

2/6

THE ECONOMICS OF PARTITION

IRISH COMMUNIST ORGANISATION

THEORY AND THE WORKING CLASS MOVEMENT

"...theory, and theory alone, can give the movement confidence, the power of orientation, and an understanding of the inner relation of surrounding events; for it, and it alone, can help practice to realise not only how and in which direction classes are moving at the present time, but also how and in which direction they will move in the near future. None other than Lenin uttered and repeated scores of times the well-known thesis that:

•
'Without a revolutionary theory
there can be no revolutionary
movement.'

J.V. STALIN: "The Foundations of Leninism"

CONTENTS

PREFACE TO THE 2nd EDITION	1.
WHAT IS THE SIX COUNTIES?	2.
ECONOMICS AND PARTITION part one	5.
ECONOMICS AND PARTITION part two	14.
THE EVOLUTION OF CAPITALISM IN THE 26 COUNTIES (Economics and Protection; Protection and Progressiveness; Protectionism Comes to Grief.)	19.
THE NORTHERN RULING CLASS (A Unionist Analysis: 1904; "Who is to do the Coercion"; Political Failure of Industrial Bourgeoisie; The Isolated Vanguard of the Upper Class; Plunkett and Connolly; "Ulster Under Home Rule".)	29.
THE CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT (The Unionists; The Working Class.)	42.
APPENDIX ON PAISLEYISM	49.

IRISH COMMUNIST ORGANISATION

1st Edition: January 1969.***** 2nd Edition: Nov. 1969.

PREFACE

to the 2nd edition

Since "THE ECONOMICS OF PARTITION" was published ten months ago the correctness of its analysis of the Partition situation, and of the current crisis in Ulster, have been put beyond all ~~doubt~~ by the political developments in Ulster. In its main outlines the I.C.O. analysis can no longer be denied by anybody who thinks at all. In the course of the summer the "uneven development of capitalism" explanation began to turn up even in the staunchest anti-Communist circles - notably in the Trotskyist groups - though, of course, no mention was made of its Stalinist origins. Indeed, the crisis in Ulster made it more than plain that the explanations of the Partition question which have been circulated in the working class movement for many decades by opportunists of every description were utterly bankrupt, and that if opportunism was to continue to spread confusion in the working class on the scale that it has hitherto done, it would have to undergo a certain "theoretical" development.

Hence it is to be expected that in the near future opportunism will attempt to regain some credibility on the Ulster question by circulating a suitable distortion of the I.C.O. analysis, an analysis which can no longer be ignored by the political representatives of capitalism in the Irish working class movement. But, for the moment, the bankruptcy of all analyses apart from the Communist one is obvious and total.

The pamphlet is made up of three articles published in 'The Irish Communist' in 1967/8, plus a further three added at the last moment before publication in response to pressure of events. It was intended to re-draft it and give it better shape for the second edition. But the pressure of events has intensified, and the second edition was required before that opportunity presented itself; hence it has simply been reprinted with a number of minor additions and omissions.

A pamphlet on the Politics of Partition, in which the whole matter is dealt with more systematically and comprehensively, is in preparation.

IRISH COMMUNIST ORGANISATION

November, 1969.

WHAT IS THE SIX COUNTIES ?

The political problems facing the working class in the 6 Counties are very complex, and over the past 25 years very little has been done towards sorting out these complexities. --- A number of articles on the 6 Counties have been published in THE IRISH COMMUNIST. While these did little more than acknowledge that the problems exist, that was still more than had been done by most other organisations which, by their terms of existence, should feel obliged to deal with those problems.

All social questions must be dealt with historically. The present situation can only be understood if it is understood how it came about. In the 6 Counties the present situation is complex as a result of a very complex history. But the very complexity in the 6 Counties, which makes it all the more necessary to understand it historically, tends to bring about a desire to scrap history and start afresh with none of the prejudices and preconceptions which are the product of history. But it isn't possible to simply wipe the slate clean because the writing on it is too confused. The products of the history of the 6 Counties are firmly embedded in the actual social structure of the 6 Counties, and any attempt to ignore them only leads to loss of contact with reality. "The history of all past generations lies like a nightmare on the brains of the living." That was said by Marx, who also showed that the only way out of the nightmare was through historical analysis.

What is the 6 Counties? Nationally, it is part of the Irish nation. Politically, it is part of the British state. Economically - for the past century and more - the dominant industry has been a section of British capitalism (from the end of the 19th century, monopoly capitalism) which jutted into the 6 Counties.

There is a very important difference between large-scale capitalism in the 6 Counties and in the rest of the United Kingdom. Large-scale capital in the 6 Counties is part of the U.K. mass of capital. It is based on the same market. But, whereas in England monopoly capitalism arose systematically out of the large-scale production of the middle ages, finding its own markets all the way, and adjusting society to itself at each stage in its growth by whatever inhuman methods were necessary, in the 6 Counties no such thing happened. At a time when the British merchant adventurers were plundering the world to gather "primitive accumulation" for large-scale capitalist production (16th and 17th centuries), the North was the last stronghold of Celtic, tribal Ireland. With regard to capitalist production it lagged far behind the rest of the country. Then, suddenly in the 18th century large-scale bourgeois production appeared in the North-East. It was based on the British market. (It was in fact

a section of British capital which engaged in production there. It did not arise out of the contradictions of society in the North East.*)

In Britain the rise of capitalism over the centuries caused the extermination of the peasantry and the rooting out of the feudal ideology. In the North monopoly capitalism came into existence in a society which was thick with the remnants of pre-capitalist modes of production. There never was, and there is not now, a base in the 6 Counties for the kind of large-scale capitalist production which predominates there. And there was not a base for it in Irish society as a whole. It was based on Britain's imperialist markets.

This enormous contradiction between monopoly capitalist production and the largely pre-capitalist society in which it existed is the root cause of many things. It is the main reason why the politics of British capitalism are more or less fascist in the 6 Counties while they are "bourgeois-democratic" in the rest of the United Kingdom. And it is the reason for the Home Rule conflicts.

It has been said that Northern industry would harmonise naturally with Southern agriculture in an independent Ireland. But this was not so. At least it was not so within a bourgeois framework. The big capitalist industries in the North could only exist on the basis of an imperialist market. The rising middle class in the South needed protection against the imperialist market in order to develop their small-scale manufacture. The conflict between them did not arise because the Southern middle class loved the green and the Northern industrialists loved the Union Jack. Their conflict on the national question was a product of their conflict of interests on the question of money-making.

* * *

D. Greaves' pamphlet (Greaves is the opportunist leader of the "Connolly Association"), The Irish Question and the British People, deals with the Northern Ireland question from an almost entirely legalistic and formalistic point of view. In all these 25 years he has failed to produce a comprehensive historical treatment of the question, and until it is dealt with historically all the proposed "solutions" must remain, from the working class point of view, more or less empty phrases. His failure to produce a historical analysis of the question from a working class point of view has led Greaves into very dangerous territory. In his pamphlet he tells us:

"That the aggression comes from the Protestant side is illustrated by the content of Orange songs and slogans... Against them there are no comparable Catholic slogans. While Protestant organisations exist with an avowed aim of opposing Catholicism...there are no comparable Catholic bodies devoted to the extinction of Protestantism."

(p.14)

*The statement within the brackets is inaccurate. It is corrected in the second article.

In a lecture in Marx House, London, two years ago he produced a comprehensive sectarian analysis of 6-County society instead of a class analysis. And in other lectures and publications he has been emphasising his view that the Protestants exploit the Catholics, and that Protestant workers exploit Catholic workers, or are in a privileged position with relation to Catholic workers. And since this way of going about things is completely at variance with Connolly's way he has had to say that Connolly did not understand the basis of opportunism (i.e. the exploitation of the Catholic workers by the Protestant workers). (In this pamphlet - published about 8 years ago - he could scorn the idea of "privileged" Protestant workers (p.17); but by 1966 he had adopted it.) He writes about "Catholics and other Nationalists", even though on the same page he speaks of the need for "keeping political and religious terms separate."

Add to this sectarianism his completely opportunist views about "the establishment of an independent Irish State" in the 26 Counties which "was a breakthrough for the forces of progress in Western Europe" and what have you but a Fianna Failer. (In this connection he speaks of the importance of making some kind of mystical distinction "between the Irish government and the Irish state". His bright idea is that the government may not be independent even though the state is. Imperialism has kept in power governments which are "hesitant in the realisation of their state's potentialities." (p.12). So here we are back with Micheal Collins and his idea of pretending that an imperialist state is an independent one so that it can be made a "stepping stone to freedom"!)

In his opposition to socialist developments among the Irish workers in Britain, Greaves says that an organisation must be relevant to the state in which it exists, and that it doesn't make sense to make demands on the Free State government from Britain. But this principle is abandoned when it comes to the Connolly Association. One point which has been thoroughly established by Greaves is that there is no 6 County state, that the 6 County state is part of the U.K. state. But the C.A., like the Communist Party of Great Britain, although it exists within the U.K. state, does not extend its activities to the 6 County part of it. The Irish Workers Party says logically enough that its organisation is based on the 26 County state and that the 6 Counties is part of a different state. And where does that leave the 6 Counties? It leaves them in a no-man's land between Britain and the 26 Counties. Virtually all the existing political organisations in both, excepting the solidly bourgeois ones in Britain, eagerly disclaim any responsibility for them. (Sections of the British trotskyist movement also treat the 6 Counties as a part of the U.K. but deny that there is any national question involved.) In all of this we can see clearly the effectiveness of Lloyd George's "solution" to the Irish question.

If the C.A. accepted the implications of its own proof that there is no 6 County state, and that the 6 County state is part of the U.K., it would be faced with the task of attempting to organise the working

class there on the basis of the principles taught by Connolly. Instead of doing that the C.A. (or Greaves) has chosen the comfortable path of opportunism as a sham emigrants' organisation in Britain - minus the 6 Counties

The 6 Counties, then, is a part of the Irish nation ruled by the British state in which the dominant method of production has up to the present been large-scale capitalism based on the British market, and very much out of key with Irish society. It has been put around by members of the trotskyst Irish Workers' Group that the I.C.O. has said these things because of "orders from China". That sort of rubbish isn't worth replying to. The basic facts appear to us to be as they have been stated here. On that basis we will try in the coming months to clear up some aspects of the question.

(THE IRISH COMMUNIST, 1967)

ECONOMICS and PARTITION (part 1)

"Partition arises out of this uneven development of capitalism in Ireland; sentiment won't remove it."
(P. O'Donnell. An Phoblacht 7.2.1931. See I.C.O. pamphlet The Irish Republican Congress, p.12.)

Partition has dominated Irish politics for close on 50 years. If the working class is to act in its own interest in any situation it must have a thorough understanding of that situation. Wishful thinking will get it nowhere. A large part of the understanding of the Irish situation is an understanding of Partition. Until the working class works out an understanding of the real causes of Partition it will be befuddled by the bourgeois explanations of it.

There are two bourgeois explanations of Partition in Ireland, the Orange one and the gombeen one. The purpose of these is not to clarify the real historical facts but to further the interests of one or other section of the bourgeoisie in Ireland. The working class therefore has its choice of two fairy tales. Those who are influenced by the fairy tale of the Southern bourgeoisie have been enabled to engage to a certain extent in progressive politics - but bourgeois politics. Sound working class politics can only come out of a thorough understanding of the past fifty years - and the past fifty years can only be understood if the economics of the previous 100 years are understood.

The explaining of Partition cannot be avoided or by-passed. Numerous attempts have been made to by-pass it. The Socialist Party of Ireland, for example, issued a manifesto in 1950 which said in effect: "To hell with all bourgeois politics and all talk about Partition. The workers on the south of the border are exploited just the same as those in the

North. Let's have a movement of all the Irish workers against all the Irish bosses". Spirited words! But where is the S.P.I. today? Where is last winter's snow?

Partition and the politics of Partition exist. They will not be overcome by a pretence that they do not exist. They will not be overcome by slogans no matter how stimulating the slogans are or how loud they are shouted. Neither will they be overcome by all the cunning and "tactics" of Desmond Greaves. There is only one way in which the Irish working class can free itself from the bourgeois influence of the politics deriving from Partition - and that is by a thorough understanding of the economics and politics of Partition.

The working class has only two weapons in its fight to abolish capitalism: theory and organisation. And the working class cannot act in such a way as to further its own class interest unless it has a clear understanding of the situation it exists in. While it re-acts more or less unconsciously to developments in the bourgeois system the system will remain. It is only when it acts on the basis of a clear understanding of the bourgeois system, and of the peculiarities of the system in the national situation in which it finds itself, that it acts towards putting an end to the bourgeois system. That is why Marx said that the working class is the most theoretical class in all of history.

The Irish national situation includes Partition and the rival bourgeois ideologies and politics which have their roots in Partition. Since 1922 workers on both sides of the border have wished for a united working class political movement despite Partition, but the intensified pressure of bourgeois ideology resulting from Partition prevented a united political movement (or even two separate political movements) of the working class from developing. The greater the pressure of bourgeois ideology the more the objective situation needs to be understood in order to develop working class politics. But the Irish working class remained dominated by the rival bourgeois views on Partition. While this state of affairs continued the only united movement that could develop was one that resulted from bourgeois politics: from changes in relations between 'Ulster' capitalism and 26 County capitalism.

TWO KINDS OF HISTORY

History can be written in two ways. Real history can be blurred and an interpretation can be given to historical events which serves some "tactic" of the moment. Or the real course of history can be laid bare and the tactics of the moment can be scientifically derived from it. For the bourgeoisie only the former course is open. Only a distortion of history serves its class interest. It is a declining class and its chief purpose in writing history is to keep the working class unconscious of itself and of its historical role.

Only the latter course - that of laying bare the real course of history - serves the class interest of the workers. The class interest of the workers coincides with historical progress. The laying bare of real history helps the working class to become conscious of itself ("the working class - the only class whose true interests are always on the side of progress" - Connolly).

