THE COMMUNIST

NUMBER TWENTY-THREE

NORTHERN IRELAND

A rupture took place four years ago between the group that developed into the Communist Party of Britain (Marxist-Leninist) and the group that developed into the Irish Communist Organisation. The division concerned not only particular policies, but the whole approach to the political task of building the anti-revisionist movement. The differences have been explained in previous issues of the COMMUNIST.

Both groups immediately recognised that their positions were antagonistic. The difference in approach will be indicated by the fact that the ICO sought to clarify the differences in every possible way, and showed itself to be ready for public or private discussion at any time. The CPB group (which has undergone many changes of form since 1965) sought, on the contrary, to blur the issues and prevent discussion of them. And it was careful to exclude ICO members from its "Conferences" and from the "Marxist Clubs" which it set up a couple of years ago. Opportunist manoeuvring, avoidance of serious Marxist political discussion or analysis, and the reduction of marxism to phrase-mongering, have characterised its approach.

In this issue we will look at its recent pamphlet on Ireland.

* * *

IRELAND ONE NATION is the title of the CPB pamphlet. Here already is a basic difference. An article in the September issue of the Irish Communist maintains that the uneven development of capitalism in Ireland, which was the economic cause of partition, gave rise to a development towards two nationalities in Ireland. But, perhaps, IRELAND ONE NATION is intended to be only a mere phrase by the CPB, and one should not try to find any concrete meaning in it with relation to the national contradiction in Irish society. If that is so it is an irresponsible phrase.

One-third of the population of Ireland showed that it was prepared to go to war to avoid inclusion under a Nationalist

government in Dublin. If the CPB has nothing concrete to say about that, it would be better if it didn't phrasemonger about nationalism.

*

"The people of N. Ireland are now face to face with the British imperialist state".

The Northern Ireland state has always been an integral part of the U.K. state. Stormont was set up by, and remained subordinate to, Westminster. It is a basic Leninist principle that all workers oppressed by the same state, regardless of nationality, should organise themselves in the same Communist Party. The CPB violated this principle at its inception, and when criticised for this refused to account for itself.

*

Of the Irish national struggle of 1919-21 the CPB says:

"The IRA waged a liberation war against Britain's notorious Black and Tans from 1919 till eventual success in 1921".

Here we are presented with the neo-colonial view of the Irish national struggle: a view which has recently been adopted by the revisionists and the opportunist Republican leadership. In fact the "eventual success in 1921" was a success for the imperialist interest. A powerful section of the IRA leadership struck a bargain with the imperialists and waged a more brutal and more effective war against the revolutionary forces than the British Army had done. The "success" of 1921 smashed the revolutionary forces and established the neo-colonial regime which still controls the 26 Cos.

This view of the "success" of 1921 was clearly stated by the Communist International, by the Communist Party of Ireland before its liquidation, and by the C.P.G.B. before revisionism became dominant in it. And it has been clearly stated by the ICO during the past five years. But the CPB, which claims in its programme to be the first ever genuine Communist Party in Britain, and which rejects the Comintern period of the British C.P. as opportunist, states the revisionist, neo-colonial position that would not have been tolerated for an instant by the Comintern.

*

The statement continues: "But this was only a partial victory. Six Ulster counties were artificially amputated from the remaining twenty-six so that Britain could keep a firm hold on the most highly industrialised part of Ireland".

In another place it compares Westminster and Stormont to puppet-master and puppet. Alas, more phrases! The "amputation" was anything but artificial, and was anything but a product of British policy. The first two Home Rule Bills had no partition clauses. An attempt was made to force Home Rule under the domination of the Southern middle class on the Northern industrial capitalists. The latter organised politically and militarily to oppose Home Rule (which would have ruined their market). It was almost twenty years before the Liberal Party, in the face of the determined opposition of the Ulster bourgeoisie, gave up the attempt to

impose Home Rule on North East Ireland. Between Gladstone and Asquith, and the Ulster Unionist leaders the relationship was certainly not that of puppet master and puppet. And the Partition was certainly not an artificial creation of British policy. What was artificial was the British imperialist policy which treated the bourgeois forces in Ireland as if they had a common integrated national interest, and the attempt to place the Northern industrialists under the domination of the Southern middle class Nationalists.

The Partition policy of British imperialism had a sound objective basis, which the earlier Home Rule policy had not. That basis was the conflict of economic interest between Northern industrial capitalists and the Southern middle class nationalists. (This has been explained in the ICO pamphlet, THE ECONOMICS OF PARTITION. The CPB, presumably, has studied the ICO analysis and disagrees with it. It would be useful if it would state why it disagrees with the analysis.)

*

"It is...absurd for some people in the Civil Rights movement to call for assistance from Westminster against Stormont. How can you recruit the puppet master against the puppet?"

More rrrevolutionary phrasemongering. Many of the Civil Rights leaders may be opportunists posing as socialists, but they are not fools. The object of the Civil Rights Association is not socialism but bourgeois democratic reform. As the ICO showed years before the present crisis erupted, a new economic situation came into being in Ireland about 1960 in which Partition was no longer economically necessary. That being so the sectarian politics made necessary by Partition were no longer necessary. And that being so the elimination of the most blatant fascist and sectarian manifestations came to be in the bourgeois interest (as it had been in the bourgeois interest to develop and maintain these forces in t e previous situation).

