

# *AN PHOBLACHT*

The Republic

Vol. 1. No 3.

Jan. 1966



**THE FIST THAT WILL SAVE**

**THE NATION**

# EDITORIAL

ONE OF THE BETTER FEATURES of a Sinn Fein Ard Fheis is that it is an occasion on which the leaders of the Republican Movement are practically forced to voice openly their opinions on social, political and economic matters. This affords people like ourselves the opportunity to assess changes, if any, in the thinking of the leadership, and thereby reevaluate our own position vis-a-vis the Republican Movement.

THIS YEAR'S PRESIDENTIAL Address touches on matters of political, economic and historic content. Therefore it offers a rare opportunity to appraise the intellectual level of the men who are considered the elite of the Movement. In all probability Tom Gill, as President of Sinn Fein, had a major say in the wording of the statement he read to the Convention. However, it would be unfair to blame him entirely for its contents, because it undoubtedly passed the scrutiny of his associates before being presented.

## CONNOLLY MISQUOTED.

ALL OUR READERS SHOULD BE AWARE by now that the Sinn Fein "economists" consider it practical to salvage our chaotic economic position by developing a co-operative system of land management in areas of low yield; and by encouraging the growth of credit unions and by establishing a state banking system so as to make available cheap credit for both industrial and agricultural development. There is nothing new in this idea; its original source can be easily traced. However, we will pass it for the moment to first challenge Mr. Gill on his unscrupulous manipulation of the writings of James Connolly to give a revolutionary base to Sinn Fein's co-op policy.

WHEN EXPOUNDING ON SINN FEIN'S latest fad, Mr. Gill remarked: "Many people think that they have no choice but to support an unchristian capitalist and individualist system or to support an anti-religious materialist and communist system. The alternative is co-operativism as preached by James Connolly -- that is co-operative control of the means of production, distribution and exchange." He went on to claim that "...Connolly said 'Socialism implies

co-operative control by the workers of the machinery of production; in the absence of such control we have nought but State Capitalism' ".

TO BEGIN, CONNOLLY WROTE: "State ownership and control is not necessarily socialism...but the ownership by the state of all the land and materials for labour, combined with the co-operative control by the workers of such land and materials would be socialism." By omitting the fundamental necessity, state ownership, Mr. Gill has placed an entirely different meaning on co-operative control.

THE LAND CO-OPERATIVE SYSTEM being sponsored by Sinn Fein, is similar to that which was advocated by Horace Plunkett and associates during the early years of the present century, and which entailed the collective management of a group of private holdings. It is, or should be, very obvious to all that this is entirely different to a land co-operative where the ownership of the land is vested in the state, and its control and management vested in the community working it.

IF MR. GILL IS WELL VERSED IN the writings of James Connolly -- which we doubt very much -- he may argue that Connolly looked with favour on the co-operative activities of Plunkett. Yes! But things must be retained in proper context if we are to ascertain their true meaning. Connolly considered the Plunkett co-operative scheme a positive contribution, in that its functioning could very well awaken the farming community to the benefits of community ownership in the Marxian sense, and thereby pave the way to an acceptance of socialism -- and let us not forget that James Connolly was a self-proclaimed Marxist. However, it was one thing for Connolly, the socialist, to look with favour on the co-operative schemes of an apolitical movement; it would be a different matter to expect his approval were the same scheme forwarded as a panacea for our economic ills by a political movement styling itself revolutionary.

NO, MR. GILL, YOU CANNOT wangle a blessing for Sinn Fein's co-operative schemes from the writings of James Connolly; unless,



of course, you misquote. On the other hand, should you desire an understanding of what Connolly considered state ownership in combination with the co-operative control by the workers --and note the term WORKERS-- you should look into both the agricultural and industrial systems as functioning in a socialist country. --We appreciate, of course, that any system adopted in Ireland will have to be dictated by Irish conditions. But, an examination of a country such as China for instance will at least give an opportunity to understand what Connolly had in mind.

THE TROUBLE WITH SINN FEIN is that its leaders have, in some degree, come to appreciate the capitalist content of their organization's economic policies that were inherited from Griffith. They have a vague idea that these are bad; but they actually do not know yet why this is so. On the other hand, they view socialism through bourgeois spectacles, so that they find it difficult to accept the economic tenets of socialism as an alternative to their old policies. Still, they cannot condemn socialism outright; obviously it has achieved a lot of good in many areas. Hence the perplexity which Mr. Gill endeavours to solve by saying "Communism...as it has manifested itself in many countries...is not an ideology which would commend itself to the Irish people." The ambiguity of this statement is apparent. Is he issuing a blanket condemnation of communism? Or, is he merely condemning that which manifests itself in many socialist countries, as distinct from all socialist countries? Frankly, we don't know.

THE SAME PERPLEXITY IS EVINCED in Mr. Gill's contention that Sinn Fein wants neither capitalism nor socialism. They desire something suspended between both; they want economic in-betweenism, and they are endeavouring to use James Connolly as a basis for this utopian concept. In reality, the economic policy now being promoted by Sinn Fein is immeasurably removed from any stand James Connolly ever took. It is nothing more than a bizarre mixture of re-hashed Proudhonism and the Social Credit theories of Major C.H. Douglas. And since history stands as the best judge on both of these isms, we have not intention now of wasting any further space to show up their absurdities.

#### INTERPRETING REVOLUTION.

"WE MUST FACE UP TO THE fact that we are a revolutionary organisation..." says Mr. Gill.

Yes indeed, but there are so many conflicting interpretations on what constitutes revolution. Fortunately, an additional gem of wisdom affords an opportunity to assess the advances made by the Sinn Fein leadership in their understanding of the revolutionary process. The Presidential Address continues: "This is the age of freedom...The work of the American and French Revolutionaries are today bearing fruit...."

DID THE COMPOSER OF THESE LINES know what in the hell he was writing; did Tom Gill know what he was saying, when he read these lines to the Convention? The American and French Revolutions, in conjunction with the Cromwellian revolution, represent the origins of bourgeois democracy, which in turn represent the foundation stones of modern capitalism and imperialism. Consequently, the legitimate heirs of the revolutionary motivation of the foregoing are the present-day capitalists and imperialists. We will agree that the bourgeois revolutions are still "bearing fruit." Imperialist aggression all over the world, and capitalist exploitation in general, attest to that. But we doubt that this is actually what Mr. Gill, or the Sinn Fein moguls, had in mind. In their innocence and ignorance of the essence of revolution they simply put their foot in it; completely unaware that, to anyone with even a smattering of knowledge on the revolutionary process, they were making complete idiots of themselves.