The chief task of those who interpret history in the working class movement is to cut through the numerous layers of bourgeois propaganda to the real course of events. In Ireland, where the history of eight centuries of revolts and rebellions plays a large part in popular consciousness, bourgeois historical propaganda takes on a great variety of forms. All of these forms are snares for the minds of workers. One of Connolly's greatest contributions to the working class movement was that he uprooted these snares up to the beginning of the present century. But a whole new set of snares have been planted on the bases of the events of 1916-32, and many of the snares torn up by Connolly have been re-planted with the help of men who say they are his followers.

TACTICS AND TAXES

What is the internal basis of Partition in Ireland? Sometimes we are told that Partition is entirely the result of "Tory policies". Well, it was imposed by a Liberal Prime Minister and was finalised by the British Labour Party in 1949. But whether it was Tory, Liberal or bourgeois Labour Party politics that imposed it, there must have been some internal basis for it in Irish society. If there was no internal basis for it, it could not have been sustained for 50 years. Was the internal basis religious or racial? Was it Presbyterianism or the Scottish planters? If its foundation had been either religion or race the Partition would have been a very unstable structure. And it has not been that.

Desmond Greaves gives this explanation of the basis of Partition in the British revisionist theoretical magazine, "Marxism Today" (April 1966). Home Rule, he says, would have meant that Ireland would have had to bear the cost of Irish social services and the cost of buying out the landlords.

"Clearly any government in Dublin would require to raise considerable revenue. How was this to be done? The national bourgeoisie replied by protective tariffs which would also encourage Irish industry. This Britain refused to concede. The alternative was inevitably a tax on industry for the benefit of agriculture. The most vigorous current of taxable production lay in the industrial north-east. Here also was a predominantly Protestant working class occupying a privileged position in relation to the Catholics. 'We will not have Home Rule',

said the captain of industry, thinking about his taxes, and proceeded to organise the protestant workers under the slogan of 'Home Rule is Rome Rule', so defend your privileges'."

The basis of the opposition by the Orange bourgeoisie to Home Rule was that it would mean higher taxes. The essence of the Ulster Unionist movement was a campaign to keep taxes down. The imperialist hysteria, the massacres, the police state and the Border are all products of a campaign to keep down taxes on Northern industry. My, my!

Peadar O'Donnell's explanation stands out a mile from this kind of balderdash, and brings us into the world of reality (though O'Donnell, unlike our Desmond, has never claimed to be a Marxist). "Partition arises out of the uneven development of capitalism in Ireland: sentiment won't remove it."

The "uneven development of capitalism in Ireland" refers to the fact that a modern industrial capitalism developed in the North in the course of the 19th century, while in the South capitalist industry declined. The real history of Ireland has been greatly obscured by religious and racial propaganda, and by the respective myths developed by the southern middle class and the northern industrialists.

St. John Ervine, in his "loyalist" biography "Craigavon: Ulsterman", remarks: "...it was at Saintfield... that there was experienced the singular sight of a Presbyterian minister, one Birch, who was afterwards nearly hanged, inciting the rebels... to ferocious combat, while a little way off, a Roman Catholic priest vainly counselled peace". (p.19)

A Unionist historian writes about the Union: "Ulster did not ask for the Union. If one of the great Ulster landlords in Castlereagh was its spokesman and engineer, others of her magnates were opposed to it. Among them were Lord Charlemont... Lord Enniskillen... and Lord Downshire... Many of the Protestant gentry were also more or less hostile from dislike of losing the power placed in their hands by the Protestant ascendancy and fear of Catholic Emancipation. Probably the majority of the Catholics in Ulster welcomed it..." (C. Falls, "The Birth of Ulster", p.244).

Up to the Union the idea that Ulster was to be the industrial and reactionary part of Ireland would not have occurred to anyone. Ulster was viewed as the industrially backward and revolutionary part of Ireland up to the end of the 18th century, the south was the centre of industrial capitalism. "Manufacture in the southern provinces... was nearly always worked on capitalistic lines". In Ulster, linen manufacture was a peasant industry which sprawled all over the countryside. "It would seem natural that the southern manufacture, designed for greater efficiency, elimination of waste, and better distribution of risk, should be more successful and more permanent

than the ill-organised industry of Ulster". (C.Gill, "The Rise of the Irish Linen Industry". Ps. 78 and 133)

Yet at the end of the 18th century and the early 19th, the capitalist industries of the south disappeared (except for Guinnesses) while the "ill-organised industry of Ulster" grew into a modern capitalist industry. This change was not the result of any government policies. Nearly all of the government grants went to the southern industries. Nor was the change a result of the Union of 1801. The politicians of the southern middle class held that the Union was the cause of the destruction of southern industry. To this view, Connolly said:

"Please explain the process by which the removal of Parliament from Dublin to London - a removal absolutely unaccompanied by any legislative interference with Irish industry - prevented the Irish capitalist class from continuing to produce goods for the Irish market? ...But neither O'Connell nor any of his imitations have ever yet attempted to analyse and explain the process by which those industries were destroyed." (Labour in Irish History, p.29.)

And Connolly explained that

"...the Act of Union was made possible because Irish manufacture was weak, and, consequently, Ireland had not an energetic capitalist class to prevent the Union... Not that the loss of the Parliament destroyed Irish manufacture, but that the decline of Irish manufacture... made possible the destruction of the Irish Parliament." (p.30) "A native Parliament may have hindered the subsequent decay as an alien Parliament may have hastened it, but in either case, under capitalistic conditions, the process itself was as inevitable as the economic evolution of which it was one of the most significant signs." (p.27).

(It is notable that Desmond Greaves, whose view of Partition has nothing in common with Marxism, writes in his biography of Connolly that Connolly's view of Grattan's Parliament was wrong. The bourgeois economist, G.O'Brien, he says, "correctly identified Connolly's weak point" (p.196). If Connolly wasn't impressed by Grattan's Parliament we can be sure he wouldn't be impressed by De Valera's Oxford Dictionary 'Republic'. But that's Connolly's "weak point", you see.

Here we can see the difference between an opportunist 'socialist' and an honest bourgeois (a rare thing these days). The only serious work on the development of Irish capitalism is "The Rise of the Irish Linen Industry" by Conrad Gill (1925). This work substantiates Connolly's conclusions with regard to Grattan's Parliament and the Union. But the opportunist 'Marxist', Greaves, has, in the interests of peddling his De Valeraite nonsense today, to put it out that Connolly was wrong with regard to Grattan's Parliament.)

AMATEUR CAPITALISTS

The capitalism of the 18th century, the capitalism on which Grattan's Parliament was founded, was a mere bubble on the surface of the society. The capitalists had not clawed their way up from the peasantry and the urban petty-bourgeoisie, as had the English capitalists. They existed on top of a society that had not produced them. Their social base was in England. Very often they were "public-spirited" landowners. Else they were merchants whose capital was got in England (or in the position of middlemen in the import-export trade.) "Manufacture in the South was too much the work of amateurs." (Gill, p. 135).

One effect of this state of affairs was described by Stephenson, an enterprising Dublin capitalist who toured Ireland a number of times and acted as the Irish Cobden. He complained that

"If a manufacturer wants to engage in any new branch of the linen manufacture, there must first be a consultation among the weavers to know if they will allow him to carry it into execution; for in the southern provinces they are to a man sworn into a combination to support a bill of prices they have made."

The gentlemen capitalists of the south were faced with a vigorous trade union movement, and they didn't quite know what to do about it. Their predicament was described in this way by a bourgeois economist:

"Irish workmen... perhaps to a greater degree than those of Great Britain, showed themselves hostile to the adoption of labour-saving machinery... Even in England there were riots directed against the use of machinery, and the reform... was carried by the high hand of the employers. In Ireland this class was weaker and less capable of facing the struggle. Even to this day (1920) it is difficult in southern Ireland to introduce labour-saving machinery into an existing business." (D. A. Chart, "Economic History of Ireland", p. 122.)

Employers were left with the choice of paying higher wages than the industry would bear; allowing weavers to spend part of their time in agriculture; or paying low wages, having frequent disputes with the workers, and probably losing them altogether in a short time... The third was often adopted with disastrous consequences." (Gill, p. 134). But whichever of the three was adopted would have led to the ruin of the centralised capitalism of the South. As Connolly said, "Under capitalistic conditions, the process itself was..inevitable."

PEERS AND PEASANTS

The capitalists of the south were gentlemen and their enterprises were centralised and heavily subsidised. In the north the linen

industry was carried on by peasant weavers scattered throughout the countryside. The linen found its way to Dublin through a complex of fairs. In the early stages of the journey to Dublin it was bought and sold by small scale jobbers and drapers. Every peasant weaver was the seed of a manufacturing capitalist. Every two-penny-half-penny trader was the germ of a merchant capitalist. Over a period of about a century a solid bourgeois class was developed out of these seeds by a process of natural selection. They fought one another tooth and claw. Many were driven down into the proletariat. Luck, cunning and ruthlessness - the law of the jungle - made capitalists out of a few.

Or, as a bourgeois would put it: "That remarkable growth was mainly due to private enterprise working against many difficulties." (Gill, p.81). "When a class of manufacturing employers appeared in Ulster it came as a normal and healthy development, due to increased trade." (p.134). And, when a "healthy" basis for trade had developed, "... the manufacturing class was recruited from above and from below - from traders as well as from craftsmen." (p. 149).

The whole of Ireland was subject to the same laws and the same natural conditions, and Northern industry was discriminated against in the giving of subsidies. What is the basic reason why an industrial capitalism developed in the North but not in the South? It is the difference in the system of land tenure. In the South the bulk of the peasants were tenants-at-will. The average lease was a year. Any increase in the output of a holding was followed by an immediate increase in rent. For the peasant there was no possibility of accumulating even a small stock of capital. He had no reason to produce anything more than his rent and the means of subsistence for himself and his family. Any extra production would immediately be turned into an increase in rent. The rent would be consumed by the landlord, and the various layers of tenantry that lay between him and the peasant producer.

It made little difference to the system whether the landlord was a "progressive" who stayed in Ireland or a dissolute absentee in London. The land system made productive investment in the South of Ireland impossible. The efforts of a number of "progressive" landlords in the 18th century were all brought to nothing by the land system.

In the North the system known as "Ulster custom" developed. Under this system the peasants had security of tenure and could work at improving their holdings. Ulster custom was not a gift from the Northern landlords to their tenants. It was, as every system is, a product of historical conditions and struggle. Ulster remained tribal until the 17th century. It was the last province to be planted. And in fact Antrim and Down, which were never planted,* formed the backbone

*The statement which has often been made without qualification in recent years, particularly by Mr. C.D.Greaves, and which is repeated here, that the Orange stronghold of Antrim and Down are two counties which were never planted, is misleading. It sets up another false histori-

of the system. The history of the system can't be dealt with here. But the essence of it is that the Ulster peasants won security of tenure in struggle against the landowners. This led to an improvement in the value of the land. Once the system had been established it would not even have been in the interests of the landowners to revert to the system of rack-renting.

In the course of the later 17th and 18th centuries a handicraft linen industry grew up more or less as a sideline to agriculture. In 1770 an economic crisis knocked out many of the capitalist industries of the South. In the North it only meant that the weavers spent more time on agriculture. The capitalist class in the North developed gradually, in what is called a "natural" way. After 1820 it began to apply modern industrial methods to linen production. (Linen was the "growth" industry.) In 1830, Derry became the pioneer of the ready-made shirt industry. An engineering industry developed to supply the linen and shirt-making industries. In 1850 the ship-building industry was started. The tribal North became the industrial North, and the capitalist South became the agricultural South.

THE ECONOMIC FOUNDATION OF THE BORDER

The backbone of the Northern capitalist class was an industrial system. But in the South, after the collapse of the 18th-century capitalism, the bourgeoisie were what is called "compradores". They were distributing agents for imports from Britain. They were likely to have capital invested industrially in any part of the British Empire except Ireland.

It is clear from this that the only real industrial capitalism which has ever developed in Irish society, and which is ever likely to develop, is the capitalism of the North. This capitalism developed out of Irish society, but not on the basis of Irish society. The market which developed it was the British market. It was hatched out of Irish society by the British market. Having developed on this basis it could only continue to exist on this basis. It could find no basis for existence in the Irish home market.

(contd. from p.11) -cal paradox. It is true to say that these counties were never officially planted. But, through spontaneous immigration, they were more effectively planted than were those counties which were planted by government policy. There is no paradox in the fact that this spontaneous planting should be superior to the bureaucratically arranged planting.

"In Antrim and Down, no such process of governmentally-directed planting took place at all... In Antrim and Down the transformation, though carried out by private enterprise and not by governmental direction, proved more complete than anywhere else...." (Ulster Under Home Rule, P.xv.)

In the South the middle class nationalist movement relied on protection of the home market to develop manufacture in the South. Manufacture in the South could develop in no other way than on the basis of a protected home market. The policy of protectionist Home Rule was given its clearest expression by Griffith in 1905 (though it was part of the Home Rule movement for decades before that.)

This diametrical conflict of interests, resulting from the different stages of development of capitalism in the North and the South, was the foundation on which the Border was erected. "Partition arises out of this uneven development of Capitalism in Ireland". In the light of this solid reality what can one do but laugh at Greaves' "tactical" explanation of it as part of a campaign for lower taxes in the North?

"Sentiment won't remove it". Since it has its basis in a real conflict of class interest it will only be removed on the basis of real class interest. In 1920 the two parts of Ireland would not fit together to make a harmoniously functioning bourgeois system. No amount of cunning would make protection serve the interests of the northern capitalists. The two could not be fitted together in a system of production for profit, in which the market is all-important. They had conflicting interests in the market.

On the basis of a system of production for use they could easily be fitted together to serve society. But production for use can only be developed when the working class has political power. And the Border became one of the chief means for preventing the development of working class political consciousness, and for subordinating the workers politically to one or other section of the bourgeoisie. In that situation, in order that the working class should begin to free itself politically from bourgeois influence (without straying into the blind alley of syndicalism, or of denying the fundamental importance of the Border), a scientific historical explanation of the situation was needed. But all that was provided by such "Marxist" "followers of Connolly" as Desmond Greaves was what O'Donnell called "sentiment", and a meaningless round of "tactics" and slogans, culminating in out-and-out De Valerianism.

