

AN PHOBLACHT

The Republic

NO. 5.

MAY 1966.



If we win, we'll be great heroes; but if we lose we'll be the greatest scoundrels the country ever produced. In the event of victory, hold on to your rifles, as those with whom we are fighting may stop before our goal is reached. We are out for economic as well as political freedom.

JAMES CONNOLLY.

National independence involves national sovereignty. National sovereignty is twofold in its nature. It is both internal and external. It implies the sovereignty of the nation over all its parts; and it implies the sovereignty of the nation as against all other nations.



P. H. PEARSE.

EDITORIAL

THE 50th ANNIVERSARY OF THE Easter Rising has occasioned much humbug and an immeasurable amount of hypocrisy. The people have been treated to a vast and colourful circus. And yet, despite the outward show of self-assurance and downright arrogance on the part of its promoters, they did not completely succeed in hiding their uneasiness. Apparently, the ghosts of 1916 are hard to dispose of; and it could well be that many of those political reprobates, who collected outside the GPO to profane the memory of true and honest men, were haunted by the ominous tone of Pearse's final statement: "you cannot extinguish the Irish passion for freedom; if our deed has not been sufficient to win freedom then our children will win it by a better deed."

BUT WHY WASTE TIME ON THE antics of degenerates who have condemned themselves to the cess-pool of Irish history? Our revolutionary ranks may be thin, with many vacancies to be filled therein; but this must not distract us from our primary object.

CONTEMPORARY REVOLUTIONARIES can do no greater honour to the memory of those who raised high the banner of independence in 1916, than to retrieve that self-same banner, cleanse it of the desecrations from political opportunism that presently foul its folds, and raise it anew at the head of a fresh and dynamic effort; that "better deed" to herald in, not merely political reunification, but a social revolution as well.

IRISH REVOLUTIONARIES cannot adequately pay their respect to the memory of their predecessors until that time when the enemies of our traditional aspirations have been toppled from power in Ireland. Until that day has dawned, it would be more dignified, more respectful, even more charitable, that Irish Republicans disciplined their flair for oratory; and instead marshalled all their energies for the real work which lies ahead. Let us all direct our unqualified attention towards what must be done; and, let the dead rest in peace until it has been accomplished.

WHAT ARE THE IMMEDIATE TASKS facing Irish revolutionaries?

IN OUR LAST ISSUE WE PRESENTED the I. R. A. Programme of 1933 as being indicative of the goals contemporary Republicans must strive to realize if they are to justify their continued opposition towards the Free State regime. We also called on the present membership of the I. R. A. to exert their influence and DEMAND that the organization return to its revolutionary position by readopting this programme.

THIS WAS A NECESSARY FIRST step on the part of the revolutionary vanguard with which we are associated. Its object was to draw a clear line between the reformist and revolutionary elements presently thrown together under the appellation of Irish Republicanism. Before any progress can be made, this division must be created; a positive distinction has to emerge between the neo-Griffithism propagated by Sinn Fein, and which aspires to nothing more than a modified form of Free Statism to encompass the nation as a whole; and the Socialist-Republicanism of the true revolutionaries, and which aims at political reunification combined with the total social reconstruction of the country. The programme of 1933 established this distinction. And regardless of what the I.R.A. membership decides on, that programme represents the minimum to which any movement can reduce its goals and still remain revolutionary.

AT THIS STAGE, THEN, THE immediate task of all revolutionaries is to foster the division between Revolutionaries and Reformists, by propagating the slogan: A RETURN TO THE PROGRAMME OF 1933. And if there still are revolutionary elements within the I.R.A., they must force the issue so as to determine the prospects of rejuvenating that body. If the I.R.A. persists in its allegiance to neo-Griffithism, then rebels in it must emerge and join hands with the revolutionary vanguard that now exists outside the fold of the I.R.A. and engage with them in

the building of a new movement.
OTHER GROUPS WHICH EXIST IN various parts of the country, and even individuals, should also consider our proposition. Because as has been said already, unless

the I.R.A. is prepared to return to its former position, and quickly, it will be up to representatives of all progressive groups to advise and decide on the formation of a new movement.

FELON-SETTING BY

PADDY MAC

THE TERM "FELON-SETTING" WAS originally coined by James Stephens. It denotes a thoroughly despicable form of collaboration, as practiced by so-called nationalists when they focus the attention of the political police on the real source of rebel activity, by the expedient of disclaiming all connection with, and all responsibility for, any occurrence which tends to unsettle the tranquillity of the ruling clique.

A RECENT CASE OF "FELON-SETTING" arose from the demolition of Nelson's Pillar by an Irish underground force. and I must say they did an excellent job by any standards. However, the dust had barely settled in O'Connell Street when the leaders of the I.R.A. dashed forth waving one of their now familiar STATEMENTS, to disclaim all responsibility, and to reiterate for the thousandth time that they did not believe in such outrageous acts. "This is quite well known to the police," whined these caricatures of Republicanism, and we protest being arrested "in the middle of the night."

