THE MARXISM OF JAMES CONNOLLY

I. C. O. PAMPLET NO. 14

CONNOLLY ON REVISIONISM

"BE MODERATE"

Some men, fainthearted, ever seek
  Our programme to retouch,
And will insist, wher'eer they speak,
  That we demand too much.
Tis passing strange, yet I declare
  Such statements cause me mirth,
For our demands most moderate are:
  We only want the earth!

*

"Be moderate!" the trimmers cry,
  Who dread the tyrants thunder.
"You ask too much, and people fly
  From you aghast in wonder".
Tis passing strange, yet I declare
  Such statements cause me mirth
For our demands most moderate are,
  We only want the earth!

*

--Concluded inside back cover

contents

Published by I e, London, N. 6
for the IRISH COMMUNIST ORGANISATION

All comments and criticisms should be sent to this address

March 1968

INTRODUCTION

The Irish bourgeoisie quickly realised after the Easter Rising that Connolly's writings were a force they would have to reckon with. The situation as seen from their point of view was put very plainly in the "Irish Monthly" in 1919:

> A year before his death James Connolly had published almost all the writings which he has left to us, he had agitated and worked for more than 20 years for his ideals, and yet he had not then an assured hope of a place in the memory of posterity. He was liked, but not idolised, by the working people of Dublin, whose enthusiasm was nearly all devoted to their hero, Jim Larkin. Outside the working class, people, when they knew of him at all, thought of him as an educated but rather inefficient and fairly moderate labour leader, a a favourable contrast to his irresponsible captain. His name was not one to excite either fierce hatred or fierce enthusiasm.
>
> This was all changed when the firing squad shot him on the

12th May, 1916...

> His writings, which up to that day had not challenged much attention, were now eagerly sought after, and were found to be rich in unexpected wealth of knowledge, thought and eloquence. His teachings were vested with the authority due to the last words of a martyr. At the present time his portrait is frequent everywhere in the working class houses of Dublin; when Dublin work-folk are questioned as to their aspirations one of the commonest answers is that they hold by the ideals and the methods of James Connolly.
>
> It is important, therefore, to know what Connolly's ideas were, especially if we wish to understand the language of the writers in the Dublin labour-world of to-day." (L.McKenna S.J. "The teachings of James Connolly," Irish Monthly, Oct 1919)

Since Connolly was fresh in the minds of the workers then Fr. McKenna saw that certain awkward truths about him would have to be acknowledged. Such as:

> The dominant note in Connolly's writings is the call to revolt ... He is ever appealing to the working class to realise their own misery and enslavement and to arise from it. Even in his historical works this is always felt to be his purpose. All his heroes are heralds of revolt.

It would also have been futile for Fr. McKenna to try the tactic, fairly successful in a later period, of denying that Connolly was a Marxist. So he remarks that

> His avoidance of any --even a friendly-- disagreement with revolutionary writers is most remarkable in the case of Marx. For him Marx is 'the greatest of modern thinkers, the first of Scientific Socialists'; according to him, 'Marx is the founder of the school of thought which embraces all the militant socialist parties in the world', In one place, where he undertakes to define Socialism, he gives a summary of the chief points in Marx's doctrine. We can hardly find a better way of grasping Connolly's views than by shortly summarising the doctrines of Marx...

The problem facing the Sinn Fein bourgeoisie in 1919 with regard to Connolly was this:

Connolly's signature was on the proclamation of the Republic. Connolly had directed the Rising in Dublin. Connolly was one of the 1916 martyrs. The workers were reading what Connolly wrote. Sinn Fein depended on the working class in their attempt to set up a national government. But if the advanced workers managed to get a firm grasp of Connolly's teaching the anti-imperialist struggle would not stop where the Sinn Fein bourgeoisie wanted to stop it. Connolly was a very dangerous fly in the ointment as far as Sinn Fein was concerned.

