

AN PHOBLACHT

The Republic

NO. 10

MARCH-APRIL 1967

THE IRISH REPUBLIC

PROCLAMATION

THE IRISH PEOPLE TO THE WORLD

We have suffered centuries of outrage, enforced poverty, and bitter misery. Our rights and liberties have been trampled on by an alien aristocracy, who, treating us as foes, usurped our lands, and drew away from our unfortunate country all material riches. The real owners of the soil were removed to make room for cattle, and driven across the ocean to seek the means of living and the political rights denied to them at home; while our men of thought and action were condemned to loss of life and liberty. But we never lost the memory and hope of a national existence. We appealed in vain to the reason and sense of justice of the dominant powers. Our mildest remonstrances were met with sneers and contempt. Our appeals to arms were always unsuccessful. To-day, having no honourable alternative left, we again appeal to force as our last resource. We accept the conditions of appeal, manfully deeming it better to die in the struggle for freedom than to continue an existence of utter serfdom. All men are born with equal rights, and in associating together to protect one another and share public burdens, justice demands that such associations should rest upon a basis which maintains equality instead of destroying it. We therefore declare that, unable longer to endure the curse of monarchical government, we aim at founding a republic, based on universal suffrage, which shall secure to all the intrinsic value of their labour. The soil of Ireland, at present in the possession of an oligarchy, belongs to us, the Irish people, and to us it must be restored. We declare also in favour of absolute liberty of conscience, and the complete separation of Church and State. We appeal to the Highest Tribunal for evidence of the justice of our cause. History bears testimony to the intensity of our sufferings, and we declare, in the face of our brethren, that we intend no war against the people of England; our war is against the aristocratic locusts, whether English or Irish, who have eaten the verdure of our fields - against the aristocratic leeches who drain alike our blood and theirs. Republicans of the entire world, our cause is your cause. Our enemy is your enemy. Let your hearts be with us. As for you, workmen of England, it is not only your hearts we wish, but your arms. Remember the starvation and degradation brought to your firesides by the oppression of labour. Remember the past, look well to the future, and avenge yourselves by giving liberty to your children in the coming struggle for human freedom.

HEREWITH WE PROCLAIM THE IRISH REPUBLIC

THE PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT:

Per Thomas J. Kelly

EDITORIAL

THIS YEAR IT IS AGAIN OUR DUTY to commemorate yet another Rising which marks the progress of the Irish Revolution. A century ago, on March 5, 1867, brave men ventured forth to win an objective first crystallized in the ideology of Irish Republicanism as it was formulated by the revolutionary leadership of the United Irishmen. The men of '67 lost the battle, it is true; but as Col. T. J. Kelly, Chief Executive of the IRB at that time, wrote in a letter to the Paris LIBERTE: "Our movement is only commencing, and is not about to finish. I speak," he wrote, "in the name of all proletarian Ireland."

IT IS NOT OVERLY DIFFICULT TO foretell the manner in which the lackey establishment in Ireland will commemorate the memory of the men of '67. The purpose, the objects, the social and economic motivations that propelled the Fenians along the revolutionary road, shall understandably be submerged beneath a torrent of meaningless and pious meanderings. But this is only to be expected. After all, these people have a vested interest in perpetuating the present state of things; and the expression of any real understanding and sympathy with the early Fenians could hardly be construed as amiable to such an end.

HOWEVER, WHILE THE REACTION OF the ruling class is predictable when it comes to such events; and while only an idiot would expect anything but hypocrisy from them on such occasions; we must admit that even we did not anticipate the extent of derogatory treatment accorded the Fenians in a recent Republican publication. We refer to the "Republican Manual of Education, Part 1: Historical," which is issued by the Republican Movement's "Educational Department." In this little "gem" the record of the IRB is granted the enormous space of some 8 lines, which are squeezed in between O'Connell and Parnell. The tone of its assessment of the IRB is so perverse, so completely contrary to fact, and at the same time so thoroughly in accord with ruling class requirements in its interpretation of our revolutionary history, that we feel compelled to treat the matter editorially.

AS SEEN BY THIS MONSTROSITY OF A "Manual", the IRB was "organized as a tight conspiracy... aiming to

organize a military coup." Its "tightness and secretiveness... proved its undoing, when the call to arms came in 1867 the nation as a whole did not respond; accepted leaders were wanting." And as if this was not enough damnation (in eight lines of print), the writer threw in an additional charge, to the effect that "Lalor's message was not picked up either by the Fenians." Significantly, the "Manual" sharply and immediately contrasts the futility of the Fenians "tight conspiracy" with "Parnell's parliamentarianism". It was considered that the latter "had a revolutionary purpose: to make it impossible for the Westminster Parliament to function, unless Irish demands were conceded." In respects to the latter contention we can do no better than quote the remarks made by John O'Leary in 1878: "I have not yet been able to see how Ireland is to be freed by keeping the Speaker of the English House of Commons out of bed." Neither have we, for that matter.