The Civil Rights leadership represents the small bourgeoisie. It wants no more than bourgeois democratic reform. Monopoly capitalism also has an interest in bourgeois democratic reform. But the machinery of fascist control is not a simple thing to dismantle when it is no longer necessary. Due to the fact that the fascist movement was Stormont's main organ of control for fifty years, it is not surprising that bourgeois democratic reform did not come easily in Stormont. When there was an outbreak of fascist terror in mid-August, there was nothing absurd in the Civil rights leaders appealing to Westminster to intervene. And Westminster intervened in a way that would have been inconceivable in the previous situation.

*

The CPB remarks that if the Bogside were attacked "the Dublin government...might not have intervened...but the Republican movement certainly would. The result would have been not only a bloody defeat for the police but quite possibly also a political crisis in the south as mass sympathy

shifted from the government to the Republicans". (This is the reason given by the CPB for the intervention of the British army.)

The record of the IRA in Irish politics since the early thirties is a dismal one. It has misled and disillusioned thousands of genuine anti-imperialists. It reduced anti-imperialism to a matter of military technique, often coupled with facist politics: and even in the matter of military technique it was a negative force. In the early sixties the Republican leadership abandoned even its elitist militarism. In the August crisis in Belfast the IRA contributed nothing, at the critical moment, to the areas subjected to terror. As predicted by the ICO early this year, the IRA has been rapidly losing its support among the masses in the 6 counties. During the last six weeks it has been clearly seen to be hand in glove with the British Army. The IRA which would "certainly" have intervened to defend the people of the 6 counties is a figment of the CPB imagination (and Chichester Clarks'). The Civil Rights leaders who appealed to the British Army to intervene, and who appealed to the IRA to stop phrasemongering, were in fact taking account of the realities of the situation from a bourgeois democratic viewpoint. They were not nearly as 'absurd' as the CPB.

(While the IRA made virtually no contribution to the defence of the people of Belfast in mid-August, it - along with the Peoples Democracy - made a substantial contribution of the strategic barricades in September, so that the fascist attacks could be renewed - as they were within a week of the removal of the strategic barricades.)

The CPB 'explanation' of the present political crisis is a statement of a number of general factors that have been operating during the whole of the past half century:

> "The political crisis in N. Ireland arises from four features of its economy. 1. N. Ireland is a colony tied to the British economy... 2. The British economy is in a state of crisis... 3. N. Ireland workers are superexploited by Britain... 4. Protestant workers are slightly less oppressed than Catholic workers... These economic facts go a long way to explain the political situation in N. Ireland."

In explanation of point 1, the CPB remarks that "Ireland provided Britain with food, raw materials and labourers. In return Britain dumped manufactured goods in Ireland". If this is intended to refer to the N. Ireland economy, it is so far from an adequate comment that it must be considered an utter distortion of the facts. The heavy industry which has formed the basis of the Ulster economy since late in the 19th century has been almost entirely dependant on the import of fuel and raw materials, and manufactured goods of the most advanced kind has formed a sizeable part of its exports. It is the Southern economy that the CPB decribes: and the difference between the two has been at the basis of Partition. The Communist movement has nothing to gain from

make-believe on this point.

*

As to Point 4: to try to explain the solid support of the Protestant workers for the Unionist government in its conflict with the Southern Nationalist forces since the 1880s, by the "slightly less oppression" of the Protestant workers as compared with the Catholic workers is absurd. That is precisely given by the revisionists who tail-end the Nationalist bourgeoisie: Can an industrial working class be bribed with a few miserable crumbs in a period of intense political conflict such as has existed in Ireland for most of the present century?

There have been periods of close cooperation on the economic level between Catholic and Protestant workers. But this economic cooperation has always been disrupted by politics. This fact does not suggest that the difference in economic status is the main reason why there has been no development of political unity between Catholic and Protestant workers.

The absence of Protestant-Catholic political unity of any form is to be explained mainly by the fact that the Partition conflict in Irish society was in substance a national conflict, expressing the conflict of economic interest between the two sections of the bourgeoisie. Each bourgeoisie maintained effective political control of its own working class movement. Each bourgeoisie gave rise to appropriate socialist and revisionist Communist movements. The result was that even at the level of social democracy and formal Communism the ideologies of the conflicting bourgeoisies confronted one another.

Even at its strongest development in the early thirties the Communist movement in Ireland never got to the bottom of the Partition issue, therefore it could not develop a form of politics which did not reflect the division inthe bourgeoisie. (Despairing appeals to the working class to unite on an economic basis could not take the place of a political analysis of the complications of bourgeois development.in Ireland). Because the Communist Party of Ireland did not get to the bottom of the political division of bourgeois Ireland, it was itself divided by that division. Then the Protestant worker would immediately discern in the Southern Communist movement the cloven hoof of southern bourgeois nationalism, while the southern worker would dismiss the Northern Communist movement as Unionist. And in fact the Communist movements since the late thirties have been tail ending their respective bourgeoisies. It is in this way that the total absence of political unity between Protestant and Catholic workers is to be explained.

The ICO published the first marxist analysis of the basis of partition two years ago, and indicated some of its political implication. This provided the theoretical basis for the development of a united political working class movement. During the past two years it has worked at developing that basis. But the CPB compl-

etely ignores the Marxist analysis of the Ulster situation.

If a Protestant saw in the CPB pamphlet nothing but a reflection of the change in strategy of British imperialism in Ireland he would have some basis for that view. It is certain that the pamphlet will not further the cause of Communism among the Protestant workers, if it should ever find its way among them.