If Peadar O'Donnell (who is not a Marxist or socialist) had done nothing else but cut through all the bourgeois sentiment and propaganda surrounding the question of the Border, with his remark that "partition arises out of this uneven development of capitalism in Ireland", he would still have made a greater contribution to the political understanding of the Irish workers than Greaves and his kind.

There are two bases on which a strong political movement for "unification" could arise. It could come from a strong political development of the working class in Ireland. Such a development has not occurred for various reasons. The other base would be a change in the relations between the dominant forms of capitalism in the North and the

South. Either there could be a run-down of capital in the North, or a build-up of capital in the South, (or both), bringing the two closer together. What is certain is that a unification movement based on sentiment and not grounded in some class interest would have little influence on the course of events.

To say that Partition has an economic basis in the conflicting interests of two sections of the Irish bourgeoisie does not mean that imperialism has nothing to do with it. It still remains a fact that Partition was imposed on Ireland by imperialism against the wishes of the majority of the Irish people. But it was only possible to impose it because it could be rooted in a real conflict of interests which existed ~~with~~ Irish society.

(THE IRISH COMMUNIST, June 1967)

ECONOMICS and PARTITION (part 2)

In the first part of this article (June 1967) it was shown that the economic basis of Partition was the uneven development of capitalism within Irish society: the conflicting interests in the market of the relatively undeveloped middle class which dominated southern politics and which needed protection against the imperialist market to develop, and the big capitalists who dominated northern politics and who needed free access to the imperialist market in order to continue in existence. The conflicting interests expressed themselves politically as bourgeois nationalism and Unionism.

Religion and race were used for propaganda purposes by both sections of the Irish bourgeoisie, but were not at all the basis of the differences between them.

That is not to deny that religion and race were contributing factors to the differing stages of economic development. They were. In the 17th and 18th centuries Protestantism was the bourgeois ideology and Catholicism the feudal ideology. Protestantism encouraged the habits and the outlook that served capitalism, while Catholicism was still at that time defending the feudal system and outlook. Furthermore, among the masses of the "native" Irish ~~the~~ tribal way of looking at things prevailed, while the planters and the immigrants brought a bourgeois way of looking at things with them. While the system of land tenure established in the North was the basic reason why capitalism reached a far higher development there than in the South in the course of the 19th century (even though capitalism had been more developed in the South in the 18th century), religion can be seen as a contributing factor.

But it is only insofar as religion and race contributed to economic development that they can be said to be causes of differences among the Irish bourgeoisie. In the present century their sole function has been to serve as part of the propaganda by which the different sections of the bourgeoisie extend their influence over "their own" masses.

* * *

In 1921 British imperialism made use of the uneven development of capitalism as the basis for Partition. To say, as has been said, that Partition was based on the Northern bourgeoisie is meaningless. To have any chance of lasting success it had to be acceptable to the politically dominant sections of the bourgeoisie in both parts of the country. In 1920 the Northern bourgeoisie agreed to it. In 1921/2 the Southern bourgeoisie agreed to it. The Treaty was the acceptance by the Southern bourgeoisie of the Partition of Ireland.

A bourgeois fairy story is told about this. It is that Griffith and Collins were fooled by Lloyd George, who promised them that the Northern statelet would be made unworkable. They acted in good faith, believing that they were doing their best for the nation. But the wicked imperialists didn't keep their promise. If Griffith, Collins, O'Higgins, Cosgrave etc. were ten-year-olds who had led a sheltered life, this might make sense. Since they were all adults with a wealth of political experience, and with a history of eight centuries of imperialist guile to learn from, it makes no sense.

Both sections of the Irish bourgeoisie agreed to Partition. If either side had refused to agree, Partition would have been unworkable. Both sections went into an alliance with imperialism. When De Valera came to power he too agreed to the Partition and went into alliance with imperialism.

* * *

Different sections of the bourgeoisie do not fight each other to the death. They may at times fight each other fairly vigorously, but in the end they recognise that they have a common exploiting interest to uphold. This can be seen on a personal as well as a class level.

For two years the Southern middle class led a struggle against imperialism in Ireland. By 1921 this struggle reached a crucial point. On the Irish side it could only be continued successfully by deepening it into a thoroughly democratic people's struggle. But if they developed such a struggle the bourgeoisie would be risking their own position as an exploiting class. And the imperialists could see that if they refused to compromise with the Sinn Fein bourgeoisie they would be unnecessarily endangering themselves. So both sides agreed to reach a compromise and spent six months bargaining.

In the previous two years Lloyd George had put the brand of murderer on Collins, and Collins had replied in kind. Yet, during the negotiations, Collins struck up genuinely friendly relations with Churchill and, especially, with Birkenhead who had been one of the leaders of the Unionist reaction in 1911/14.

In 1920/21 all three parties agreed to compromise though each side tried to get as much as it could in the compromise. Thereafter all anti-Partition talk by the southern government was mere talk. De Valera disagreed with Collins and Griffith in thinking that they could have got a little bit more by harder bargaining. After the Free State had demonstrated its worth to imperialism in the 1920s De Valera was able to get that little bit without much bother in the 1930s.

One of the arguments peddled by the opportunists in the working class movement (revisionist, trotskyst and social-democrat), and of course by the 26 County bourgeoisie, was that the separation of the "industrial North" from the "agricultural South" was the basic reason why progress in the south was held back. It is perfectly true that Partition was a base for reaction in Ireland. But Partition of itself was not the reason for holding back industrial development and continuing emigration. If the profit motive were eliminated, and if the people in the south were permitted to utilise the economic resources of the South directly and without concern for the rate of profit a flourishing society could have been built in the South. Partition of itself was not the reason why development was held back in the South.

On the basis of capitalist production a flourishing Irish society cannot develop. The idea that if only the northern and southern bourgeoisie would unite and put an end to partition a flourishing capitalist society would develop, has no basis in reality. When Connolly demonstrated scientifically in 1896 that a flourishing capitalist society could not develop in Ireland, there was no hint of Partition.

* * *

Mr. C.D. Greaves, opportunist editor of the Irish Democrat, writes:

"...partition is the basic precondition upon which neo-colonialism can have any stability in Ireland." (Neo-colonialism and Ireland. Marxism Today, April 1968).

And in an article in Marxism Today, April 1966 Mr. Greaves propounded the absurd idea that the economic basis of Partition was the fear of the Northern capitalists that they would have to pay higher taxes under a Home Rule government than under the British government. Greaves did not refute, or even refer to, the scientific explanation of the economic basis of Partition given by Peadar O'Donnell in An

Phoblacht
explanatio
became a r
socialism
apply it.
like Mr. G

(Here again
by Mr. Gre
the Irish o
al Socialis
Irish trots
bourgeois i
of the fore
explained t
the 6 Count
to the grat
ernational o
be achieved.

Greaves give
reduces the
precondition
bourgeois sy
can only be
the imperial

A study of th
22 shows that
for the Sinn
them to betra
for them to a
would make th
the case of t

Except for the
tensify milita
ority in the D
since, had an
lins (Ireland'
tionist - next
"Ireland's man
the public pla
effective step
workable. And
version of hist
paign in the N
the Four Courts

Partition did n
as Greaves sugg

Phoblacht in 1931, and he has not commented on the proof of O'Donnell's explanation given in the Irish Communist last year. Since Mr. Greaves became a renegade opportunist his only possible attitude to scientific socialism is to ignore it and spread malicious gossip about those who apply it. May all our opportunists be spiteful little opportunists like Mr. Greaves!

(Here again trotskyism takes up the revisionist position established by Mr. Greaves. P. Healy of the trotskyist I.W.G. gave an address on the Irish question to the Harringay (London) branch of the "International Socialism" group - a British social-imperialist group which sponsors Irish trotskyism. (Irish trotskyism responds by hailing T. Cliff, the bourgeois intellectual who runs this social-imperialist body, as "one of the foremost Marxists of our time" - Irish Militant.) Mr. Healy explained that the setting up of the Border was part of a campaign by the 6 Counties bourgeoisie for lower taxes. He further explained, to the gratification of the social-imperialists, that, due to the international division of labour, Irish national independence could never be achieved.)

Greaves gives an absurd explanation of the economic basis of Partition; reduces the question of Partition to the 6 Counties. Now, the "basic precondition" for neo-colonialism in Ireland is not Partition but the bourgeois system. Connolly showed that the bourgeois system in Ireland can only be neo-colonial. Partition came in later as an extra card in the imperialist hand.

A study of the relations between Sinn Fein and the imperialists in 1921-22 shows that Partition was virtually an irrelevance: its significance for the Sinn Fein leadership was not that it put additional pressure on them to betray the national struggle, but that it made it more difficult for them to agree to a betrayal which involved Partition, since this would make their betrayal more obvious and give additional strength to the case of the Republican "extremists".

Except for the section of the Army which was genuinely prepared to intensify military struggle in the North, (and these were in a small minority in the Dail), the statements made about Partition in 1921-22, and since, had an unmistakable air of unreality about them. Micheal Collins (Ireland's most cunning and capable renegade and counter-revolutionist - next to De Valera - who has now become for C. D. Greaves "Ireland's man of mystery") was a great anti-Partitionist blusterer on the public platforms in 1922. At the same time he was taking very effective steps to control the "extremists", and to make Partition workable. And at about the time when, according to the fairy story version of history, the Four Courts Republicans were to begin a campaign in the North with Collins' secret military support, Collins shelled the Four Courts.

Partition did not give strength to the Southern neo-colonial forces, as Greaves suggests. The neo-colonial state in the South was set up

despite the difficulty which the acceptance of Partition involved for the neo-colonial wing of Sinn Fein. If there had been no Partition involved, their treason could have been a discreet, sophisticated affair, and the first major exercise in neo-colonialism could have been represented as a triumph over colonialism. But the need to agree to Partition and the direct military occupation of the North by the British army meant that the treason would be gross, vulgar and obvious.

Partition was not the basis of neo-colonialism, therefore the ending of Partition would not necessarily affect the roots of imperialism in Ireland. It would do so if it were abolished through a revolutionary struggle against imperialism: not if it were ended through the collaboration of the imperialist and neo-colonial forces. The kind of reunification envisaged by the Irish Press and the Irish Democrat would be a reorganisation of the bourgeois, neo-colonial superstructure. The country would be unified as a neo-colony. The Irish bourgeoisie would be reunited. The bourgeois system in Ireland would be re-integrated. The division in the social base of imperialism in Ireland would have been overcome. But there is no reason to expect that a unified bourgeoisie would be a less reliable base for imperialism in Ireland than the divided bourgeoisie has been, or that the 26 County bourgeoisie would become anti-imperialist at the precise moment when it was relieved of the need to make occasional anti-Partitionist noises.

There is nothing to be gained by speculation about what may happen about Partition in the future. But in order to develop the working class position on this question a thorough analysis of historical and current developments is necessary. And the attempts of Greaves and his kind to spread confusion about fundamental questions relating to Partition must be constantly exposed. These creatures do not distort history for no reason.

(IRISH COMMUNIST, June 1968)

If
tal
(if
eco
ie
eco
pub
cal
Cap
sis

Under
nume
prop
comm
the

In th
the c
tical
the e
econo
and t
resen
been
basis
ago.

O'Higg
anothe
ruthle
O'Higg
that h
of his

Pearse
sary a
ness w
finely
O'Higg
the rec
death,
the Cum

THE EVOLUTION OF CAPITALISM IN THE 26 COUNTIES

If the economic basis of Partition was the uneven development of capitalism in Ireland, the disappearance of the economic basis of Partition (if it occurs within bourgeois relationships) means an evening out of economic conditions and a harmonising of the interests of the bourgeoisie in the 6 and 26 Counties. It is the I.C.O. contention that the main economic basis of Partition ended in the late 'fifties. We made and published this analysis in 1964 - a year before the first major political effect of the new economic situation, the first meeting between Captain O'Neill and Sean Lemass in Stormont. A summary of this analysis is set out below.

* * *

Under the leadership of De Valera and the Fianna Fail party the most numerous stratum of the bourgeoisie, the rural and urban medium-sized property-owners, rose to political dominance in the Free State. The commercial interest, which was dominant during the first ten years of the Free State, was ousted from governmental power in 1932.

In the later twenties the most developed political representative of the commercial interest, Kevin O'Higgins, made overtures to the political representatives of the 6 County ruling class, and a scheme for the ending of Partition was developed. There was, in fact, no basic economic conflict between the interests of the 6 County bourgeoisie and the interests of that section of the 26 County bourgeoisie represented by O'Higgins. If the interest represented by O'Higgins had been firmly in the saddle in 26 County society the internal economic basis of the Partition of Irish society would have ended a generation ago.

O'Higgins was shot in 1927 and the commercial interest could not find another political representative of his drive and ability. O'Higgins' ruthlessness is often referred to. But the distinction between O'Higgins and some of his colleagues who were equally ruthless was that his ruthlessness was finely and coldly calculated. Unlike many of his colleagues, O'Higgins was highly developed politically.

Pearse said that the British ruling class never committed an unnecessary act of cruelty. They used naked violence with utter ruthlessness when this was necessary, but their use of violence was always a finely calculated instrument of politics. The same may be said of O'Higgins: he stood for the intelligent, political use of terror; the reckless use of terror to which his colleagues resorted after his death, undoubtedly hastened the end of the Cosgrave government and of the Cumann na nGaedheal Party.

However, it is improbable that the influence of O'Higgins' death was a decisive factor in shaping subsequent events. The basic economic fact was that the economic reserves from which a vigorous movement for the development of an anti-imperialist - that is to say, protectionist - capitalism could develop in the 26 Counties were not being used up very quickly during the period of the Cosgrave government (1922-32).