SURELY IT IS A SPECTACLE, unique even in our chequered record of pseudo-patriots, to see self-styled revolutionaries frantically protesting against any notion that they were responsible for ridding our Capital of that monstrosity erected to perpetuate the memory of an English cut-throat, and an adulterer to boot. It could well be that should these characters still be around when our revolution is finally successful, they will crawl from their rat-holes with yet another of their statements to deny any responsibility for it as well.

THE IMPORTANT POINT IN THIS recent display of irresponsibility by the leadership of the I.R.A., is that their action amounts to a clear case of collaboration with the Free State police. Make no mistake on that fact. By rushing

forward to establish the non-participation of I.R.A. personnel in the destruction of Nelson's Pillar, our "great men" automatically made the job of the Brody Harriers easier, by enabling them to cross a large number of suspects off their lists, and then concentrate on the remainder.

WHAT IS THIS BUT COLLABORATION?

THE LEADERSHIP OF THE I.R.A. attempts to justify its felon-setting on the plea that they cannot be expected to take responsibility for the acts of others. There is nobody asking them to do so. However, the undeniable fact remains, that the need for the now familiar statements of innocence arise basically from their own two-faced position.

THE REPUBLICAN MOVEMENT, THE leadership of which are mostly I.R.A. men, is presently attempting to pursue a constitutional path under the guise of maintaining the traditional revolutionary position. Consequently, when any other organization carries out a job like that done on the "Pillar", the Republican Movement finds itself caught between the demands of its constitutionalist course of action, and the liabilities of its revolutionary facade. Their reaction to date has been THE STATEMENT; which attempts both to clear the movement in the eyes of the status quo, and thereby retain the tolerance of the Free State regime, so vital to the continued functioning of Sinn Fein; and, at the same time, to retain the allegiance of the I.R.A. rank-and-file, by intimating that such acts of terrorism disrupt and undermine the great plans that are being made ready for a really big fight. Of course, the plans that are being upset have nothing whatever to do with fighting, but many I.R.A. men have so far failed to see this.

IT WOULD BE A VERY EASY matter for the I.R.A. led Repub-

lican Movement to end all need for its statements denying responsibility for acts of an anti-government nature in the Free State. All that is required is for the movement to cease pretending to be what in reality it is not; and for it to tell the country openly that the Republican Movement no longer believes in physical force -- which would be the honest truth -- and that it's now but a political party like any other party in the state.

IF SUCH AN END WAS PUT TO THE present masquerade, with the leadership of the Republican Movement taking off the uniforms of Tone, Emmet, Connolly and Pearse, and dressing in civvies, the need for felon-setting statements would die a natural death. This, at least, would be the honest thing to do. The question is, does such a sense of honesty prevail in the ranks of the present Republican leadership?

THE QUASI-IRISH PARTY

OF LATE THE I.W.P. HAS ENGAGED in strenuous efforts to oblivate the fact that their party(sic) is but an extension of the British Communist Party. But their gift of double-talk is hard put to serve their purpose.

ANYONE WHO IS AT ALL FAMILIAR with the development of the Communist movement in Britain and Ireland, is well aware that Irish Communists have never been anything but satellites of the British Party since its formation in the twenties. At times this position has been blatantly illustrated in the SUPERIOR ATTITUDES adopted by the "Parent Body" towards their "Irish sidekicks." One example of this was to be found in the practice of listing Irish casualties in the Spanish Civil War as British in the Daily Worker. However, for the most part, I will admit that the King St. Kremlin has been more subtle; more delicate in its open handling of its allies. But this, of course, does not detract one iota from the completeness of the inter-dependency of the Irish groups on the central directing command; at best the Irish groups may be credited with the status of regional autonomous bodies within the overall structure of the British Party.

PERHAPS THERE ARE SOME IN THE I.W.P. and the C.P.N.I. who do not believe this. If so, then I would advise them to pay a greater attention to what's going on in their organizations. Why, for example, does the I.W.P. and the C.P.N.I. have permanent representation on the Central Committee of the British Party, if they are supposed to be independent bodies? Why were Irish Communists divided into two groups to better complement the imperialist division of our country? Certainly, this is not to the advantage of any organization which aspires to a truly revol-

utionary effort in Ireland. But it is definitely to the advantage of the British Communist Party, which requires flexibility to manoeuvre within the overall British imperialist framework encompassing the two islands. Also to be noted is the fact that official relations between the I.W.P. and the C.P.N.I. are through the Central Committee in Britain, and not directly between Dublin and Belfast. Isn't this a very strange procedure for two so-called independent parties?

AND WHAT ABOUT THE PAPER OF THE I.W.P.? Isn't it rather peculiar that a so-called independent party gets the Irish Socialist printed in Britain by Ripley Printers Ltd.? Why not get it printed by Irish trade union labour? But then, of course, this would be rather difficult considering that the British C.P. subsidizes the undertaking.