*

We give below a brief review of coverages of Northern Ireland in the CPB paper THE WORKER during 1969.

February: "In nearly every case, since protestantism came to Ireland in the 1600s, catholics and protestants have fought side by side for emancipation. Many of the risings have been initiated and led by protestants right up to the 1916 Rising and is continuing in the struggles of the IRA to this day" (our emphasis).

In fact the IRA has failed totally to deal with the sectarian question in Ulster, and since the early thirties (when it became the spearhead of anti-Communist reaction) it has functioned as a Catholic sectarian influence. IRA sectarianism has been blatant in the present crisis.

"It was at this point" (ie the truce period in 1921) "that the policy of partition was introduced".

In fact the Stormont government has already been set up before the truce. And the partition clause had been added to the Home Rule Bill in 1914, and accepted by the Irish Nationalists. But what do mere details of historical accuracy like that matter to revolutionary phrasemongers!

March: "The general election in Ulster has come and gone, with its predictable outcome of victory to the forces of reaction".

If by the forces of reaction is meant simply the bourgeoisie, the statement of course is absolutely true - and, in the context, meaningless. But if the Paisleyite forces is meant, then the statement is completely false. The elections were won by the bourgeois forces which saw the need for bourgeois democratic political reform and were working to achieve it. It was not a sweeping victory, but they won.

This issue of the WORKER quotes favourably a phrase by the trotskyist (I.S.) leader of many years standing, Michael Farrell. What was needed from the working class standpoint was an exposure of Farrell.

May: This issue refers to the "gallant role of the IRA" in the 1930s. In the 1930s the IRA under the extreme right wing leadership of Twomey, McBride and Russell was the force mainly responsible for aborting the strong revolutionary movement of the

early thirties. Their political role in the early thirties has been shown in the ICO pamphlet, THE REPUBLICAN CONGRESS. In the late thirties the leadership was more or less fascist and collaborated with the Nazis.

We are told that "all progressive sections" in Ulster have accepted the need for a Citizens Army "if the quislings and lackeys of British imperialism are to be prevented from crucifying the people of Ulster yet again". More phrasemongering. Even the "gallant IRA", so dearly loved by the CPB, had a policy of disarming the people. The fruits of the military policy of the IRA and the unspecified "progressive sections" was seen in mid-August. The people of the Falls area had to learn, under the terror how to improvise some elementary means of defence.

September: "...the Irish working class knows its enemy very well... The real question is: What is the rest of the British working class to do...?"

The CPB rejected the revolutionary Leninist principle that all workers oppressed by the same state should have a common revolutionary organisation. They adopted the nationalist principle of Party organisation, the opportunism which Lenin exposed so clearly. They organised, not on the basis of the UK state but of the British nation (dogmatically denying Scottish nationality). Northern Ireland was excluded on the national principle (along with Hong Kong - a comparison which has been repeatedly made by opportunists). But here we find the N. Ireland workers included as part of the "British working class" - though they must not organise in common with "the rest of the British working class".

"The absurd idea that the armed forces of British imperialism would be used in N. Ireland to 'protect' the people from the excesses of British imperialism's local agents there we utterly reject." What the CPB rejects, in fact, is the analysis of objective class interests. The 'absurd idea' was a fact which only a hopeless phrasemonger would deny. The British Army did intervene in a fascist pogrom to stop its excesses. It did so because the imperialist class interest did not in 1969 require fascist pogroms. When the imperialist interest did require fascist progroms in Ulster it supported them. But the British ruling class is not so stupid as to allow a pogrom to develop unchecked when it is not necessary to its interest. The British Army intervened in the imperialist interest to stop an unnecessary pogrom.

The CPB declares that "Connolly lives again!" Connolly stressed the working class need for clear, concrete analysis, and carried out many such analyses. He attacked phrasemongering in a manner comparable to Lenin's statements on the "revolutionary itch". The ICO has been applying Connolly's approach with good results during the past few years. But the CPB rejects the ICO as "ultra-left" etc. In what organisation, then, does it see Connolly living again?

(We have dealt only with the main piece of phrasemongering.

If we took up all points there would be no end).

*

Part of an ICO leaflet circulated in Belfast is reprinted in the September issue of THE WORKER. Since some members of the CPB have been given illusions by their leadership with regard to relations between the ICO and the CPB - to the effect that while bad relations exist with the London section of the ICO, good relations exist with the organisation in Ireland - we wish to make it clear that the attitude to the CPB which has been expressed ov over the years in THE COMMUNIST is the attitude of the ICO, and not not merely of part of it.

The CPB, cunning in the way of its kind, reprinted an ICO leaflet dealing entirely with an urgent immediate practical question, which is probably the only document ever issued by the ICO on the Ulster crisis which did not summarise the ICO analysis of the basis of Partition and its explanation of the current crisis. As we have seen the CPB is in fundamental disagreement with the ICO analysis, and itself circulates an opportunist analysis.

*

We wish to make it clear that if the CPB has any reply to make to our criticism it will be published in THE COMMUNIST. And if the CPB should ever find it in its interest to have a public debate, or a meeting between the two organisations, to deal with the differences that exist between us, it will find the ICO, as ever, anxious for such a debate or meeting.

++

SELECTION OF PAMPHLETS AVAILABLE:

The Economics of Partition 2/6

In Defence of Leninism (an exposure of some basic trotskyist positions) 2/6

The Palestine Question 1/-

Stalin: On Linguistics 3/-; Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR 3/-; On Trotsky, 2/-; On an article by Engels 1/-.