Fr. McKenna was aware of the problem posed by the danger that Connolly's writings would bring revolutionary Marxist politics to a large section of the advanced workers in a revolutionary situation. He could find no real answer to the problem. He articles end on a wistful note:

> It is a pity that James Connolly, with his heroic spirit, his great love of the Irish people, his intimate knowledge of their history, ever allowed his mind to be obfuscated by the German philosophical doctrines which he either misunderstood or interpreted in a sense different from their authors. A more intimate acquaintance with Catholic doctrine would, so far from hindering him, have helped him in what was after all the chief object of his life, the redemption of the suffering masses of the Irish people; while at the same time it would have saved him from the glaring inconsistencies which mar his work, and from the errors and unpleasant things which tend to discredit it.

It was left to a more enterprising priest, Fr. Peter Coffey, to find a way of appearing to support Connolly as a revolutionary socialist while in fact counter-acting him as a revolutionary socialist. That was done in 1920 in a Republican monthly called "The Catholic Bulletin". It is described later in this pamphlet.

We have not attempted in this pamphlet to present a comprehensive account of Connolly's political development. We are not yet in a position to do that. The distortions of half a century cannot be unravelled overnight. A year ago we thought we had reached a position from which we could present a comprehensive account of Connolly's development. That was a very great illusion. When we tried to produce such an account we realised that we had only cut through a couple of the more obvious and superficial layers of distortion. It was necessary to go deeper; else we would ourselves, whatever our intentions, have made ourselves perpetuators of those distortions.

The more obvious distortions are not those which do the most damage. For example the distortions of those who deny that Connolly was a Marxist (or assert that he was a Marxist only because he did not "really" understand Marx), and who say that he was a Catholic social reformer whose policies were in harmony with the social policy of the Papal Encyclical, Rerum Novarum, are easily seen through. But the distortions of those who begin by declaring that Connolly was a Marxist, and who then proceed to expound a "Marxist" distortion of Connolly's teaching, have much greater potential for sowing confusion in the ranks of the advanced workers. There have been many such distorters in the past. It is certain that there will be even more in future.

Here we have limited ourselves to clarifying a few points. Much work remains to be done before a comprehensive pamphlet on Connolly can be produced.

CONNOLLY - HYNDMAN - DE LEON

Connolly came into politics by way of the British Social-Democratic Federation (founded by H.M. Hyndman). In the early years of the 20th century he was the outstanding organisational and theoretical leader of the movement against the opportunist S.D.F. leadership and the formation of the Socialist Labour Party, under the political influence of the ideas of Daniel De Leon. Desmond Greaves explains this aspect of Connolly's behaviour as follows:

> Recoiling from Hyndman's opportunism, he embraced the dogmatic ultra-leftism of De Leon... (Life and Times of James Connolly. P 226)

Let us see.

HYNDMAN

In the 1890s there were two main socialist influences in Britain: The Fabian Society and the Social-Democratic Federation.

The Fabian Society was founded in the 1880s by a group of bourgeois intellectuals, including G.B. Shaw (who had "refuted" Marx's labour theory of value in 1887) and Sidney and Beatrice Webb. Fabianism adopted the policy of gradually reforming capitalism, and it consciously and openly supported imperialism (on the grounds that it was 'international' of course). The Fabian "reform" of capitalism, and the "progressive" Fabian imperialism have been of considerable service to the British ruling class in the 20th century. The leadership of the British Labour Party has always been Fabian.

The Marxist Social-Democratic Federation was founded by H.M. Hyndman in the early 1880s. Hyndman had begun his career as a Radical Tory. In the late 1870s he had read Capital and agreed with the economic analysis it presented. But he was uncomfortable about Marx's theory that socialism would come about through revolution. He preferred the theory of evolution.

Marx explained to him that evolution became revolution because the ruling class resisted it. Hyndman thereupon decided to try to persuade the aristocratic section of the ruling class not to resist it. in 1881 he had a meeting with Disraeli.

Disraeli had been a great "Tory rebel" in the 1830s and 1840s. In 1845 he had published a novel called "Sybil: or The Two Nations". In England, he wrote, there were

> two nations, between whom there is no sympathy; who are as ignorant of each other's habits, thoughts and feelings, as if they were dwellers in different zones, or inhabitants of different planets; who are formed by different breeding, are fed by a different food, and ordered by different manners, and are not governed by the same laws... THE RICH AND THE POOR.

