and Irish lackeys, but between the

"Party leaders", "outstanding individuals" and between the 2 main Irish ruling class parties, Fine Fail and Fine Gael.

Furthermore the same view is erroneously followed by various sections of the working class movement and leads to confusion, that there was, or could be a "progressive" side, a "nicer" side of Irish capitalism which could lead the Irish people forwards and establish an independent Irish capitalist economy. Succeed where De Valera failed! But this is a totally false view of Irish history. In fact De Valera and Fianna Fail and Fine Gael all represented Irish capitalism, and were all engaged basically in trying to establish that at the cost of the working class and small farmers. Each section of the capitalists had its particular relationship with its masters - British imperialism, but no section was fundamentally against British imperialism. De Valera, when he came to power never put a halt to British imperialist interests in Ireland, despite the economic war etc. The economic war was a war between the Irish bourgeoisie and their masters for a "better deal" for themselves, not for independence. So to say that De Valera only went wrong later on is confounding the truth. De Valera and Fianna Fail came to power as a capitalist party right from the start. They are against the workers and basically allied with British imperialism; although they had to fight in their earlier days to gain the credence they desired. This laid the basis for the more blatant sell-out to foreign imperialism in the 50's and 60's. To think that De Valera was "better" than Cosgrave, or Fianna Fail better than Fine Gael, or petty bourgeois as opposed to bourgeois is to deny Marxism-Leninism and to interpret history by virtue of individuals and by looking only at what people say, not at what they do.

Similarly today, there is no section of the Irish capitalists left who are going to lead the national independence struggle to victory, or establish or maintain an independent capitalist Ireland.

The differences between Fianna Fail and the Fine Gael reflected contradictions within the Irish capitalist class itself, just as the differences between the Tory Party and the Labour Party in Britain reflected contradictions within the British monopoly capitalist class. To confuse this, and make out that the Fianna Fail government represented the petty bourgeoisie is complete rubbish. Those who argue this point of view sometimes cite the 'Economic War' with Britain in the 1930's as proof of the progressive nature of the Fianna Fail government. All this actually proves, however, is that the Fianna Fail government represented a section of the Irish capitalist class which had some contradictions with British imperialism and was looking for a better deal from that imperialism. Secondly this 'Economic War' occurred in a period where tariffs and such 'wars' were going on throughout the capitalist world as a result of the capitalist world's economic depression, and Ireland was very much in line with all other capitalist countries throughout Europe.

The Clifford clique's promotion of this distortion of Irish history (and their concoction of anti-Marxist theory to back up their distortion) is very much

in line with their entire viewpoint on the Irish revolution. In this case they seek to prettify Fianna Fail to give credence to the viewpoint which they were propagating at that time which was that some class other than the working class organise as a class, was capable of leading the Irish revolution in the stage of anti-imperialism.

c) THE CLIFFORD CLIQUE VACILLATE ON THE ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE IRA

Lastly, as far as the Irish situation is concerned, the Clifford clique's line is clinched by the stand it takes on the question of the IRA itself. Here its 'left' republicanism emerges in its full glory, although once again it tries to cover its tracks the entire time with talk of 'the need to build a Communist Party', etc. Basically the line is the same as the discredited line of Peadar O'Donnell in the 1930's -- the line of the Republican Congress. In the main Clifford lauds the IRA to the skies, praising this and that characteristic and putting them against the backdrop of the counter-revolutionary revisionist parties of Ireland and Britain. The fact that, compared to these, the IRA emerges in glory is proof to Clifford that the IRA is the organisation in Ireland. However, as with every other thing that the Clifford clique touches, the attitude towards the IRA is 'what I give with this hand, I will try to cover with the other'. So, in order to cover his tracks, Clifford makes sure that every time he says that the IRA is great that he also says that the working class needs its own Party.

In an article entitled, "Revisionism, Unionism and Republicanism in Ireland", Clifford practises his deception like this, "The IRA is not the vanguard of the working class. It is more a remnant of petty bourgeois nationalism. It is confused and divided: half the time its ideas are lost in the clouds. But at its best it has a seriousness of purpose which a Communist Party cannot do without. This seriousness is lacking in the present Parties, which in practice are merely Menshevik. A new Party must be established which has the seriousness of purpose, which Connolly had, and to a great extent the Parties of 1921/3 and 1933/8 also had" (An Solas No.3 April 1965). Here Clifford states one thing, i.e. that the IRA is petty bourgeois, etc, and then in the very next breath he is praising some characteristic it has, comparing it with the revisionists, etc. He even goes so far as to compare it favourably with regard to the Communist Party of Ireland in the time when that Party was under revolutionary Marxist-Leninist leadership in the 20's and 30's, and this really shows which side of the fence he is standing on. Also within the quote we can see how Clifford on the one hand one-sidedly praises the IRA while on the other hand he makes unprincipled attacks on it (this can be seen more clearly in later quotes).

BRITISH AND IRISH 'COMMUNIST' ORGANISATION

Trotskyite Thugs, Sham Marxist-Leninists and Agents of British Imperialism. Price 4p.
Pamphlet from the Communist Party of Ireland (Marxist-Leninist).

A series of quotations from an article by Clifford entitled "The Working Class and the IRA" brings out the line in its entirety. All these quotes come from An Solas No 6, July 1965.

"The Irish Republican Army is the only objectively revolutionary organisation in Ireland". "It is, with its political wing, Sinn Fein, the class representative of the small property owners. But over the last forty years, it has consistently lost the support of the class which it represents."

"The petty-bourgeoisie does not at the present stage stand as a class for the Republic".

"But the objective interests of the working class are always Republican. The more conscious of his class interest a worker is, the more Republican he will be". Hence we have two major inconsistencies in the position of the IRA.

1) It is a petty bourgeois organisation whose membership is mainly working class. No. 2 often manifests itself in a contradiction between the militancy of the rank and file and the conservatism of the leadership".

"To deny that the IRA is a revolutionary organisation -- and that, in fact, it is the only objectively revolutionary organisation in Ireland or Britain at present -- is to deny reality. But to assume, on the other hand, that the IRA as at present constituted, is fitted to lead the anti-imperialist revolution to a conclusion is to believe in illusion. IRA propaganda betrays a very incomplete understanding of the necessary class nature of an anti-imperialist war. Its most important revolutionary activity is that it keeps alive the duality of power in Ireland" (2) (the emphasis in this quote is ours - ED).