The main part of these reserves was the large agricultural petty-bourgeoisie. The Fianna Fail party based itself on this section, and in the international capitalist crisis of the early 'thirties - to which the commercial interest was highly susceptible - became the ruling party in the Free State.

THE ECONOMICS OF PROTECTION

The economic policy through which De Valera hoped to develop a flourishing capitalist society in the Free State was simple. Home manufactures were to be substituted for imports. To make the home-manufactured commodity competitive with the commodity produced by the more efficient monopoly capitalist industry in Britain, an import duty would be imposed on the commodity manufactured abroad. The import duty would negate the difference in production efficiency by making the foreign commodity dearer in Ireland than the home-manufactured item.

The ambitious petty-bourgeois could study the list of imports, pick a commodity which was imported in sufficient quantity to justify the establishment of a home industry, and apply for an appropriate tariff.

"De Valera's immediate action of retaining the land annuities started the economic war with Britain. The retaliatory British tariff on Irish imports gave De Valera the opportunity to begin his protection policy with a tariff on British goods. His method was to grant a licence, a monopoly to an Irish firm to manufacture goods which were being imported from Britain in a reasonably large quantity. The Irish firm usually produced less efficiently than the British, but the tariff on the British article made it more costly to the Irish consumer than the more expensively produced (and inferior) Irish article. The effect of this as far as the Irish consumers (mostly workers and small farmers) were concerned, was to replace British goods with inferior and dearer Irish goods. The commercial capitalists, who previously had made their profit by buying these goods in Britain & selling them in Ireland had their method of profit-making taken away from them. The profit now went to the monopolist manufacturer." (The Second Development of Capitalism in Ireland, Patrick Murphy, Irish Workers News - May 2nd 1965).

The
the
thir
of i
ufac
limi
woul
seco
imple
ment
fore
ing I

(Erne
cians
expla
we kna

The fo
econom

"In
of
and
They
Fail
cove
Manu
to s
good
a ma
take
Then
manu
of gr
These
resul
diti

"In th
output
estima
the fi
with F
figure
italis

To produ
needed in
only the 1
of British

The initial response of commercial capitalism to this development took the form of a fascist movement - the Blueshirts. However by the mid-thirties the commercial capitalists saw that De Valera had no intention of interfering with normal capitalist processes beyond stimulating manufactures through a policy of import substitution - an exceptionally limited policy - and that a short period of evolutionary development would bring them both together again. Their differences were of a secondary and temporary nature. De Valera did not even attempt to implement such a modest, ^{NATIONAL} bourgeois measure as controlling the investment of money abroad. Irish commercial and finance capitalism therefore abandoned their Hitler, General O'Duffy, and without their backing Irish fascism became a mere movement of cranks.

(Ernest Blythe, one of the most prominent and coherent of the politicians representing the commercial capitalist interest, has recently explained: "When we saw Fianna Fail put the I.R.A. in jail (1935) we knew our work was done.")

The following will give an indication of what was involved in the economic policy of protectionism as applied by De Valera:

In late 1931 the Irish Press carried out an industrial survey of five industries. These articles were quoted by De Valera and other Fianna Fail members in the 1932 election campaign. They were, in fact, on a limited scale, what was to be the Fianna Fail industrial policy after they were elected. The industries covered were Tanning, Boots and Shoes, Wholesale Clothing, Woolen Manufactures and other non-woolen textiles. The procedure was to scan the table of imports and select for home manufacture any goods which were being imported in sufficient quantity to justify a manufacturing plant. The total figure for imports was then taken. For example, in 'other textiles' the figure was £2,898,482. Then, the average rate of gross output per worker in Irish firms manufacturing these types of goods, and also the average rates of gross output per worker in similar firms in Britain, was given. These figures were then divided into the import figure and the result was the employment potential under Irish and British conditions.

"In the above instance under the Irish estimated rate of gross output there was potential output for 10,501 people, and at the estimated British rate of gross output for 7,192 people. Taking the five industries together the estimated employment potential with Free State figures was 45,427 and at the estimated British figures 27,274." (P. Murphy, The Development of Free State Capitalism. An Solas, March 1965.)

To produce a given output, the labour of 45,427 workers would be needed in the productive conditions of 26 County capitalism, while only the labour of 27,274 would be needed in the productive conditions of British capitalism. And since the labour theory of value holds

good in the actual capitalist production process, however much it may be denied in bourgeois economic theory, the products of 26 Co. capitalism could only be made competitive with the products of British capitalism by neutralising the difference in labour productivity through a price policy.

An import-duty was imposed on the products of British industry which made them dearer in Ireland than the products of Irish industry. Roughly speaking, in the example given the function of the price policy was to make a commodity produced by three workers dearer than a commodity produced by five workers. (The process is, of course, complicated by other factors, but this is the fundamental thing in protectionism.)

The only substantial beneficiary in this process is the protected capitalist. In these hot-house conditions he can make a profit which he could not in the international market.

PROTECTION AND PROGRESSIVENESS

Here a word must be said about the "progressive" nature of protectionism in the 26 Counties. Bourgeois nationalist "socialism" tends to criticise Fianna Fail for abandoning the "progressive" protectionist policies in favour of a reactionary free trade policy. Now the actual, concrete, experience of a class-conscious worker in the 26 Counties is that in the "progressive" period of Free State capitalism, black anti-working class reaction was dominant, while, since the abandonment of protectionism, internal reaction has been taking on a more bourgeois-liberal character.

Since, in the protectionist period, there was undoubtedly a conflict between the capitalist system in the 26 Counties and the British imperialist system - 26 County capitalism bearing a certain anti-imperialist character - , which in the recent period, with the adoption of a free trade policy, has been eliminated - 26 County capitalism losing its anti-imperialist character - , how are we to explain this?

At the height of the anti-imperialist phase the blackest brand of social reaction was dominant. But as a consequence of the abandonment of the anti-imperialist economic policy, the bourgeois dictatorship liberalised its methods of rule. A paradox? Not in the least. It is merely an expression of the fact that opposition to imperialism can occur on the basis of two different, and antagonistic, class interests. It can be bourgeois or proletarian.

A bourgeois dictatorship, with a fragile economic basis, operating an anti-imperialist (protectionist) economic policy, will operate this policy solely in the interests of the bourgeoisie. The idea has been propagated by the bourgeois-nationalist "socialists" that

an
pol
his
ten
iod
was
this
rela

The
tend
tion
is no
polic

If De
by s
withi
devel
that w
econom

In ord
dictat
within
to sma
itical
He did

To main
spons
right-w
attempt
ible fo
did come
ed this

There co
that in
than the
between
mosphere

Some bou
icisms of
progressi
roach is
Valera's

It is sai
banking in

an anti-imperialist economic policy and a progressive internal social policy are linked with one another. Even though the actual course of history in the 26 Counties showed that this was not so in fact, the pretence that it was so had to be kept up. During the protectionist period Mr. C. D. Greaves, the opportunist, declared that the Free State was "the most progressive state in western Europe", and in support of this listed some points which looked quite good on paper but bore no relation to reality.

The opposite contention - that an anti-imperialist economic policy tends to be accompanied by an intensification of internal social reaction - is in many cases much nearer the truth. The reason for this is not difficult to find: a state cannot pursue a difficult external policy if it is being endangered by serious dissensions in its home base.

If De Valera's anti-imperialist economic policy had been accompanied by a development of working class and revolutionary Republican politics within the 26 Counties, then this economic policy would be provoking developments which threatened the base of the bourgeois dictatorship that was implementing it. And if this happened it is clear that the economic policy would have to be changed.

In order to sustain an anti-imperialist economic policy, a bourgeois dictatorship must be able to suppress movements which threatened it within its base. It was therefore a matter of urgency for De Valera to smash the revolutionary Republican movement, and the embryonic political working class movement which was beginning to gain strength. He did this with the customary mixture of coercion and bribery.

To maintain control of the protected, hot-house home market, De Valera sponsored the growth of every variety of social reaction. Aggressive right-wing Catholicism was put in control of the situation, and an attempt was made to develop an atmosphere in which it would be impossible for a genuine working class thought to come into being; or if it did come into being, to make certain that the worker whose head contained this thought quickly found his way onto the boat.

There could hardly be a more convincing demonstration of the contention that in the final analysis it is economics that determines consciousness, than the fact that 26 County society continued to produce Communists between the mid-thirties and the late fifties despite the political atmosphere developed by De Valera and his cohorts.

Some bourgeois-nationalist "socialists" are prepared to make some criticisms of De Valera to the effect that, while his economic policy was progressive, he should not have done the other things. But this approach is utterly subjectivist. It "overlooks" the little fact that De Valera's internal politics served his economic policy quite directly.

It is said that De Valera should have suppressed the commercial and banking interests, established a state monopoly of foreign trade and

investment, expanded the home market regardless of private profit, put the welfare of the people-first, given freedom of development to working class and left-wing Republican politics, and thus won the support of the mass of the people for the struggle against imperialism. One might as well say that Hitler should have been a lover of Slavs and Jews, an instrument of international peace, and a champion of the working class interest.

De Valera was the political leader of a bourgeois dictatorship. If he had followed the course of action outlined above he would have disrupted the dictatorship he was leading: he would have been a traitor to his class. What is the point in saying that a political leader of the bourgeoisie should have acted in such a way as to endanger the dominance of his class and the existence of the capitalist system? It is something that could only be said by an opportunist trying to spread confusion in the working class movement.

We still hear stupid-cunning schemes for manoeuvring the bourgeoisie into developing socialism being propounded. Must it not be concluded that the initiators of these schemes are guilty of criminal intentions against the working class?

* * *

There are many countries today in which we can see the implementation of an anti-imperialist policy by a bourgeois dictatorship being accompanied by an attempt at the total suppression of the independent political working class movement. Among De Valera's most "progressive" successors in this respect are President Nasser of Egypt and President Nyerere of Tanzania. On the one hand there is no doubt that they pursue anti-imperialist policies. On the other hand there is no doubt that they aim at the complete suppression of the political working class movement.

These are perfectly consistent policies for a bourgeois dictatorship in a developing capitalist system to implement. Such a bourgeois dictatorship must manoeuvre between international monopoly capitalism and its own working class - the latter being its most deadly enemy in the long run. When it rouses the masses to strengthen its own hand against the imperialist capitalists it must do so with some variety of bourgeois ideology, and it must try to eliminate antagonistic ideologies.

A contradiction between a national bourgeoisie and imperialism is a short-term contradiction between bourgeois forces which may be exploited by the working class political movement, for example in the foreign policy of a socialist state. But in a national bourgeois society where the working class movement is being suppressed by a variety of bourgeois anti-imperialist politics (whose opposition to imperialism is inevitably limited and temporary) the political move-

ment of the working class can only come into being and strengthen itself in conflict with the bourgeois nationalist politics which are attempting to suppress it. It cannot develop within the fringes of the bourgeois nationalist movement. And it cannot exploit contradictions within the bourgeoisie until it is itself a substantial political movement.

PROTECTIONISM COMES TO GRIEF

The initial results of De Valera's protectionist economic policy were remarkable.

"Between 1932 and 1936 manufacturing output increased by 30% (and employment by 40%). Manufacturing profit increased and commercial profit decreased." (P. Murphy, Irish Workers News, May 9th 1965).

To safeguard Free State companies from foreign takeover, and to prevent foreign companies from simply setting up manufacturing subsidiaries in the 26 Counties, 51% of the capital had to be owned by Free State citizens.

The short-term advantages of the protectionist policy are obvious, but so are the long-term limitations. The substitution of home manufacture for imports stimulated the development of home industry. But it is only in the hot-house market of the 26 Counties that the new capitalist industries were competitive with international monopoly capitalist industry.

Though 26 County industry expanded rapidly for a short period under the influence of the policy of import substitution, the extent of the 26 County market did not grow significantly. Home industry did not grow as a consequence of the growth of the home market. It only grew because of the tariff barriers against foreign industry.

The limit to the growth of the home industry, therefore, was more or less the amount of commodities that had been previously imported. This was a limit which was reached very quickly. And when it was reached stagnation was the only perspective. This stagnation is shown by the fact that, after a remarkable increase in the early '30s, the number of industrial workers stagnated, even though there was a huge surplus population in agriculture. Between 1951 and 1961 the number of industrial workers in the 26 Counties actually fell, from 664,816 to 637,759. (Figures given in "Notes on Classes in Ireland", by Angela Clifford, Irish Communist, January 1966.)

(In the article just quoted the following characteristic of the period is also noted:

"The natural tendency in capitalist society of the number of employers to decrease, and for businesses to get bigger as capitalists take one another over, was slowed up in the 1930s, by

the Fianna Fail protectionist policies. In the 20 years, 1926-46, the number of (industrial) employers fell by only 475, or by about 1%. By contrast, in the 10 years, 1951-61, when the policy of protected national capitalism in the Free State was being abandoned, and when more and more concessions were being made to imperialist capital, the number of employers in industry fell by 8,402, or about 42%."

In agriculture the petty bourgeoisie actually increased as a percentage of the population - from 73% to 78% - between 1926 and 1961, while workers as a percentage fell from 21% to 17%.

The relative growth of the rule of the petty bourgeoisie, and the large number of small urban capitalists, which resulted from the protectionist economic policy, constituted the class basis for the intensification of the political and social reaction between the mid-thirties and late fifties.)

Since the home market could not be increased significantly by the economically inefficient and politically reactionary (even by bourgeois standards) capitalism that developed as a consequence of Fianna Fail policy, 26 County industry could only increase by operating on the international capitalist market.

On the one hand the small home market offered very little scope for the development of a new industry, and very quickly brought it to the point where any significant further expansion could only be achieved on the international market. On the other hand, the very same condition - the small, highly-protected home market - offered the new industry little scope for making itself competitive internationally. Connolly maintained in "Erin's Hope" (1896) that this must be so. De Valera demonstrated in practice that it was so.