FROM THE IRISH REVOLUTIONARY standpoint, it is impossible to condone this present cosmopolitanism as practised by Irish Communists. No measure of double-talk can obscure the fact that our struggle is distinct in all its primary aspects from that of the British working classes. Their struggle is primarily their business; our struggle is primarily ours. Irish communists cannot simultaneously serve the demands and interests of both; and if they try, then, as Irishmen they automatically demonstrate their contempt for the Irish Revolution, by withholding their unreserved allegiance to it.

TO DATE, THIS SINISTER STATUS OF Irish Communists has remained obscured. All their critics have restricted their attacks to the fact that they are communists; and have ignored the only pertinent point: that they are Irishmen whose

political actions are subservient to directives initially formulated by a British political party! Due to this subservience the so-called communists in Ireland divided their ranks to better complement the British dominated partitionist regimes; and they also hold the unique distinction of being the only self-styled revolutionary movement in Ireland that has never even contemplated the overthrow of the imperialist puppet regimes by any means other than parliamentary action. Man, this is following the footsteps of the British Social-democrats with a vengeance.

DURING THE FIFTIES, WHEN THE I.R.A. initiated armed conflict in the 6 Counties, the social-democrats of the I.W.P. (a more politically correct title than communist) were a hostile bunch indeed. And this hostility did not stem from any dispute with the shortcomings of policies which directed the Republican effort; it arose completely from the issue of the use of force. In a word, the social-democrats exhibited their natural opposition towards any resort to physical force to resolve the Irish issue, regardless of the correctness of those policies which it served.

NOW, HOWEVER, IT IS DIFFICULT to find any hostility towards the Republican Movement in the pronouncements of the I.W.P. Why? Well, for one thing, the Republican Movement has gone completely, or almost completely, constitutional in its outlook; and as well, has shown itself inclined towards an acceptance of at least some of the social-democratic aims of the I.W.P. All of a sudden the men who were denouncing the I.R.A. a few years back discovered a great sense of republican patriotism-- and an organization which showed the prospects of providing them with a suitable front to better pursue their objects as dictated from King Street.

A FUNCTIONING REVOLUTIONARY movement in Ireland could not tolerate the existence of a party such as the present I.W.P.; it could not afford to tolerate the continued functioning of a party that has always been subservient to eternal directions. It is bad enough that revolutionaries, who are presently trying to re-establish a revolutionary movement in Ireland, are faced with obstacles thrown up by the petty-bourgeois Sinn Fein, without having to con-

tend with British indoctrinated Social-democrats as well. A great clearing is needed; and the decks will be cleared when the coming revolution in Ireland is set in motion. And if Irish Socialists presently grouped within the I.W.P. and the C.P.N.I. desire to serve the interests of their country in that revolution, then, they would be well advised to do some hard thinking. Yes, friends, you had better do your thinking now, because a new breed of revolutionary is in the making in Ireland; a breed of men who can be expected to take a dim view of both double-talk and double-talkers.

A CRISIS?

THE I.R.A. IN KILKENNY HAS contrived to embarrass both the Free Staters and the Republican Movement by their aggressive actions in recent weeks; and it is possible that their "disobedience" may be contagious. All of this demonstrates the contradictions which exist in the Republican Movement, and which arise from its efforts to pursue a constitutional course while endeavouring to retain the country's revolutionary mantle. The manner in which the leadership reacted to the incidents -- another of their felon-setting statements -- should make it clear to all concerned that there is no room for militants in the plans of the movement.

A BREAK BETWEEN THE constitutionalists and the militant Republicans in the movement would seem inevitable, because it is difficult to see how militants can be fooled any longer by the current hypocrisy. Consequently, while it is admirable to see the I.R.A. men of Kilkenny and elsewhere protest against the jailing of comrades by the Free Staters; it is important also that they take stock of their whole position.

IT IS NECESSARY TO PROTEST against the jailing of volunteers by the Free State; but it's of even greater importance to strive for the destruction of the root cause itself -- the Free State. Ireland needs men who are prepared to fight; men who are willing to fight not only for their comrades, but also for a positive programme of political unification and social and economic rejuvenation. Some I.R.A. men have shown they are ready to act in the case of the former; will they do the same for the latter? If so, then there are also others like them; they should get together.

IRELAND: IMPERIALISM AND

ANTI-IMPERIALISM!

BY

AODH MACELROY

"POLITICALLY THE ANGLO-IRISH Trade Agreement is the greatest thing since the Act of Union. It emphasises the logic of the Unionist approach to Irish politics and underlines our knowledge that these Islands have a common interest in the world today. It creates a trading area such as we had in 1921."