Available by post (postage 3d per item) from G. Golden, 28 Mercers Road, London, N 19

++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++

O N C E A G A I N O N
INTELLECTUAL REVOLUTIONISM

The political strategy of the 'bourgeois working class' school of 'Maoism' underwent a substantial development last month with the publication of ONCE AGAIN ON THE INTELLECTUALS. IN THE LIGHT OF THE TEACHINGS OF LENIN AND MAO-TSETUNG" by A.H. Evans (introduction by J.A. Hoffman.) The main theorist of this school of 'Maoism' since 1966, I. Kenna, merely used the 'theory' as a justification for disrupting the development of a Communist movement in Britain. He did not deal with the strategic problems of a revolution involving an elite sect of 'Marxists' with no class basis in the society, and a reactionary 'bourgeois working class'. The Evans-Hoffman pamphlet is a pioneer work in that field:

> "The danger is that the towns and cities are overlooked and largely ignored and the setting up of highly trained 'action squads', saboteur experts, never comes into the picture. Yet how easily is a factory or a power station put out of action. The result of a serious shortage in the cities and towns would immediately lead to increased unemployment, to a sharp drop in the standard of living of masses of people. Such an increase of pauperisation of not only the orking class but the petty bourgeoisie - the shop keepers - as well would buttress the armed struggles of the countryside. The trouble is that our movement becomes permeated to the point of dominance by an intellectual elite many of whom are incapable of facing up to the harshness, the vicious cruelty, of class struggle". (p2) But isn't Evans notion a typical notion of a petty-bourgeois intellectual fascinated by revolution?

> "Marxists do not rely on spontaneity... Marxists believe in planning, in preparing as far as possible for the future... The time arrives when it is the duty of Marxist revolutionaries to add to the terror of capitalism, to take steps to increase the number of unemployed so that their mass weight presses more and more heavily on the employed and partly employed, so that we draw this latter over to us... The factory and not the bank is the heart of the capitalist system. Destroy the factory, the power houses which feed it with current, and another thousand, ten thousand or hundred thousand desperate men and women are added to the number of totally unemployed. Revolutionaries must not shrink back from the destruction of great citi s; they are not ours even though we and ancestors built them. They belong to capitalism and sentiment must not be allowed to interfere. The cities the working class will

build for themselves will be infinitely more beautiful and livable than any of the past." (p36). Fire, it seems, is the great weapon with which the petty bourgeis 'Marxists' will proletarianise the bourgeois working class and provoke them into revolution.

Throughout the pamphlet there is a petty bourgeois fascination with terrorism. A 'Marxist' elite of saboteurs will terrorise the bourgeois workers into revolution. And in the construction of socialism terrorism is the solution to all problems. The likes of it hasn't been seen since Trotsky's Terrorism and Communism and his schemes for building socialism in the way that the bourgeoisie build their armies. In fact, Trotsky's schemes were sane and sober in comparison with the Evan-Hoffman delirium.

According to Hoffman, the influence of the liberal intelligentsia in Russia in the early twenties "pushed Lenin back, bit by bit, from a firm adherence to the principle of equal wage payments, so that during the Stalin period, equalitarianism as a guiding policy, had been thrown out altogether. Neither Lenin or Stalin ...were able to see clearly enough that revolutionary terror, rather than 'temporary' bribery, would have proved a more effective instrument for converting the intellectual resources of the class enemy to the service of the proletariat." (pii). Stalin once remarked that paper will bear anything that's written on it, which is the most appropriate comment here.

Lenin took great trouble to explain why the New Economic Policy (N.E.P.) was necessary: a ruined economy, a declassed working class (which Evans denies), an overwhelmingly petty bourgeois environment (which, again, Evans denies), the increasing bureaucritisation of the state machine and even of the Party. It was Lenin's view that in this situation an intensification of terrorism would merely have resulted in a breakdown of its effectiveness. The NEP was the only alternative to the breakdown of the system (whose contradictions had already given rise to the Kronstadt rebellion in March 1921.) But, of course, Evans and Hoffman do not agree. Whereas Lenin dealt with objective social realities, Evans and Hoffman only deal with their own emotions and fantasies. But the notion of Lenin acting under the influence of bourgeois liberalism is certainly a novelty: the notion is a very 'original' plaything.

*

The pamphlet seems to have been intended as a polemic against the Irish Communist Organisation (or "Brendan Clifford and his group of followers in the ICO"). In various places the ICO has been known as "Pat Murphy's group, "Mick Murray's group", "Angela Clifford's group" etc. In the British "anti-revisionist movement" the standard form of organisation has been a "leader" and his little sect of followers. We can quite understand that Evans should be incapable of understanding that another kind of organisation is possible.)

The main "criticism" of the ICO is on the peasant question. It appears that the ICO, seeing everything in terms of Ireland, imagine that every peasant has "the mentality of the corner shop-keeper", and is a hardened petty bourgeois. They "bring with them their particularised knowledge of the Irish and British countryside and apply it universally." (p4)

In the first place, the social structures of the 'Irish and British countryside' are very different. Big capitalist farming is overwhelmingly predominant in Britain, which is still far from being the case in Ireland. Even within Ireland there are vast differences. Rural bourgeois development in the area of the Ulster plantation has gone much farther than in most other areas. But even there it is not nearly so developed as in Britain.