As against the middle class, Neville Chamberlain-type of Toryism of Peel, Disraeli developed an aristocratic, Churchillian type of Toryism designed to have greater popular appeal. His acute consciousness of the class antagonism in British society (and his great "sympathy" with the poor) did not by any means make him a socialist; it made him a more effective representative of the class interest of the bourgeoisie, and a conscious imperialist. Just before his death in 1881, when he had completed a long period as Prime Minister, Hyndman proposed a scheme to him for the democratic reorganisation of the Empire, the instrument for carrying out which would be the Tory Party. According to Hyndman, Disraeli replied:

> 'You can never carry it out with the Conservative Party. That is quite certain... The moment you tried to realise it on our side you would find yourself surrounded by a phalanx of great families: they and their women. And you would be no better off on the other side (ie the Liberals)... private property which you hope to communize, and vested interests which you openly threaten have a great many to speak up for them still. I do not say it to discourage you, but you have taken upon yourself a very-heavy-work indeed... It is a very difficult country to move Mr. Hyndman... But do you intend to go on?' I said I did. 'Then I shall have the pleasure of seeing you again.' (Hyndman. Record of an adventurous life. P 244)

Hyndman never lost his admiration for Disraeli. "What attracted me", he wrote, "was his manifest sympathy for democratic and social progress as opposed to middle-class Liberal hypocrisy and chicane". And it must be admitted that Hyndman's admiration for Disraeli was at any rate no worse than the more customary admiration of non-Marxist socialists for the sanctimonious personification of the meanest and most vicious aspect of the bourgeois spirit: the Liberal, Gladstone. If Disraeli personified the buccaneering aspect of capitalism, Gladstone personified its essential shopkeeper and pious slavedriver aspect. Gladstone was undoubtedly the more subtle and dangerous enemy of the working class.

Hyndman explained why Disraeli became a Tory instead of a Chartist: "...he sympathised with the revolutionary chartists...and...he only gave up his adherence to their views when he saw that it was quite impossible their ideas should attain to political success in his day." (Record of an adventurous life. P 232)

Hyndman reckoned that the chances of becoming a revolutionary Prime Minister had improved considerably since the 1840s and made his career in socialist politics. Twenty years later, (Sept. 1900), however, he began to have doubts, which he expressed in a letter to Neil Maclean, which was published in The Socialist (SLP newspaper) Dec. 1904:

I do not mind saying that I am utterly disgusted with the workers here, and with our own party in particular. Neither deserve to have men of ability from the educated class serve them. It is a waste of life. They are not worth the personal sacrifice and the continuous worry... All I have done is to cramp the exercise of my own abilities to no purpose. I could have done more good and saved more mischief if I had gone into high office years ago.

'Hyndman", says the Encyclopeedia Brittanica, "always remained an aristocrat among the socialists".

In these twenty years he produced a number of valuable works on Marxist political economy, and carried on a certain amount of useful propoganda for Marxism; but in essence he remained the "Radical Tory". His socialism sprang from aristocratic contempt for the upstart middle class; not from proletarian class hatred for the exploiting capitalist class. He was only "making his career" in work -ing class politics (as the modern revisionists are today). Despite he personal abilities this imposed very serious restrictions on the contribution he could make to the development of a Marxist movement in Britain.

Connolly's assessment of Hyndman was sober and reasoned. It had nothing of the character of a "recoil" as alleged by Greaves. In the Workers Republic, April 1903, he wrote:

> As an exponent of socialist economics Hyndman has no ardent admirer than the writer, but we contend that as a political guide his whole career has been one of a long series of blunders; a fact which explains, as nothing else can explain, the wobbling state of the movement in England. The keynote of his character has been to preach revolution and to practice compromise, and to do neither thoroughly.

DE LEON

Let us now glance at the "dogmatic ultra-leftism of De Leon" which Connolly, allegedly, "embraced" in his "recoil" against Hyndman.