J. Taylor, Unionist,
M.P., South Tyrone.

THE SOUTH TYRONE UNIONIST HAS taken a quick look at the Trade Agreement and pronounces it the "greatest thing" since the Act of Union. It could be more fittingly described as the greatest act of treachery since Diarmuid Mac Murrough swore allegiance to Henry II, and led the Anglo-Normans into Ireland. But Taylor's joyful declaration is of interest since the pro-English Unionist emphasises what AN PHOBLACHT has already stated, namely; that the Trade Agreement is, in essence, a return to the fundamental conditions that prevailed under the Act of Union; curtailment of the franchise, famine, and mass migration. And who would know better than an Ulster Unionist what plots the scheming politicians at Westminster and Stormont are hatching against the Irish people?

A SECOND FAVOURABLE FACTOR WHICH Taylor discovers about the agreement is that "it emphasises the logic of the Unionist approach to Irish politics." The results of more than four decades of this Unionist logic has been to turn the 6 Counties into a happy hunting ground for English landlords and merchants. The people of the 6 Counties have been held as a special reserve for British army recruitment and a supply of cheap

labour when England has need of it. When England no longer has need of 6 county production, workers are pushed aside to exist on the dole or migrate in search of work that will provide them with a minimum of decency. Special powers acts and the armed terror of the "B" Specials suppress even the most mild and timid shows of protest; not to speak of any serious attempt to change the direction of politics and economics in the 6 counties.

TAYLOR'S "WE TOLD YOU SO" ATTITUDE is indicative of the fact that the intention of the anti-Irish plotters is to extend 6 county conditions to all Ireland; re-establish the English and Orange ascendancy, and extend the rule of armed terror to all parts of the land. The Anglo-Irish Trade Agreement is to ensure that the political, economic and social conditions now prevailing in the 6 counties will become general in all Ireland with the Unionist puppet bourgeoisie on top of the heap. This bears out the correctness of the forecast made in the third issue of AN PHOBLACHT: "...the Unionist block of imperialist henchmen... will be transformed into the majority bourgeois group... and will give the nationalist bourgeoisie their come-uppence for having had the audacity to think they could rule independently." Taylor is chortling over this situation even before the Trade Agreement is implemented.

THE "LOGIC OF THE UNIONIST approach" means the expansion of Ulster's economic condition to the Free State at a time when that economy is seriously deteriorating. England has lost her long-held place in the sun; she is no longer "ruler of the seas," nor can she any more lay claim to the title "workshop of the world." England's own economy is totally dominated by foreign (U.S.) monopolies and in a constant state of crisis. Binding Ireland's economy still closer to that of England can only result in Ireland importing England's economic crisis, but intensified

a thousand fold. The largely illusory advantages which, in former times, fell to the lot of the loyal Orange bootblacks of her imperial majesty are no longer there in even their most illusory form. Under the Trade Agreement it will be Ireland's fate to become a market-garden producing fresh vegetables for English dinner-tables, and a holiday resort for wealthy English, German and American capitalists. The Irish people will be condemned to become a nation of domestic servants.

THE NEXT POINT IN TAYLOR'S statement which calls for examination is the following: "It... underlines our knowledge that these islands have a common interest in the world today."

FROM THIS REMARK ONE IS SURELY entitled to assume that Taylor would suggest that the lamb has common interest with the lion in preparing dinner, when it is public knowledge that the lamb is to be the main dish served up for the lion's enjoyment. Advocacy of a common interest such as this would no doubt prove pleasing to the lion, but it would be difficult indeed to find any sane person who would suggest it would be at all advantageous to the lamb. The South Tyrone Unionist wants us to ignore the most elementary fact of our society; that there can be no common interest between exploiter and exploited, between the owners of property and the dispossessed - between the two mortal enemies there can be nothing but irreconcilable enmity and unrelenting struggle.

PUTTING FORWARD HIS PROPOSITION of "common interest", Taylor simply ignores a number of serious questions crying out for answers. For example: what possible identity of interest could Ireland have in England's exploitation of the remnants of empire East of Suez?--- unless he proposes that we fill the role of a scab-infested Lazarus living on the crumbs that fall from the table of the rich. What do the Irish people have in common with the British Labour government's unqualified support of the U.S. aggression against Viet Nam-an aggression similar to that which England has pressed against Ireland for almost 8 centuries. The identity of interest of Ireland of the FAMINE is with the starving millions of India, not with the Anglo-American monopolists, who mercilessly exploit the people of India. Taylor ignores these facts because mention-

ing them might well raise the thought that the Anglo-Irish Trade Agreement will bring the same disasters to Ireland.

GEOGRAPHICALLY, IRELAND IS PART of Western Europe. It is the most westerly outpost of Europe and as such strategically important to any imperialist power that can control it. But, excepting Ireland, all the nations of Western Europe are imperialist in nature with ruling groups closely allied to the United States, the most powerful imperialist nation in the world today. Ireland, therefore, in spite of her geographical location, has vital interests that run directly counter to the imperialist states with whom she has closest physical contact and that includes Britain. Our social, political and economic interests are closely linked with the anti-imperialist movements in the Colonial and neo-Colonial nations. Far from having a common interest with Britain, as Taylor claims, Ireland has a vested interest in victory for those forces that seek to destroy England's imperialist power and liquidate the last vestiges of Empire. Taylor, in fact, is calling on us to forge the chains for our own enslavement; he counsels us to assist our traditional and most bitter enemy to hold in subjection our true friends and allies.