"The working class therefore has a strong interest in maintaining the duality of power as it exists in Ireland, in constantly putting before the people the circumstances in which the Irish statelets were founded and the purpose which they serve, and in opposing petty-bourgeois pressure on the Republican movement to abandon the duality of power in favour of constitutional work with Stormont and Leinster House".

"The revolutionary workers' movement must establish itself in the lead in the Republican movement; and it must do so by organising its own party. In doing this it will not be in competition with the IRA (which is likely to remain the leading Republican force for some time). A revolutionary workers' movement could in fact only be a source of strength for the serious members of the IRA. Though the IRA retains its petty bourgeois ideology the petty bourgeoisie does not stand unequivocally for the duality of power. Its class interest leads it to waver between the Republic and the Empire; between revolution and reform; between constitutionalism and Fenianism. But the class interest of the working class demands that the duality of power be treasured since it works against the capitalist-imperialist state power of Stormont and Leinster House: It is unequivocally Fenian".

"The class which stands to gain most from the Republic is the working class. The working class is therefore the main Republican force. The cause of the Republic must be furthered by the development of a revolutionary workers'

movement; and the interest of the working class must gain from the existence of a strong and active Republican leadership".

All these quotations, taken together, show that the line of the Clifford clique on the Republican movement can be briefly summarised as heaping praise on that organisation, even at the expense of the genuine communist history of the country e.g. they call for a "reconstitution" of the Republican Movement - as if this will change its nature i.e. that of a petty bourgeois nationalist organisation. Similarly to compare the IRA with the CPI is like comparing the petty bourgeoisie as a class with the working class as a class. The petty bourgeoisie can and will participate in revolution and has done so for centuries in the past (especially the peasantry). The working class however can provide the consistency of policy, tactics and disciplined organisation to lead the revolution. Their line is clearly one of working for some 'left' change within the Republican movement, and seems from what Clifford says (he is deliberately vague on precisely this question) that the intention of the clique was to found a 'Party' as a ginger group to ensure the proper 'left' swing within the Republicans. Whether Clifford himself hoped to become the leader of a more 'left' Republican movement, or whether he hoped to attach himself to the side of that movement and split it thus building up his own outfit is not clear. What is clear is that the clique was doing something along these lines. (The second of these courses of action is more likely, particularly in the light of hindsight. The Clifford clique's method of work has been to nestle up to some organisation, split it and strive to build up his own membership through the split -- Trotskyism in action as disruptors and splitters). We shall also see in the next section, that in other places and on different topics, Clifford was also able to lash the Republicans with a great fury and this lends some weight to the idea that his plan was to strive to latch onto the IRA and then split it. The ICO's line on the IRA is a manifestation of the entire line on the petty bourgeoisie and the working class. They have no sympathy for the small farmer and other petty bourgeois as a class with contradictions with imperialism; but then they see some are in the IRA and promote its hegemony of the Irish national struggle. This is quite contrary to the necessity to build the working class party as an independent party, to seek leadership of the national revolution and in the course of this to unite with and lead the petty bourgeois national elements.

Hence we have seen that on the question of the Irish revolution, the Clifford clique consistently push right opportunism, consistently strive to make the Irish working class lick the bootstrings of the political organisation of other classes, and strive to keep socialism and Marxism away from the Irish workers; and all this under the hoax of a Marxist-Leninist analysis of Ireland. No wonder it took such a long time for the ICO to lay the so-called theoretical groundwork for the Irish revolution! that is to work out theory to oppose it.

bourgeois political p...
emergence of the petty bourgeoisie as a distinct

THE LINE OF THE NEO-TROTSKYITE CLIFFORD CLIQUE ON THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

There is not too much that can be said under this heading, for the simple reason that the Clifford clique's narrow nationalist analysis of Ireland extended to the level that they hardly ever talked about anything else other than Ireland. In fact, in the entire 7 issues of *An Solas* where this clique wrote, only once did they ever mention international affairs. However, when they did, Clifford was their spokesman again, and he churned out a line on international affairs which was every bit as rightist and opportunist as the clique's line on Ireland and echoed the entire position of the 2nd International - - capitulate to one's own bourgeoisie, betrayal of the revolution

The article in question is one entitled "Irish Revolution and the United Front", in which he deals with the situation of the United Front Against Fascism during World War II. Clifford's basic thesis here is that the IRA was thoroughly counter-revolutionary not to have supported the anti-fascists, but he goes further than this and characterises the entire war as being fascist versus anti-fascist, thus castigating the Republicans for refusing to unite with British imperialism from the beginning. In doing so Clifford thoroughly distorts the nature of the world war, erring in such a way as to come close to the social chauvinist theories of Kautsky during World War I.

Characterising the war, he says, "From the working class point of view, therefore, the essential thing about war was that it was a war of imperialist aggression against the Workers' Republic in Russia, at that time the first and only workers' state in existence on the earth, and against the workers' movement everywhere. The main success of Stalin's foreign policy in the preceding years showed itself in the fact that it was not a general imperialist war against the Soviet Union, but that Britain, one of the chief imperialist powers, was at war with Germany". "For the workers in Britain and Ireland this means doing everything possible to intensify the British imperialist war effort, and to make sure that British imperialism did not slacken for an instant in its war against German imperialism; it meant the co-operation of the revolutionary working class movement with British imperialism for the purpose of destroying German fascist imperialism."

Everything that he says on the war stems from this completely capitulationist analysis of the war. Comrade Lenin pointed out long ago that in the era of imperialism there is contradiction between the imperialist powers for world hegemony, and that world wars are bound to break out as the imperialist powers strive to re-divide the world according to their new strengths on account of the uneven development of capitalism. The Second World War was the result of the re-growth of German imperialism following its destruction in the First World War, and its desire to smash up the British empire and to challenge the British imperialists for world hegemony. It was with the invasion by the Nazis of the Soviet Union in 1942 that the character of the

war changed, and that the call was made for an International United Front to defeat Fascism and to safeguard the first ever Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

In the first period of the war, that period which can be characterised as an inter-imperialist war for world hegemony, therefore, the task of the proletariat of the different countries was to oppose the war, to launch attacks on their own bourgeoisie and to fight for socialism in their own country, thus making use of the chaos of the bourgeoisie. In the second period of the war, when the Soviet Union was under attack, the Communist International called for the unity of all possible allies against the Nazis, but even then it was essential that the working class did not liquidate its Party and submerge itself under the leadership of the bourgeoisie of its own country, or give up the task of overthrowing the bourgeoisie as the best possible way of opposing Nazism and the attack on the Soviet Union.