Until late in the 19th century the most remarkable thing about the peasantry in other areas was the lack of bourgeois development among them. There was a very low development of the market until the Land Acts of 1880-1902. In a previous issue of THE COMMUNIST, certain similarities between the Irish peasantry up to the late 19th century and the Asian peasantry were pointed out. We did not, as Evans suggests, attribute the "shopkeeper mentality" of the mass of the Irish peasantry to the mass of the Asian peasantry. The widespread peasant rebellions that continued in Ireland up the 1870s were not made by peasants with the 'shop-keeper mentality'. They were made by a revolutionary peasantry whose social circumstances were akin to those of the Asian peasantry.

Since 1880 there has been a substantial development of the market in the Irish countryside, and in most areas the shopkeeper mentality has become dominant: though there are still pockets, chiefly in the Irish speaking areas, where the old attitude survives. The ICO has taken theis change into account in Ireland: but it has clearly recognised that this change has not yet taken place in the Asian countryside, and that a strong basis for peasant revolution remains in India, for example. It has even gone to the extent of doubting whether the bourgeois transformation of the countryside is a practical possibility for the future. So much for Evans' tale that the ICO sees the Asian peasant masses as having the mentality of corner shop-keepers.

Evans says that "Our Irish comrades have backed away from a real struggle against the Church, they are frightened of its power, its hold on the minds of the people." (p2). We assume that he refers to the ICO. The statment is completely unsubstantiated. The ICO has issued both theoretical and agitational material dealing with religion. The subject has also been extensively dealt with at public meetings in Dublin. Evans has not substantiated the statement because he could not, because it is merely a lie. But there are those who do back away from religion. In 1964 Evans' colleague A. O'Neill was influential in a grouping from which the ICO developed. O'Neill who was in alliance with some trotskyists, 'backed away'. He did everything he could to pre-

vent the emergence of an openly Communist organisation. Due to the influence of the Catholic Church "the Irish people weren't ready" for Communism, we were told. Because they would have no truck with this line, the group that later formed the ICO was "sectarian", ultra-left". etc.

*

Hoffman criticises the ICO for "following Connolly's notorious belief that the stomach and not the brain is the seat of politics" (pii). He presumably refers to the section on "The Economic Basis of Politics" in Connolly's NEW EVANGEL. Connolly disagrees with the view "that an effective, aggressive political force may have its origin, not deep down in the daily life of the people, but in the brains of some half dozen gentlemen... The truth (is) that the political movements of a country spring from the pulsations of its economic life".

> "Examine the great revolutionary movements of history and you will find that in all cases they sprang from unsatisfactory social conditions, and had their origin in a desire for material well being. In other words, the seat of progress and source of revolution is not in the brain, but in the stomach."
>
> "Where the mass of the people find existing conditions intolerable, and imagine they see a way out, there will be a great political moement; where the social conditions are not so abnormally acute no amount of political oratory, nor yet cooperation of leaders, can produce a movement."

The ICO certainly agrees with this "notorious belief": it is the Marxist view of revolution. Hoffman, of course, does not. Hoffman, apparantly, identifies material welfare and capitalism. The material class interest of the workers is not, in his view, the force which brings socialism into being: it is a force which generates capitalism. The British working class he sees as a bourgeois working class whose class interests are opposed to socialism. Hoffman, Evans and Kenna are "revolutionaries" and the working class is bourgeois. There is, therefore, no class basis for their "revolutionary" politics. The basis of their politics is certainly "the brains of some half dozen gentlemen" - or intellectuals.

Evans asserts that, on his notion "the bourgeois working class" was held by Marx, Engels, and Lenin, "and their views in the form of literally dozens of quotes have been placed before... the ICO...all without avail". (p8). Evans' brains "creates" not only the future but the past. But there is no doubt about the facts. In 1966/7 the Anti-Revisionist Front (also known as the Hands Off Vietnam Committee) was the most representative body of the anti-revisionist movement in London. It included members of t e Forum group, the Manchanda group, the Birch group (W. Ash), the Vanguard group, the F.C.A. (Kenna), the ICO and a number of individuals. Evans joined in 1967. He and Kenna began to propagate the bourgeois working class line at public meetings of the

Front. An attempt was made, mainly by ICO members, to get Evans to explain precisely what he meant. Kenna had made his meaning clear in an F.C.A. pamphlet which maintained that the British working class lived on surplus value produced by colonial workers. Evans used the phrase but did not explain it.

The ICO said that if Evans meant that the British working class was heavily influenced by imperialist ideology, with a relatively small labour aristocracy bribed off (which was Lenin's view), then that was obviously correct. But if he took up Kenna's position, it was absurd. Evans refused to give a straight answer, but continued plugging the phrase at public meetings. Eventually it was decided to call a special meeting of the Front to discuss the "bourgeois working class question". Evans and Kenna would have had ample scope to explain their views. But Evans stayed away with diplomatic toothache. Kenna attended but refused to participate in the discussion. They continued plugging the phrase at public meetings, however.