MODERN REVOLUTION, WHICH FOR practical purposes is usually considered to encompass all progressive revolutionary upheavals since the Paris Commune of 1871, possesses a completely different base than did the American or French Revolutions. Today, all progressive revolutions are socialist in content; that is to say, regardless of whether or not socialist theories exert an influence on a present-day revolution at its outset, they will inevitably become the dominating influence due to the nature of forces which will invariably oppose the progress of the revolution. In other words, a present-day revolution need not necessarily be initiated by doctrinaire socialists to become a socialist revolution. The predictable capitalist opposition to the revolution will direct it towards a socialist orientation, and if it is to advance, then, the revolution itself will in fact create its own doctrinaire socialists.

THE SINN FEIN BRAINS-TRUST may attempt to counteract this



rather simplified analysis of a very complex process, by saying the Irish Revolution of 1916-22 was not socialist. True. But neither was it successful. The harsh truth is that despite the heroism shown by I.R.A. combatants in the war against vastly superior forces, and despite the fact that the I.R.A. initiated many of the tactical elements of revolutionary guerilla warfare, the predominant political influence within the revolutionary movement was reactionary. This is readily manifest by the turn of events in 1922; and in what happened afterwards.

STILL, DESPITE ALL OF THIS there is also evidence that by 1922 the actual pressures of the Irish struggle were forging a socialist consciousness in a small activist nucleus. And had the struggle been more protracted, it is at least conceivable that this element would eventually have exerted itself to direct the revolution along a more progressive path. Obviously, all of this is purely speculative. But keep in mind also that the Irish struggle of that period was very short indeed when compared to contemporary struggles for national liberation. Consequently, many of the contradictions inherent in the revolutionary movement were not resolved.

IT IS PARADOXICAL PERHAPS, BUT IT could well be that had Ireland suffered more and for a longer period during that era we call the TAN WAR, it may in the long run have suffered less. Because, had a condition of social, political and economic turmoil, comparable say to that experienced in Algeria, occurred in Ireland at that time, the limitations of Sinn Fein's bourgeois and petty-bourgeois policies would have been exposed for what they were, as would the Sinn Feiners. But the struggle was not sufficiently intense to resolve this reaction. Hence, we have had over 40 years of mismanagement in Ireland that is the direct outcome of the reactionary politics which governed the Irish struggle between 1917-22. Look at all the suffering both direct and indirect which this has incurred? And the hard fact still prevails that the Irish Revolution still remains to be consummated; the contradictions and political reaction which destroyed the previous effort still remain to be resolved; and this will undoubtedly demand further sacrifice and suffering on the part of the people. So it can be seen why we say it may have been better if the nation had suffered more during the TAN WAR

and had won, rather than have endured what it did to gain that pittance of freedom it received.

#### EXPLOITING SOCIALIST IDEAS.

A PERUSAL OF THE PRESIDENTIAL Statement as a whole cannot fail but convince one that Sinn Fein is living in a little world of its own. Not alone are its ideas on revolution outdated by at least a century and a half, but all of its evaluations are based on subjective rather than objective interpretations of existing conditions. The Address is, of course, ideally suited to draw cheers from the floor of the Convention, with its usual collection of cliches on freedom, the rights of man, even a harsh word here and there for the capitalist, and a bit of back-handed praise for socialism. A good mixed brew that is ensured not to offend the sensibilities of any but the downright West-Briton.

THIS TREND OF GIVING A SOCIALIST flavour to its policies is new for Sinn Fein. The whole affair is quite harmless of course, but still the Sinn Feiners no doubt think it the height of progress to mention such a word as "Communist" before the faithful; it shows how broad-minded they have become. However, the progressive minded Republicans throughout the country should be wary of this venture into a socialist vocabulary on the part of Sinn Fein, and not be lead to believe that it implies a change of heart on their part. Judge them by their actions and not by their words; it is always safer. During the latter years of the last century Connolly had this to say about the United Irish League, which at the time was indulging in the use of some radical phrases and in a manner very similar to the present-day Sinn Feiners: "So far our United Irish League agitators are borrowing the arguments of the socialists to suit their own purposes; but they, with characteristic class selfishness, stop short at the application thereof."

HOW TRUE? WORDS ARE EASY enough to employ; and safer by far than deeds. If Sinn Fein truly desires to embark on a revolutionary road, then let us see some action in that direction. Let them dispense with the flowery phrases and proceed with the work in a pragmatic and honest fashion. When that day appears, this little paper will have done its work. It will then be silent.



# THE EDITOR'S POST BAG

THE FOLLOWING IS A FAIR cross-section of the letters we have received since beginning publication.

\* \* \*

## THE IRISH WORKERS PARTY.

ADVICE RECEIVED FROM ONE OF the Kremlin's boys.

..."As an Irish Republican (internee 1940's) and a Communist, I am writing to you to express my indignation with regard to your publication. Not since the so-called Catholic paper "The Standard" attacked the Communist Party some years ago have I read such criticism of the party of the Irish Working Class.

MY ADVICE TO YOU IS TO CEASE publication, as there are too many papers in Ireland seeking to put forward progressive views today. Neither my comrades nor myself think that Republican differences should be aired publicly, as it can only profit the enemies of the cause."

\* \* \*

THIS GREAT CONCERN FOR THE Republican Movement, which has lately taken hold of the I.W.P., is amazing. A few years back they viewed Republicans as a bunch of degenerate petty bourgeois nationalists. Of course we are well aware of the reasons for this change of heart, but we'll let it pass for the time being.

AS TO HELPING THE ENEMIES OF the cause by airing the differences which have rent the revolutionary front asunder: we would point out that our paper is only circulated amongst members of organizations or groups styling themselves "Republican", or "Progressive." In any event, since the real enemies of our cause are already well aware of the inner conflicts, and their sources, it is difficult to understand how harm could be done by giving a public opinion on the reasons why the situation is as it is.

ONLY THE GENERAL PUBLIC would be enlightened by airing openly the causes of Republicanism's present dilapidated state. Then, perhaps, the Irish people would really appreciate why the movement has degenerated to the degree it has. But no! Our half-assed revolutionaries would rather keep the causes of all the dissension over the past few decades between themselves and the "Castle".

AT PRESENT OUR PAPER HAS only a limited circulation. Therefore, it just breaks the surface in its attempt to expose the stupidity, the ignorance and the downright reaction that prevails within the ranks of organized Republicanism, and other self-styled revolutionary groups. But give us a little more time to mobilize the resources necessary to expand operations, and we'll tell the people in general all about the Sawdust-Casesars and little Tin-Gods that have methodically destroyed the effectiveness of the Irish revolutionary effort over the years, so as to reduce it to a size which they could manage. These individuals haven't got the intelligence of a mentally retarded flea; and their handiwork is the best evidence of this.