The new, hot-house capitalist development was reaching the end of its tether by the late 'thirties. The first major economic retreat from the declared Fianna Fail principles of 1932 came in 1938 with the trade agreement with Britain. The outbreak of the world war the following year slowed up subsequent developments. But in the early 'fifties the economic crisis struck. The contradictions of protectionist capitalism offered no way out of the crisis. Economic stagnation and high unemployment remained throughout the 'fifties. In the late 'fifties the inevitable conclusions were drawn: the 26 Cos. must be opened up to imperialist capital, and 26 County industry must be forced onto the international market, where only the healthy would survive.

"Fianna Fail came to power having visions of a flourishing and independent Irish capitalism. Capitalism was to be the basis of national independence in Ireland. But Fianna Fail, when it came to power, was unable to make a serious attempt to establish Irish independence precisely because it was capitalist."
(P. Murphy, Irish Workers News, May 9th, 1965.)

This revision to viewpoint aggravated

Fianna a quarter solution

In 1930 vigour had been established and had

The general bourgeois

By the dominant group stable is no element

This that between of pro national

The movement old the the social

The requirement is to integrate the long bourgeois

In anti

The

This reversion to a free trade policy, however, was not a simple reversion to the situation that existed in 1920. From the imperialist viewpoint the De Valera government had achieved a great deal. Certain aggravating contradictions were considerably weakened.

Fianna Fail had consistently maintained a high rate of emigration over a quarter of a century, thereby making a massive contribution to the solution of certain agrarian problems.

In 1930 there was a numerous, economically ambitious, and politically vigorous small bourgeoisie. By the 1960s the fittest of these had been enabled to claw their way into the big (by 26 County capitalist standards) bourgeoisie, while the majority had been given their chance, and had fallen by the wayside.

The greatest part of the economic reserves out of which a strong national bourgeois development could occur had been used up.

By the 1960s the small bourgeois elements were no longer politically dominant. By now the dominant section of the bourgeoisie is a stable grouping of commercial-banking-bigger industrial elements. (It is stable, we mean, in the sense that its dominance within the bourgeoisie is no longer being seriously threatened by other, smaller, bourgeois elements, as it was in the 1920s. In the context of the worker-capitalist contradiction its position is not, of course, particularly stable.

This stable 26 County ruling class became aware in the late 'fifties that it would have to abandon protectionism and abolish the barriers between the 26 County market and the British market. The continuation of protectionism offered only the perspective of chronic economic stagnation and mass unemployment of dangerous dimensions.

The repeal of the Manufacturers Act in 1959 and the Free Trade Agreement with Britain in 1963 were measures which decisively abolished the old economic policy and implemented the new. And in accordance with the new economic policy "rationalisation" measures appropriate to the free trade policy are being implemented in all spheres of social life.

The economic policy with regard to the British market which is now required by the class interest of the ruling class in the 26 Counties is therefore identical with that which has been required by the class interest of the ruling class in the North since the early 19th century. The essential economic conflict which was the basis for Partition no longer exists. The economic conditions exist for the unification of bourgeois Ireland.

In the 26 Counties the political consequences of the new economic situation have long been apparant. We will give a number of examples.

The Civil War used to be regarded by Fianna Fail as a conflict between

imperialism and nationalism. But now the bourgeois nationalist elements of 1922 have developed sufficiently to acquire an active pro-imperialist interest. And now the civil war is viewed as a kind of Greek tragedy that happened because of "Fate", whatever that might mean:

"It was fated. The inexorable movement of events was too complex, too dynamic and too swift to be diverted and the purgative of blood was the only possible resolution". (Irish Press, 23.6.68. Review of D.McArdle's "The Irish Republic".)

In fact what happened was that a substantial section of Sinn Fein (the bourgeois organisation founded by Griffith that had political leadership of the struggle of 1917-21) led by Micheal Collins made a bargain with the British imperialists, built up a mercenary army over a long period, attacked the I.R.A., and smashed it. But "... today...old passions are ebbing; ...old divisions are closed and ... national unity of purpose has been restored". (ibid.) They are all imperialists now, so the real significance of unfortunate little incidents like the civil war must be glossed over. History becomes a romantic tragedy. De Valera attends a Collins memorial mass. And former Republicans orate at the shrine of the counter-revolution in Beal na Blath, where Collins was shot.

On March 4th 1968 the Irish Press declared in a front page headline: "ECONOMICS AND REASON WILL END THE BORDER" :

"Political and religious factions and violence brought the border into being. Economic factors and reason will end it. This is how the majority of Irish people on both sides of the border see their wish for one Ireland being realised."

Or to put it more accurately: Bourgeois economics brought the border into being. But the continuation of the border is no longer a necessary consequence of bourgeois economics.

(In the foregoing summary numerous aspects of 26 County economics have not been touched upon. Only a bare outline of the essential economic development is given.)

THE NORTHERN RULING CLASS

While the bourgeois system in the 26 Counties was going through the evolution described above, the market interests of the Northern ruling class did not change substantially in this respect. Although the linen industry declined and there were severe setbacks in heavy industry, the structure of Northern ^{INDUSTRY} remained such that it continues to require free access to the British market.

The Northern ruling class has produced highly detailed studies of the industrial structure of the North and its requirements. Furthermore, it has usually stated its politics with remarkable frankness. However those organisations, purporting to serve the interests of the working class in Ireland, who have come under the bourgeois-nationalist influence, have utterly failed to make an objective class analysis of the Northern situation. Attention has been focussed entirely on the political methods which the Northern bourgeoisie have found necessary to use in order to maintain their political dominance during the period of nationalist revolutionary development, i.e. pogroms, fascist militia, extreme religious sectarianism, etc. The objective situation which made it necessary for the Northern ruling class to resort to these methods has not been analysed.

The nationalist bourgeoisie have had to propagate the myth that bourgeois Ireland required unity and economic protection, and that partition was a product of the religious bigotry, or the sheer inherent wickedness, of the Northern ruling class. If they had made a reasoned analysis of the causes which led the Northern ruling class to fascist political methods, in a period when their brothers in England operated under bourgeois democratic forms, they would have had to expose the myth that bourgeois Ireland required national unity in a protected economy.

Opportunist socialism is a detachment of bourgeois politics operating in the working class movement. The division in bourgeois Ireland gave rise to two distinct brands of opportunism: Sinn Fein socialism and Unionist socialism. Sinn Fein socialism has had to propagate the myths of its own bourgeoisie with relation to Partition. It dare not analyse the objective economic situation. It can merely represent the Northern ruling class as the incarnation of gratuitous evil. In fact the Northern ruling class is a relatively developed and capable ruling class, with radical traditions, which was compelled to resort to desperate measures by a desperate situation. The very effectiveness of its fascist methods over such a long period is sufficient proof that there has been reason and method guiding its madness. The German ruling class could not control Hitler in the way that the 6 County ruling class is controlling its Hitler.

A UNIONIST ANALYSIS: 1904

While the establishment and consolidation of Partition was ultimately **due** to economic causes, politics played its part also: not only in the sense that every economic force **must** have its political expression in order to operate socially, but also in the **sense** that a higher level of political development by one of the parties concerned may have averted the situation in which Partition became inevitable.

In a situation where the Nationalist/Sinn Fein bourgeoisie controlled the **majority** of the workers and small farmers in the South, and the Unionists controlled the majority of workers and small farmers in the North, Partition became inevitable. But was the development of this situation itself inevitable? On this point we will refer to an exceptionally acute bourgeois analysis of the situation, "Ireland in the New Century", made by a Unionist, Sir Horace Plunkett, in 1904. (Extracts are from the third edition: 1905. Plunkett was the founder of the agricultural co-operative movement in Ireland. He should not be confused with Count Plunkett, the Home Ruler.)

"It is a commonplace that there are two Irelands, differing in race, in creed, in political aspiration, and in what I regard as a more potent factor than all the others put together -- economic interest and industrial pursuit." (p. 36)

"It will be remembered that when the Home Rule controversy was at its height, the chief strength of the Irish opposition to Mr. Gladstone's policy, and the consideration which most weighed with the British electorate, lay in the business objection of the industrial population of Ulster; though on the platform religious and political arguments were more often heard. The intensely practical nature of the objection which came from the commercial and industrial classes of the North who opposed Home Rule was never properly recognised in Ireland. It was, and is still, unanswered. Briefly stated, the position taken up by their spokesmen was as follows:- 'We have come... into Ireland, and not the richest portion of the island, and have gradually built up an industry and commerce with which we are able to hold our own in competition with the most progressive nations in the world... It is now proposed to place the manufactures and commerce of the country at the mercy of a majority which will have no real concern in the interests vitally affected, and who have no knowledge of the science of government. The mere shadow of these changes has so depressed the stocks which represent the accumulations of our past enterprise and labour that we are already commercially poorer than we were.' "

(p 66/7)

Note to 2nd edition: The Ulster bourgeoisie made the nature of their objection to Home Rule completely clear in 1886. Thomas Sinclair, a leading bourgeois politician, said in a speech at a special meeting of the Presbyterian Church in March 1886:

"The leader of the Nationalists had declared that it was his intention to make Ireland a nation. They did not know what he meant by that, but probably it was that he intended to reorganise its industries... It was especially stated that a policy of Protection would be gone into, a policy which if adopted would empty their mills, clear their rivers and shipyards, would stop their looms, would make the voice of their spindles to be silent, and would cause a complete destruction of the industry that had made the province so prosperous." (Reported in "The Witness", March 12th, 1886.)

The "Northern Whig", the main bourgeois newspaper, protested that the industrial capitalist interest was in danger of not being fully taken into account because of the sharpness of the struggle between the landlords and peasants in Ireland. It stated the industrial capitalist case against Home Rule:

"Capital can only be procured for the promotion of Irish industries through credit. But the direct effects of the Irish Nationalist movement... have the result of driving away capital by utterly destroying credit. England is the greatest capitalist in the world. Ireland owes a great deal to the use of English capital, a great more than the Irish Nationalists are disposed to acknowledge. This country is a gainer and not a loser by the British connection. Without that connection Belfast and all that is most prosperous in Ireland would be ruined... An Irish Nationalist Parliament.. would, if it were established, fall like a blight on the productive interests of the country... Our commercial and manufacturing classes are devoted to the Union because they know that trade and commerce would not flourish without the Union." (Editorial, Jan. 21st, 1886.)

"Mercantile Ireland versus Home Rule, by a Belfast Merchant" was published by the Ulster Liberal Unionist Association in 1888. The writer repeated the irrefutable statement that: "There is no class....more alive to the advantages to be derived from the maintenance of the Union in its present form than the Irish merchants and manufacturers." (p.4).

"Naturally it (Ulster) was the poorest, most sterile, and barren province, but under the Union it has become a great centre of industry and wealth, and the land in it the most highly cultivated and productive. This is entirely owing to the indomitable perseverance, thrift, and loyalty of the people who, without any extraneous or special advantages, have made this part of the country what might be called the Lancashire and Yorkshire of Ireland..."
"...the birth of a Dublin Parliament will be the death of credit."

in Ireland." Economic decline would result until "the once prosperous Ulster is changed into a poverty-stricken wilderness, with her shipyards and mills and factories silent as the grave." (p. 7/8.)

(To make the foregoing accurate the writer should have given the social relation of Ulster land tenure as the basis on which perseverance and thrift could operate to some purpose. On a basis of rack-renting, as in the rest of Ireland, perseverance and thrift were pointless. The rack-rented peasant in the South did not occupy a petty-bourgeois economic position, therefore the petty-bourgeois virtues were alien to him. His social position made it more sensible for him to observe the lilies in the fields who did not sow, neither did they reap, than to shape his mind according to the Puritan version of Christianity.

Another side of the petty-bourgeois virtue that was general among the Protestant peasantry is described by the Ulster novelist, Shan Bullock:

"Around him on hill and field was life and movement... : cattle grazing, horses tramping masterfully, men working and shouting, women flaunting their coloured kerchiefs in the sunlight; ... the world spun merrily amid the golden hours, but of it or of anything that blessed it Hugh had no heed, save of the dull earth he would conquer and hard thought within him that sweetened toil." (The Squireen, p. 91.)

The extension of Ulster tenure throughout Ireland in the last quarter of the 19th century also extended petty-bourgeois virtue.)

The Ulster bourgeoisie made their position clear in 1886. The Nationalist Party, which controlled three-quarters of the Irish masses, pretended not to hear, pretended that there was no industrial case against protectionist Home Rule, pretended that the Unionist movement was a landlord creation. They could not deal with the facts of the case, so they pretended the facts did not exist.

"WHO IS TO DO THE COERCION...?"

"I have already said (that) the real force which turned the British democracy against Home Rule ... (is) the commercial and industrial community in Belfast ... (is) the commercial and industrial community in Belfast and other hives of industry in the north-east corner of the country, and in scattered localities elsewhere. I have already admitted that the political importance of the industrial element was not properly appreciated in Irish Unionist circles. No less remarkable is the way in which it has been ignored by the Nationalists. The

quest
which
conce
to co
nativ
the i
among
a tin
tion
at th
sitt
figh
the l
them
erty
dism
to p
will
ted

"The
obvi
shou
What
forc
thes
oust
man
poll
the
very

"Nov
for
the
pre
spe
not
atm
(pa

Neithe
(altho
post-F
that F
added

question which the Nationalists had to answer in 1886 and 1893, and which they have to answer today, is this— In the Ireland of their conception is the Unionist part of Ulster to be coerced or persuaded to come under the new regime? To those who adopt the former alternative, my reply is simply that, if England is to do the coercion, the idea is politically absurd. If we were left to fight it out among ourselves, it is physically absurd... I am aware that, at a time when we were all talking at concert pitch on the Irish Question, a good deal was said about dying in the last ditch by men who at the threat of any real trouble would be found more discreetly sitting on the first fence. But those who know the temper and fighting qualities of the working-men opponents of Home Rule in the North are under no illusion as to the account they would give of themselves if called upon to defend the cause of Protestantism, liberty, and imperial unity as they understand it. Let us, however, dismiss this alternative and give Nationalists credit for the desire to persuade the industrial North to come in by showing it that it will be to its advantage to join cordially in the building of a united Ireland under a separate legislature.