Since it was clear that they were not prepared to engage in an honest discussion of the matter, a motion on the subject was proposed by the ICO as a statement of policy. Evans immediately sent in a statement denouncing B. Clifford of the ICO, and resigning from the Front. Kenna's group stayed on. Since Kenna was chairman he was able to prolong discussion on the motion for months (the liberalism of other groups, who opposed Kenna's line and deplored his tactics, would not allow them to support an ICO attempt to depose him from the chair). Kenna stayed on for as long as he could obstruct, remaining Chairman to the end. Late in 1967 he walked out during the meeting and did not return. He stole a considerable amount of property belonging to the front which was in his possession (pamphlets, plus a comprehensive card indexing system on banking and industrial inter-connections which had been compiled by members of the Front during the previous year). Again, the prevailing liberalism prevented any action being taken about the theft - even though Kenna, as a landlord, was exceptionally vulnerable. Elementary class instinct has been sadly lacking in the British anti-revisionist movement.

As for the quotes that Evans talks about: the same half dozen quotes have been turned over again and again. These quotes will be dealt with in a pamphlet to be published shortly. In context they don't bear the interpretation given by the Evans-Kenna clique. The ICO position is that the evolution of the antagonism between capital and labour has been considerably influenced by the imperialist nature of British capitalism, and by historical factors relating to its position as the first industrial capitalist power. No other position than this was held by Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin or Mao (Hoffman, of course, has still not come up with substantiation of his attribution of the bourgeois working class position to Mao.) The view that imperialism has negated the capital-labour antagonism in the imperialist countries is an absurd delusion of petty-bourgeois 'revolution-

ories' who are over-anxious to become the great leaders of the revolution. (Evans, however, is now beginning to suspect that he may have to wait until his death to "gain the respect of my working class throughout the world." (p40)

Hoffman writes "Arthur Evans alone came out in 1965 after Needham's inaugural SACU address and exposed the man's slanders against the Chinese people and our Great Teacher, Mao Tse-tung." (ii) Two documents about Needham, exposing his function and the formation of SACU, were issued. As far as we remember they were issued on the same day. One was produced by Evans: the other by the ICO.

*

Some other points will be taken up later, particularly the Evans-Hoffman 'criticism' of Lenin and Stalin, which is considerably extended here. The more they "criticise" Lenins and Stalin, the more do their "criticisms" bring to mind the jingle that Lenin applied to the 'Marx critics':

> The lap dog must be strong indeed
> If at the elephant he barks.

* * *

****

(The following article was written on the basis of the July events in Ulster. The reference to "Connolly's line on lumpen-proletarians", is to a position attributed to Connolly by E. McCann, with which McCann expressed agreement. So far as we know, the allegation that Connolly held this position - which has often been attributed to him by trotskyist elements - is without foundation.)

This contribution from a comrade not previously familiar with the Irish situation shows the vast superiority of serious analysis over the CPB's phrasemongering and repetition of imperialist and revisionist cliches.)

U L S T E R

The political fact of the desertion of the Civil Rights leadership by the masses of Northern Ireland has been, in part, obscured by the press image of the degeneration of legitimate demonstrations into looting and vandalism. This fact - that the masses are taking action at once independent of and condemned by the established leadership - calls for an explanation, and it is fairly simple.

The Civil Rights Association is bourgeois. Its social composition is an indication - CRA is mainly made up of high status Catholics (teachers, businessmen.)

Secondly, CRA will not (unless forced to by the Left) go beyond its minimal liberal-democratic demands for electoral reform, with passing references to ending discrimination in employment against Catholics.

And thirdly, the forms of action used to back these demands are wholly constitutional. Elections have been used as an end in themselves, i.e., in a bourgeois manner (this tactic was used in CRA's good old days, say October '68 to spring/summer '69, when the masses had confidence in them.) Once elected, the MPs in Stormong have fallen in with parliamentarism - accepting the government's timetable of reform etc. CRA marches are also constitutional, given the role of the march in Ulster, ie, an expression of sectarian domination over a territorial area. (The burning of public e tenders in Dungiven on July 12th is a non-political action by the Catholic masses and was expected retribution for the two Orange marches through the 95% Catholic town). But in the main, the marches go though their own ghettoes, the borders are not crossed. The ability of the Royal Ulster Constabulary to order the route of a march obviously enables them to present all marches as sectarian: all left-wing marches are forced into the Catholic ghettoes.

The point about CRA, however, is that they want to march in the Catholic ghettoes, ie, they are totally sectarian, fitting willingly into the dualist status quo of division and rule (erected in 1921 by British Imperialism). The CRA sees the Catholic masses as its constituency and its role as a pressure group on their behalf. And the texture of its communication is moralistic: "Out of 74 busdrivers employed by Fermanagh County Council, 73 are Protestants! Is it not a disgrace?" (this for Protestant consumption) and "Stay off the streets and behave like decent citisens" (this for Catholic consumption).

Now CRA's moralism springs mainly from its bourgeois constitutionalism (like that of all Social Democratic groups to which it is broadly parallel, though, being sectarian, CRA can never achieve the electoral majority). And it also comes from the repressive,

violent environment (in which it differs, crucially, from that of other social democrats).

Ulster is a highly repressive state. The police have extensive power (eg to prevent a post-mortem!) and heavy equipment (guns, armoured vehicles) and they are centrally controlled by Belfast, not by local watch committees. The RUC are the first British police force to use tear gas against the people on 12th August. There are the B-specials, (the Orange Order in arms) and the riot police. There are the Public Order Acts and the Special Powers Act, passed by the gerrymandered Stormont.

Added to this is the opposition of the Protestant workers to any Catholic pressure group, for within the context of Ulster's depressed economy, more jobs for Catholics means, simply, fewer jobs for Protestants. This is a reinforcement at the base for the sectarianism fostered by the Orangemen and militantly crusaded for by Paisley.