SURELY, IT IS BAD ENOUGH TO HAVE to contend with the machinations of British imperialism when it comes to distorting our revolutionary history. However, let us delve briefly into the false allegations contained in the "Educational Manual." To begin, the term "conspiracy" can be applied equally to the whole people or, to a small unrepresentative group, when they combine to overthrow established authority. Therefore, a war of national liberation that enjoys the fullest support from the population is a "conspiracy" in the eyes of the ruling regime. However, the "Manual" emphasizes the "tightness and secretiveness" of the IRB conspiracy, and its remoteness from the people. Hence, it uses the term specifically to denote a small, adventuristic group operating exclusive of a popular support. It specifically charges the Fenians with ADVENTURISM, which is one of the more serious charges that can be laid against a revolutionary organization. This, incidently, is the very charge laid by British imperialism and its Irish cohorts against the Fenians; so that the Republican Movement is consorting with very questionable partners, to say the least.

IT IS TRUE THE IRB WAS INITIATED in 1858 according to the prevailing conspiratorial practices; especially those of Louis Auguste

Blanqui. In this context it was conceived as a tightly knit organization which would serve as the spearhead, the leadership of a revolutionary struggle. However, regardless of what the movement might have been prior to 1861, ample documentation exists to show that subsequent to the "MacManus Funeral" it rapidly expanded into a full-blown mass movement, which enjoyed more popular support than any Republican movement before or since. By 1865 it had a membership of some 95,000 men, exclusive of the strength it could anticipate from the Fenian Brotherhood. This was a rather unwieldy conspiracy, insofar as "tightness and secretiveness" were concerned, to say the least.

THE DEGREE OF POPULAR SUPPORT enjoyed by the IRB--support which could not be amassed under any circumstances by a tightly knit conspiratorial group--is mirrored in the fact that not alone was it capable of completely isolating the "Parliamentary nationalists" such as John Martin (and old Peter Gill) etc.; but it was also able to stand up to and eventually master the Catholic Hierarchy and clergy, who took it upon themselves to combat the revolutionary sympathies of the majority of the people. One has only to peruse the polemics vis-a-vis the Hierarchy in the pages of THE IRISH PEOPLE, to appreciate the tremendous popular support which the IRB had to have securely won, so as to be able to deal so sharply, so thoroughly, and so successfully on questions of Church and State. No Republican Movement since has ever been in that position; at least not to the same degree. Frankly, to call such a movement a "tight conspiracy", is to possess a monumental ignorance of its history; or, what is more to the point in this instance, to be subservient to interests whose welfare dictates a complete falsification of facts, in an attempt to denude the Irish people of the strength of purpose that can be theirs through a full knowledge of their revolutionary heritage.

HENCE, WE CHARGE THAT THOSE responsible for the compilation of the "Manual" are, by imputing to the IRB a course of conspiratorial secretiveness, alleging the Fenians were ADVENTURISTS. And, we charge further, that this is nothing less than base slander, identical to British imperialist propaganda over the years.

THE CHARGE OF "ADVENTURISM" IS further extended by the assertion

that Lalor's "banner of agrarian revolt...was not picked up either by the Fenians." To claim the Fenians of the 1860's ignored the "Land Question," is to discount completely the vigorous and continuous propaganda carried on in The Irish People during the two years of its existence. Files of that paper still exist. We have one such file before us, and after leafing through all issues cannot find one which does not deal in some way with the land question. Indeed, far from ignoring Lalor's "banner of agrarian revolt," the Fenians took a position far to the left of Lalor on this issue; which was of course fundamental to any revolutionary movement, since the means of production in Ireland were primarily agricultural.

IN OUR OPINION, THE FENIAN position was more revolutionary than Lalor's on the land question; because 1) they held that in regards to property rights: "Labour must be at the very foundation of such rights;" and 2) they held property rights to be subordinate to distributive justice: "Land is the raw material out of which everything valuable to supply man's needs ... is originally extracted. It is the inheritance of no privileged class, but of the entire community; and should be parcelled out by the State." (I.P.30/7/'64) In other words, the Fenians proposed to destroy the prevailing property relations, and reorganize them according to the rights of "Labour." Lalor, on the other hand, never went this far. He did not advocate the eradication of large ownership--landlordism. As T.P.O'Neill correctly pointed out in his essay on Lalor in "Leaders and Workers": "He applied principles of English legal theory to the Irish situation. In England the ultimate ownership of land rested in the crown. In Republican Ireland Lalor substituted 'the people' for 'the crown'. According to him the people would give grants of land to landlords exactly as the crown had done with but one modification; the people, as original owners, would not give the landlords power to oppress themselves as tenants." The writer goes on to demonstrate that "Lalor was basing his limitations on the property rights of landlords not on distributive justice, but on his own interpretation of 18th century social contract theory." However, this is opening up a completely different field of discussion than that started by the scribe who penned the Sinn Fein "Manual." He asserts the early Fenians ignored the land question

altogether. This is a lie; and anyone who wishes to check our charges can spend an hour perusing the pages of THE IRISH PEOPLE in the National Library.

FINALLY, THERE IS THE MONSTROUS slur on the characters of all the IRB Centres of the 1860's: "accepted local leaders were wanting." Admittedly, the prose of the "Manual" is so amateurish that this could be taken to mean "local leaders were wanting," in the sense they did not exist; or, those who did were "found wanting" in the pursuance of their duties. In any case, either way it still constitutes a base slur, because there was no want of local leaders, and they were not generally found wanting in their duties. All of this, mind you, from a clique who have been "found wanting" in every respect themselves, and who have forsaken the "Revolutionary Road" of the Fenians for the less arduous path of "Parnell's Parliamentarianism."