Why was it that the Clifford clique completely turned its back on the analysis of imperialism as made by Comrade Lenin. There are two reasons: first of all because of its consistent betrayal of the interests of the working class, and its consistent right opportunistism on the Irish situation, the Clifford Clique has taken this completely rightist stand on the international situation; secondly because this gives them the opportunity to reveal their real feelings about the Republican movement. Listen to what he says about it during this period, "That such a view should have been held by the leadership of the IRA at the outbreak of the war is easily understandable". "It dared not develop a proletarian outlook. It was unrelievedly petty bourgeois, and it had been completely brainwashed by the ferocious Free State propaganda campaign against Bolshevism which began in 1922 (one of its first victims was Liam Mellows who was first slandered and then murdered) and continued throughout the twenties and thirties, reaching a fascist pitch of intensity in the mid-thirties. The IRA leadership therefore was timid and cowardly in most essential matters relating to revolution. Its sole revolutionary asset was its recognition of the inevitability of violence in the war against imperialism. But this asset, because it had no guiding theory behind it, often became a liability. In many cases it was merely a hysterical acceptance of the need to kill, or an emotional involvement with terrorism. At this stage the IRA leadership can only be called militarist. They refused to deal with the social realities of the Irish situation therefore they were merely militarist. And militarism, especially in the 30's was merely a whisper away from fascism. Some of the leaders quite simply were fascist and shared hysterical delight on the eve of the expected fall of Stalingrad. It is not surprising then that the IRA leaders, most of whom were anti-communist, and some of whom were fascist, should see no difference between the first world war and the second; or should even believe that there was even more justification in the second war of availing of England's involvement in war with Germany in order to engage in military activity against England than there was in the 1914 war, since Germany was

this time engaged in a sacred anti-Bolshevik crusade".

Finally, just to cap his view of the IRA, he says, "The history of the IRA leadership since 1922 has been a disgraceful one of mistakes, blunders and cowardice, with outstanding individual exceptions like Peadar O'Donnell" (ibid)

Hence we see, on the international situation, the opposite to Clifford's line of all-out praise. One minute praise, the next utter denunciation. But the reference to O'Donnell shows how these seeming opposites are in reality combined into one entity -- i.e. 'left' Republicanism. Move the Republican Movement to the left instead of organising an independent alternative through organising a genuine Party of the Proletariat. One day heap praise on it, next day denounce it, but never provide a class analysis of the IRA or seek to unite with it against British imperialism as the communists in the 20's and 30's sought to do.

On this question, just like on the Irish question discussed earlier, the Lawless Trotskyites opposed Clifford. On this issue they put forward their dogmatic and liquidationist line of refusing to unite with any section of the capitalists ever, and consequently they say that the entire line of building the International United Front against Fascism from 1942, until the end of the war was wrong. Thus once again you have the publication becoming the centre of debate between two opposing Trotskyite lines.

CONCLUSIONS

Shortly after these two issues came up within 'An Solas' the neo-trotskyite Clifford clique split from the Trotskyite Lawless clique, the former giving rise to the "Irish Communist Organisation" and the latter to the "Irish Workers Group" which was a straightforward Trotskyite organisation.

However, what we have seen to date about the Clifford clique shows that, right from the start they were presenting themselves as Marx-

ist-Leninists while churning/all the old capitulationist and chauvinist lines about the Irish revolution and class collaborationist lines about the world revolution. The central issue was to try and prevent the working class organising independently around its class issues and to tie it to the petty bourgeois nationalists. Although covering up his tracks carefully back in 1965, it was already becoming clear that here was an avowed enemy of the Irish working class, an emissary of British imperialism. For the present, right from the very start the Clifford neo-Trotskyite clique serves as a useful lesson by negative example to the Irish proletariat. Its combination of narrow nationalist analysis of Irish history and the present, and of the Trotskyites is really an anti-national line the "labour line" are embedded in the early ICG writings and appear as the ideology of "left; republicanism" all parading as an "anti-revisionist" trend.

It is clear that the ICG was not a break with revisionism, but a further incarnation of it in a new 'anti-revisionists' clothing. This "anti-revisionist" trend was a complete miscarriage. The new Marxist-Leninist "headquarters" was built not out of this, but from the Internationalists leading to the founding of the Communist Party of Ireland (Marxist-Leninist). It was no coincidence that sharp struggle occurred between the ICG and the CPI(M-L) right from 1967.

The Communist Party of Ireland (Marxist-Leninist) developed partly in opposition to the bogus theories of this clique, whose main pre-occupation in practice has always been to oppose revolution. That is why it spent so much time churning out sham "Marxism" against the Internationalists and CPI(M-L). The working class and entire revolutionary movement can only learn from the experience and move forward.

Editor's note: this came about because the Clifford clique came to the Internationalists for 'help' as they said they didn't seem able to mobilise anybody, but saw that the Internationalists were making great headway. (To be continued)

NATIONAL NEWS

'Sectarian' killings' used to justify further attacks on the people

Editors note: This article was written before the 10th December announcement that the SAS were to be officially used in all parts of the north, which bears out the points made here.

Since the recent and much publicised wave of 'sectarian assassinations' in the north, particularly in north Belfast, there has been feverish propaganda carried out by the pro-imperialist press in favour of stepped up suppression of the working people, culminating in recent demands from a number of politicians in the north and in Britain for the SAS to be sent into the area to 'put an end to the violence'. This all rests largely on two presuppositions: first that the violence is carried out by "protestant people" because they hate "catholic people" or vice-versa, and secondly that the armed forces of imperialism have some interest in solving the problem.

Both in general terms and in many particular

cases, it has been seen that in fact the imperialists benefit from these 'sectarian killings' as they serve the dual purpose of dividing the people and of providing an excuse for Britain to maintain its troops in this country. Ever since 1969, when the British imperialists sent a large garrison of troops, Britain has used the excuse of 'keeping the two sides apart' to justify its own worst atrocities against the working people. At the same time it has fostered fascist organisations, and sent its regular troops into them to keep them 'on the right lines'. One such case was that of Albert Baker, who admitted to four murders of Catholics while working for the army in the ranks of the UDA. (He also revealed that British intelligence had masterminded the mass murder by bombing in Dublin and Monaghan in 1974).