"The difficulties in the way of procuring this conviction are very obvious. The North has prospered under the Act of Union - why should it be ready to enter upon a new 'variety of untried being'? What that state of being will be like, it naturally guesses from the forces which are working for Home Rule at present. Looking at these simply from the industrial standpoint and leaving out of account all the powerful elements of religious and race prejudice, the man of the North sees two salient facts which have dominated all the political activity of the Nationalist campaign," i.e. hostility to the crown, and "the introduction of politics into business in the very virulent and destructive form known as boycotting.

"Now hostility to the Crown, if it means anything, means a struggle for separation as soon as Home Rule has given to the Irish people the power to organise and arm. And (still keeping sternly to the practical point of view) that would, for the time being at least, spell absolute ruin to the industrial North. The practice of boycotting, again, is the very antithesis of industry - it creates an atmosphere, in which industry and enterprise simply cannot live."
(pages 86-88)

Neither the Nationalist Party, nor Sinn Fein, nor Cumann na nGaedheal (although individuals within it attempted to) nor Fianna Fail, nor the post-Fianna Fail version of Sinn Fein, ever faced up to these hard facts that Plunkett stated so bluntly long before the Partition clause was added to the Home Rule Bill in 1914.

THE POLITICAL FAILURE OF THE INDUSTRIAL BOURGEOISIE

Another important fact which Plunkett drew attention to was the divorce between industrialists and politicians in bourgeois politics in Ireland. The Nationalist Party was in the main a bunch of upstarts who made their living out of politics and degraded bourgeois political activity (again, applying bourgeois standards) as it has rarely been degraded. The Irish question was their gimmick. Votes in Ireland were their bargaining counter. Westminster was the centre of their universe. After they toppled Parnell in a welter of hypocritical, moralising, they split the Party into fragments over various trivial differences. They were utterly incapable of developing and applying a far-sighted bourgeois political and social strategy.

But Plunkett also drew attention to deficiencies of his own movement.

"To my own party in Ireland then, I would... direct the reader's attention. I have already referred to the deplorable effects produced upon national life by the exclusion of the landlord and industrial classes from positions of leadership and trust over four-fifths of the country. I cannot conceive of a prosperous Ireland in which the influence of these leaders is restricted within its present bounds. It has been so restricted because the Irish Unionist party has failed to produce a policy which could attract, at any rate, moderate men from the other side, and we have, therefore, to consider why we have so failed. Until this is done, we shall continue to share the blame for the miserable state of our political life which, at the end of the 19th century, appeared to have made but little advance from the time when Bishop Berkeley asked 'Whether our parties are not a burlesque upon politics'.

"The Irish Unionist Party is supposed to unite all who, like the author, are opposed to the plunge into what is called Home Rule. But its propagandist activities in Ireland are confined to preaching the doctrine of the status quo, and preaching it only to its own side. From the beginning the party has been intimately connected with the landlord class; yet even upon the land question it has thrown but few gleams of the constructive thought which it might have been expected to apply to it. Now and again an individual tries to broaden the basis of Irish Unionism and to bring himself in touch with the life of the people. But the nearer he gets to the people the farther he gets from the Irish Unionist leaders... and he is treated by the leading players on both sides like a dog in a tennis court.

"Two main causes appear to me to account for the failure of the Irish Unionist Party to make itself an effective force in national life". The first was the notion "that the Irish question is

not a matter of policy but of police".

"The second... was the linking of the agrarian with the political question; the one being, in effect, a practical, the other a sentimental issue. The same thing happened in the Nationalist party; but on their side it was intentional and led to an immense accession of strength, while on the Unionist side it made for weakness. If the influence of Irish Unionists was to be even maintained, it was of vital importance that the interest of a class" (read "the interest of the landlord class" - I.C.O.) "should not be allowed to dominate the policy of the party" - (which should be a party serving the interests of the industrial bourgeoisie, which had become the main basis of Unionism in Ireland. - I.C.O.)

"But the organisation which ought to have rallied every force that Ireland could contribute to the cause of imperial unity came to be too closely identified with the landlord class. That class is admittedly essential to the construction of any real national life. But there is another element equally essential, to which the political leaders of Irish Unionism have not given the prominence which is its due. The Irish Question has been so successfully narrowed down to two simple policies, one positive but vague, the other negative but definite, that to suggest that there are three distinct forces - three distinct interests - to be taken into account seems like confusing the issue. It is a fact, nevertheless, that a very important element on the Unionist side, the industrial element, has been practically left out of calculation by both sides. Yet the only expression of real political thought which I have observed in Ireland.... has emanated from the Ulster Liberal-Unionist Association." (ps.63-6)

The "Three distinct forces" to which Plunkett refers are: the landlord class, the big industrial bourgeoisie, and the middle class (to use a vague term to cover the heterogeneous medium and smaller propertied interests that constituted the mass base and middle and lower leadership of the Nationalist Party, and later of Sinn Fein and Fianna Fail.)

IT WAS ONLY ON THE BASIS OF THE CLASS INTEREST OF THE SECOND, THE INDUSTRIAL BOURGEOISIE, THAT NATIONAL UNITY COULD HAVE BEEN ACHIEVED WITHIN THE BOURGEOIS SYSTEM. So Plunkett maintained, and so it was in fact.

The logic of the middle class position required the separation and protection of the Irish national market. When this bourgeois element generated a political movement of its own it came into conflict with the interests of the big industrial bourgeoisie who needed to remain in the British market. But, under the political domination of a big industrial bourgeoisie which saw the need for extensive internal reforms, the evolution of these middle class elements could have run its course without disrupting the nation.

It would scarcely have been possible for the obsolescent landlord class

to oversee the bourgeois evolution of the agrarian situation. The landlords went along with the land reforms implemented by the British bourgeoisie between 1800 and 1902 because they had little choice in the matter. If they themselves were the dominant class they would inevitably have failed to guide the bourgeois evolution of the agrarian question. But under the dominance of the industrial bourgeoisie, whose interests were not essentially hostile to agrarian reforms, an evolution of the agrarian question which did not disrupt national life would have been possible.

If landlordism was the main class basis of Unionism in Irish society, then there would have been an antagonism between Unionism and the agrarian reform. But if the industrial bourgeoisie was the main class basis of Unionism, then there was no necessary antagonism between Unionism and agrarian reform, and it was possible for Unionism to extend its influence within the nation by making itself an agency of agrarian reform. In fact the industrial bourgeoisie had become the main economic basis of Unionism, but this change had failed to reflect itself adequately in Unionist politics.

"My sole criticism of those leaders of commerce and industry in Belfast, who, whenever they turn their attention from their various pre-occupations, impart into Irish politics the valuable qualities which they display in the conduct of their private affairs, is that they do not go further and take the necessary steps to give practical effect to their views outside the ranks of their immediate associates and followers. Had the industrial section made its voice heard in the councils of the Irish Unionist party, the Government which that party supports might have had less advice and assistance in the maintenance of law and order, but it would have had an invaluable aid in its constructive policy. For the lack of wise guidance which our captains of industry should have provided, Irish Unionism has, by too close adherence to the traditions of the landlord section, been the creed of a social caste rather than a policy in Ireland...

"...there must be a combination of the best thought of the country aristocracy and that of the captains of industry. Then, and not till then, shall we Unionists as a party exercise a healthful and stimulating influence on the thought and action of the people." (p. 67-8)

But the "captains of industry" failed utterly to become the dominant political and social force in the nation. They were content to maintain and consolidate the degree of mass influence which came easily via religion, and to use this to prevent the disruption of their marketing outlets. The bluff and bluster of the nationalist bourgeoisie could not move them. Within the scope of bourgeois politics they were impregnable. In defence of their position they resorted to ruthless coercion. Coercion alone would overcome them. But who, among the bourgeois forces involved, was to coerce them?

"...if England is to do the coercion, the idea is politically absurd. If we' (i.e. the bourgeoisie in Ireland) "were left to fight it out among ourselves, it is physically absurd."

Note to 2nd edition: Ulster Liberalism, the politics of the bourgeoisie, began to gain ground rapidly at the expense of the Tory Party in the middle of the 19th century. Ulster Toryism - unlike the Tory Party in Britain which was an advanced bourgeois party - was a backward landlord faction. Ulster Liberalism, on the other hand, was more radical than the British Liberal Party as a whole. Its influence grew steadily from the 1850s to the 1880s. But before it could achieve political dominance its development was cut short by the rise of Parnellite Nationalism, and the attempt by the British Liberal Party to place the industrial bourgeoisie of Ulster under the political dominance of the Parnellite movement. The Home Rule Bill forced Ulster Liberalism into a close alliance with Ulster Toryism in order to develop an effective Unionist movement against Home Rule under Parnellite dominance. This does not mean that the Unionist Alliance was a mere Tory-landlord movement. The Tory-landlord flavour is a relatively superficial feature of the movement, whose backbone has always been the industrial bourgeoisie.

In the South, however, the Unionist movement was predominantly the expression of obsolescent landlordism. And the behaviour of these Southern Unionists shows the absurdity of the view that the Unionist movement was based on Tory-landlordism. In the South, where this was so, the Unionists came to terms with Home Rule. In fact Ulster Unionism had parted company with the decaying landlord Unionism of the South long before 1916.

PLUNKETT : THE ISOLATED VANGUARD OF THE UPPER CLASS

Because he saw that "A community which has always suffered from the lack of a middle class would certainly not be socially improved by the withdrawal of the upper class" (p. 49), Plunkett, a highly class-conscious member of the upper class, attempted to do what his party was failing to do: link up Unionism with social reform; develop social reform under upper class initiative with a view to broadening the base of Unionism in Ireland.

Furthermore, he saw that : "This work of reform must, of course, be primarily economic, but economic remedies cannot be applied to Irish ills without the spiritual aids which are required to move to action the latent forces of Irish reason and emotion". (p. 40). In other words, economic reform needs an ideology. From a conscious Unionist viewpoint he supported, for example, the Gaelic Revival, which he saw as a development of national bourgeois ideology which would stimulate internal economic development.

Plunkett's approach to the Gaelic Revival was far from the deliberate duplicity of De Valera and his creatures. He said frankly: "I should, speaking generally, regard it as a mistake, supposing it were practicable, to substitute Irish for English in the conduct of business". (p158). He saw that the value of the Revival movement to the bourgeoisie was unconnected with the possibility of actual "revival", and said so. De Valera, while prating about an Irish speaking Ireland, took very effective steps to prevent any such development.

Since the "Revival" movement did not base itself on the fact of an oppressed people speaking an oppressed language in the Gaedhealtacht Plunkett was perfectly correct in assuming that it could be used for developing a mass base for Unionism. (It is said that Ireland is a country with two languages. In fact there are three. The "first official language" - and the second language of the bourgeois intelligentsia - is a recently developed language: Government Irish. The second is English. The third is the oppressed language spoken in the Gaedhealtacht.)

~~Plunkett's main work~~ of course was the development of agricultural co-operatives, which were designed to aid the formation of a stable rural middle class, the lack of which was such a serious deficiency in the structure of bourgeois Ireland. His view was that successful economic reform of this kind, especially if carried out under the initiative of Unionist politics, would destroy the basis of political nationalism.

Plunkett saw the significance of the Land Acts of 1880-1902. He saw how they created the economic conditions for the development of a substantial rural middle class, which, as it developed, would acquire a vested economic interest in the market connection with Britain. And if the upper class was active in helping the development of this new class the political gulf between the upper class and the middle class could be bridged: and the division in the nation could be healed.

The efforts of Plunkett, and the small section of the Unionists which supported him, were, of course, not successful in establishing a mass base for Unionism throughout the South. His class as a whole failed politically. The most developed form of capitalist economy, the big industrial capitalism of the ~~North-East~~, failed to develop an adequate political superstructure. The industrial capitalists, the only class on ~~the~~ basis of whose interests bourgeois Ireland could have been held together, failed utterly to become the dominant social and political force in the nation. It failed even to make a serious attempt to achieve dominance. The causes of the failure will be gone into in a subsequent pamphlet. The failure itself is obvious.

As a consequence of this failure, the middle class, which in most bourgeois societies lives under the social and political hegemony of the big bourgeoisie, developed its own political and social movement and came into antagonism with the big industrial bourgeoisie. The

political
concentr
ion betw
alist
bourgeo
was the

A war w
Then a
resulte
olution
previou
middle
class w
line w

Before
matter
the ec
opment
Where
exist
the de
But wh
the c
colon

This
out b
nolly
Plunk
oppos

See
legi
be a
the
Unio
ion
wor
str
ial

political failure of the industrial bourgeoisie, plus the geographical concentration of big industry in the North-East, caused the contradiction between the big and small bourgeoisie - which exists in all capitalist countries, but which is usually kept well in hand by the big bourgeoisie - to become aggravated to the point where the only solution was the political division of Ireland.

A war was fought for two years to make sure that no one was bluffing. Then a tri-partite agreement was reached. Two varieties of Home Rule resulted, and the Southern middle class made war on the people's revolutionary forces that it had made use of to fight its war during the previous two years. Then, in the following 40 years, the heterogeneous middle class elements in the South evolved a stable bourgeois ruling class whose interests with relation to the British market came into line with those of the Northern ruling class.

PLUNKETT AND CONNOLLY

Before leaving Plunkett, it is worth noting that on one fundamental matter his opinion is identical with Connolly's. Connolly held that the economic situation in which Irish society existed made the development of an independent capitalist society in Ireland impossible. Where the economic pre-requisites for an independent capitalist society exist, the achievement of legislative independence will contribute to the development of such a society (e.g. in America in the 18th century). But where, as in Ireland, such economic pre-requisites do not exist, the concession of legislative independence will merely lead to neo-colonialism.