## POOR OLD FRANCO.

THE FASCISTS ARE ALSO HOWLING. Our comments on foreign events in our first issue brought a stack of letters in defence of Franco. It was difficult to make sense out of most of them; but we did get the message -- there are a lot of BLUE SHIRTS around yet, and they are as thick as ever. Here is an extract from one letter:

... "AS AN ARDENT ADMIRER OF GEN. Franco, the saviour of Europe against Communism, the man whose cause was obstructed by both de Valera and Britain at the same time; whose armies were opposed by ... (A) handful of so-called Irish Republicans linked with the ranks of the British Tommies in the International Brigades ... I was disappointed in the organ styling itself AN PHOBLACHT ... Red Russia would be delighted with your correspondent's vapourings on Spain. ... The Spaniards can look after their present-day interests themselves without Irishmen --- and I hope their allegiance (Irishmen?) is to Ireland and not to the Comintern."

\* \* \*

WELL, IT TAKES ALL KINDS TO make a world. However, for our money Franco never was any good, and never will be any good. History condemns him as a mass murderer, a racist, a fascist, and a dictator who has exploited religion to further his crusade against political freedom, economic democracy, and human dignity in general. If our readers don't already know

what Franco is, and what he stands for, there is little chance that we can enlighten them in a couple of lines of type.

WE WOULD ONLY LIKE TO ADD THAT the articles on foreign revolutionary events have been omitted due to lack of space. We anticipated this, but thought it best to make our general position clear so that everyone knew where we stood in relation to the revolutionary struggles around the world.

#### A CHANGE OF PACE.

"YOUR VIEWS ON THE REPUBLICAN Movement are hard-hitting ... I think they will in the next few years bring about their own downfall. At present they don't know whether they are going or coming. 'Should we recognise the courts?' 'Should we enter Leinster House or not?' This is all they talk about lately."

IN MUNSTER THEY THINK IT progressive to move in on 1916/1966 Commemoration committees even if it means rubbing shoulders with F.F. and F.G. traitors. Don't say anything against the Labour Party they tell you; after all, didn't Mac Aonghusa their Vice Chairman agree to speak on a Republican platform in Waterford.... Keep up the good work lads ..... Enclosed you will find 10/- for the funds."

\* \* \*  
THE ONLY COMMENT WE WOULD make on this letter, is that the Republican Movement, and for that matter the Free State and Stormont, will never fall down on their own. No matter how rotten they get, they have to get a push. So, it's of little use saying "keep up the good work" to us; if you think we are in any way right, then you should be in there working with us, helping us to give that little push that will topple the R.M.; so as to clear the ground to take on the Free State and the other crowd.

#### THAT'S A FAIR QUESTION.

"RECENTLY I OBTAINED A COPY OF both issues of AN PHOBLACHT. Having read them I will say that at least they make a fellow think, and that's a change..... I don't know yet whether I agree with you or not, but maybe you could answer one question for me if you have the time. Being a believer in physical force, I have a great suspicion of political parties. Over the years I have seen too many sell-outs engineered by politicians..... I would like to know what you mean when you say that a new revolutionary political party should be formed.... For myself I can't see where we need a political

party, I think it would be more business-like to start getting a new army together and have a crack at the bastards across the border."  
Eoin Mac C.

\* \* \*

THE GREAT TROUBLE WITH MOST physical force men is that their concept of politics is usually very limited. Generally, politics and parliamentarianism are synonymous to their minds. This view is, of course, erroneous.

REVOLUTION IS YET ANOTHER form of political action, since it entails the overthrow of one system of government, and its replacement by another. To achieve this revolutionaries have to possess an armed force and a political force. In simple terms; the armed force is the battering ram which will reduce the enemy to political rubble; the political force will serve as the guiding hand in this job, and will assume the reins of state power when the task is completed, and continue to guide the labour of reconstruction which must inevitably follow.

THE MAN WHO SAYS THAT the Irish revolution can succeed without the prior establishment of a revolutionary political organization to guide it, is as stupid as he who claims it can be realized without resorting to armed struggle.

THE CRUCIAL POINT WHICH must be understood is that physical force is but the means to an end. It might well be that a purely physical force movement could free Ireland. But what then? With no pre-established political authority to guide it the whole affair would either fall prey to inter-movement disputes on what should or should not be done, or, into the hands of careerist politicians. And there are always plenty of them around to avail of any presented opportunity.

IT IS, OF COURSE, OBVIOUS that the inter-organizational relationship between the political and military bodies in a truly revolutionary movement cannot be the same as that existing within the Republican Movement. However, to deal with this matter would require at least one or two articles; and we shall try to fit this into the next issue.

---

WHEN YOU HAVE READ AN PHOBLACHT WHY NOT PASS IT ON TO A FRIEND, AND HELP PROPAGATE THE IDEAS OF REVOLUTIONARY IRELAND.

---



# THE SECOND ACT OF UNION!

O, the land is sold for German gold,  
And English sovereigns too,  
But we'll live like kings on tax and things,  
And Fianna Fail Ballyhoo.

BY

AODH MACELROY

\* \* \*

MR. LEMASS, IF PERMITTED TO proceed unimpeded, will put an end to partition. However, bold Sean is not about to achieve his objects by way of the revolutionary destruction of the last vestiges of imperialist rule in the land. Mr. Lemass has a different plan; he will remove the border by a re-enactment of the ACT OF UNION.

IN THE ACT OF UNION OF 1800 Britain, frightened at the thought of a self-supporting Ireland, deliberately set out to destroy the limited amount of economic independence we then enjoyed. The Act ensured that Ireland would remain weak and economically undeveloped; a source of cheap food, cheap labour and a source of manpower for times of war and peace. The system of imperialist rule brought us famine, unemployment, mass emigration and left us a weak and dependent colony.

PARTITION AND THE ESTABLISHMENT of the Free State made little change in the pattern of affairs. The continued decline of population is sufficient proof that this is so. We secured the shadow, but little of the substance of freedom. Now the Irish ruling class is preparing to dispel even the shadow--the advent of Free Trade will mean no effective difference between the Free State and the 6 Counties. The 6 Counties, after all, also have their local parliament and ENJOY the blessing of massive emigration.

LIMITED REPORTS FILTERING down from above indicate that Lemass, following numerous pilgrimages to the flesh-pots of London, has already reached an agreement to mortgage Ireland to England's imperialist exploiters. The Irish ruling class, with their pawn-broker's souls, are ready and willing to betray the nation for a price. The meagre natural resources of Ireland will be placed at the disposal of the English and American Anglo-Saxon rulers of the Western world, and what little industry we have managed to develop over the past few years will be soon wiped out by massive competition from the cheap imports of

the mass production areas. Irish capitalists, whose loyalty is to their bank balance and not to the nation, will take the price of betrayal and invest it in areas that will provide greater profit returns than can be obtained in developing Irish industry.