Daniel De Leon became the leader of the Socialist Labour Party of America in 1890. In the course of the following decade he made his positive contribution to the development of the movement by exposing the role which trade union bureaucracies were increasingly playing in the class struggle:

> It has been the habit in this country and in England that, when a strike is on, "stars" in the Labour Movement are invited to appear on the scene, and entertain the strikers; entertain them and keep them in good spirits with rosy promises and prophesies, funny anecdotes, bombastic recitations in prose and poetry: stuff them full of rhetoric and wind --very much in the style that some Generals do, who, by means of bad whiskey, seek to keep up the courage of soldiers whom they were otherwise unable to beguile. Such has been the habit in the past; ...and it is so everywhere, to the extent that ignorance of the Social Question predominates. To the extent however that Socialism gets a footing among the working class such false and puerile tactics are thrown aside... (What Means This Stike? 1898, P3)

> What we now stand in need of, aye, more than of bread, is the knowledge of a few elemental principles of political economy and sociology. Be not frightened at the words. It is only the capitalist professors who try to make them so difficult of understanding that the very mention of them is expected to throw the workingman into a palpitation of the heart... (ibid P 10)

De Leon vigorously exposed the "labour fakirs", the labour lieutenants of capitalism:

> ..You have here a 'labour leader' named Ross (Applause in several parts of the hall) --Unhappy men! ... As well might you applaud the name of your executioner. (ibid p23)

He showed the inadequacy of "pure and simple" trade unionism --trade unionism divorced from politics (or subordinate to bourgeois politics, which is what 'absence' of politics means). In "The Burning Question of Trade Unionism" he asked:

> Are the two utterances: "The capitalists hate the Union" and "The capitalists love the Union" as irreconcilable as they looked at first?... capitalism justly sees in Socialism...its unquestioned foe, while with equal accuracy it perceives in the Union an organisation of various possibilities --a possibility of injury to the capitalist class, and also a possibility of safety and protection. (P 6)

> ...the capitalist interests...ever fasten themselves to the selfish trade interests on which the labour fakir, or labour lieutenant of the capitalist class, thrives. (ibid P 22)

> The Labour movement that has not a well pointed political lance-head can never rise above the babe condition in which the union is born; on the other hand, unhappy is the political movement of Labour that has not the shaft of the trades union organisation to steady it. It will inevitably become a freak affair." (ibid. p 16/17)

CONNOLLY AND THE S.L.P.

Connolly explained why he supported De Leon in an article in The Socialist (Edinburgh) in June 1903 ("The S.L.P. of America and the London S.D.P."):

The S.D.F. (Hyndman's Party) professes to be a political party independent of all others, and the only real exponent of Socialist principles, yet ever since the Independent Labour Party (left reformist forerunner of the British Labour Party: which was, however, far to the left of the present Labour Party Left) came into existence the SDF has never had the courage to engage in a parliamentary candidature without soliciting the help of the ILP and playing for the votes of the radicals.

The SDF declares Trade-Unionism (i.e. in the "pure and simple" sense: ICO) to be played out, yet denounces any attack upon the labour leaders who declare Trade-Unionism to be all-powerful...

The SLP does everything the SDF has not heart enough to do: it therefore shows its belief in its principles, and wins the respect of its enemies even whilst they hate it. On the other hand the SDF recoils from the logical application of the principles it professes to believe in...

There was revolutionary activity and fight in the SDF once, but their leaders, Hyndman, Quelch, Burrows etc., have led it indeed as a lightening conductor leads lightening --into the earth to dissipate its energy.

In June 1904 Connolly wrote in "The Socialist": "...I consider the SLP of the U.S. the clearest and most revolutionary of the Socialist parties in the world today", and gave his reasons for thinking this (substantially those outlined above).

What are we to make of this last statement of Connolly's? Was it correct? Undoubtedly it was not correct. Was it then the illusion of "dogmatic ultra-leftism"?

It was not correct because the Bolshevik Party had been founded by Lenin in 1903, and history has proven beyond all doubt that the Bolshevik Party was the only thoroughly Marxist Party in the world in 1904 when Connolly wrote these words.

On the other hand virtually nothing was known about the Bolshevik Party in Western Europe or the U.S.A. before 1917. So, putting the question correctly: Taking Connolly's statement in the context to which it refers (the context of W. European and American parties) was it correct? What political party was there in this area which had a clearer and more correct political position than the S.L.P. of the U.S.? Let Mr. Greaves answer that if he can.