TO ATTEMPT TO ADEQUATELY ASSESS the reasons why the Fenians of the 1860's did not put up a more extensive struggle than they did, is far too big a job to be undertaken in an editorial. However, these are the pertinent facts. In tune with the thinking of the times, the IRB saw the struggle for state power being contested along conventional military lines; and their plans relied on external aid, in the shape of financial support from the Fenian Brotherhood, to equip their military formations for this task. In accordance with this, the IRB pursued a course of mobilizing and organizing its formations; to the F.B. was designated the task of amassing the financial means to equip them. Unfortunately, the F.B. failed to fulfil its obligations; at the critical period, the end of 1865, it was wrecked on the rocks of internal dissension, and in effect was at that time lost forever to the Revolution. IRB plans were thrown into disarray; an organization which by the end of 1865 had been keyed psychologically and otherwise for combat, lost both the initiative and the tactical element of surprise. Attempts by James Stephens to salvage the American situation during 1866 failed, so that by early '67 the movement in Ireland found itself devoid "of the sinews of war" and on the defensive on all fronts. The delay of twelve months had enabled the enemy to regain the initiative. The IRB could not call on the people to revolt, because they lacked the weapons to equip them to fight as

it was reckoned they must fight. So they opted to give limited battle anyway, for somewhat the same reasons as their successors in 1916. It may be deemed an error by some for the IRB to have so relied on external aid; but the fact remains, the failure of such aid to materialize reflected in no way either on the capacity of "local leaders" in Ireland, or on a lack of such leaders. Therefore, such a mention of them, as in the "Manual", could only be motivated by vile and anti-Fenian objects.

FOR OUR PART, WE CAN APPRECIATE the effects produced on Fenian plans by the failure of the F.B. to forward the finances then at its disposal to buy the required arms; so also can we appreciate the conditions which influenced the decision, made at the very outset, to rely on the Irish-American wing to fulfil this role. Space denies the opportunity to delve into the latter factor now, which is a highly significant one since it pertains to the class basis of the IRB, and the hard class line pursued by it. However, there is yet another element which must be taken into account when assessing the Fenian chances for success in the 1860's; which is, that in terms of revolutionary development, the Fenians of that specific period were too far ahead of the times. Objective conditions for the success of their aims did not yet exist. This does not mean that the "advanced" position of the Fenians reflected a superiority on the part of the Fenians as revolutionaries. Essentially, it was a reflection of conditions in Ireland. The subjective conditions in Ireland practically forced the Fenians to adopt a position to the far left, while the objective conditions barred their road to success. It may be worth our while to take a look at the cause of this because it is still of relevance today.

DUE TO THE PECULIARITY OF conditions in Ireland, that is the abnormality of the country's social framework which was of "forced" creation, and dating from the end of the 17th century, Irish revolutionaries were inadvertently placed in a position without parallel before the 20th century. For example, following the Williamite Wars Ireland was not alone converted into a TOTAL colony of Britain, but this was done by regulating the nation's social fabric according to the pattern and demands of capitalist society as it was evolving in Britain. As a consequence, from the 18th century

onwards there developed a bourgeois society in Ireland whose evolutionary roots were in British and not Irish society. In this context the Irish could be bourgeois, but the bourgeoisie could never be Irish. The process of social evolution fundamental to the emergence of an Irish bourgeoisie did not exist, could never again exist, because the chain of Irish social development had been irrevocably severed on the victory of British capitalism at the end of the 17th century, and there had been interposed a completely different chain of social evolution which was anchored to British society. Catastrophic results from such an abnormal reshaping of society, any society, were inevitable, and the history of Ireland attests to this fact. However, for our purposes we need only refer to a few salient factors of such a structure, as it effects the revolutionary position.

FIRST OFF, IRISH SOCIETY AFTER the Williamite Wars was "forcibly: moulded, in defiance of the natural processes, to the shape of a capitalist framework. Hence, from the 18th century onwards, Ireland had a bourgeois society per se; and the fact that it manifest itself almost exclusively as land-capitalism does not detract from this. To say, for instance, that feudalism still existed in Ireland is the height of nonsense. Now, in a situation such as this, where the hostile reactions of the majority of the community germinate a revolutionary potential, that potential could not develop in the form of a bourgeois revolution, because it is ridiculous to contend that you can have a bourgeois revolution in a country that is an already functioning bourgeois society. Therefore, any revolution in Ireland from the 18th century onwards, had to be one "beyond" the bourgeois stage of social development, and not comparable to it. However, during the 18th and 19th centuries the predominant "revolutionary philosophies" were bourgeois; and as revolutionaries; Irish Republicans subscribed to them, lacking the means to discern that while such philosophies, and the politics resulting from them, were revolutionary for nation's evolving as independent entities, they were in fact reactionary with respects to Ireland. Hence, the contradiction which at once pushed Irish revolutionaries -- both during the United Irishmen and early Fenian periods -- ahead of their times and at the same time denied them the ability to win.