THE END RESULT OF THE Free Trade agreement will be to turn Ireland into an agricultural hinterland to supply meat and dairy products for English tables while Irish workers and farmers go hungry. The concentration of ever greater tracts of Irish lands in fewer--and alien--hands will receive considerable impetus as the agreement begins to take full effect. The Irish will become landless and workless; soon to become homeless and doomed to flee the land in search of life's necessities. Once again Dark Rosaleen's exports will be the children she bears.

HALF OF IRELAND'S agricultural lands are already alienated from her people with the least economical units falling to the lot of Irish farmers--and the trend continues in the same direction with increasing momentum. A British rubber company, taking note of a resurgence of Malaya's fight for national liberation, has liquidated its Malayan rubber interests, and is bargaining for the purchase of a 300 acre island in Waterford's river Suir. (The current owner is an Italian Prince). The brave men who took a shot at the British torpedo boat in Waterford Harbour would be well advised to give some consideration to the idea of making life somewhat less tranquil for those who are buying up Waterford land.

THE SUGGESTION THAT OPEN ports and closer union with England will lead to prosperity is a tale that will be believed only by those who still have faith in fairies. The Federation of Irish Industries expressed grave doubts on the matter and listed some of the bad effects the agreement would have on Ireland's economy. They contended Free Trade would mean stiffer competition for home ind-

ustries with the most serious effects coming after 1970. The home market and exports would expand more slowly after 1970, and there would be a fall in employment in manufacturing industry with a consequent sharp rise in emigration. Any benefits that might accrue to agriculture could not possibly reverse the trend of declining employment in industry.

IF ANYONE IS IN DOUBT as to what Free Trade holds in store for us, let them look about in the land, there are plenty of examples to be studied. Look to the 6 Counties that have never had anything but close union with England. What has this union brought other than unemployment, misery and heartache? When England in wartime had need of the hard labour and military support of the 6 Counties population there was work and promises aplenty. But with the passing of England's hour of trial there was no further need to cater to the people of the 6 Counties -- England's ruling class went off in search of more profitable markets to exploit; and Ulster workers were condemned to bitter years of unemployment or to emigrate in search of work in foreign lands. With the main sections of industry and the banks in foreign hands the 6 County Government has no control over investment and the export of capital (the same is true of the Free State). Capital is exported at a constantly increasing rate and what little local industry there is operates, or ceases to operate, at the absolute discretion of foreign capitalists whose only motive is maximum profit.

THE FREE STATE AREA IS not lacking in experience in these matters itself. English owned retail chain stores have established a firm foothold in recent years, and will certainly expand operations under the Free Trade agreement. Operating on a central buying system there will be a tendency, with Irish protection removed, for these chains to carry only the same lines as the British outlets, resulting in the elimination of Irish products even when these products are fully competitive, as to price and quality, with similar English goods. There will be an additional hazard due to the well known fact that these chain stores own manufacturing and packaging operations whose lines they will be anxious to push. A bleak prospect indeed for the future of Ireland. What Lemass is doing under the banner of Free Trade is leading Ireland back along the road to England's reconquest of Ireland; and with

never a shot being fired, Lemass will achieve unity with O'Neill under England's protection and partition will be ended in the new Act of Union.

THE ONES SLATED TO REAP the major benefits from this shady deal (after the London financiers take the cream off the top) will be the unionist block of imperialist henchmen who, by virtue of their firm alliance with the imperialist bourgeoisie, will be transferred into the majority bourgeois group in the land; and will give the nationalist bourgeoisie their come-uppence for having had the audacity to think they could rule independently on their own behalf. But there is little to be gained on talking to this brand of traitors who will risk their destruction, and take the nation down with them in their mad quest for wealth and power.

IS IRELAND TO BE REDUCED to the status of playground for a dissolute band of wealthy parasites; little better than a brothel to satisfy the lust of a mid-twentieth century edition of the Rakes of Mallow? Or will our land move in the direction of real UNITY and TRUE FREEDOM, walking in dignity and with head high amongst all the nations of the earth?

UNDER LEMASS AND THE IRISH capitalists, who are partners in a conspiracy with Stormont and the English imperialists, Ireland and her people can only look forward to a future that is bleak and pregnant with disaster. It is time Irishmen awoke to the realization that we can no longer afford the luxury of a class of parasites who make a career out of betraying the nation and selling the people into bondage.

IRELAND WILL NOT REALIZE unity in freedom until the "men of no property," the heirs of those who fought with Hope, McCracken, Tone and Emmet, with Pearse, Connolly and Clark, the working people of Irish town and countryside, rise up and drive the traitors and exploiters from our soil and give back the land to the common people whose land it is by right.

WITH ALL THE STORM CLOUDS that are darkening the horizon Ireland is now, more than ever before, in dire need of a revolutionary party that will lead the people in an unrelenting struggle to change the planned course of events from a direction that spells disaster for the nation, to one that leads to freedom from foreign rule and exploitation. While the potential for such an organization undoubtedly exists it cannot truthfully be said that it is now in



being, or that the outlook for the immediate future is at all rosy.

THE GROUPS NOW IN existence that make pretensions of being revolutionary are anything but that in fact, and are more of a hindrance than a help to the development of a revolutionary party and the elaboration of a revolutionary programme. The ranks of these organizations are filled with false prophets who announce themselves to be men of great vision commissioned to lead the people to the promised land by "peaceful, parliamentary paths." Caughey and Goulding, the Connolly Association and the Communist parties (two of them, for they accept the imperialist partition of the nation), each present their own special panacea to cure Ireland's ills, and in spite of the different wrappings they look strongly alike. We are called to the REVOLUTIONARY task of organizing co-operatives with which to drive the capitalists out of business by means of peaceful competition. Nothing is said of the fact that the capitalists have control of the land, the raw materials, the factories and the markets, and that they have in their hands the armed power of the state to ensure a continuation of their control. Only a fool or a knave would suggest that the ruling class will vacate the field of battle without putting up a fight with every weapon at their command. These half-brained "revolutionaries" would send out the hunter armed with a weapon no more deadly than a willow wand to bring down the wild bull elephant.