Connolly's statement certainly shows him to be free of the customary view of the time, that the German S.D.P. was the model Marxist party.

It is true that the forerunners of Desmond Greaves were not admirers of the De Leonist S.L.P. But that is another matter.

The SLP of today is an absurd organisation. But that is beside the

point. De Leon died before the two events which drew definite lines of demarcation between revolutionaries and opportunists at the beginning of the century: the Russian Revolution and the outbreak of the First World War.

We cannot comment of the controversy between Connolly and De Leon in 1906/7. The original materials were not available to us. But the indications are that De Leon began to lose his political bearings at about the time that Connolly went to America.

In the 1890s De Leon undoubtedly made a positive contribution to the development of the working class movement by exposing the role of reformists and "pure and simple" trade unionists in the leadership of the trade unions; by showing the possibility of the trade unions, under the leadership of the "labour fakirs" becoming organs of bourgeois oppression instead of organs of working class struggle; and by stressing the need for the guidance of the trade unions by working class politics and for the development of an independent working class political party.

This, and not "dogmatic ultra-leftism" was De Leon's distinctive contribution 9 in the 1890s and the early years of the 20th century. And it was this that Connolly embraced.

THE WORKER AS SOCIALIST THEORIST

Connolly was no ping-pong ball being batted back and forth between opportunism and dogmatic ultra-leftism. He was a class conscious worker who joined a socialist movement that was dominated by bourgeois intellectuals in a society in which the bourgeoisie as a class had left the revolutionary era of its existence well behind it.

In this situation he did not merely learn to repeat what the intellectuals said. He thought things out for himself, assimilating what was of value in which the intellectuals were teaching, and learning to identify what was opportunist or irrelevant: "I have long been of the opinion that the Socialist movement...was to a great extent hampered by the presence in its ranks of faddists and cranks, who were in the movement, not because of Socialism, but because they thought they saw in it a means of ventilating their theories on such questions as sex, religion, vaccination, vegetarianism etc..." (The Socialist. June 1904)

Connolly wrote that:

> ...as the working class has no subject class beneath it, therefore, to the working class of necessity belongs the honour of being the class destined to put an end to class rule, since, in emancipating itself, it cannot help emancipating all other classes. Individuals out of other classes must and will help ...but on the whole the burden must rest upon the shoulders of the most subject class.
> (Forward. Aug. 2. 1913)

Connolly did not distinguish himself by saying this. What was unusual was that his actions throughout his life followed from the principle stated. The intellectuals who have, up to the present, dominated the Marxist movement in W. Europe have, of course, stated the principle. Since Marx was so emphatic on the point they could hardly avoid repeating it if they want to play at Marxism. But in their actions they consistently followed the contrary principle: that Marxist analysis was the function of the bourgeois intellectuals. Hyndman acted on this assumption, while stating the contrary assumption. Today D. Greaves, R.P. Dutt, M. Dobb, M. Cornforth, and the other CPGB intellectuals whose ideas and approach dominate the revisionist movement in Britain and Ireland, while they will say that the working class must emancipate itself, consistently act on the assumption that the bringing about of socialism is the task of the bourgeois intelligentsia: that it is the destiny of the working class, not to emancipate itself, but to be emancipated by the intelligentsia.

This is expressly stated by one of the pioneers of modern revisionism in political economy, Oskar Lange, who had been hailed by the revisionists as a great Marxist economist. In "Problems Relating To The Polish Road To Socialism" (1957) Lange says that socialism will be brought about by the politics of the liberal intelligentsia coupled with the organisational power of the working class. In this view (which is the real, though unspoken, view of Greaves, Dutt etc.) the working class plays essentially the same role in the struggle for socialism as did the rank and file of Napoleon's armies in the battles between the French bourgeoisie and European feudalism.

The history of the Marxist movement up to the present might appear to contradict the view that the working class must emancipate itself: that, though individuals from other classes will assist it, basically it must rely on itself. Most of the great Marxist leaders of the past century have come over to the working class from the bourgeois intelligentsia. Marx, Engels, Lenin and Mao all passed through the bourgeois universities.