THE FINAL POINT TO BE considered in the quotation from Taylor is this: "It creates a trading area such as we had in 1921." Taylor is hesitant about telling us what was so wonderful with the trading area of that particular year which makes it so desirable. Since any alleged advantages accruing to the Irish nation would depend upon what we received from England, let us review briefly just a few of the many "blessings" which were shipped across the Irish Sea in 1921; this should be a reasonable approach to the discovery of what Taylor thinks is good for the Irish people.

BY 1921 THE TAN WAR WAS AT ITS height. In the closing days of 1920 Gen. Strickland presided over the burning of Cork City. British authorities celebrated New Years day, 1921, with an official order for "reprisals." Homes of Republican sympathisers were to be dynamited following every attack by Volunteers against the British occupation. Middleton, Co. Cork, was the scene of the first operation under this new scheme whereby the British government openly

sponsored and initiated these acts of terror against the population of Ireland. On January 2nd, the following statement was issued by Strickland:

"As a result of the ambush and attack on police in Middleton and Glebe House, it was decided by the Military Governor that certain houses in the vicinity of the outrages were to be destroyed, as the inhabitants were bound to have known of the ambush and attack, and that they neglected to give any information either to the military or the police authorities.

"The houses of the following were duly destroyed between 3 P.M. and 6 P.M. on 1st January: (the list included seven names)

"Previous to the burning notice was served on the persons affected giving them one hour to clear out valuables, but not furniture. No foodstuffs, corn or hay were destroyed."

A GRIM COMPETITION DEVELOPED between official and unofficial perpetrators of "reprisals" to see who would be first on the scene with acts of terrorism. In the first two weeks of January, 1921, apart from houses "officially" destroyed, the towns of Ballina, Co. Mayo; Nenagh, Co. Tipperary; Carrickmacross, Monaghan; and Cork City, were "shot up." Shops and houses were destroyed by fire in Scariff, Co. Clare; Elphin and Carroweel, Co. Roscommon; Camlough, Co. Armagh; Falcarragh, Co. Donegal; Ballinalée, Co. Longford; Garrybawn and Ballyboy, Co. Monaghan; Kilbeggan, Co. Meath; and Innishannon, Co. Cork. Public meeting places were destroyed in Tramore, Co. Waterford; Crossan, Co. Westmeath; and at Limerick Junction.

TERROR AND DESTRUCTION WAS THE daily fare served up by England's hired murderers well into 1921. Irish people, of both sexes and all ages, were arrested in large numbers. Many were imprisoned, tortured and often brutally murdered. The Irish people withstood the terror with heroism and courage until Arthur Griffith betrayed them, near the closing of the year, when he accepted the Treaty, agreed to partition and split the nation thus giving to England what she had been unable to take by force.

THE TYRONE UNIONIST, THEREFORE, must be of the opinion that a year which brought a rich harvest of murder, pillage, rapine and betrayal was a good year for Ire-

land, and one worthy of emulation. We should thank John Taylor for having drawn our attention to the rich blessings that the Anglo-Irish Trade Agreement holds in store for us, and tell him to inform his Unionist friends at Stormont that this Devil's broth is not for us.

WHAT'S THIS?

HOW DOES SINN FEIN PROPOSE TO end British occupation in our 6 North-eastern counties? Well, when their spokesmen are giving forth throughout the Free State, one can almost smell the powder as they expound their plans to march shall Irish manhood under the banner of the I.R.A. and drive the bastards out at the point of a gun. However, it's a slightly different story when they speak in Belfast.

WHEN SPEAKING AT THE REPUBLICAN Plot in Belfast on Easter Sunday, Mr. Niall Fagan suggested, rather timidly I suspect, that the matter "should be put before the United Nations." "An election should be held "under U.N. supervision," said our brave Sinn Fein revolutionary, and if the country was united via this expedient; it would be all right to let "British forces remain for 10 or 15 years so as to allay whatever fears some sections of the people still hold."

NOW, WHAT'S A PERSON SUPPOSED TO say to a suggestion like that? Already, the Sinn Fein dominated Republican Movement has outlawed armed action against the Free Staters; somebody might get hurt, and as we all know, Sinn Fein is a respectable party which does not believe in offending anyone. Now, however, their spokesman in Belfast has intimated that armed action against British forces and their puppets in the 6 counties is also a bad idea. Get the U.N. in the act, said he; look at the fine job the U.N. did in the Congo. IT IS, OF COURSE, NOT IN THE LEAST surprising that Sinn Fein should have come to such a reactionary conclusion in regards a solution to partition. And it's only a matter of time before they openly proceed with surrenderist policies that are the logical outcome of compromise, and take their stand alongside the other self-styled republicans -- Fianna Fail. What the hell, if you are going to invite British forces to remain in the North; you may as well bring them down to the Curragh, and do a good job while you're at it!