In order to create conditions for stepped up fascist

against the people in south Armagh, in response to a long series of military setbacks, British imperialism used the incidents in which fifteen people were killed in a week as the pretext for announcing that it was sending the SAS into the area to keep the peace. Apart from the incidents mentioned, the rate of so-called sectarian murders in the area was around one per month. Now the British capitalist press is heaping praise in the SAS for so effectively keeping the peace there, whereas all that has changed is that there are more direct attacks on the people by the army in exchange for less of the 'sectarian killings'. Particular cases are that of the patriot Peter Cleary, murdered while held in captivity by the SAS, and the murder of 12 year old Majella O'Hare by paratroopers. Also there are strong links between the murder of Seamus Ludlow in Co Louth, and various cross-border missions by the SAS, some of which have been accidentally discovered by the Free State Forces. Under a headline proclaiming that the SAS was 'winning the war', the Daily Telegraph gave a number of figures concerned with the violence in south Armagh. Among these was the 'fact' that there are 30 active terrorists in the area; but this is exactly the figure quoted by the bourgeoisie nine months ago. The only victories the SAS can claim are a handful of cowardly murders which have not had the desired effect of stopping the people's resistance at all. All this boils down to the fact that the British imperialists deliberately carry out so-called "sectarian assassinations", through the SAS or one of their fascist movements and then use this as an excuse to introduce their other source of violence against the people i.e. open army attacks.

Similarly in Belfast at the moment, despite all the military and political 'initiatives' of the British government, opposition to the army is not ebbing at all, but is being maintained and even stepped up by the people. Hence the need to confuse the issues, paint all the violence as sectarianism, and use this in a two fold way against the patriotic forces; on the one hand to whip up opposition to violence in general, and boost the so-called 'peace' movement to oppose the national struggle; and on the other to enable the army to step up its use of force against the people.

Going on past and present experience and information it is clear that the British imperialist state is involved in the latest killings in the north Belfast. Some of the statements made by the police and army reinforce this view; for instance when the first killings in the latest 'wave' took place, the RUC said that they thought it was the beginning of a series of attacks and counter-attacks i.e. they knew what was coming because they were part and parcel of the plan to bring it about. The RUC themselves have a special assassination squad in their organisation to carry out their so-called "sectarian murders". Only recently when a number of communists were arrested and harassed by the RUC, one of their leaders openly threatened to ring up his friends in the UVF to attack the communists, and it also transpired that

one of the leading RUC men was actually a British officer masquerading in a Belfast accent. Also in October, when an 'ex'-soldier was killed up the Shankill Road after going there to join a fascist organisation, the RUC knew about his movements in detail for some days, and also the reason for his killing, but at the same time claimed that his identity was a 'mystery'. In each case their predictions turned out to be uncannily accurate, hardly surprising in view of the direct links between the police and the fascist organisations.

It is quite in keeping with this activity for north Belfast to be chosen, as there it is a relatively simple matter to make any killing look sectarian, the region comprising as it does of a number of small 'catholic' and 'protestant' areas clustering together. It also helps the imperialists in fostering divisions between the people where it is not practical for them to build huge fences between the 'two communities' as in other parts of the city. But despite the intensive propaganda about how the people are supposed to hate each other, these killings have not brought about any escalation of sectarian conflict, whereas attacks by the British army on the people always bring

about a rapid intensification of the opposition to them. This underlines the fact that the people's sentiment is definitely not against the 'other community' but is definitely against the British army.

Now that calls have started to go out for the SAS to be sent into north Belfast, there is every sign that the imperialists mean to step up their terror against the people there. While this may assist them temporarily to suppress the patriotic forces there, it will only have the effect of making it very clear to the people just who is basically responsible for the violence going on in Ireland, and bringing the imperialists more out in the open. Far from solving any problems for them, this will merely weaken their ability to confuse the people and accelerate their total defeat. The British imperialist army has systematically tried to divide up Belfast in this way. In every area where people of all religions are living together (as they were doing before the British imperialists escalation of activities in 1969) the army has a) carried out or sponsored "sectarian" assassinations, i.e. 'class' assassinations - the imperialists against the workers of both religions, and b) then either built walls between the communities or forced the people of one religion out. They use this to fuel their claim of there being two communities in northern Ireland, and to divide and try and incapacitate the working class.

It is crucial for the workers of both religions to see that these attacks are directed against the working class and small farmers by British imperialism and Irish monopoly capitalism. It is trying to prevent the growth of class solidarity and class consciousness of the workers.

It is crucial that the revolutionary movement sees the necessity to fight back tit for tat against these activities by attacking the "Godfathers" behind them i.e. the British army, the British government and the Unionist section of the Irish

capitalists and their defence organisations in the RUC and UDR. Most especially the British imperialists however are the architects of this plan and have the largest stake in it. They rely on the fact that a murder covered in all their sectarian window dressing does not cause the massive resistance and hate from the people that open attacks by the soldiers cause. For example by creating a smokescreen around Maire Drumm's assassination, and suggesting that she was

killed by "protestants" they aim to try and disarm the people ideologically, confuse the class and national issues and thus get away scot free with their attacks on the revolutionary movement.

Every "sectarian" attack is directly or indirectly caused by British imperialist intervention in Ireland. The real criminals must be made to pay and the workers united in the course of this.

Hit at the real enemy to unite the people!
Unite the people to hit at the enemy!

British monopolies enforcing higher production to maximise profits

Two British monopoly capitalist companies, the largest in the confectionary industry, Cadbury (Ireland) Ltd and Rowntree/Mackintosh, have in the last months launched drives to enforce new productivity deals on their workers in order to maximise their profits. In the case of Rowntree/Mackintosh the company tried 8 weeks ago to blackmail the workers by refusing to pay the National Wage Agreement unless new productivity schemes were accepted. Since then the workers have been fighting a militant strike and justly insisting that the National Wage Agreement be paid in full (with no strings attached.) What has been pointed out by the workers is firstly, the company have no right to deny them the already signed agreement and certainly no right to add strings to it and secondly, that this productivity deal envisaged by the company will mean lay offs and possible redundancies while increasing the company profits. This is fully born out in the experience of the Cadbury's workers who have recently had a new productivity deal introduced in their factory.