Can it be inferred from this that there is a more or less natural division of labour between the liberal intelligentsia and the proletariat in the struggle for socialism? Is Lange right in assuming that the liberal intelligentsia provide the theoretical analysis while the workers provide the organised strength; and was it merely another example of Connolly's "dogmatic ultra-leftism" that he said that, on the whole, the workers themselves would have to do all that was necessary to bring about their own emancipation, instead of dutifully acknowledging that the workers would be led by the noses into socialism by the Hyndmans and the Greaveses?

Marx, Engels, Lenin and Mao were all products of an oppressed bourgeoisie: of a bourgeoisie which was made more or less radical by the fact that it was a subject class: that it suffered from class oppression. They all developed in societies which included an oppressed bourgeoisie and a growing militant working class movement

(and, in the case of Lenin and Mao, a powerful peasant rebellion).

These four great Marxist leaders who came over to the working class from the bourgeoisie were products of societies in revolutionary tumult in which sections of the bourgeoisie itself were engaging in revolutionary propoganda, and even in revolutionary actions, to bring about the class emancipation of the bourgeoisie.

But in Britain the bourgeoisie made its revolution three centuries ago, and the last vestiges of political oppression were lifted from the middle class early in the 19th century. By the time the Marxist movement began to develop the British bourgeoisie had long ceased to have any revolutionary tasks to perform, and having been faced with the task of holding down a powerful industrial working class it had become skilled in the arts of counter-revolution. It is not a matter for surprise therefore that the British bourgeoisie gave no Marx or Lenin to the British working class; and that the bourgeois intellectuals who joined the socialist movement exerted a continuous opportunist influence on it --an opportunist influence capable of great subtelty.

Another point deserving attention is the following: In the middle of the 19th century, when the theory of scientific socialism was being developed, the mass of the proletariat could not read or write, the means of learning to read and write were not easily available to them, and the 12 or 14 hour working day meant that it would not be easy for them to make use of these facilities even if they were available.

The task of developing the theory of scientific socialism required a familiarity with the most advanced scientific achievements. In the mid-19th century the conditions of working class life made it virtually impossible for a worker to achieve this. The task therefore fell to the scientific intelligentsia developed by the bourgeoisie. But

> Most scientists arrive at the iopinion that the working class movement is a revolt of troublemakers whom it would be a good thing to bring to their senses with the aid of a whip. Others believe that it is the duty of the rich to throw some crumbs to the poor, i.e., that the working class movement is a movement of paupers whose object is to obtain alms. And out of a thousand scientists perhaps only one may prove to be a man who approaches the working class movement scientifically, scientifically investigates the whole of social life, watches the conflict of classes, listens to the murmuring of the working class and, finally, proves scientifically that the capitalist system is by no means eternal, that it is just as transient as feudalism was, and that it must inevitably be superseded by its own action, the socialist system which can be established only by the proletariat by means of a social revolution. In short scientific socialism is elaborated." (Stalin: Collected Wks. Vol. 1. Pl:3)

Engels writes:

> While Marx discovered the materialist conception of history, Thierry, Mignet, Guizot, and all the English historians up to 1850 are the proof that it was being striven for, and the dis-covery of the same conception by Morgan proves that the time was ripe for it and that indeed it had to be discovered. So with all the other accidents, and apparent accidents, of history. (Engels. Letter to H. Starkenburg. Jan. 25th 1894)

The discovery of the theory of scientific socialism had by the mid-19th century become a historical necessity. Its discovery by the particular individual called Karl Marx was one of the accidents through which necessity operates. If Marx and Engels had both died in their youth historical necessity would sooner or later have given rise to other individuals who, by making themselves strictly scientific agents of the historical process, would have produced a more or less comprehensive elaboration of the theory of dialictical materialism.

That, in the 19th century, these individuals should come from the bourgeois intelligentsia was made more than likely for practical reasons (i.e. the condition of the mass of the workers) and not by any inherent superiority in the bourgeoisie. But from the end of the 19th century, especially in Britain, the spontaneous struggles of the workers, coupled with the need of technologically developing capitalism for a literate proletariat, opened the door to elementary literary culture to the workers, and provided them with a certain amount of leisure in which to engage in scientific investigation.