IRELAND COULD NEVER HAVE A bourgeois revolution, because the results of such a revolution had already been imposed on the nation's social fabric. And this posed an insoluble contradiction for the bourgeois who were Irish, but who could never become an Irish bourgeoisie. Many of this class have given evidence of a desire for an Irish bourgeois democracy; and to this end they have lent a hand to the revolutionary struggle fermenting among the masses. But as the crisis of such a conflict with Britain sharpened, the bourgeois Irish invariably saw, or instinctively sensed, that to free Ireland must involve not alone "breaking the connection with England" politically, but also breaking up the social framework of bourgeois order in the country. You could not get rid of England and still retain intact the class structure which England extended to Ireland as a means of exploitation in tune with capitalist requirements; no more than you could separate a branch from a tree and expect it to instantaneously acquire the necessary roots to survive and grow unimpaired. Consequently, we witness the exodus of Irish bourgeois from revolutionary ranks during every revolutionary crisis. They had to choose; class extinction and the end of British occupation went hand in hand; there was no middle ground; no way to avoid the unavoidable.

OF COURSE, SUPERFICIAL commentators still talk of a bourgeois revolution in Ireland. By this they mean a quantitative change in the country's political scene, rather than a qualitative change in its politico-economic structure. They are not talking of revolution; merely of a political reorganization which would leave unaltered the essentials of a capitalist system whose roots lie in Britain, and cannot lay elsewhere. You cannot free Ireland from Britain unless you free it from the essentials of that class structure which is synonymous with British rule -- the bourgeoisie. Consequently, for the past 200 years it has in effect been futile for Irishmen to talk of a bourgeois revolution; or to talk in terms of a united effort with the bourgeois Irish to realize the Irish revolution. Ireland cannot have a bourgeois revolution, if we are to be in any ways meaningful in the use of the term. Likewise, Ireland has not, and never had, a national bourgeoisie. In reality, to talk of uniting with the so-called Irish bourgeoisie, is to propose uniting with that segment

of the English bourgeoisie whose ethnic origin is Irish; and who presumably are expected to fight against themselves. Such a maize of contradictions naturally mitigated against the success of both the United Irishmen and the early Fenians; because conditions which would enable them to solve them did not yet exist. Today, however it is different; we are equipped to understand such problems and und-

ertake their solution. We can now overcome more easily the obstacles which barred the progress and victory of the Fenians. For this we are not better men, merely those who can benefit from a century of experience that was not available to the Fenians. Let us keep this fact in mind, when we undertake to pass judgement on their efforts in 1867.

CLANN ARD FHEIS: PADDY MAC

IT IS DOUBTFUL IF THE "SCHEMERS" are at all happy with the way the Clann Na h-Eireann Ard Fheis went. The "Brass" returned to Dublin dragging their ass behind them, so to speak; the big drive to merge the Clann with the Connolly Association had failed despite all their intrigues.

ADMITTEDLY, THE "SCHEMERS" KNEW before the Ard Fheis convened that their efforts to integrate the Clann with the Connolly Association had run up against a stone wall. However, counter measures were drawn up by the Dublin-based cabal; when it was decided to try back-door methods. But here again the opposition held solid in their determination to block, at least in their particular area of influence, the continuing British Communist Party take-over of Irish Republican organizations. The aggravation and frustration caused by such opposition was a sight to see when the Dublin "brass" returned to report a failure. But according to reports, this was nothing compared to the show put on at the Ard Fheis itself.

AT THE ARD FHEIS, MR. GOULDING dragged in 1916 and the Citizen Army in support of his plea for co-operation with the Connolly Association. He stated also that he knew some of the Clann who were also members of the Connolly Association, and that there were C.A. members present. Presumably, these were amongst the 25 delegates from London, with whom it was hoped to "pack" the convention. There are many responsible people in the Clann who question the legality of 25 delegates from London; but this aside, it was surely a fine display of contempt for the Clann on the part of a high official of the Republican Movement, when he could so brazenly make such a statement in the knowledge that such membership is explicitly forbidden by the Clann Constitution. This pertinent detail was, of course, brought to the attention of the gath-

ering, but the "schemers" there and then proposed a motion to delete all mention of the Connolly Association from the Constitution. This resolution was duly carried with the aid of the "questionable delegates", although it should be noted that this procedure was in direct violation of the rules governing the Ard Fheis. So much for the scheme to integrate the Clann with the Connolly Association; it didn't get very far; but with the help of a "packed" convention, at least one barrier has been removed by amending the Constitution. We can now confidently await further efforts on the part of the "schemers" to follow through with their plans; and expect further displays of their brazen manipulation of rules and regulations in the process.

THE OTHER HIGHLIGHT OF THE ARD Fheis centered around Resolutions which 1: urged "the Republican Movement to cease contesting General Elections in the 26 counties;" and 2: urged "the Republican Movement to cease contesting General Elections in the 6 counties." On the request of Mr. Goulding these were withdrawn. WHY? It is difficult to see any harm in them, especially when the President of Sinn Fein has said that Republicans would not enter such parliaments. We know, Irish Republicans will not enter such parliaments; but this does not mean that Sinn Fein will not do so. There are, after all, REPUBLICANS and republicans, and it is obvious that the Sinn Fein species of republican has parliamentary aspirations which cannot be sated without participating in Partitionist politics. In this light it is understandable why they should desire to suppress all references to non-participation in Partitionist politics; even at the Clann Ard Fheis.