This view of Connolly's has been criticised (or, rather, denounced without being refuted) by Mr C.D. Greaves, the opportunist leader of the Connolly Association. (see ICO pamphlet: THE MARXISM OF JAMES CONNOLLY). Plunkett, however, made the same assessment as Connolly, though from the opposing class viewpoint. He wrote:

"Temporary phenomena and legislative machinery have been endowed with an importance they do not possess, and miracles, it is supposed are about to be worked in Ireland by processes which, whatever rich good may be in them, have never worked miracles, though they have not seldom excited very similar enthusiasms in the economic history of other European lands." (p11)

Seeing clearly that no miracles would be worked by the concession of legislative independence, Plunkett declared political nationalism to be a mirage, and worked instead for the stimulation of the economy and the achievement of far-reaching bourgeois economic reform within the Union. Connolly, seeing equally clearly that the aim of political nationalism was a mirage, worked from the outset to develop a socialist working class movement which would seize the leadership of the national struggle, and immediately consolidate a political victory over imperialism by overthrowing capitalism in Ireland and building a socialist

economy. The only sound economists in Ireland at the beginning of the century, the only ones who were not pursuing mirages, were the class conscious bourgeois, Horace Plunkett, and the class conscious worker, James Connolly.

"ULSTER UNDER HOME RULE"

A selection of articles by various Unionist writers covering the economic and political situation in the Six Counties was published in 1955 under the title "Ulster Under Home Rule" (edited by Thomas Wilson). In the Introduction by D. Lindsay Kerr it is stated that:

"Northern Ireland did not in any real sense begin, still less has it continued, simply as the creation, however interesting and important, of a British statute....The Act of 1920 did not so much create Northern Ireland as admit to all intents and purposes that it already existed and would endure." (p xi)

The Northern ruling class did not itself seek the Stormont arrangement. This particular aspect of Partition was the product of the political circumstances of the time.

"Trying to reach conclusions on the benefits and drawbacks of provincial autonomy for N.Ireland, it is necessary to bear in mind that the system was devised for political rather than economic reasons. Furthermore it was not actually sought by the majority of the people of N.Ireland but - to put the matter bluntly - was forced upon them in an effort to appease the then embryonic Irish Free State."

"....it is hard to resist the conclusion....that Northern Ireland is worse off economically than it would be if the Government of Ireland Act were repealed and the semblance of self-government were thereby removed....Whatever may be true of its non-economic effects, it appears that provincial autonomy has been a doubtful privilege economically." ('Economic Policy': K.S.Isles and N.Outhbert; *ibid.* p 165-6)

"Northern Ireland is so economically interwoven with Great Britain that, looked at broadly, it is not a separate economy at all but an undifferentiated part of a single economic system embracing the whole of the United Kingdom. This economic unity is closely bound up with political unity." ('Ulster's Economic Structure': K.S.Isles and N. Outhbert; *ibid.* p 91)

"Eire seems a natural market for some of N.Ireland's manufactured goods; it is also a natural source of supply of some agricultural commodities, for use both in consumption and as raw materials. If the border were removed the flow of trade would consequently increase. As things are, however, economic union with Eire would mean economic disunion

"with Great Britain; the removal of the border with Eire would involve its erection between N.Ireland and Great Britain. But owing to N.Ireland's much closer economic integration with Great Britain which is firmly based on the complementary relationship between them, the gain from such a change would be outweighed by the loss. This would be so even without taking into account the loss of the benefits derived from equality of services and taxation. The only way in which N.Ireland could benefit from the removal of the border would be by getting rid of it altogether, not by shifting it from where it is to the coast. If located there, the harm done would be greater." (our emphasis. Isles and Cuthbert, 'Economic Policy' ibid. p 181)

In other words: Partition was not a cause, but a consequence, of the division of the nation. The only kind of re-unification which would be acceptable to the Northern ruling class would be re-unification within the British market. Unity behind protective barriers against the British market would be no more acceptable than it was at the beginning of the century. Re-unification, therefore, would involve a complete removal of the barriers between the 26 County economy and the British market.

"The only way in which N.Ireland could benefit from the removal of the border would be by getting rid of it altogether, not by shifting it from where it is to the coast." This statement gets to the root of the matter by economically equating the border and the tariff barrier against the British market.

From the 1930's to the 1950's Fianna Fail, when it spoke of the removal of the border, meant the inclusion of the 6 Counties within the Free State tariff barrier. It was impossible to devise a policy by which this could be done with the consent of the Northern ruling class, (and the overthrow of the Northern ruling class within the sphere of bourgeois politics was never on the cards). The removal of the border would be acceptable to the Northern ruling class only as a consequence of the removal of the protective barrier.

The one constant factor in bourgeois Ireland during the past century has been the class interests of the Northern ruling class, and its determination that it was not going to be moved from its class interest. The Northern ruling class failed to achieve political dominance in the nation as a whole, and so prevented its division, but there has never been the remotest possibility of a bourgeois re-unification of the nation which did not accord with the economic interest of the Northern ruling class. Re-unification, therefore, became a possibility only when the class interest of the 26 County ruling class came to require the dismantling of the tariff barriers behind which it had developed.

Such are the objective consequences of the uneven development of capitalism in Ireland. The desire not to face up to these unpleasant facts has been strongly felt by socialists in Ireland. It has even been felt

that by facing up to and analysing these facts one is somehow strengthening and reinforcing them. That is one of the reasons why socialism in Ireland has degenerated so much into exercises in daydreaming.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT

As soon as Partition ceased to be economically necessary in bourgeois Ireland, it ceased to be politically desirable from the viewpoint of an intelligent assessment of the interests of the Northern ruling class. It was only while it served a sound bourgeois economic purpose that it was worth the frictions which it created.

But there could not be a simple transition from Partition to unity in bourgeois Ireland. Economic developments rarely find a direct and immediate reflection in the political and social superstructure of society. The political and social effects of the previous economic situation tend to obstruct the development of the political and social superstructure required by the new economic situation. And in view of the more or less fascist nature of the politics required in the 6 Counties in the old economic situation, it could not be expected that the political change would come about without major social struggles.

The sectarian, fascist political machine developed by the Northern ruling class to defend its interests in the period when it found itself besieged by the national revolution could not be dismantled overnight. The machine itself would resist "democratisation", and the ruling class could not afford to come into direct antagonism with it. The reform of the machine, therefore, had to be done gradually and in a roundabout manner.

Social change is made necessary by economic developments, and in the long run its course of development is determined by economics. But it is actually brought about by people, by classes, who engage actively in social struggles to gain objectives. Some of the objectives are illusory; others are not illusory even though they are stated indirectly in religious or highly abstract terms; and others again are stated directly and bluntly. But the possibilities of social struggles are always determined, in the final analysis, by the economic situation in which they occur.

As Marx put it: "Men make their own history, but they do not make it just as they please; they do not make under circumstances chosen by themselves, but under circumstances directly encountered, given and transmitted from the past." (The 18th Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte).

At the present moment the change in the superstructure of 6 County

society is
the Cathol
stated to
geois dem
up of Stor
a legal en
from bourg
denial of

In the old
the supren
united fr
not expre
to Unioni
terms.
express i
And the c
past, doe
the main
of Govern

The Union
must char
taken pla
same time
The deman
demand fo
student r
ment, ha
for gree

The poli
what the
lares th
tish dem
with Bri
ising th
of "Brit

In the b
finding
is a pa
ssary a
graph e

On Dece
those..
Kingdom
stronge

society is taking the form of a Civil Rights struggle. The denial to the Catholic (nationalist) population of the Civil Rights which are stated to be the rights of every citizen by the ideologists of bourgeois democracy has been a feature of Orange rule since the setting up of Stormont. In the 1920s this denial of civil rights was given a legal enactment. Now that the threat to the Northern ruling class from bourgeois nationalism has been removed the basic reason for the denial of civil rights no longer exists.

In the old days a civil rights campaign would have been a threat to the supremacy of the ruling class and would have been opposed by a united front. And for that reason opposition to the Unionists did not express itself in a civil rights campaign as such: opposition to Unionism in that situation expressed itself directly in national terms. In periods of social crisis and mass activity it tended to express itself in military terms. But today it is "civil rights". And the civil rights movement, unlike the republican movement of the past, does not essentially express an antagonism with Unionism. In the main it merely expresses opposition to certain Unionist methods of Government.

The Unionists realise that in order to safeguard their future they must change their methods of rule. The changes which have already taken place in Unionism have led to an intensification, and at the same time to a narrowing down, of the popular demand for change. The demand for political reform of the regime has grown while the demand for its overthrow has receded. Furthermore the rise of the student movement, coinciding with the rise of the civil rights movement, has led to an intermingling of the two, and this has not made for greater political clarity in the civil rights movement.

THE UNIONISTS

The political representatives of the ruling class interest know exactly what they want to achieve in the present situation. Gerry Fitt declares that the electoral system "is a negation of every concept of British democracy". Some of the Unionists may not be so much in love with British democracy as Mr. Fitt, but the Unionist leadership, realising that it must come, have the aim of making unionism the main party of "British democracy" in the North.

In the best manner of British democracy, "the party is in the course of finding the best equilibrium between the old and the new. The process is a painful one as Paisleyism has shown, but it is none the less necessary and it has to be faced and not run away from." (Belfast Telegraph editorial, 26.9.1966.)

On December 9th 1968 Captain O'Neill said: "I have a word too for those... who see in change a threat to our position in the United Kingdom. I say to them: Unionism, armed with justice, will be a stronger cause than Unionism armed merely with strength... The

adoption of ... reforms will not lose a single seat in Stormont for those who support the Unionist cause." ("Justice", it should be understood, means the operation of the bourgeois dictatorship under the forms of bourgeois - or if the opportunists prefer, British - democracy.)

The Unionist leaders have consciously set themselves a clear, and realisable, political objective. The fact that their objective is realisable does not mean that it will, in fact, be actually realised. Whether it will be realised will be determined in the course of the class struggle. But there is no doubt about the fact that it is a feasible objective.

The main thing which will determine the actual outcome of this particular struggle is the quality of Unionist politics as compared with the politics of opposing organisations. At present none of the opposing organisations have aims which are as clear-cut and as definite as the aims of the Unionist leadership.

THE WORKING CLASS

It will be noticed that in this pamphlet we have dealt with Partition entirely in terms of bourgeois economics and politics. There are two reasons for this. The first is that the division in the nation came about exclusively because of bourgeois economics and politics. The second is that working class politics have not been an active force in the development of Irish history since the death of Connolly. Opportunism destroyed working class politics in 1916-21. Where working class activity has not been limited to "pure and simple" trade unionism, it has in the main expressed itself through one or another variety of bourgeois ideology. Working class activity has, to use Marx's way of putting it, never succeeded in being more than the left wing of bourgeois politics.

Two serious attempts were made to develop a Communist movement, in the 1920s and 1930s. But from the late thirties until the sixties there was no serious Communist organisation in Ireland.

Since 1916 the Irish Labour Party has been acting blatantly as the social-democratic wing of bourgeois politics. The complex situation in the 6 Counties led to the appearance of a number of Labour Parties.

Irish history during the past half-century has, therefore, been determined by bourgeois class interest, and by the divisions in bourgeois class interest which led to the political division of the nation. Politically the working class has acted under the influence of the bourgeoisie.

Throughout the Irish working class there is a deep desire for unity. The opportunist leaders have often given sentimental expression to this desire. But since the division is a consequence of bourgeois

politics unity cannot be achieved on a sentimental basis: it can only be achieved through an analysis and exposure of bourgeois politics and economics, and the development of working class politics.

Of course the ending of the major division in bourgeois Ireland and the reunification of the ruling class would have the consequence of reuniting the working class under bourgeois political influence. But if the working class movement is not to be reunited merely as a by-product of bourgeois politics, it must begin to free itself from the influence of bourgeois politics - and it can only do this by analysing and becoming conscious of them.

* * *

One of the features of the past ten years has been the development for the first time of a trotskyist movement in Ireland. Spontaneous reaction against social-democratic or modern revisionist opportunism in the working class movement very often tends towards trotskyism, which in the main operates within the social-democratic movement, functioning as its left wing. In the South trotskyism obstructed the growth of a Communist movement for many years after revisionism had corroded the old Communist movement, but during the past few years the development of a certain amount of working class political clarity by the I.C.O. has checked the growth of trotskyism.

Being unable to operate in conditions where an increasing number of workers are thinking things through in political terms and are refusing to be satisfied with half-answers or slogans, the trotskyist movement moved North where political confusion was greater and where the Communist movement was slower in freeing itself from revisionism.

In times of social and political change, when the bourgeoisie themselves are instigating that change in their own interests, the development of radical political tendencies in the working class movement is taken for granted by them. Their main concern is that during this period of necessary change there should not develop a revolutionary Communist movement of the working class. To avert this, they themselves take the initiative in instigating pseudo-socialist and pseudo-Marxist political varieties. Today in Dublin every second bourgeois intellectual is a "Marxist". The spread of non-Communist "Marxism" is designed to avert the rise of a Communist working class movement during the present period of necessary social and political change.

In the North trotskyism is functioning as the radical fringe of the bourgeois democratic movement; as the safety valve of the bourgeois system in its crisis. Its function is to attract the militant elements in the struggle and hold them back from Communism. Its function is to dissipate the revolutionary energy of the working class. Trotskyist movements are noted for their high turnover of membership. The building of a Communist movement needs long, painstaking and concentrated work. But to lead a worker, or a student sympathetic to the working class cause, from political rebellion via trotskyism to political

disillusion, is a different matter entirely.

As a method of disrupting the vanguard of the working class, trotskyism has been doing its work for over sixty years. For almost forty years, however, it has also been a stepping-stone into jobs in the propaganda organs of the bourgeoisie.

But let the opportunists rest assured that even trotskyism is no more than a very temporary, unstable, obstacle to the development of a nation-wide political movement of the working class in Ireland.