So, along with the diminishing possibility of the bourgeois intelligentsia in the more advanced capitalist (imperialist) countries giving rise to scientific socialists, the cultural liabilities preventing the working class from becoming the theorists of scientific socialism also diminished. History, therefore, does not present us with the "paradox" of the cause of scientific socialism continuing to depend on the bourgeois intelligentsia long after the bourgeoisie has ceased to be a revolutionary force in society. History does not tend to produce such 'paradoxes'. As Marx explained:

> mankind always sets itself only such tasks as it can solve; since, looking at the matter more closely, we will always find that the task itself arises only when the material conditions necessary for its solution already exist or are at least in the process of formation. (Critique of Political Economy)

The great scientific socialists who came over to the working class from the intelligentsia all came from societies in which the bourgeoisie had not exhausted its revolutionary potential. And their most vicious enemies once they had become scientific socialists were precisely the liberal intelligentsia.

Marx, Engels, Lenin and Mao never preached the idea that the historical destiny of the socialist cause depended in any degree on the bourgeois intelligentsia. That idea is preached by the Fabians,

the social democrats and the modern revisionists.

James Connolly provides living proof that the development of Marxist theory does not now depend on the bourgeois intelligentsia. Connolly is undoubtedly the foremost Marxist theorist (he was no mere 'man of action') who has so far emerged in the British Isles. It is of course accidental that a man called James Connolly did certain things. But it cannot be considered accidental that the foremost Marxist theorist and leader to have developed in the oldest capitalist society was a labourer. And it cannot be considered accidental that the revisionist intellectuals of the CPGB, who have painstakingly brought to light every petty, obscure intellectual who has ever dabbled in Marxism, or inflated his ego by "criticising" Marx, have diligently ignored Connolly (except for the old sentimental remark that they have the greatest respect for "John Connolly").

Connolly always stessed the necessity for the working class to emancipate itself, and continuously urged the workers to think things out for themselves (not the abstract "workers" --there are many opportunists who are prepared to state in the abstract that the workers should think for themselves-- but the actual workers with whom he was in contact.) He encouraged every initiative towards self-reliance on the part of the workers.

He was not intimidated by the reputations of the intellectuals in the movement --nor did he swing across to ultra-leftism in reaction against their opportunism. He made a sober assessment of their positive contributions (for example, Hyndman's books on political economy) as well as of their limitations.

In the development of the CPGB the working class Marxists (many of whom had been associates of Connolly in Scotland) allowed themselves to be intimidated, as far as theoretical work was concerned, by the intellectuals: the Dutts, Dobbs, Cornforths, Rothsteins etc. As a consequence the Party suffered severely, and within a generation it succumbed to opportunism.

Connolly's work in the British working class movement is now almost unknown. It has suited the British opportunists (those of them who do not denounce him outright as an Irish bourgeois inationalist) to condescendingly accord to Connolly a certain amount of merit as a peculiar Irish breed of Marxist. And in British politics it is sufficient to apply the adjective "Irish" to something to turn it into a matter fit only for John Bull humour. (This is true even of the anti-revisionist movement which has now arisen in reaction against the revisionism of the CPGB.)

But the historical fact is that Connolly developed into a Marxist in the British working class movement; that he began to struggle against opportunism masquerading as Marxism in Britain; that he was equally familiar with British and Irish affairs; and that until the collapse of British socialism in 1914 he regularly under-

took active political work in Britain.

Connolly, more than any other socialist in the British Isles, was free from the influence of bourgeois nationalism. Nothing could be more alien to Connolly's approach than the approach of the intellectual, C.D. Greaves, who urges the Irish emigrant workers in Britain not to attack the Free State government (De Valera's neo-colonial "Republic") where the "English" can overhear them. In fact some of Connolly's sharpest attacks on the Irish Home Rulers were published in socialist newspapers in Britain during the height of the Orange reaction of 1912-14. They were written for the specific purpose of exposing the reactionary nature of the Home Rulers (the forerunners of De Valera "Republicanism") to the British workers. That is how much Connolly was influenced by con-siderations of bourgeois nationalism, and by concern that "the English" should not overhear "the quarrels of the Irish".