Productivity schemes to intensify production per head of workforce is a part of the general policy being conducted by the monopoly capitalists to maximise their profits. They use the catch cries of 'economic crisis' and threats of redundancies to enforce this on the workers, when the only crisis these monopoly capitalists face is the crisis of how to maximise profits at the workers expense. This is one of the characteristic features of every crisis under monopoly capitalism; the big bourgeoisie use the opportunity to take away from the workers all the gains in wages, conditions, etc that had been won in the bitter battles of the boom period of production thus intensifying their rate of profit and amassing fortunes very rapidly in the next upturn of the economy. In the confectionary industry at this time which is dominated by the big British monopolies of Rowntrees and Cadbury's, it is no coincidence that both together launched an attack on the workers with new productivity schemes.

In Cadbury's where the productivity schemes were accepted after the company threatened redundancies unless it was implemented and the unions went along with this and refused to fight, the workers lose out on every question while the company gains. Altogether the company will 'save' between £500,000 and £1m the coming year as a result while the workers will gain nothing, not even the guarantee of their jobs. Some of the measures adopted are 1) a complete cutback on overtime which for many workers was essential because of the confectionary industry's notorious

reputation of paying one of the lowest basic rates in all industry. While the workers lose on this, the company has organised it so that through a new continuous rotating shift that no production is lost and if anything increased. 2) to intensify production and in the process increase competition amongst the workers to achieve this, the new scheme has changed the bonus scheme from one based on individual or machine bonuses to block bonuses. Thus the bonuses of individual workers depends on the overall production of possibly hundreds of workers in combination. When, as is the case almost daily, some machines break down, the general production drops, so does the bonuses of the entire bloc of workers.

3) The guarantee against job loss was met by a guarantee of permanence for all workers over 2 years service. This is no guarantee at all, because should the company wish to enforce their regular quota of 'limited' (sometimes hundreds of workers are involved) redundancies then there is sufficient workers with less than 2 years service to meet this. If the question of complete closure ever arose then the 'guarantee' of permanency is baseless and these 'permanent' workers would be laid off like everyone else. So the original basis which the company raised for this new scheme i.e. to protect jobs is no more than a smokescreen, with no validity in the real world, and was and is being used simply to enforce higher productivity, cutting wage costs and maximising profits. This is similar to a scheme which is being proposed by to the workers at Rowntrees/Mackintosh and which the company is trying to enforce by withholding the NWA. The instincts of the workers to oppose any new productivity scheme by the company are very much verified by the workers experience in Cadbury's.

In Cadbury's the labour aristocrats which control the affairs of the union and who at every opportunity conciliate and compromise rather than fight for the workers' interests, supported this scheme when it was introduced under the pretext of not wanting to call the managements bluff and this has meant that the workers have gained nothing. This is the same policy of class compromise carried on by the leading labour aristocrats in the ICTU when they accept everything the bourgeoisie throws at the workers and says that it hopes to 'modify' these attacks by negotiations, by going softly softly. The entire experience of the working class has been that it is only through waging militant class struggle and all out resistance to the attacks on them by monopoly capital that anything has been gained. This must

scribed on their banners in every battle
ed today. The rich are set on their policy,
maximise profits by cutting back on living
standards and nothing will deter them from this
urse except the militant and revolutionary
uggle waged by the working class in defence
their own interests. One of monopoly capital's
in planks for forcing cut-backs through is
policy of conciliation and compromise per-
ed by the bought-off social-democrats in the
ade unions, the other is the threat of legis-
ation. This carrot-and-stick policy to drive

the workers down into further poverty must and
is being resisted, with increasing strikes and
other actions .

In the last issue of Red Patriot No . 41, when
talking on the attitude the workers should adopt
to the Tripartite discussion, we said that opposi-
tion to these discussions and intensification of
the class struggle is the path to tread to opp-
ose the schemes of the government/employers
and ICTU. Such is the case at every place of
work where the bourgeoisie are launching att-
acks and the social-democrats in the unions are
selling-out.

EEC MONOPOLY CAPITALISTS ATTEMPT TO GAIN RIGHTS OVER IRELAND'S FISHING RESOURCES

In recent week there has been much discussion
by the respective monopoly capitalist class ' in
Ireland and the EEC countries about the devel-
opment of an EEC fishing policy. At the same
time Irish fishermen have been waging a militant
struggle to defend their interests and oppose
some of the solutions that have been offered to
solve the crisis in the European fishing industry.
The main suggested solutions have been put for-
ward in an all Europe fishing plan which is the
basis for discussion by the EEC ministers. Lets
look at the main features of this plan.

Firstly the plan proposes that a common 200
mile fishing limit be introduced in which all member
states may fish and in which the navies of any
member state may enforce the protection of the
limit and other provisions. This 200 mile limit
may at first seem progressive and in line with
the struggle in the world for control of national
sea resources . However, the plan is an attack
on the national sea resources of Ireland .

The main feature of this section of
the plan is that it cannot serve the interests of
the working people of Europe as a whole and partic-
ularly the Irish fishermen because it is based on
the fact that the huge factory-ship fishing fleets of
the major monopoly capitalist countries have
stripped their own seas of all their fish and it is
only in the seas around Ireland and some area of
Britain that any substantial quantity of fish still
exist. This in fact is illustrated by the fact that
fleets flying the flag of the Soviet social-imperialists
will travel thousands of miles in order to fish
in Irish waters. One of their factory ships, fish-
ing on its own, will catch as much in 200 days as
the entire Irish fishing fleet can catch in one year.
In September 100-150 such ships from the Soviet
Union and their allies were fishing off the south
coast alone, and hundreds more plunder the Irish
seas every year. One of the direct results of this
was a drop of 17% in the Irish fishermen's exports
in 1975. Thus the European monopoly capitalists
are trying to rob the national resources of the
Irish people having anarchistically run down their
own resources. The world catch of fish increased
from 19.6 m (metric tons) in 1948 to 69.7 m in
1971, due to the enormous expansion of the major
fishing fleets and their use of factory ships. However
since 1972, catches have been falling despite the
increase in fleets. In Europe the main areas with
well-stocked seas are Iceland, Scotland and

Ireland whilst the coastal waters of continental
Europe are over-fished. The overfishing of
Irish waters by foreign factory ships have led
for instance to the decrease in herring catches from
48,000 tons in 1972 to 28,000 in 1975. This
anarchy of production is a predominant feature
of capitalism in the stage of monopoly capitalism
which is responsible for the crisis in the fishing
industry as well as the crisis in the world economy
as a whole. As in all other sections of production
it is the working people that is forced to pay for
the crisis. In this case, the monopoly capitalists
are vainly hoping that the people of a nationally
oppressed country like Ireland will timidly hand
over their resources to imperialist plunder.