ALL SUPPORT TO THE REVOLUTION

REVOLUTION vs. REFORM

THE BATTLE NOW BEING WAGED

THE CENTRAL ISSUE FACING Republicans today is that pertaining to the course of action best suited to the realization of our people's social and economic betterment. It is quite apparent that the ranks of activist Republicans are sharply divided on this fundamental question. Day by day a clear division in opinion is developing to an unprecedented degree. On the one side are those who believe that REFORM will do; which can be pursued within the confines of established political practices. On the other side are those who are convinced that REVOLUTION, and only a revolution which is both social and political, can produce the desired results. This then is the issue which is at the root of the present conflict within Republican ranks. Is organized Republicanism to pursue a REFORMIST course, or is it going to march forward on the REVOLUTIONARY road, in unison with the peoples of all other exploited nations?

THE MAIN DIFFERENCES

THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE Revolutionary and Reformist positions can be simply stated. The Reformists propose to rectify the prevailing disparity between the privileged and non-privileged sectors of the community, through a process of political negotiation, arbitration and conciliation. They contend that the present privileged minority can be persuaded to see the light, and embark more or less voluntarily on a process of social and economic change that would see that minority divested to a substantial degree of its present advantages, in the interests of humanity. The Revolutionaries, on the other hand, have little patience with such nonsense. They propose to overthrow the privileged minority politically; transfer the functionings of state power to the underprivileged majority; who will then proceed to radically reconstruct the social and economic foundations of the state in their own interests.

REVOLUTION DICTATES THE complete destruction of the existing system as an unsubstitutable prerequisite for the rebuilding of a new and more equitable order. There is no way in which this

BY
EOIN McDONAILL

basic requirement can be circumvented, because revolution, in its real sense, entails the rebirth of a society in a form totally dissimilar from its prior state. On the other hand, reform is universally acknowledged to mean the pursuance of objects which can be realized without introducing fundamental change to the prevailing system. Reform stands for alterations in the external forms of an existing social structure; while Revolution stands for the total realignment of the essentials of social order. Revolution proposes to reconstruct man's socio-economic environment, so that all men shall benefit equally therefrom. Reform proposes to alleviate the more severe aspects of the existing system, so that the prevailing disparity in social and economic status between the privileged minority and the non-privileged majority shall be lessened to a "tolerable" degree.

FROM THE OUTSET, WE HAVE stated clearly that we stand for REVOLUTION. As the voice of Revolutionary Ireland, AN PHOBLACHT has advocated the urgent need for the adoption of a revolutionary stand, which we consider compatible to Republican traditions; as against a futile involvement with the Reformist position now being pushed by the neo-Griffithites in Sinn Fein, and which we consider to be the antithesis of Republican traditions.

IN ADDITION, WE HAVE STRESSED the need for honesty in all political activity carried on under the banner of Irish Republicanism. We fly the revolutionary flag; and disdain to operate under any other, regardless of shorttranged benefits which may come our way if we pursued a less defined course. For their part, the neo-Griffithite Reformists lack the back-bone to be as explicit on their position. They are forever ranting about their "revolutionary" status, in an attempt to mislead the people. The neo-Griffithites try to have it both ways. By giving voice to revolutionary sentiments they try to humbug the people into support-

ing them, in the belief that by so doing our traditional Republican cause is being supported. And by restricting their activities to within reformist limits they are, at the same time, pursuing a course of reconciliation with the status quo. We strenuously object to such base treachery; not because it affects us, but because it represents the lowest form of political double-dealing that can be practiced on a people who have suffered too much for too long in the interests of Republican attempts to establish a sovereign nation founded on the interests of the working classes.

THE NEO-GRIFFITHITE REFORMISTS who presently run the Republican Movement, endeavour to cover their debasement of Irish Republican ideals by confusing the basic issues at stake. They are forever and a day reminding us on the need for a new approach to the solution of problems which confront Republicanism's advance. They are trying to convince all that they, the neo-Griffithites, are presently engaged in honest search for such new courses of action, while it is transparently clear that all they are now trying is to find ways to put across policies already decided upon.

TWO OF THE MAIN PLANKS IN THE "New Departure" platform currently being advocated by the Reformists in Sinn Fein, evolve on the question of co-operatives as a solution to the economic troubles of rural Ireland; and, on the proposition that victory over the present political apparatus can only be secured through an alliance between the Republican Movement and organized labour. Like all Reformist proposals, these contain that grain of truth sufficient to ensure their plausibility; especially when presented out of context.

THE CO-OPERATIVE QUESTION

NO ONE WILL DENY THAT co-operative farming proffers the only solution whereby agricultural production in Ireland can be developed to meet national needs. However, it is one thing to suggest the revitalization of rural Ireland through the reorientation of the means of production along lines of co-operative labour and control, when you possess the political power to implement such a scheme. It is an entirely different matter for an organization such as the Republican Movement to pursue such a policy at this stage when it lacks political power, and

when in fact such policies are in direct conflict with those being pursued by the people who do possess political power.

IN OTHER WORDS, THE POSSESSION of State Power is essential to the implementation of policies relating to radical change in the relations of production; which in this instance undeniably applies to the question of large-scale co-operative farming in Ireland. So that when the "Progressives" talk of the paramount need for the development of co-operatives to offset rural depopulation and the spread of agricultural capitalism, while at the same time minimizing the relevance of the struggle for state power as the determining factor in the realization of such ends; they are leading the people up the garden path. And the only people to ultimately benefit from this type of political sophistry are those now in power. Because to suggest that state power can ultimately be secured by the labouring classes through a process of gradual assault on the economic bastions of the ruling classes - and the creation of scattered co-operatives is presented as an integral part of such a war of "economic resistance" - is to transpose the relative positions of cause and effect.