FOR A NUMBER OF YEARS NOW leading committees in a number of Communist Parties around the world have been joining in the universal chorus: "the peaceful parliamentary road to Socialism." No matter how great the difference between nations, or how varied their traditions, the same monotonous refrain is heard. In the aggressive imperialist camp of the United States; in bourgeois-democratic England; in the social-democracies of Scandinavia; in the Fascist dictatorships of Spain and South Africa and the militarist regimes of Latin America; in neo-colonial countries like Malaya, South Korea, the Congo or in colonies like Angola and Mozambique; wherever there is a Communist Party that responds to the dictates of Moscow, we encounter a stereotyped version of the "parliamentary road to Socialism". Like a couple of nattering fishwives Ireland's two Communist Parties join in the joyful chorus: "the peaceful path to Socialism -- elect Progressives to parliament."

"A PROGRESSIVE GOVERNMENT," says the Irish Worker's Party, "is needed to carry out a programme in the Twenty - six Counties which would lay the basis for a united, independent Ireland."

THE COMMUNIST PARTY NORTHERN Ireland is not to be outdone in the exhibition of lunacy. Here is a sample from the Party Programme: "The aim of the Communist Party, jointly with the Irish Worker's Party, is ... the establishment of Progressive Governments in Belfast and Dublin."

"The Communist Party, the Irish Worker's Party in the Republic and the Communist Party of Britain will participate in the struggle to secure working class and progressive majorities at Stormont, The Dail and at Westminster."

"The Irish working class can rely on its powerful ally, the British working class, to ensure that Imperialism in London or its representative in Belfast will not bar the way to the advance of the Irish people."

WHAT THE HELL THE IRISH people -- North or South -- have to do with the election of "progressives" to Westminster is a piece of logic that escapes my comprehension. I have always been of the opinion that the task of the Irish people is to FREE IRELAND and leave the British workers to settle accounts with their own ruling class; or at least for us to stay out until invited to participate on the side of the downtrodden. Perhaps the Communist Party N. Ireland could enlighten me on this point.

THE COMMUNIST PARTY N. Ireland must take us for damn fools if they expect us to rely on the British working class, in their present state of confusion and political backwardness, to protect us while we pass resolutions ordering the capitalist class to dissolve themselves. Go ask the people of Malaya, Aden, the Congo, Rhodesia, Cyprus, how much reliance we should place on English labour to protect us from the vengeance of the imperialists. How much can the Liberation forces of Vietnam rely on British workers to prevent the London imperialists from siding with U.S. imperialism in its aggression in Southeast Asia? Is it not a fact that the British workers own "Labour" Government is doing everything possible to facilitate that aggression?

THE PEOPLE OF IRELAND, LIKE the people of every land, must rely first of all, and mainly, on their own efforts, unity and strength to defeat the enemy in their own country, and not wait for guarantees of support from abroad.



DEFEATING IMPERIALISM IN Ireland Irish workers will be rendering assistance to the workers of Britain, by undermining and weakening the common enemy. Whether or not English workers take advantage of the situation to rid themselves of their own ruling class is entirely their affair. The possibility of their failure to do so should have no effect whatever on our decision to engage the enemy where we find him.

TO HELL WITH STORMONT AND Westminister -- and Leinster House for that matter. Ireland has no need of "progressives" with their bleeding hearts. What we require is for the people to rise up in revolutionary wrath and clear the land of the traitors and knaves who would sell the nation into bondage.

THE PLOT COOKED UP BETWEEN Leinster House, Stormont and Westminister must be defeated at all costs. This can not be done by electing to parliament PROGRESSIVES hungry to share in the spoils of political office. There is one sure and certain way to bring to naught the plot of Mr. Lemass. To consolidate his Free Trade marriage Lemass needs harmonious relations with the imperialists. But if Irishmen were to take up arms to sweep the remnants of imperialist rule from the land it would be impossible for Lemass to continue in his conspiracy with Westminister -- if he did he would be shot as a traitor.

EVERY IRISH REVOLUTIONARY worthy of the name should strive to unite the people around a programme of struggle, designed to place Ireland's destiny securely in the hands of the people of Ireland. The "men of no property" must take control of the political and economic affairs of the nation then, and not till then, will we be wholly free.

BEING ULSTER BORN AND HAVING witnessed, in my earlier years some of the tragic events that led to the division of the nation and Ireland's long night of travail, I cannot, in all conscience, end my comment without making some observations on the astounding programme cooked up by the Communist Party N. Ireland as published in 1963.

THE IRISH COMMUNIST PARTY gives tacit recognition to, and infers acceptance of, Britain's political tactic of "two Irelands" designed to divide the Irish people and facilitate England's imperialist domination over the nation. This recognition is both implicit and explicit in the organization of separate political parties with

distinct programmes for each part of dismembered Ireland, the Communist Party in the 6 Counties; the Irish workers' Party in the Free State.

THE COMMUNIST PARTY N. IRELAND goes to fantastic lengths in their endeavour to provide an ideological base for an act of TREASON, and at the same time ingratiate themselves with the 6 County bourgeoisie and middle class and prove their fitness to hold office at Stormont. In the very first page of their programme, "Ireland's Path to Socialism", they attempt to forge for Ulster a background of traditions distinct from the revolutionary struggles of the people as a whole. Reading the first page of the programme one not versed in Irish history might well believe that the White Boys, Right Boys, Hearts of Steel and support for the French Revolution were all movements peculiar to "Protestant Ulster," and having little or no effect on the rest of the land. It seems apparent that the Communist Party N. Ireland is diligently working to besmirch the proud name of the Ulster Democrats by making the Unionist henchmen of the imperialist bourgeoisie custodians of the Dissenter tradition.

THROUGH THE USE OF OUTWORN anti-Tory clichés the Programme's authors adroitly sidestep any incisive criticism of the Belfast working men's desertion from the struggle for national liberation and Socialism.

WE CANNOT ACCEPT AS SERIOUSLY intended any examination, however brief, of Ulster's role in the revolutionary struggle that does not take account of the signing of the Ulster Covenant by 100,000 Ulstermen at Belfast in September, 1912. However much the responsibility for the origin of the policy may be laid at the door of Carson, the Unionist traitors and the tory imperialists, the fact remains that it was the act of national suicide by the men of Ulster, more than any other single act in that period, that made POSSIBLE the defeat of home rule, military defeat at Easter Week, Partition and the Civil War that followed it. It is the continuation on this path that makes POSSIBLE the maintenance of partition and ignoring it, attempting to conjure up for Ulster a revolutionary tradition that is not hers by right will not result in exorcising the ghost that haunts the 6 Counties and brings tragedy on the land.

INSTEAD OF PANDERING TO THE widespread bigotry and political illiteracy that permeates the po-



political, economic and social life of the 6 Counties, revolutionaries should be telling to Ulster men and women the bitter truth and lay bare for all to see the tragic results to Ireland of Ulster's rejection of a united Irish revolutionary struggle for national liberation, national unity and national dignity. So long as Ulstermen fail to learn the lessons of history they will remain but pawns in the hands of the imperialist overlords. The revolution-

ary duty of Communists is to point out the lessons, not to pander to political backwardness to gain popularity as a stepping stone to a seat at Stormont.