This brings us to the second major point of
the EEC fishing plan. The plan suggests that
quotas will be fixed for the amount that each
country's fleet can fish. These quotas will
be based on the previous experience of the fishing
industry. Two reasons are given for the quota
system i) It will conserve fishing stocks 2) It
will give every one a 'fair chance'; As already
been pointed out the very cause of the crisis is
the anarchy of production of the monopoly capitalists
which places the maximisation of profits above
all else. Who are they now hollering to about
conservation. In relation to the proposal that
quotas will give a 'fair chance' and 'equal
opportunities (slogans of the monopoly capitalists
which mean a 'fair chance and equal opportunities'
for the monopoly capitalists) this is like the
200 mile limit proposal, a direct imperialist
attack on the resources of the Irish people. Sec-
ondly, the Irish fishing fleet can in no way compete
with the floating fish factories of the EEC mon-
opoly capitalists. As it stands many of the Irish
ships are too small to be able to fish the waters
between 15 - 35 miles, where most of the fish -are
found. Lastly the reserves in the areas they can
fish are being run down by foreign fishing fleets
both inside and outside the present 12 mile limit
(Most EEC countries plus Spain have rights to
fish for certain species up to 6 miles.)

The greed of these profit hungry predators
is clear. When the Irish Free State government
signed the Treaty of Accession (to the EEC) in
1974 one clause specifically stated that EEC
countries would be able to fish up to the shore
in 1982. Having planned the take over then,

they could only wait two years, drooling at the prospect of fresh plunder, before introducing this new plan. This greed is boundless. For years already foreign fishing fleets have been stealing resources even inside the Free States' legal 12 mile limit. Areas like the Porcupine Bank and the oyster beds of Connaught have been severely overfished by British and French fleets fishing inside the 12 mile limit and using outlawed fishing practices - such as using very fine nets which catch the small as well as large fish, thus destroying the chance of natural replenishment. Are we now supposed to believe that they want to give the Irish fishermen and people a 'fair chance' and fishing conservation and protection? The imperialists will only make agreements to deceive the people while they exploit them. The Irish fishermen and people can never rely on those who exploit them to be fair and reasonable.

The EEC commission has been offering numerous 'concessions' and 'safeguards' but none of these are more than promises of goodwill and do nothing to meet the fishermen's demand of an exclusive 50 mile limit; Promises of 'protection assistance', the possibility of a temporary 30 - 35 mile limit until 1982 etc.

The interests of the monopoly capitalists including the Irish monopoly capitalists are antagonistic to those of the working people. The working and oppressed people have no choice but to fight. Red Patriot slautes the fishermen in their militant battle for their rights against imperialist plunder. It can only be through waging such struggles that the working people can win anything and learn how to solve their main problems. Relying on the Irish government to represent them the Irish fishermen would win nothing but capitulation. They are entirely justified and correct to declare their stand and insist that the Irish monopoly capitalists enforce it.

For the fishermen and all the Irish people there can only be one final solution to the problems that beset them - to take the path of revolutionary struggle against imperialist domination - the mainstay of which is British imperialism.

NOTE

As Red Patriot goes to press it has been announced that the Irish fishermen have categorically stated that they will accept no-thing less than a 50 mile limit. Red Patriot extends full support to the just battle of the fishermen.

PUBLICATIONS FROM ALBANIA

Available - Progressive Books & Periodicals 10 Upper Exchange Street, Dublin 8

HISTORY OF THE PARTY OF LABOUR OF ALBANIA

The Party of Labour of Albania on the building and life of the Party

*The economic and social development of the Peoples Republic of Albania during 30 years of people's power
Study Marxist-Leninist theory linking it closely with revolutionary practice*

MEHMET SHEHU Report on the 5th Five Year Plan 1971-75

BASIS OF STRUGGLE

FOR A NATIONALLY INDEPENDENT AND
UNIFIED PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF
IRELAND

This pamphlet is available from Progressive Books and Periodicals, 10, Upper Exchange Street, Off Parliament Street, Dublin 8. Price 10p

PEOPLE'S LIBERATION MUSIC - SONGBOOK

'We only want the earth'

"In support of the Irish people's struggle"
Available from:

Progressive Books and Periodicals
10 Upper Exchange St, Dublin 8
price 40p

AN ARTICLE ON THE FIANNA FAIL ECONOMIC PROGRAMME AND THE GOVERNMENT GREEN PAPER

In recent weeks a whole series of reports have come out from the bourgeoisie on the subject of "producing an economic and social plan for Ireland" and the feature of all these reports are the unanimity of agreement amongst all sections of the bourgeoisie that the workers must pay through 'wage restraint', 'through sacrifices and disciplines' for the imperialist induced economic crisis in Ireland. This cycle of reports began with the Fianna Fail programme which called for 'pay and income restraint' until 1980, continued with the Government Green Paper, which said that 'pay restraint' is the "first priority" to any economic and social plan, and was added to by the recent National and Economic and Social Council report which having 'dismissed' 4 other 'alternative solutions' to the economic crisis blatantly advocated 'pay restraint' as the 'only' viable alternative (for the monopoly capitalists, no doubt) to resolving the economic crisis. In addition to the above, there are at present tripartite negotiations going on between the government, the employers and the labour aristocrats in the trade unions, which have as their object, the ways and means by which the monopoly capitalists can induce or force the working class to 'voluntarily' agree to 'wage restraint' in the same manner which they got the workers to 'voluntarily' agree to a 8% cut in real wages in the recent National Wage Agreement.