Within this framework, CRA's weapons, the traditional arsenal of social democracy - elections, marches, moralism - can be seen by the masses to be pissing against the wind. Under capitalism this is always so, but it is too obvious to be missed in Ulster. At any rate, it has not been missed by the masses, who realise, and act upon the knowledge of CRA's ineffectiveness. In a non-repressive, capitalism, the ineffectiveness of social democracy is obscured, the masses rarely act independently.

Historically, the Catholic masses did support the CRA when it seemed to present a real threat to the Unionists. They answered its election appeals, and the old Nationalists were routed. Following the elections, the 'Opposition MPs' fell into traditional fake left roles and the CRA, after a six week truce, resumed action - peaceful marches. Reforms (undefined) were promised in eight months.

Seeing CRA's threat to Unionism fizzling out, the masses in crucial areas (Derry, then Belfast) deserted the CRA and continued to act. Partly they reverted to the old traditional Fenian consciousness - 'Burn the Orange bastards out!' but some changes have occurred: no longer do they vote Nationalist; violence seems to be expressed more at the police than the Protestants.

This raising of consciousness (by no means as great as has been hinted elsewhere) is limited by its sectarian, and historically is the result of unplanned experience. That is, it has little to do with the activities of the Left, whose impact has been minimal. Admittedly, the Left set things up like October 5th (in conjunction with the predictable RUC response); but no organic links with the people followed from this, and the Left's ability to raise consciousness is thereby limited. For (in Derry at least) though the Labour Party (the only functioning left wing group albeit with worker members) wants revolution, it does so only superstructurally. No need is seen for participation in,

leadership of, mass action. They do not know what to do in relation to the rioteers: When, on Monday 14th July, council workmen cleared some barricades before a large crowd, no attempt was made to hold a meeting to defend the barricades, negotiate with the workmen, to organise and direct the nights' inevitable violence against the police etc. etc.

The same applies to squatting - it is a very spontaneous, economic event. Labour Party people perform the role of removal men; having been asked to do so by the families, politics does not enter into it.

Further in relation to the rioters, the only definite tendency to emerge from the party is a rejection of the masses. Party men stood on the CRA cordon separating police and people, appeals to stay home were issued, and there was commendation for Connolly's line on lumpenproletarian - he shot looters, to say this is to write off Ulster's social unrest - to what extent is lumpen a meaningful category in underemployed Ulster? For the unemployed, there, are hardly society's drifting castoffs, but would-be proletarians (whose emmigration to the UK eases the tight labour market here). And how can people who will bomb the police be rejected - what level of consciousness is required of the masses before the Left will lead them?

This matter is also crucial for the UK, for a deep crisis in Ulster, ie, a revolutionary insurrection meaning British troops being sent in etc. implies a need for revolutionary action in the UK. For only with such action could any Ulster insurrection be successful; and such an insurrection would be an invaluable issue for mobilising class forces in the UK and precipitating a crisis in the British ruling class.

For still the masses act, their military capabilities, if not their political understanding, reaching new heights. Seeing the determination of the masses, CRA and the Ulster Left (Derry Labour Party, B. Devlin) have been forced to participate in some manner in order to retain some link with them. For without any link, any power they had will dissolve, they will be without a constituency. This volte-face demonstrates that the previous stances, ie, of repudiation, derived not from political principle but from an opportunist assessment of the peoples' determination to act. When this determination is high, they are no longer condemned.

The CRA's link with the rioters is bourgeois and parliamentary - a deputation to the Home Affairs Minister to demand new anti-riot tactics with the threat of... more demonstrations.

The left's link is more complex. On the one hand, B. Devlin has gone behind the barricades and helped to fight the RUC - though, notably, this intervention was post hoc, ie she can be accused of tailism, of following, not leading mass action. And on the other hand she has called for Westminster to intervene, that is, she has demanded imperialist troops to supplement RUC

and B-Special strength. The only role these troops will play will be to bolster the bourgeois of Ulster (though no doubt at some price - increased Westminster influence in Ulster, a more tightly circumscibed independence for Stormont). But obviously the immediate results of the sending in of troops will be the enforcement of law and order, mass action will be effectively stopped. Bernadette Devlin has called for the containment of the struggle.

Revolutionary strugle can only be successful if the masses are organised and armed: organised meaning knowing where and when to strike with the forces to do so effectively; armed meaning having the ability to do battle. Until the Left sees this and transforms itself into a party capable of organising the people, there will be no successful revolutionary insurrection in Ulster.

Their present relation is a parasitical one, they are riding the crest of a mass wave. They ought to have better links with the people through a Bolshevik-type party, to choose the time and place for engagements with the ruling class, to explain to the masses how to win, ie, win politically, not merely militarily, for the masses in Derry can only win (partial and defensive) military victories.

That this is so, that the Derry people are good at street-fighting means the task of raising consciousness is not the only one: they have materially demonstrated their desire to smash the State. The need is for a Bolshevik party which can help the masses organise themselves to crush the enemy - though this task will not be accomplished in any short space of time.

And now that Belfast has exploded, now that Protestant and Catholic masses are attacking the police, showing they see the state as an enemy, possibilities for action by the Left multiply a hundred-fold, in the direction of uniting the workers. But can this be done by the Peoples Democracy? It is necessary to state, contrary to the interpretation by Farrell in a recent interview in New Left Review, PD has in fact less integration with the proletariat than virtually any other student movement in Britain. The leadership is also seemingly negative at present. Thirdly their non-sectarianism is a bourgeois non-sectarianism - one of religious freedom to worship where one will; not a revolutionary non-sectarianism, ie, an anti-churches position (based not only an an intellectual atheism, but on the social power of religion.)