THE REVOLUTIONARIES ALSO acknowledge the importance of co-operatives, both in the fields of production and distribution, as an admirable means to rectify the adverse social and economic effects of the present system. But with this fundamental difference. They stress that the adverse effects resulting from the present order cannot be changed to any worthwhile extent, until such time as their cause is first removed. Which means, we cannot introduce essential change into the existing social and economic structure of the country, until we first overthrow the source of political power which is responsible for the perpetuation of the system. Consequently, the only logical course open to any movement which professes a desire to see such fundamental change, is to mobilize all who now suffer the adverse effects of the prevailing order behind an effort to eliminate the basic cause--which means the political power of the ruling class. When this has been achieved, then and only then will we be in the position to do something constructive about the plight of the majority of our people.

THERE IS SOMETHING PATHETICALLY nonsensical in the proposition that the success of a few scattered co-operatives, such as the Glencolumbkille project, gives a valid indication on the course of action to be pursued by a movement such as organized Republicanism in its struggle for state power. Mind you, we detract in no way from the admirable progress being sustained at Glencolumbkille; indeed we think it a graphic illustration of what the people could and would do throughout the whole nation, if the power to determine the politics of the country rested solely in their hands. But the hard fact remains: such an isolated economic incident, restricted to one townland, constitutes no threat whatever to the interests of the ruling class. Hence, the fact that its existence is tolerated -- and only barely at that -- is not a true indication that a proliferation of co-operatives would likewise be tolerated; assuming the people possessed the economic means to do such a thing. Of course, the crux of the matter is: the people do not possess the economic means, and for so long as the present ruling class retains its political ascendancy over the destinies of the majority, they effectively control the economic affairs of the country. And for so long as this state of affairs remain it is they, and not the people as a whole, who will decide what is, and what is not to be done in the field of economic development. Even as things now stand, it requires the combined efforts of all the "Progressives" to keep Glencolumbkille going. It would be ludicrous to claim that the Donegal project multiplied a thousand times -- could be likewise sustained in the face of governmental opposition. Reduced to political values: the "Progressives" position on the co-operative issue, means they are regulating their national policies according to the workings of "village politics." The normal procedure is, and must be the reverse.

ORGANIZED LABOUR:

THE OTHER MAIN PANACEA BEING tossed about by the Reformists applies to the question of organized labour; by which is meant the Trade Union Movement and Labour Party. It is suggested that Republicanism cannot succeed unless it establishes a working alliance with these bodies who are, of course, expected to return "to the policies of Connolly." All of this sounds good and proper -- at first. But the boggy is, the neo-

Griffithite Reformists do not attempt to differentiate between the working class membership of these organizations, and the ideological motivation which dictates both their structure and functioning in tune with ruling class affairs.

THERE IS, IN OTHER WORDS, A distinct difference between the working class support that maintains the Labour Party, and the Party machine which directs that support along channels amenable to the functioning of the bourgeois state apparatus. In like manner, a distinct difference exists between the proletarian membership of trade unions, and the majority of trade union bureaucracies which manipulate the strength of the proletariat in accordance with the requirements and laws of a bourgeois ruling class. So that it becomes very apparent that when Irish Republicanism, as a revolutionary movement, speaks on the question of organized labour, it has to be specific in what it means by such a term.

WHEN REVOLUTIONARIES SPEAK OF mobilizing organized labour, they propose, amongst other things, to independently mobilize the bulk of the present memberships of both the Labour Party and Trade Union Movement under the leadership of a Revolutionary Political Movement. This obviously implies a by-passing of the existing machinery of those bodies altogether; to appeal to the memberships in question, not on the basis of their association with the Labour Party, not on the basis of their membership in a trade union, but on the basis of their class interests, which can only be truly forwarded by a revolutionary movement which squarely formulates its programme on the premise of the class struggle.

ON THE OTHER HAND, THE neo-Griffithite Reformists project the quixotic notion of integrating the Labour Party and Trade Union Movement with the Republican Movement; thereby concocting a mass and diversified effort against the entrenched Free-staters and Stormontites, as the case may be. They prattle about the Labour Party and the Trade Union Movement "returning to the policies of Connolly;" completely ignoring -- as is a great practice of theirs -- the fact that those bodies never really subscribed to the revolutionary position of Connolly in the first place. By what mysterious process they are to "return" to a position they never held to begin with, remains one hell of a problem to say the least.

WHEN ONE CONSIDERS THAT THE Labour Party and the Trade Union Movement cannot even get together to present a united front in Free State politics, on behalf of those whose interests they allegedly represent; it is decidedly difficult to foresee them banding with the Republican Movement to kick the Free Staters out altogether. One of the principal Trade Union's in the country is quite openly an annex of the Fianna Fail Party; a situation which is readily acknowledged as the stumbling block to the Labour Party's hopes of cornering effective trade union support for its political undertakings. The Reformists propose rectifying situations such as this by "boring from within"; by having "representatives in the trade union movement whose function it will be to examine Trade Union law and structure with a view to making the Trade Union's more revolutionary." That's what they said in that famous "Document" of theirs which saw the light of day some months back. The question is, do these humbugs seriously expect us to believe that they can change, or hope to change, the course of a trade union such as the I.T. & G. W.U.? If they so believe, why in the devil draw the line with the Trade Unions? Why not also "bore from within" in Fianna Fail, and make it "more revolutionary?" Frankly, we fail to see where the latter could or would present a greater challenge than the former.