* * * *

CONNOLLY, SOCIALISM AND

BY EOIN McDONAIL

SINN FEIN

JAMES CONNOLLY WAS AN exponent of scientific Socialism. In plain language, James Connolly was a Marxist; and there is no record of any attempt on his part to apologise for, or renounce, this commitment. All of his political labours were directed by the principles of Marxism; and he died a Marxist. To suggest or infer that had Connolly lived to witness the Russian Revolution and its developments, he would have denounced Marxism, is purely speculative and therefore utter nonsense. What Connolly might have done is anybody's guess; what he did do, and what he stood for all his political life, is the only certainty.

MANY IRISHMEN, SOME EVEN AMONGST the working class, may well disagree with Connolly's Marxist interpretation of the Irish Revolution. That's fair enough. However, while it is one thing to disagree openly with the Marxist position of Connolly, it is a completely different matter to use his name as a means to establish a historic base for social-democratic propositions that are in complete variance with all he ever stood for. The social-democrats of the I.W.P. have engaged in this form of despicable activity for years; and of late they have been joined by the so-called "progressive" faction in Sinn Fein. It is with the latter opportunists that we will concern ourselves at this time.

DURING THE RECENT WESTMINSTER election, Rory Brady stated emphatically that "the Republican Movement was not Socialist." We believe this to be the truth. In any event, although Rory is a petty-bourgeois reactionary, at least he had the courage to state his convictions clearly; and for this we sincerely respect him. However, while Rory was giving one version of the Republican Movement's relationship with Socialism, Mr. Tom Gill had the opposite to say at the inaugural conference of the Irish Association of Labour Student Organizations. Said Mr. Gill: "Republicans today are coming more and more to see the close connection between the Socialist and Republican tradition; which

has been shown in the past by the alliance between Connolly and Pearse. It may well have been true that Republicans had neglected the Socialist principles of Connolly in past years, BUT THIS IS NOT TRUE TODAY.

IT COULD WELL BE THAT MR. GILL was clueless as to the implications inherent in this statement of his, in which case he could be benevolently viewed as a sort of political "village idiot". But, if he did know what he was saying -- in effect, that Sinn Fein was going Marxist -- at this meeting where he consorted with representatives of the British imperialist Labour Party, the Free State Labour Party, and the Free State Communist Party (I.W.P.), then, his remarks warrant grave censure, because he knows very well it is far from the truth.

IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO IGNORE statements made by Mr. Tom Gill. He is President of Sinn Fein; consequently, all he has to say is of relevance to Irish Republicans. Already we have had occasion to take him to task for his blatant misrepresentation of Connolly's Socialist position, in an attempt to give a revolutionary base to Sinn Fein's co-operative schemes that are essentially social-democratic in content. But it is a full-time job to keep up with Sinn Fein's President in all of his devious manoeuvrings and contradictory pronouncements. For instance, at the last Ard Feis Mr. Gill gave forth on the evils of Capitalism in Ireland; it had to go, according to him. Yet, two months later, (January, 1966) he said: "we don't oppose a free enterprise economy"; and what is this but CAPITALISM?

APPARENTLY, MR. GILL CAN, ON THE one hand, harangue representatives of the British imperialist Labour Party, the Free State Labour Party, and the I.W.P., on Sinn Fein's new-found awareness of the Socialism of James Connolly; and, on the other, lecture the faithful in Cork City on "people who are advocating alien ideas." "We want to say," said the bold Mr. Gill in Cork on Easter Sunday, "that the

Republican Movement is not communist, nor has it any association with communism." Which reminds us of the habitual equivocator who invariably ends his tale with: "and that's a fact."

IT COULD BE THAT AN IMPENDING new crisis within Sinn Fein, between the "progressive" and the "traditionalist" factions, necessitated this outburst; or, perhaps, Mr. Gill's anti-communist remarks were given for the benefit of the clergy. Anyway, he knows (or should know, unless he's completely asleep) that members of the I.W.P., which is the only Communist Party in the Free State, are openly connected with the Republican Movement in Dublin. Furthermore, that in Cork City on January last, an invitation only lecture sponsored by the I.W.P., and given by Mr. M. Riordan, Nat. Sec. of the I.W.P., was chaired by a well-known local member of Sinn Fein. We are not overly interested in any liaison which may, or may not, exist between the parliamentary communists (social democrats) of the I.W.P. and the petty-bourgeois Sinn Fein. That's their affair. We are, however, concerned when either, and Sinn Fein especially, claims allegiance to the Socialist principles of James Connolly, while at the same time promoting bourgeois aims.