Only on these lines can workers' unity be built and the present situation in Ulster exploited.

RICK STEAD 7.8.69.

****

MARXISM AND MARKET SOCIALISM (On Stalin's 'Economic Problems' part two) has recently been published by the Irish Communist Organisation. It reviews the writings of Marx and Engels on the nature of the commodity, and of the varieties of "market socialism" that existed in their time. There is a chapter dealing with the history of "market socialist" theory from the 1820s down to the present day. The main part of the pamphlet carries out an extensive analysis of the writings of the economic theorists of modern revisionism on the nature of the commodity, the basis of the commodity in socialist production, and the operation of the law of value in "market socialism".

This pamphlet, unfortunately, cannot be compared with others for critical purposes. It is the only one of its kind. That this should be the case is an expression of the extremely grave theoretical weakness of the anti-revisionist movement. The essential work done by the pamphlet has been needed since the mid-fifties. Making allowances for the inevitable lag of consciousness behind practice (the lag between the opportunist revision of basic Marxist political economy and the Marxist analysis of that revisionism), this pamphlet is still at least ten years overdue.

Available from the address given below at 5/6 post free.

*

c o n t e n t s

Published by G. Golden,
28 Mercers Road,
London N 19

A L L O U R T O M O R R O W S . ! ! !

The employing class,(whether represented by the Daily Mirror or Lord Stokes) , are unanimous that something has to be done about "inflationary" wage increases, and the strikes which force employers to concede them and also cause losses in production. Having worked for the best method, they have adopted a three prong attack.

First, with Productivity Deals, they introduce a "Take now - Pay Later" plan.They know that with inflation the workers will be driven to seek ever bigger wage increases. Under this plan, the employer insists that the workers must agree to a Productivity Deal which is aimed at reducing the labour force and introducing more profitable techniques,(new machines and faster times).

The second prong is "the new science of Industrial Relations", the purpose of which is to convince us that it is really only a question of a 'communications' problem between workers and employ -ers. If the workers could only learn reasonableness there need be no ugly scenes. That is why shop stewards and personnel manag-ers are sent to schools - to learn to speak the same language.

The third prong is the Government's Industrial Relations Bill. This bill takes away rights which the Working Class fought hard for, and won, in 1871, and 1906. These were the right for workers to strike without the risk of being sued for the money which their employers may claim to have lost, and the right for the workers to strike in breach of agreements made between their trade unions and their employers.

Now the Working Class is being asked to 'respond to the call for industrial action, demonstration, protest and lobby of Parliament.....to defeat the Tory anti-union bill'.

In fact, the one-day stoppage cannot defeat the bill. Under Parliamentary Government the party in power can pass any law the ruling class considers necessary.

That is why the Labour Party can commit itself to "fighting" the bill....line by line in the House of Commons, and why Barbara Castle accepts the task of leading this "fight". The Labour Party refused to take a stand against laws on strikes and trade unions at its Annual Conference. It would not oppose them because the Labour Leaders accepted that laws were necessary,but it can oppose the bill line-by-line because this will not prevent its passage through Parliament.

THE TUC HAVE DECIDED TO EDUCATE "PUBLIC OPINION" ON THE BILL.
THIS WILL NOT DEFEAT IT EITHER!

The day of actioc on 8th Dec is also well within their rules. A lobby of Parliament is when "your" member listens to your point of view. And that's it ! A one day's strike,(and the "further action" promised by the organisers) , will achieve nothing, and that is the intention.

please turn over

The organisers of these "protests" do not intend to lead any act -ivity that might force the Government's hand. Their recent history shows this quite clearly.

The whole object of their strategy is to build up opposition to the bill for the exprexx purpose of rallying support for the return of a future Labour Government on the "promise" that it will repeal or amend the legislation.

THE ALTERNATIVE.

To have called for action as a declaration of our intention - as a first step towards establishing and developing the organisation and ideas that alone can render the legislation unworkable - that would have been taking the first step towards defeating the bill.

Indeed, if sufficient numbers of those workers taking part in the strike, demonstration, etc; have this idea in mind it will change the character of the activity regardless of the wishes of the organisers.

The point, stressed here, is that power lies with the masses if they make up their minds to use it.

In fact, the only way the working class can defeat the bill is by doing it for themselves and not relying on others to do it for them.

This means organising in order to ensure that the legislation is unworkable at the point where it is meant to operate - the workshop floor.

The employers know that they can only succeed if the workers allow them to.

WE WOULD LIKE TO HEAR YOUR VIEWS.

Why not come along and make your contribution to the discussion on Tuesday 8th December, at the Kent Room, Anson Hall. Cricklewood. N.W.2. 6-30

Anson Hall is situated at the junction of Chichele Road/Anson Rd;

Buses 266,260, pass the door.

Buses 32,16,245,616, to Cricklewood Broadway then 3 mins walk, second on left down Chichele Road. Nearest tube station Willesden Green on the Bakerloo Line, turn left on leaving the station, 5 mins walk to Anson Raod.

Publisheb by the N.W.London Workers Association.
116, Woodhal Lane, South Oxhey. Herts.