THE VITAL NEED IS FOR emphasis on the revolutionary unity of the nation, and not on its division as is the case in the establishment of two Communist Parties and the forging of bogus revolutionary credentials for "Protestant" Ulster.

## SINN FEIN AND THE LABOUR PARTY

THE "PROGRESSIVES" IN THE Sinn Fein leadership, who failed to swing the extraordinary Ard Fheis in June behind the motion to enter into Free State politics, are presently holding fast, waiting for their next break. It would appear that most of them were sorry to see Caughey go from the party when he did; they felt he had jumped the gun as it were.

STILL, DESPITE THE TEMPORARY lull in the overt activities of the "Progressive" clique, it is by no means difficult to chart the trend in their covert operations. This cult of mutual admiration that has lately sprung up between the Labour Party and Sinn Fein, is one indication of the way the wind is blowing. No doubt about it, there are great hopes of a future Sinn Fein - Labour alliance in Leinster House.

TO PREPARE THE SHEEP FOR SUCH an eventuality, the Labour Party has, for some time now, received favourable and ever increasing coverage in the pages of the United Irishman. Did any of you ever stop to wonder why this was so? Yes indeed, even Mr. Tom Gill perceives "a new awareness by the Labour Party of the dominant position of Britain in the 26 County economy." Now isn't that amazing. After 43 years' service as the bourgeois labour faction in Leinster House, our so-called labour leaders suddenly discover that the place is nothing but a clearing-house for the interests of British Capitalism.

THE SINN FEINERS AND PARLIAMENTARY communists see this new Labour Party position as a great breakthrough; an event of great revolutionary potential. "Labour north and south has a great opportunity to become a great party;" says the IRISH DEMOCRAT of November

last, "if it combines in a united front with the Republicans and the left it may win the honour of establishing the new Ireland." Of course, our Red advisers in London do not think that this new Ireland should be sought through the use of force. Oh no! It must be achieved through parliamentary means -- the reasonable man's way. The winning of a few seats in Stormont and Leinster House will do the trick. "This will be done," the Democrat tells us, "and then the people will be fighting British imperialism on the terms of the late twentieth century, and not trying to repeat in stereotyped the experiences of 1912 - 22."

WHAT ALL OF THIS AMOUNTS TO IS plain enough. The "Progressive" Sinn Feiners, and their counterparts in the Labour Party, view the ever increasing rightwards swing of Fianna Fail as presenting an opportunity for the emergence of a new bourgeois left in Free State politics. By forming a United Front both groups have hopes of capturing the leadership of this new left; an achievement neither apparently considers possible were they to operate alone. As for the parliamentary communists: they are endeavouring to get on the bandwagon early; after all, this sort of "revolutionary action" is right down their alley.

REPUBLICANS CAN'T SAY THEY were not warned of this typical bourgeois political intrigue that is being carried on behind their backs. It's only a matter of time before the issue of entering Free State politics will again come to the fore in Sinn Fein; and when it does, you can be sure that the "Progressive clique" will be better prepared than they were last June.

PADDY MAC.

# THE NEED FOR REVOLUTIONARY LEADERSHIP

THE PAST YEAR HAS SEEN a tremendous rise in the level of social and economic discontent throughout the country. There can be little doubt but that the structure of the bogus national state established in 1922 is beginning to creak under the strains of its neo-colonial commitments. However, Revolutionary Republicans should not be too hasty in their assessments of the situation. There exists discontent, both conscious and unconscious, with the Free State government's management of Irish affairs; but this is far removed from being revolutionary in its content.

IF A TRULY REVOLUTIONARY movement was presently functioning in the country, there can be no doubt that it would have laboured hard to give a political, and therefore revolutionary, orientation to the diverse forms of dissent that sprang up in so many areas. Such a movement would have moved into Midleton to give leadership and direction to the town's people in their battle against the sale of their town from one foreign landlord to another. It would have come to the fore in Limerick to lead the storm of protest against the unreasonable rise in rents by the Corporation. A revolutionary movement would have committed its forces to the assistance of the I.T.A. in its gallant fight against both bogus trade unionism and governmental tyranny. It would also have raised its voice in support of the Irish farmers, and would have used its resources to direct the mass protest of farmers along a wider course. A revolutionary movement would have done all of those things; and while it is unlikely that this, of itself, would have begun a revolution, it most certainly would have contributed to the laying of a basis for one at a future date.

## BUT WHAT HAPPENED?

The so-called revolutionary body, the Republican Movement, in conjunction with its tacit allies the Communist Party and the bourgeois Labour Party, advised the people of Midleton to "protest" to the government, and to "demand" that "the defacto government" buy the town from the imperialist landlord. The people were not "advised" to fight for their rights; they were not given the leadership to fight, although they were in the mood for

a battle. No sir! Our Republican Movement wanted the Free State Government to pay an English robber-baron for the property that was STOLEN IN THE FIRST PLACE FROM THE IRISH PEOPLE, so that they, the Irish people of Midleton, could continue to live under reasonable conditions on what is theirs by right. And those political bastards call themselves revolutionaries !!!

WHAT HAPPENED IN THE CASE OF the I.T.A.? Here was a small, but militant, body of Post Office workers who moved into battle against both reactionary trade unionism and the Free State Government which brought out its special weapon, the OFFENCES AGAINST THE STATE ACT. If any body can lay claim to the trade union heritage of Connolly the I.T.A. can. We certainly take off our hats to them, and are only sorry that we were not in a position, as an organization, to give them our ACTIVE SUPPORT. We can only hope that the forces of revolutionary Ireland will be in better array the next time a militant trade union takes to the field. But what did the Republican Movement and its allies do? Well, the heirs of Arthur Griffith gave the I.T.A.'s struggle some coverage in the U.I.; although they were careful not to mention the fact that its origins arose from a dispute with the reactionary company union, the I.P.O.W.U. Other than this, the Republican Movement availed of the I.T.A. battle to grind its own axe on the Offences Against the State Act. Sinn Fein distributed a document to all Local Authority in the Free State on the Act, and advised its Cumann to "contact members of these bodies ... who you may think would be well disposed towards us in this instance ... It may be a long time before we get an opportunity like this again." In a word: Sinn Fein's reaction to the battle being fought on the streets and in the cells of Mountjoy by the members of the I.T.A., was an attempt to make political hay at the expense of others. When Irishmen mounted the barricades to fight for their rights, our brave Sinn Feiners, in the tradition of their patriarch, Arthur Griffith, mobilized their scribes to pass resolutions.