THIS FORM OF DUPLICITY IS DESPICABLE BY ANY STANDARDS; A BASE DEFAMATION OF THE MEMORY OF A MAN WHO GAVE HIS LIFE FOR THAT THE IRISH PEOPLE MAY BE FREE. IT IS THE SORT OF THING WHICH REPUBLICANS DENOUNCE THE FREE STATERS FOR; AND HERE ARE SINN FEINERS AT THE VERY SAME GAME.

"US SOCIALISTS," SAID JAMES Connolly, "we base our political policy on the class struggle of the workers." Where does Sinn Fein stand in relation to that position, Mr. Gill? And how does Sinn Fein reconcile your reformist statements on the free enterprise system made last January, with Connolly's clearcut pronouncement: "The day has passed for patching up the capitalist system; it must go."—and that half a century ago! "And in the work of abolishing it the Catholic and Protestant, the Jew, the Freethinker, the Buddhist, the Mohammedan will co-operate together, knowing no rivalry but the rivalry of endeavour toward an end beneficial to all. For, as we have said elsewhere, Socialism is neither Protestant nor Catholic, Christian nor Freethinker, Buddhist, Mohammedan, nor

Jew, it is only HUMAN. We of the Socialist working class realise that as we suffer together we must work together that we may enjoy together."

WE HUMBLLY SUGGEST TO THE President of Sinn Fein that he should find the time to peruse, and absorb, both Connolly's writings and the social and political philosophy which motivated him, before he again ventures to announce his organization's adherence to the Socialism of James Connolly. This would help in straightening things out, perhaps; and it would save us a lot of time now taken in reminding him of his reactionary tendencies.

THE HARD FACT IS, THE PRESENT Sinn Fein position does not differ essentially from the original stand as expounded by Griffith. The present Sinn Fein social and economic policies are simply neo-Griffithist; that is, their essence has remained constant, while secondary innovations have been introduced to meet changing conditions. And Connolly had this to say about Sinn Fein's economic position: "With its economic teaching, as expounded by my friend Mr. Arthur Griffith in his adoption of the doctrines of Frederick List, Socialists have no sympathy, as it appeals only to those who measure a nation's prosperity by the volume of wealth produced in a country, instead of by the distribution of that wealth amongst the inhabitants. According to that definition, Ireland in 1847 was a prosperous country because it exported food, whereas Denmark was comparatively unprosperous because it exported little."

SINN FEIN HAS A LONG WAY TO GO before it can claim to have aligned itself with the Socialism of James Connolly. In the meantime, let's have less of this political somersaulting; less of this irresponsible humbug which finds the President of Sinn Fein asserting; on the one hand, that his organization is inspired by the Socialism of Connolly; and on the other, that it has nothing to do with "Reds".

TO OUR READERS

AN PHOBLACHT IS THE ONLY PAPER consciously working towards the establishment of a new and dynamic revolutionary effort in Ireland. You can help by your encouragement and assistance. When you have read AN PHOBLACHT, pass it on to a friend.

I.W.P. POLITICALLY BANKRUPT!

STARTLING ADMISSION BY PARTY PRESS

AN EDITORIAL IN THE MARCH ISSUE of Irish Socialist --organ of the Irish Workers' Party--is deserving of some comment, especially since, being an editorial, it undoubtedly reflects the considered opinion of the leading committee of the Party.

THE EDITORS TAKE ISSUE WITH statements made in an address delivered by Dr. David Thornby of Trinity College during the course of which Dr. Thornby is alleged to have advanced the proposition that "Connolly is as irrelevant to conditions in Ireland today as Keir Hardie is to conditions in Britain."

THERE ARE MANY THINGS FOR WHICH Connolly can be sharply criticized, but he -- unlike Hardie, who was a Social-Democrat--was a revolutionary and scientific socialist who proclaimed the necessity and inevitableness of a Communist society. In view of the fundamentally correct programme which Connolly advanced, it is difficult to understand how the leading body of a party which claims to be defending scientific socialist principles, in times like the present when such principles are under attack from powerful enemies on all sides, considers it can afford the luxury of giving ground to Dr. Thornby as they do in the statement; "Dr. Thornby has performed a service to the Labour movement." Dr. Thornby, when he attacks Connolly, is attacking fundamental socialist positions in Ireland, and in this he is serving the ruling class -- not Labour.

BUT EVEN THIS IS NOT THE MOST surprising aspect of the Editorial, for in it we read the following: "Dr. Thornby is correct in deploring the fact that no original Socialist ideas have emerged in the Labour movement since Connolly." According to this, not a single original idea has been developed in the Irish Socialist movement in half a century. What makes this statement more astounding is the fact that the editors who penned it have proclaimed themselves the heirs of Connolly and the only fit custodians of Socialist principles in Ireland for 45 of the 50

years since Connolly's death. They have challenged and censured every proposition advanced by others outside their circle and now, on their own admission, it is discovered that, in half a century, they have not contributed a single original idea to Socialist thought in Ireland.