* * *

The outcome of the civil rights struggle cannot be predicted in any detail. The leadership of the movement is thoroughly bourgeois. The Financial Times (the paper that the British bourgeoisie produce for their own information) says: "Most of the stories of I.R.A. and Communist infiltration into the ranks of the Ulster civil rights movement, can be discounted. Of course, there are opportunists; but the civil rights leaders believe they are all known, that they are few, and that they cannot manipulate the movement for their own ends." (8.1.1969). "Opportunists" is the word: and the Financial Times knows very well that such opportunists have their role in this situation, in the services of the same class interest as the Financial Times itself.

Unless there is active working class political intervention in the struggle, it seems likely that the immediate outcome will be along the lines envisaged by the Fianna Fail-Unionist Party leadership. The Irish Press speculated that the Unionist Party might tear itself apart, and "the civil rights movement under the leadership of Messrs. Cooper and Hume could emerge as a considerable force". (Editorial, 27.1.1969). But even if the civil rights leadership developed a party which became the main party in the North, nothing would be essentially altered. There would merely be a new Unionist party.

* * *

There are two distinct class interests involved in the civil rights movement. The leadership represents the interests of the smaller bourgeoisie (who are still quite a substantial bourgeoisie by Irish standards). But the rank and file is, to a great extent, working class. The middle class want the removal of restrictions on their own political liberty. Their demands are ~~well~~ summed up in the demand for "British democracy": the most formal kind of democracy. The achievement of bourgeois democracy would not bring about the changes needed by the working class.

But shouldn't we support the civil rights campaign, limited and bourgeois though it is? Certainly. But since we know the limits of

what ca
stant
ment -

The bot
For the
us as
could
in the
end of
erest,

If we v
be tow
Concol
crisis
were s
been r
LAND).

The Ma
"Strik
Nor do
period

The in
over m
facts
Revolu

JANUAR

what can be achieved under bourgeois leadership we must not for an instant slacken in our efforts to develop a working class political movement - a Communist movement.

The bourgeoisie have developed their politics. We must develop ours. For the time being the bourgeoisie would be quite prepared to accept us as militants on the fringe of bourgeois politics, knowing that they could dispense with us when the time came. This has often been done in the past. If in the present situation we scamper along on the tail end of bourgeois politics we shall be serving only the bourgeois interest, and we shall be helping in the deception of the working class.

If we want to learn what our attitude, as class conscious workers, should be towards bourgeois democracy in the present situation, we should study Connolly's attitude towards the bourgeois democracy during the Home Rule crisis in the years before 1914. (Many of his writings in this period were suppressed by the bourgeoisie and the opportunists, but some have been republished recently by Connolly Books in PRESS POISONERS IN IRELAND).

The Marxist principle is: Organise separately: strike together. "Striking together" does not mean enlisting under bourgeois leadership. Nor does it mean that one stops analysing bourgeois politics during periods of joint activity.

The influence of accumulating opportunism in the working class movement over many decades has made us tend to forget one of the most fundamental facts of social life, to which Lenin continuously drew attention: Revolutions are not made by trickery.

JANUARY 1969.

Note to the second edition

An item on the Republican movement, which was made wholly inadequate by recent developments, has been omitted from the present edition. So has an item on the revisionist Irish Workers' Party. The August crisis threw the revisionist/Republican movement into a welter of self-contradiction which it would take too much space to describe here. However, the opportunist manner in which these organisations have reacted to the Ulster crisis has been dealt with in various pamphlets and articles in the Irish Communist over the past few months. Suffice it to say here that the sectarian, anti-working class nature of the Republican leadership was amply demonstrated in "Free Belfast". Further, the opportunist character of the Trotskyist 'Peoples Democracy' has likewise been amply demonstrated in practice throughout this period. Several articles exposing the "revolutionary socialist" leadership of this organisation have appeared in the Irish Communist in the past.

* * * * *

Is Pa
obsta
Paial
them?
his m
all.
form
serve
being
maint
to di
imper

One o
union
union
peria
natio
imper
is f
peri
the
was
ist,
drawl
focu
form

Whil
clea
Iris
of P
the
a na

APPENDIX ON PAISLEYISM

(We reprint below two editorials on Paisleyism published in THE IRISH COMMUNIST in 1966, when various pseudo-marxist were representing Paisley as the chief representative of the imperialist interest in the Six Counties.)

PAISLEYISM

Is Paisleyism the main enemy of the Irish people? Is it the main obstacle to progress in Ireland? Is it a fact that all the anti-Paisleyite forces are progressive, and that we should unite with them? We are told that this is the case by Desmond Greaves and by his mirror-image, Irish trotskyism. In fact it is not the case at all. What is happening is that British imperialism is changing its form of rule in the 6 Counties. Old-style Orange Unionism no longer serves the imperialist interest effectively, so imperialist rule is being "democratised". Paisleyism is old-style Unionism trying to maintain its position in the 6 Counties when imperialism is trying to discard it. In terms of power Paisley does not compare with the imperialist forces opposed to him in Britain or the 6 Counties.

One of the main reasons why imperialism is discarding the form of unionism represented by Paisley is because it has bred a new kind of unionism in the 26 Counties. Fianna Fail, under pressure from imperialism, has become an imperialist force working against the Irish nation. Because of its revolutionary past it is of far more use to imperialism in Ireland than the present-day forms of Carsonism. It is for that reason that Paisleyism has fallen out of favour with imperialism. Imperialism now sees an opportunity of putting an end to the Irish Question. Paisleyism could never put an end to it. It was necessary in the period before Fianna Fail became entirely Unionist, but once Fianna Fail was won over Paisleyism had the very serious drawback of being openly imperialist and fascist, and therefore of focussing attention on imperialism in its most naked and reactionary form.

While being thoroughly opposed to Paisleyism we must make it very clear that it is not just Paisleyism that is the main enemy of the Irish people, but imperialism in all its forms, and that the ending of Paisleyism would not be the ending of imperialism; it would be the substituting of a disguised form of imperialist rule in place of a naked form.

(THE IRISH COMMUNIST, Aug. 1966)

Two months ago we explained what Paisleyism is, and we explained why Paisleyism was not the main enemy in the 6 Counties, and why Paisley could not become another Carson. Carson became what he became because he was backed by the imperialist state. Carsonism served imperialism as a means of confusing the Irish question, and of bringing pressure to bear against the South. But Carsonism also had its drawbacks. It was nakedly imperialist, and it whipped up anti-Catholicism at a time when, outside the 6 Counties, imperialism was beginning to realise that religious strife between the various forms of Christianity was not in its interests at all. And when in the late 'fifties Fianna Fail definitely became an imperialist force, the job of old-style Unionism had been done. It then became in the imperialist interest to "democratise" its rule in the 6 Counties, and to develop friendly relations between Stormont and Leinster House.

Paisleyism is a passing product of the "democratisation". It is old-style Unionism trying to assert itself against the changes that are occurring. It is nothing new. Two months ago we explained that it could not under present circumstances do what Carsonism did, because the imperialist forces which gave Carsonism its power were not supporting Paisley. And the power that Paisley can wield is so trifling that it could not even put up a good fight. At that time the Irish Democrat, the Irish Militant and the rest of the opportunist press was representing Paisley as the main enemy in the 6 Counties. Paisley was represented as a budding Hitler. But an elementary class analysis showed that Paisley could not become a **Hitler**. There can be no Hitlers without the support of monopoly capitalism, and it was O'Neill who was doing the work of monopoly capitalism.

All the main imperialist spokesmen, including Wilson and O'Neill, have now declared that Paisleyism is fascism. This shows how necessary it was to point out clearly what Paisleyism actually is. Those who join with O'Neill and Wilson in branding Paisley as a Hitler, help O'Neill and Wilson to represent themselves as democrats. And in the present circumstances it is precisely O'Neill and Wilson who need to be exposed.

The recent "conspiracy" against O'Neill has clearly shown the historical insignificance of Paisleyism. When it came to a showdown between O'Neill and the rebel M.P.s, those staunch Paisleyites were made so uncomfortably aware of where the real power lay that they passed a unanimous vote of confidence in O'Neill. Imperialism played the Orange card and played it very well. It is now going to play the "democratic" card. And sentimental Carsonites like Paisley who refuse to come to heel will be brought to heel.

In this
est is no
is doing
ism is d
will be
We must
is not t
by O'Nei
themselv
"Hitleri

I.C.

FRED

KARI

I.C.

LIAN

R. C.

(Re
wit

IRI

Iri

Com

I.C.

(A

I.C.

JOH

WOL

WOL

C.I.

In this situation what is needed to serve the anti-imperialist interest is not an inflating of Paisley into a Hitler (which imperialism is doing in its own interest), but a clear exposure of what imperialism is doing. It is trying to take on an appearance which it hopes will be less easily identifiable as imperialism than Carsonism was. We must learn to identify it under its new appearance. Paisleyism is not the main enemy. The main enemy is the forces represented by O'Neill and Wilson. The forces that are now trying to represent themselves as the forces of democracy struggling against Paisley's "Hitlerism".

(THE IRISH COMMUNIST, Oct. 1966)

I.C.O. LITERATURE LIST

IRISH HISTORY

- FREDERICK ENGELS : HISTORY OF IRELAND (to 1014) 5/-
- KARL MARX : THE FENIANS (translated by Angela Clifford) .. 4/-
- I.C.O. : ~~THE~~ WORKING CLASS IN THE IRISH NATIONAL REVOLUTION (1916-23) 2/-
- LIAM MELLOWES : NOTES FROM MOUNTJOY (with introduction) 1/-
- R. CONNOLLY : THE REPUBLICAN STRUGGLE IN IRELAND
(Reprinted from The Communist International, 1922;
with introduction by the I.C.O.) 1/6
- IRISH COMMUNIST REPRINTS (Two articles from the
Irish Communist (1934), theoretical journal of the
Communist Party of Ireland. Introduction by I.C.O.) 1/6
- I.C.O. : THE IRISH REPUBLICAN CONGRESS
(A history of the 26 Counties, 1931-36) 2/-
- I.C.O. : THE ECONOMICS OF PARTITION 2/6
- JOHN LESLIE : THE PRESENT POSITION OF THE IRISH QUESTION
(1894) ... 1/-
- WOLFE TONE : AN ADDRESS TO THE PEOPLE OF IRELAND 1/6
- WOLFE TONE : AN ARGUMENT ON BEHALF OF THE CATHOLICS
OF IRELAND 1/6
- C.D.GREAVES : DE VALERA (exposure of opportunism by I.C.O.) 1/-

JAMES CONNOLLY

Connolly's suppressed writings

- Volume 1 : PRESS POISONERS IN IRELAND and other articles ... 1/6
- Volume 2 : YELLOW UNIONS IN IRELAND and other articles 1/6
- Volume 3 : THE CONNOLLY-WALKER CONTROVERSY 2/6
- Volume 4 : SOCIALISM AND THE ORANGE WORKER 6d.
- Volume 5 : IRELAND AND THE INSURANCE ACT (out shortly)

Also

- JAMES CONNOLLY : THE NEW EVANGEL (with introd. by I.C.O.) .. 1/6
- I.C.O. : CONNOLLY 6d.
- I.C.O. : THE MARXISM OF JAMES CONNOLLY 2/6

NEIL GOOLD

THE TWENTIETH CONGRESS AND AFTER

The first Marxist assessment of the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (in 1956) and its significance for the international communist movement. Includes an analysis of Trotskyism; also one of the 1956 Russian invasion of Hungary. 1/6

STALIN

- ECONOMIC PROBLEMS OF SOCIALISM IN THE U.S.S.R. (1952) 2/6
- ON AN ARTICLE BY ENGELS 1/-
- CONCERNING MARXISM IN LINGUISTICS 3/-
- ON THE PERSONALITY CULT 1/-
- ON TROTSKY 2/-

ECONOMICS

BY I.C.O.

CAPITAL AND REVISIONISM - An exposure of revisionist attacks on Capital	1/6
REVISIONISM AND IMPERIALISM - On revisionist economic theory	1/-
IN DEFENCE OF LENINISM - An exposure of trotskyist and modern revisionist theories	2/6
ON STALIN'S "ECONOMIC PROBLEMS", PART ONE	3/-
ON STALIN'S "ECONOMIC PROBLEMS", PART TWO - MARXISM AND MARKET SOCIALISM	5/-

PAIMBHLEIDI GAEDHILGE

MARXACHAS LENINEACHEAS le PADRAIC O CONAIRE (agus scribhneoire eile)	1/6
TUASCEART NA hEIREANN AGUS AN GHAEDHILG	2/-

THE SIX COUNTIES

THE ECONOMICS OF PARTITION	2/6
THE STORMONT ELECTIONS - A working class analysis (Feb.1969)	6d.
THE CRISIS IN THE UNIONIST PARTY (May 1969)	6d.
THE SITUATION IN THE NORTH (August 16th 1969)	1d.
ULSTER AND HOME RULE (1889) By An Irish Presbyterian	1/6

MISCELLANEOUS

BY I.C.O.

THE CONNOLLY ASSOCIATION - A historical review of its
degeneration 2/-

THE PALESTINE QUESTION 1/6

THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION 1/6

BLACK POWER 2/-

MAGAZINES AND NEWSPAPERS

THE IRISH COMMUNIST - monthly theoretical journal of the ICO. 1/0

COMMUNIST COMMENT - fortnightly newspaper of the ICO 6d.

THE COMMUNIST - theoretical publication of the Communist
Workers Organisation (London) 6d.

YOUNG WORKER - publication of a group of young communists
in Cork 1/-

ALL LITERATURE AVAILABLE FROM SELLERS ON SATURDAY AFTERNOONS

AT G.P.O. , DUBLIN,
AND ROYAL AVENUE, BELFAST.

OR BY POST FROM :

Connolly Books,
62 College Road,
CORK.

L. Callender,
28 Surrey St,
BELFAST 9.

G. Golden,
28 Mercers Rd,
LONDON N.19.

***** (Please add appropriate amount for postage) *****

(N.B. ABOVE DETAILS, ESPECIALLY ADDRESSES, NOT NECESSARILY CORRECT
AFTER END OF 1969.)

Title: The Economics of Irish Partition

Organisation: Irish Communist Organisation

Date: 1969

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.