THERE ARE THOSE WHO QUESTION OUR call for a Revolutionary Movement in Ireland, by pointing to the existence of the Republican Move-



# A PRIMER ON REVOLT

BY

JER. COLLINS

## PART 1.

### INTRODUCTION

THERE ARE MANY IN IRELAND who flippantly disregard the great need for a theoretical knowledge of revolution, by saying that it is ACTION and not THEORY that is required. This sort of error is one which cannot avoid producing dire consequences.

A THOROUGH UNDERSTANDING OF revolutionary theory is indispensable to the successful pursuance of revolutionary action. A revolutionary activist can no more cope with the many and diverse problems of revolution without revolutionary theory, than can an electrical engineer master his problems without a knowledge of electricity. The question is as simple and straightforward as that.

UNDER NORMAL CIRCUMSTANCES men and women endowed with the burning desire to change the course of their country's history would receive a revolutionary education when joining the ranks of a revolutionary organization. In this manner a wide and thorough appreciation on social, political and economic problems, their causes, effects and solutions, would be acquired by them.

BUT THIS IS NOT THE method of Irish Republican organizations. There is no such thing as promoting an educational programme on revolutionary theory in the ranks of Irish Republicanism. As a consequence, not alone are the rank and file for the most part unable to participate knowledgeably in the formulation of Republican programmes and policies, but, they are also incapable of deciding as to whether or not such programmes and policies are truly revolutionary in content. The facts are: Republican programmes and policies are formulated by a few at the top, and then presented to the general body for ratification, where they are usually accepted without question or comment.

OBVIOUSLY, THIS STATE OF affairs is not conducive to the cultivation of a revolutionary consciousness among Irish radicals. Instead, it is bound to produce

that situation we Republicans have been experiencing over the past few decades; where a repetition of past errors has been the rule, and where the last vestiges of our revolutionary heritage have been cast aside by men who possess no identity whatsoever with revolution. It is, perhaps, too much to expect of the majority now in the ranks of organized Republicanism that they would change their ways. Their political tomfoolery has become too much a way of life to the most of them. However, there are always that few whose sincerity keeps driving them onwards; they want answers; they crave understanding. Eventually, these men and women find themselves discarded by the movement because they refuse to become just another round peg to fit into the regulated compartments of accepted republican thinking. It could well be that our appeals for a return to the path of revolution will be headed by those people, and that they will join us in our struggle. It may be that these articles on revolution will help to light the way for their return to the fold.

THIS SERIES OF ARTICLES on revolution have been undertaken with the hope that they will serve in some small way to introduce the fundamentals of revolutionary theory to our readers. They cannot hope to give all the answers; but they should at least serve as a stimulant to seek out those answers. As a beginning the main elements of revolution will be given so as to differentiate between them, and to illustrate their interrelationship and interdependency. This should serve as a rough picture; presenting a basis of understanding of the overall process. Future articles will then deal with each individual segment; elaborating on the various aspects as they relate specifically to Ireland.

### REVOLUTION

IN TERMS OF PRESENT CONDITIONS in Ireland: Revolution stands for the total overthrow of that social, political and economic system which functions in the country as a whole; and its replacement with

an entirely new order of things, more compatible to the needs of the people, more beneficial to their progress and general welfare, and designed to ensure the undaunted independence of our Nation State.

FROM THIS IT IS OBVIOUS THAT the Irish Revolution must be a two-phased effort. The first, must be aimed primarily at the overthrow of the Partitionist regimes, and the seizure of State power by the revolutionary movement. The second, must represent a co-ordinated national effort during which the national community, under the leadership of the revolutionary movement, will undertake the reconstruction of the nation on completely new lines.

THE MOST IMPORTANT THING to understand, and understand fully, is that revolution not alone entails that period of national struggle to free the country, but also encompasses an after period, to implement the social, political and economic changes necessary to give the newly acquired independence a durable substance. Consequently, the revolutionary political organization which mobilizes a popular support for the battle against the present regimes in Ireland, must, of necessity, retain the directorship of national affairs after that battle has been won, so as to ensure that what the people fought for shall be realized.

TO PROPOSE THAT THE MATTER of national leadership could be arranged in any other fashion is ridiculous. It is stupid, for example, to say that when Ireland is liberated from its colonial yoke, and re-united politically, a parliamentary election should be held to elect a 32 County Parliament. What political interests are going to compete with the party of the Revolution in such an election? Are the old parties to be permitted to continue, even under different names? Obviously, such a set-up, wherein the political opposition to the revolution is allowed to retain its cohesiveness after the revolution has won, cannot be entertained by any reasonable person. Furthermore, it is highly absurd to suggest that new political parties would come into being in the aftermath of victory. Where are they going to come from? What interests are they going to represent? It should be plain enough that all progressive groups in the country are going to identify themselves with the revolution during the colonial struggle, and as a consequence, they are going to become part of the revolutionary political organization. Anyone,

any social or economic interest, which does not establish such an identity must be opposed to the revolution. You cannot have neutrals in a revolutionary struggle; and if it should happen that a segment of the population did adopt a neutral position during the struggle, then, they have automatically forfeited the right to participate as an independent political force in the State founded by the Revolution.

THE FACTS OF THE MATTER ARE: a modern revolutionary movement must have a popular base if it is to succeed. During the anti-colonial struggle its organizational structure must facilitate a mass mobilization of the community within the framework of the movement. The desires of the people will therefore be expressed through the revolutionary movement during the struggle. This is quite logical; and it is equally logical to say that the will of the national community can be as beneficially expressed through the same medium during the period of reconstruction that follows the anti-colonial struggle.

IN EFFECT, A REVOLUTIONARY government under these conditions would be drawn from one political party--the People's Revolutionary Party. The State would function under a system of Socialist Democracy; wherein the various contradictions, or legitimate conflicts of interest, of the community, would be represented in the People's Party, and would be resolved by the democratic machinery of that party. The only interests which would not be represented in, or recognized by, the State would be those antagonistic to the interests of the community. This, gentlemen, is the revolutionary way. There is no other.

#### REVOLUTIONARY PROGRAMME.

WHEN A REVOLUTIONARY movement calls upon the people to rise in active opposition to the status quo, it must base its case on positive proposals of its own, as well as on the negative aspects of the ruling regime. The people must be given a tangible reason why they should overthrow the existing order; in that they must be presented with the prospects of an alternative system emerging from their struggle which will incorporate benefits not forthcoming under the prevailing ruling clique.