THIS ADMISSION SHOULD PUT AN end to any claims the leaders of the Irish Workers' Party may make as to their capacity and fitness to lead the revolutionary working class movement in Ireland. Might we suggest that it would be a good thing if these people stepped aside, and stopped impeding the advance of the Irish Working Class.

RUMOUR-MONGERS IN CORK

OUR CORK ASSOCIATES REPORT THAT Local Sinn Feiners are actively engaged in spreading rumours to the effect that they (AN PHOBLACHTS FRIENDS) are responsible for the painting of I.R.A. monuments outside the city. "This," said our friends, "is a bloody lie." But although the rumour-mongers know this right well, obviously, they are simply availing of the event to hit back at AN PHOBLACHT for its disclosures on their milk-and-water brand of Republicanism.

AN PHOBLACHT HAS CHALLENGED THE Sinn Feiners on purely political issues. Now, apparently, the only answer the Cork Sinn Feiners have to our polemics, is to SLANDER some of our friends. Well, ye miserable species of Republicanism, even a rat can fling dirt with its hind legs, but it takes a measure of intelligence to rebut our charges knowledgeably. You have not answered, but you have thrown dirt instead; so that by your own actions you have "labelled" yourselves admirably.

IT COULD BE, OF COURSE, THAT this slander campaign in Cork was instigated by the Sinn Fein Leadership. If not, they could issue one of their famous STATEMENTS on the matter. They have done so for less.

* * *

CONCESSIONS BE DAMNED!

IN A NOW FAMOUS ARTICLE, published in IRISH FREEDOM, July 7, 1911, Sean MacDiarmada concluded with this revolutionary rallying-cry: "We repudiate all bargains or treaties concerning the rights of the nation. CONCESSIONS BE DAMNED, WE WANT OUR COUNTRY."

IT WAS REFRESHING, INDEED invigorating, to hear that self-same defiance hurled in the face of Free Staters during the recent commemoration ceremonies, and by the sisters of Sean MacDiarmada: "We are true to the 32-county Republic for which all those Leitrim men, including Sean, died, and we object to commemoration ceremonies by those who have accepted less."

GOOD FOR YOU, MARGARET AND ROSE MacDermott, and Mrs. Keany; you threw their blood-stained thirty pieces of silver back in their hypocritical mugs. You stand alone, the only family of the signatories of the Proclamation of 1916 who have consistently refused to make a meal-ticket out of the memory of their kin. You have, by your honesty, integrity and your wholesome respect for the memory of your brother, given our people a shining glimpse of that DIGNITY which remains the hallmark of our cultural heritage. You were in the unique position to brand traitors in the spotlight of publicity. You did so, as you have done many times before; and by so doing, you made the rats squirm if only for a minute.

THE IDEALS FOR WHICH SEAN MacDiarmada so willingly gave his life are still to be realized; but at least this can be said: his memory remains unsullied, and his bones have not been ground to dust by the trampling feet of his relatives as they scrambled for the spoils of betrayal.

IT MUST HAVE BEEN AN uncomfortable few minutes for the Spanish-Irish Governor-General from the "Park" as he admitted "with great regret" that MacDermada's relatives refused to accept honorary degrees along with "six close relatives" of the remaining signatories of the Proclamation. "He (MacDiarmada) spent the best years of his life in organizing together those who would be prepared to fight for Irish Freedom," said Dev. Yes indeed, and he could

have added: "and I've spent 34 years of mine tracking down, jailing, torturing and shooting similar minded parties."

IT'S A GREAT PITY INDEED THAT the relatives of the other signatories collaborated with the Free Staters. Had they remained aloof with the MacDermott's, they would have contributed to the focusing of a very bright spotlight on the Kildare-Street-puppets as they mocked the memory of men who died to rid the nation of both alien and native parasites. But it was not to be; perhaps it was even too much to expect.

DEFACED MONUMENTS

DURING APRIL, REPUBLICAN MONUMENTS in counties Dublin, Tipperary, Galway and Cork have been either damaged, painted or defaced. The Free State press has intimated that this hooliganism is the work of "extremists" who have "broken" from the Republican Movement. And even the Republican Movement has inferred in its "Statements" that this was so.

NOW, LET IT BE CLEARLY UNDERSTOOD by all that no group associated with AN PHOBLACHT had any connection with the forementioned anti-Republican acts of vandalism; nor do we believe that any group of Republicans were in any way involved.

IT IS VERY OBVIOUS, WE THINK, that these acts of desecration were perpetrated either by individuals from the pro-British element in our midst; or else by Irish quislings, in the hopes of discrediting embryo revolutionary groups like ourselves. No one would blame the Republican Movement -- and rightly so; but those "extremists" who are now in ideological conflict with that movement could be blamed. This is the line taken by the Free State press; and it is not to the credit of the R.M. that it has intimated the same thing. Neither has charged pro-British vandals with the crime. IT IS OF INTEREST TO ALL REPUBLICANS, regardless of differences, to discover who actually is responsible; and when, or if, any group does find out, then that group should take appropriate action.