WE COULD GO ON AND ON RECOUNTING the many blatant fallacies inherent in the Reformist position without any difficulty whatever. But what is the use? Anyone with a normally functioning brain can readily and easily perceive that if one desires, for example, to free a garden of weeds, you do not graft them to the vegetables; you do not just pluck a leaf off here and there; you simply pull the weeds out by the roots. Likewise, if it is desired to cleanse a country of an iniquitous socio-economic system, it too has to be torn out by its roots, and not just pruned here and there to make it less obnoxious in its external appearance.

TYPES OF REFORMISTS

YOU SEE, THERE IS NOTHING mysterious about the essential functioning of either politics or economics; and when anyone says otherwise you can rest assured he's trying to humbug you for one reason or another. Now, in the case of the present neo-Griffithite Reformists there are, in our opinion, two distinct categories

who attempt to confuse the issue. Firstly, you have the section representing an element who lack the nerve to embark on a revolution. Usually they believe in revolution, but they lack the courage to engage in it. However, combined with this lack of nerve is an equally potent desire to remain active as Republicans of the traditional type; and from this contradiction develops their Reformist stance. As Reformists, they can gratify their emotional hankering for revolutionary action by loudly talking revolution from platforms; while at the same time avoiding the actual risks associated with revolution, by indulging only in a course of action that in no way offers a fundamental challenge to the status quo. At the worst, this sort of thing brings the odd few months in jail now and then. But this type of punishment they can endure; it helps both to enhance their standing in the eyes of the people, and at the same time it gratifies their own frustrations.

SECONDLY, YOU HAVE THE FAR MORE sinister element, who have infiltrated the ranks of Irish Republicanism for the express purpose of diverting it along channels of endeavour that will not challenge the foundations of the status quo. In the past --but not too distant past --this element was primarily Free-stater; their task was essentially political, in that their object was to fragmentate the political threat posed by the traditional Republicans to the Free-state republicans. Of late, however, this sort of sabotage has taken on a different and deeper tone with the infiltration of agents from the British Communist Party, and the establishment of a network of gullible Irish Republicans who have fallen for their line.

MANY MUST WONDER WHY THESE foreign agents have so suddenly taken such a sympathetic interest in Irish Republicanism; especially when it demands no great mental feat to recall the derogatory manner in which they, or their bosses ridiculed Republican soldiers who dared to shoulder a gun against the British military occupation in the Six Counties. Ah! but times have changed; and a good opportunist is he who can interpret a changing situation before, and not after it becomes readily apparent. To any politically perceptive person, it is obvious that Ireland is the one place in Western Europe that now possesses the greatest potential for revolution. Furth-

ermore, it is also apparent that such an occurrence, if allowed to develop, must have dramatic economic and social consequences; it cannot fail but result in social and economic revolution with the most radical repercussions. Keeping all of this in mind, we can go further and see: 1) at present Irish Republicanism represents the only logical force to lead such a revolution; 2) such a revolution most decidedly would not be in the best interests of the "Power Block" to which the British Communist Party is subordinated--the Soviet Union. Conditions such as these logically demanded the Irish sections of the British C.P. to do the "old Moscow twist"; they reversed their hitherto support of "democratic" Fianna Fail in favour of a suddenly popular Irish Republicanism. By pursuing such a course their main object was to gain control of the movement, and reshape its basic driving force, so that any leadership it was capable of offering to the Irish people in time of crisis would be tamed considerably. In other words, the object is to purge organized Republicanism of its inherent revolutionary motivations, so that in time of crisis it would not rock the boat.

THE FOREIGN AGENTS WERE considerably assisted in their aims by the fact that their need to infiltrate the Republican Movement coincided with a period of internal crisis in the movement. During the early sixties, not alone was the movement denuded to a large extent of its more politically aware membership through disaffection and purges, but it had also reached a stage where it was obvious, even to the more stupid, that a lot of re-thinking was needed with regards to programme and policy. Enter the trained agents of the British Communist Party. Here were men capable in organizational matters, and possessing the ability to fluently articulate on policies which, in contrast to those that then guided the Republican Movement, appeared the essence of radicalism. The "New Departure" with its "Parnellian solution" was born, and the men who acted as its midwife naturally had established themselves as good "Progressives" in the movement. It was as simple as that.

IT CAN BE SEEN THEN THAT THE Reformist ranks actually represent a coalition of two diverse motivations. From the revolutionary standpoint, the first category is the least dangerous; indeed it is

our contention that although such people are not revolutionaries, they are still capable of doing productive labour on behalf of the revolution, and are therefore potential allies of the revolutionaries. As to the second category, it is a revolutionary obligation to fight these characters to the bitter end, because they stand for the most loathsome of political practices. They must be exposed; they must be routed if the Irish Revolution is to avoid being stabbed in the back again.