The main bogus argument, which the Green paper and the other reports base their call for pay restraint on, is that Ireland's produce must be competitive on the world market, that her goods must be produced cheaply enough to allow this to occur and that at present Ireland's inflation and Ireland's cost of production is above that of Britain and her other competitors. Consequently, the Green paper argues, wages must be cut, restraint must be introduced so as to cut costs etc. This is the same timeworn, nonsense argument which the capitalist class has been presenting to justify every attack on the wages of the working class. In the past, in the era of free competition the capitalists used it to cut the wages of their own workers, in order, they claimed to be able to compete with rival capitalists, now in the era of imperialism when monopoly capital controls every aspect of the capitalist world economy, the bourgeoisie of whole nations use this argument to lower the wages of the entire working class. Look at Britain, at the U.S., Germany or any other capitalist country and the bourgeoisie there are presenting the same arguments to their working class. All it means is that monopoly capitalism is attempting to alleviate its economic crisis by foisting the burden on to the working class. According to the government's economic policy the competitiveness of prices is determined by wages, or by the "wage cost spiral" as modern bourgeois jargon puts it. However, the changes in prices of commodities are determined, not by wages but by supply and demand, or more commonly by the price fixing of various capitalist groups who

have a monopoly of the market and raise prices artificially in order to reap monopoly profits. A good example of the latter can be seen in the manner in which the 5 major oil companies who dominate the world market, continually by agreement amongst themselves, raised oil prices in 1972/3. Then when the government of all the capitalist countries were complaining about the Arab oil-producing countries raising oil prices, these oil monopolies increased their profits from 150% to 350%. The prices since then have not come down. In this case the competitiveness of oil prices was dismissed by the oil companies and instead there was an agreement to raise prices and maximally exploit the people. Another major factor in the case of the general rising of prices, that is occurring is the manipulation of the money supply by governments which cuts the real wages of the workers by devaluing the value of money and thus causing price increases. In this manner the living standards of the working people is cut while the bankers intensify their speculation, their wheels and deals on the world's money market etc. (The effects of this will be dealt with in more detail in a further article. When wages increase either in the case of an individual factory or in the case of the economy as a whole it means a cut in the profits of the capitalists and this is what the entire concern of the Green paper and other bourgeois attempts to foist wage restraint on to the working class, is all about - the reduction of wages in order to increase the profits of the monopoly capitalists. Certain of the more 'honest' exploiters amongst the monopoly capitalists openly admit this and call for the need for more profits. On a recent "7 Days" programme on the economic crisis, Colm Barnes, head of Glenn Abbey and a member of the board of directors of the Northern Bank, called for the need for profits and then qualified that with what he termed "socially responsible profits for investment", "investment which would alleviate unemployment". What a grand manner the monopoly capitalists have for trying to induce the working class to 'voluntarily' participate in the attempts to impoverish the workers, reduce their living standards and strengthen the domination of capital over labour. It is a vicious spiral where wage cuts would allow the monopolies to increase their profits followed by reinvestment in the most profitable areas of the economy (i.e. where wages are lowest and rate of profit the highest), a continuation of this frenzied activity until the next crisis came along and again the workers would hear again the plaintive cries of the bourgeoisie for wage restraint and competitiveness.

The Green Paper says that Ireland's industrial and agricultural goods must become competitive because at present 'all sections are feeling the effects of the economic crisis'. This covers over the basic fact that the finance capitalists are not suffering in any way from the economic crisis. When capitalist economy goes into crisis, as it

TABLE 1
COMPARATIVE SIZE OF NATIONAL DEBTS

Total National Debt* as percentage of GNP
1973/74

United Kingdom	62
Ireland	57
United States	40
Canada	29
Netherlands	28
Italy	23
Japan	14
West Germany	13
France	9

Source : Bank of England Quarterly Bulletin
December 1974

*Excludes debt payable in foreign currencies and debt of subordinate public bodies (except for West Germany)

The figure quoted for the UK includes some nationalised industry, whereas that for Ireland does not, therefore the percentage given for Ireland is understated compared to that of the UK.

Editors note

As this table indicates 57% of Ireland's GNP is owed by the country for our National Debt (see table 2) this debt is based on the loans, bonds, securities etc by which the government raises revenue. These debts are owed to the Kings of finance capital, the bankers of Ireland and abroad.

TABLE 2

BREAKDOWN OF FOREIGN DEBT AS AT DECEMBER 31st (£M)

Currency	Amount (£m)	% of total
Dollars.....	249.6	53.2
European Units of Account	58.3	12.4
Deutsche Marks.....	52.0	11.1
Sterling.....	27.5	5.9
Dutch Guilders.....	24.0	5.1
Swiss Francs.....	20	4.3
United Arab Emirates dirhams.....	16.2	3.5
Belgian Francs.....	10.5	2.2
Kuwait dinars.....	10.4	2.2

Editors note :

Besides the massive growth in the overall national debt, the interest of which is serviced by the taxpayers, this table shows the massive increase in Ireland's foreign debt when adjustments made for the devaluation of sterling are taken into account the £448m debt shown here increases by 20% to £560m. Consequently, foreign loans have risen by £420m since 1972 and amount to 23% of the total National Debt, So as foreign monopoly capital decreases its industrial investment in the Irish economy, the same monopoly capital continues to make profits from the interest rates on loans. Thus these finance capitalist do not lose out but in fact make profits whether the Irish economy is stable or depressed.

TABLE 3

BANK PROFITS (pre-tax)

	1973	1974	1975
BANK OF IRELAND.....	10,689,739	15,299,000	18,087,000
ALLIED IRISH BANKS.....	9,669,182	12,193,000	15,008,000
ULSTER BANK.....	-	6,420,000	6,408,000
NORTHERN BANK.....	-	7,847,000	8,929,000

Progressive Books & Periodicals

10 Upper Exchange Street, off Parliament Street, Dublin 8

Open: 5.30p.m. - 7p.m. Monday to Friday

10.a.m. - 8p.m. Saturday

5.p.m. - 8p.m. Sunday

On Sale:

RED PATRIOT , Journal of the Communist Party of Ireland
(Marxist-Leninist)

NUA CHULTUR - Journal of the Culture and Art for National Independence
Study Group

Periodicals from China : PEKING REVIEW, CHINA PICTORIAL, CHINA
RECONSTRUCTS, CHINESE LITERATURE.

Periodicals from Albania ALBANIA TODAY, NEW ALBANIA

From England : WORKERS' WEEKLY - newsweekly of the Communist
Party of England (Marxist-Leninist)

Works of MARX, ENGELS, LENIN, STALIN, CHAIRMAN MAO TSETUNG

inevitably does every decade or so, the finance capitalists protect their interests. At present Ireland, like Britain is running large scale budgetary deficits and drawing on loans from native and foreign banks and other institutions at high rates of interests which guarantee profits for the banks. As the rate of profit in industry goes down the banks, the centres of the monopoly capitalists, simply invest in government stocks and loans (see charts showing Ireland's borrowing from native and foreign banks). Thus their profits are guaranteed and the peoples' taxes, which are constantly being raised are the means by which they are guaranteed. Last year alone approximately 25% of all taxes collected went to pay off the interest on bank loans to the government.