GENERALLY, IT IS THE practice of revolutionary movements to issue a social, political and economic programme, so as to enlighten the community on its ultimate aims and ideals. This programme, with its contents exemplifying the ideological motivat-



ion of the revolution, represents the CORE of the struggle for freedom. By assessing its contents against corresponding elements of the status quo, it is possible to determine whether or not that CORE is sound or hollow; whether or not the fight, even if successful, is going to be worth the sacrifice and trouble it will inevitably incur. Does the programme propose modifications to the existing system, or does it involve the creation of a completely new and progressive order? That is the main question. And an analysis of any programme will answer this question, and by so doing, will make clear at once if its contents are in fact revolutionary or not.

IT WOULD, FOR INSTANCE, BE criminal for any movement to promote an armed revolt when its programme could eventually be realized through a process of protracted parliamentary agitation. As an example, take the present programme of Sinn Fein. It contains nothing which could not be achieved eventually through the parliamentary process of compromise; and this includes the political reunification of the country, and the withdrawal of British forces from the 6 Counties. The fact is, these particular goals can be fulfilled without major detriment to that economic and social structure which forms the essence of the neo-colonial order now ruling Ireland. The 6 County ruling clique can be integrated with that of the Free State without suffering economic or social disabilities; and without upsetting the overall British influence in the country. The only thing that the Unionists would lose by such an occurrence is a certain amount of independent political power. But an aggressive parliamentary campaign could convince them, as it would Britain, that it was best to sacrifice a degree of political power in order to retain, maybe even strengthen, the economic and social hold on the country as a whole. Indeed, it is the writer's opinion that it is but a matter of time before this actually happens. The same criticism can be leveled at Sinn Fein's Social and Economic programme; it is in no way revolutionary. In fact it is, for the most part, complementary to the continued operation of the capitalist system under which the country is now managed. So that regardless of what Sinn Fein claims in respects to it being a "revolutionary organization", it is no such thing; and by associat-

ion with Sinn Fein's programme, the I.R.A., as a consequence, can claim no moral justification for its continued existence as an armed body.

A TRULY REVOLUTIONARY PROGRAMME for Ireland must, of necessity, be diametrically opposed to the existing order of things. This is only logical; and since Ireland now functions according to the dictates of capitalism, then, it is but common sense to suggest that an Irish revolutionary movement must found its programme on the principles of Revolutionary Socialism. There exists no other known alternative.

IT IS USUAL FOR A REVOLUTIONARY movement to conceive its aims within the limits of a minimum and a maximum programme. This means that a revolutionary leadership will formulate its ultimate social, political and economic goals, which will be considered the maximum programme; this will represent, as it were, the revolution as a finished product. However, to mobilize the people it must be taken into account that they are not necessarily conditioned to an acceptance of radical changes in their way of life, regardless of how beneficial they be; changes must be introduced gradually, and not violently; people must be acclimatized to change, and this is but natural. Consequently, it is necessary for the revolutionary leadership to present an initial programme that is at once an advance on the prevailing order but not too radical in its alterations to that order, and, at the same time complementary to the maximum programme. The initial programme is styled the minimum programme.

IN PRACTICE THE MINIMUM programme is that by which the people are mobilized behind the revolution. On acquiring state power, the revolutionary movement will immediately move to implement this programme. However, as circumstances and conditions permit, additional programmes, gradually increasing in radical content, are then presented and realized; until eventually the maximum programme is reached. In this manner the social, political and economic structure of the nation is remoulded through a gradual process of change. The people are acclimatized to this evolutionary march forward; they can absorb it, and the final condition will, when reached, be accepted without any qualms on their behalf.

To Be Continued.

ment. Surely, it must be apparent, without delving deeper into the events of the past year, that the R.M. is as far removed from revolutionary action as is the Free State government itself. The Republican Movement is a parliamentary body; its reactions to recent events, combined with its policies and programme, give adequate proof of this. In our opinion, the ills of Ireland demand a revolutionary remedy; and this in turn requires the services of a revolutionary

movement. Unless revolutionary-minded Irishmen awaken to the fact that they have to start anew and construct such a movement, then, we can see little hope for salvation. The past year has seen many instances of the necessity for a revolutionary leadership in Ireland. Come together you men of revolutionary fibre and forge such a leadership, such a movement. It is the only hope Ireland has got today.

\* \* \*

## A VOICE FROM THE PAST

THE ARMY COUNCIL OF THE I.R.A. released early in 1935 a "Political and Economic Plan for the Republic of Ireland." This programme is, in many ways, an illuminating document; especially when its contents are compared to the present programme of the Republican Movement. We will republish this programme in its entirety at a later date for the perusal of our readers. However, we will now quote a few excerpts from the introduction, just to give an idea as to the tenor of this historic document.

\* \* \*

"THE RESOURCES AND WEALTH OF the Nation are very largely in the possession and under the control of those sections who are hostile to National Freedom, and who have allied themselves with British Imperialism. The immediate task is to rescue from them the heritage which they have robbed and plundered from the mass of the people. The powerful interests which dominate Irish life at present were built up on the basis of the Conquest.

THE MACHINERY OF STATE WAS devised and has been developed to serve these interests. The powers of this State machine must be smashed. The machinery of State of the Republic of Ireland will be devised to serve, not any privileged sections, but the needs of the whole people."

... "LAND SETTLEMENT CANNOT be seriously tackled while it proceeds on the lines of Land Acts and Land Bonds Acts dictated by the landlords. The entire Land Commission with its whole landlord-created system must be swept away. Landlordism has its root in the Conquest, and consequently it must be abolished. As far as possible restitution must be demanded from the plunderers of Irish soil."

... "OWNERSHIP AND CONTROL OF industry are in the hands of individuals and of companies whose only object is to reap the highest profits which can be extracted, and who, naturally, while actuated by this object will strike to keep the workers in economic bondage."

"MOREOVER, INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATION on such a basis will, in time, lead to more widespread unemployment, poverty and hunger, as is the case today in every highly industrialised country which has reached the maximum of productive capacity. Side by side with vast actual and potential wealth and productive capacity, millions are starving. Our programme aims at eliminating these evils from Irish society, by the establishment of a more just and saner economic and social order."

... "MEMBERS OF THE IRISH Republican Army must accept the responsibility which the organisation has shouldered and which history and tradition has imposed on it; that is the leadership of the struggle for National Freedom and for the economic liberation of the people. Not only must they be the organised and armed vanguard but they must also supply leadership and guidance in directing the thoughts of the people along constructive revolutionary lines."

\*\*\*\*\*

THERE CAN BE LITTLE DOUBT but that the I.R.A. has strayed a hell of a long way from the path trod by the men of the thirties; and Ireland is the worse off for it. We Republicans got rid of Sinn Fein once; if the remnants of the present I.R.A. desire to return to the path of revolution, they had better do so again, or be lost forever to the Irish cause.