AIDING AND ABETTING TREASON

THIS BRINGS US TO YET ANOTHER matter: which is that relating to anyone who lends either the prestige of his name and background, or his talents to the Reformist hoax. Of late there has been quite a few who have "returned" to the arena of Republican activity; or at least, they have made themselves conspicuous on the periphery of its activity. There is no need at present to be more specific, but the fact is, by their activity they are aiding and abetting the debasement of the Republican position by allowing the Reformists to exploit at least their apparent association with Reformist objects. Let's not fool around on this issue. Anyone who gives any support, or appears to give even a tacit backing, to the present plot to undermine the revolutionary position of Irish Republicanism; then that person or persons are as guilty as those who actually do the dirty work. This is the position of the revolutionaries; who are prepared to let the chips fall where they will, regardless of who is involved, and regardless of the prior achievements and services of those involved. Fancy double-talk is not going to relieve anyone of their responsibility in this matter; and there will be little use in saying later on: "I only gave them a little help." As far as we are concerned there is no such escape clause as giving "only a little help;" as is there no such thing as being "only a little pregnant."

IN CONCLUSION, LET IT AGAIN BE stated that the fundamental issue now at stake for all true Irish Republicans is: will they allow themselves to be fooled once more by fancy-talking political opportunists; or are they for once and for all time going to get down to the business of getting this Revolution of ours moving? For our part we say: Let's get rid of all this damn double-talk; let's get rid of all these elaborate excuses currently being tossed about in an

attempt to side-track the main issue; let's decide positively on REVOLUTION, and then proceed with the business of determining the best manner by which it is to

be carried forward to VICTORY! That, and only that is the issue now at stake; REVOLUTION versus REFORMIST HUMBUGGERY.

* * *

THE IRA BADGE

MOST REPUBLICANS ARE FAMILIAR with the IRA badge which depicts an armed volunteer waving the tri-colour as he cleans his boots on the Union Jack. It has been with us many a year now. Recently, we received word from an angry Republican exile in England, who informs us that "Dublin" refuses to supply this badge any longer. Apparently, it has been decided to cease printing it; or at least it has been decided to cease issuing it in England.

WE WONDER WHY THE REPUBLICAN Movement has taken this latest step. Are they ashamed of the IRA badge in question? Or have they in their newly acquired sophistication, decided it unbecoming of Irish Republicans to walk about the enemy's home ground flaunting an IRA badge which shows the greatest contempt for the Union Jack? Perhaps the "brass" consider it "bad taste" to wear such symbols any longer; it might offend their newly acquired friends in the Connolly Association and the British Communist Party.

ONCE A PARTY EMBARKS ON THE road of compromise, it becomes very difficult for it to halt. We think this incident of withdrawing the IRA badge is just one more illustration of the inevitable results from the course of compromise embarked on by the Sinn Fein "Progressives". After all, it is highly unlikely that men who set out to disarm the IRA would continue to issue badges which glorify the strength of the armed volunteer.

FALSE HISTORY

THERE IS NO DOUBT BUT THAT THE United Irishman has a limitless capacity for making the movement it represents look foolish. It rants and raves about the enemy propagandists who distort and misconstrue our Republican history, while itself is as big an offender as any.

IN THE MARCH ISSUE GREAT prominence is given to an article by Padraig O'Snodaigh, and headed "The Fenian Plan of Government." The writer bases his article on a pamphlet entitled "On The Capacity Of Ireland To Exist As An Independent State", which was published in Dublin in 1862 over the pseud-

onym "A Silent Politician." In accrediting this pamphlet to James Stephens, the writer commits one of those errors common to the amateur historian; he accepts written statements at face value.

I DO NOT PRETEND TO KNOW THE source on which the writer based his authority; but I would hazard a guess that the information was acquired either from The Dictionary of National Biography, or from some library which catalogued its holdings according to data in the D.N.B. At any rate, the writer is in error, because James Stephens did not write the pamphlet.

ANYONE AT ALL FAMILIAR WITH Fenian history would immediately question the authenticity of any statement which attributed the pamphlet to Stephens; if for nothing else, because it is not mentioned by any of Stephens' associates. It is true that the IRB published a pamphlet in 1862, but the one played up in the March U.I. is not it, nor does it give a true indication of the political ideas of James Stephens. The error in confusing the "Silent Politician's" pamphlet with that issued by the IRB during the same period, is one of those things which often occurs in "sloppy" historical research. But this is hardly an excuse for a Republican writer who should, if he is at all interested in his subject, check and recheck his facts before committing statements pertaining to Republican history to paper.

O'SNODAIGH CAN CHECK ALL THE documentary material relating to the IRB without finding any basis for his article. On the other hand, he will find ample evidence to establish that the pamphlet issued by the IRB in 1862 was nothing more than a reprint of public speeches made in Philadelphia by Doherty, O'Mahony and others, after the American delegation had returned from the "McManus Funeral." This was the only pamphlet issued by the IRB or anyone associated with it, before 1866.

THIS MONTH'S COVER

ON THE COVER OF THIS MONTH'S number we reprint the PROCLAMATION issued by the Provisional Government during the Rising of '67. It is an important document which is not without significance. It is a pity it is not better known to Republicans.

* * *

Title: An Phoblacht, Vol. 1, No. 10
Organisation: Irish Revolutionary Forces
Date: 1967

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.