Finance capital withdraws investment from industry during times of crisis, but when wages are forcibly held down (as the government is doing here) and therefore industry becomes more profitable, the finance capitalists will again invest in industry. This was the case in the late 1950's and early 60's in Ireland, when the First Economic Programme of the Fianna Fail Government, provided all sorts of incentives for intensifying British monopoly capitalist control and ending restriction of the monopoly capital of other countries. Everywhere the IDA advertised Irish industry as an area of cheap labour, with low wages, and where return on investment was very high. The growth of ind-

ustrial investment that followed this period also saw the concentration of the banks to marshal this investment. In the south the Allied Irish Bank was set up merging three banks together, and the Bank of Ireland consolidated its group, by taking over two other banks. Along with this there has been the establishment of numerous new banks with their centres in the U.S. Bank of America, Chase Manhattan, First National etc. It has been from these banks that the loans given to Ireland by the International Monetary Fund are raised and returned with the high interest rates yielding great profits for the banks. Within Ireland the case of the Allied Irish Bank and the Bank of Ireland clearly revealed this in the last few years profit returns (see chart No.3 below).

Capitalist society has now been in existence for two hundred years and the capitalist class long ago came to expect economic crisis and have adapted ways and means to use these crises to their best advantage. Finance capital, the dominant form of capital in the present era ensures that its profits are protected, like in the examples shown above. For the working class the situation remains the same i.e. as wage slaves and who are constantly attacked by capital and whose only path in the defence of their interests is one of resistance to these attacks.

Contd from page 3 - LOYALISTS

By appealing to the Unionist bourgeoisie in this way, the Republican movement shows its aspirations to be only to represent the "Catholics" and not all the people ; to demand a better deal from imperialism and not total national liberation, and in practise to uphold the interests of a class doomed to extinction.

The only true way forward for revolutionary nationalists is to break with such tried and tested - and failed - means of struggle, and to throw in their lot with the working class, the only class that has nothing to lose by the total defeat of imperialism and that can lead the struggle through to the end.

NUA-CHULTUR

*Cultúr Nua do Chosmhuintir
na h-Éireann*

*The new culture of the oppressed
people of Ireland*

JOURNAL OF THE CULTURE AND ART
FOR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE

STUDY GROUP Vol 1. No 3 now available

Available from Progressive Books
and Periodicals, 10 Upr. Exchange St.,

Dublin 8. Price : 20p.

Available from:
Progressive Books and Periodicals,
10 Upr. Exchange St., Dublin 8.



**WE ARE THE
HEIRS OF
NORMAN
BETHUNE**

**NEW LITERATURE &
IDEOLOGY No. 19**

February 1976

Published by:
NORMAN BETHUNE INSTITUTE
1976

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL:

- Organise to defeat British imperialist aggression and plunder - p. 1
Organise to defeat the Irish monopoly capitalists north and south..... p. 2
A comment on An Phoblacht's "Letter to Loyalists"..... p. 3
On the Present situation in the north..... p. 3
What is all this nonsense about the sectarian divide?..... p. 5
Notes on studying - "Opportunism and the collapse of the 2nd International"
by V.I. Lenin and on the struggle against the 2nd International in Ireland..... p. 6

INTERNATIONAL NEWS

- Support grows for Palestinian people's struggle..... p. 11
Mass resistance in Spain to fascist attacks increases..... p. 12
Spanish people protest against death sentences passed on Noel and Marie Murray p. 12
Lysenko, great scientist of the "Russian and world's people, dies"..... p. 13
Notes on studying "Marx, Engels and Lenin on the Irish Revolution" by Ralph Fox p. 13

FOR YOUR REFERENCE

- The top monopoly capitalists in Britain, Part 1..... p. 18
Top Profits..... p. 20
Commentary on Left Alternative's programme: "Nationalisation is not the
path to economic independence..... p. 20

BRITISH NEWS*

- Militant demonstration organised by the Communist Party of England (Marxist-
Leninist) to denounce the so-called 'peace' movement..... p. 22
The revolutionary movement in Ireland in the last 10 years: Part 1:
"Anti-Revisionist mis-carriage"..... p. 23

NATIONAL NEWS:

- "Sectarian Killings" used to justify further attacks on the people..... p. 31
British monopolies enforcing higher production to maximise profits..... p. 33
EEC monopoly capitalists attempt to gain "rights" over Ireland's fishing
resources..... p. 34
Article on Fianna Fail Economic programme and Govt: Green Paper..... p. 35

RED PATRIOT NOTICE

For the months to come (an indefinite number) RED PATRIOT will be appearing not as a newsweekly at 8p, but as a journal. This will vary in its size from 12 pages to anything up to 30 pages, but will usually be approximately 20 pages. Its cost will vary accordingly.

RED PATRIOT will treat all present subscriptions accordingly i.e. will deduct the required amount and notify subscribers in good time when the subscription is running out. Red Patriot invites readers to subscribe by sending £2.50 on the basis that this will approximate to the cost of 10 issues plus postage of 5p i.e. a total of 50p for 10 issues. Red Patriot will accept subscriptions for any number of issues, not necessarily 10.

Red Patriot is appearing as a journal because of the need at this time in the revolutionary movement to clarify a number of issues theoretically and to deal in depth with various trends. We hope all our readers will support this effort and encourage their friends and colleagues to buy it.

NOTE ON THIS ISSUE

This issue of Red Patriot incorporates No. 42 and No. 43 and covers the two publication dates of December 1st and December 14th. We apologise to readers for the absence of No. 42 on the publication date but this is due largely to obstacles which the Red Patriot Editorial Staff cannot avoid but must deal with by revolutionary means. The paper is selling at the minimum price of 30p, but is actually worth more, and we ask readers to donate more than the fixed price in this case. The next issue of Red Patriot will appear on December 28th.

Title: Red Patriot, Vol. 5, No. 42-43

Organisation: Communist Party of Ireland (Marxist-Leninist)

Date: 1976

Downloaded from the Irish Left Archive.

Visit www.leftarchive.ie

The Irish Left Archive is provided as a non-commercial historical resource, open to all, and has reproduced this document as an accessible digital reference. Copyright remains with its original authors. If used on other sites, we would appreciate a link back and reference to the Irish Left Archive, in addition to the original creators. For re-publication, commercial, or other uses, please contact the original owners. If documents provided to the Irish Left Archive have been created for or added to other online archives, please inform us so sources can be credited.