The workers of Britain have as much to learn from Connolly's approach as the workers of Ireland. In the history of the international working class movement there have been two outstanding proofs that it is possible for a working man to master and apply the science of Marxism, and that the working class has therefore the ability to emancipate itself; James Connolly and Joseph Stalin.

There is an enormous amount to be learned from Connolly's political and historical writings. But the most important thing to understand about them is that they are the writings of an unskilled labourer who whas never subjected to a bourgeois education.

The intellectuals often say how marvellous it was that a worker, who had none of the advantages of a University education should have written "Labour In Irish History". This sounds as if they were doing honour to Connolly. In fact what they are doing is browbeating the present generation of wrokers: giving them to understand that Connolly was some kind of freak; that even though they are workers like Connolly it is unthinkable that they should do what Connolly did.

In fact there is nothing marvellous in a labourer writing "Labour In Irish History". It would not have surprised Karl Marx one bit. Marx pointed out that "a porter differs less from a philosopher than a mastiff from a greyhound." (Poverty of Philosophy P 144) And he never tired of saying that the working class is the most theoretical class in modern society.

In a society in which the bourgeoisie are in an advanced stage of counter-revolution, the marvel would be if a bourgeois intellectu-al had done what Connolly, the labourer, did.

The opportunists would make Connolly into an object of veneration for the workers. They encourage workers, in various subtle and not so subtle ways, to find consolation in the fact that one mem-

ber of their class did great things, which of course they can never aspire to. But Connolly should be a spur to emulation, not a source of consolation. He showed what workers can do, and what, sooner or later, great numbers of them must do. Because ther is no other way to socialism.

SOCIALISM and NATIONALISM

"But James Connolly was a Socialist... James Connolly was indeed. But what marks him off and makes him different from some other socialists is that he said: 'Get Ireland free first' --and we can talk about the social system afterwards." (21 Questions answered about the Connolly Association.)

The above distortion of Connolly's position on the national question is the common property of his opportunist "defenders" who, under a pretence of acknowledging the "primacy of the anti-imperi-alist struggle", attempt to make working class politics the tail end of bourgeois politics.

We will assume that the reader is familiar with the statements by Connolly which are in customary use today, in which he says that the working class must engage in struggle against the imperialist domination of the nation if it is to achieve its own emancipation as a class. In "Erin's Hope", 1896, Connolly made this clear, and in the next twenty years he never wavered on that point.

Rather than spend the next few pages in religious meditation on the thought that "socialism and nationalism in Ireland...were two different aspects of one democratic transformation of society" (Greaves), we will take a look at the manner in which Connolly conducted relations with the Home Rule bourgeoisie during the height of the Orange reaction of 1911-14.

It is well known that in these years the Orange opposition to the Home Rule Bill took on the form of naked fascism. Here was a case if ever there was one for glossing over class questions within the national forces in order to bring about the unity of all the nat-ional forces against the Orange reaction. Yet in January 1911 we find Connolly, writing in Forward, describing Home Rule politics thus:

> slimy capitalist organisations which, under the name of the United Irish League, fight to maintain every kind of reaction and obscurantism in our Irish cities. (Forward. 14.1.1911)

In August 1913 he gave the following description of the Home Rule bourgeoisie:

> We see in Belfast a Home Rule journal, the Irish News, a careful study of whose columns would be an enlightenment to those comrades in Great Britain who imagine in their innoce-

nce that an enthusiasm for Labour is the inevitable accompaniment of the advocacy of a measure of political freedom for Ireland.

They would find that that journal is one of the most deadly enemies of the Labour movement that this country possesses, and...it never lets slip any opportunity to wound that movement even whilst softly purring it sympathy for Labour on all occasions. In all Ireland there is no journal more ready to proclaim from the housetops its readiness...to do something for the working class, and in all Ireland there is no journal more ready with the poinard to stab to the heart every person or party that dares to organise the workers to do something for themselves.

In this treacherous attitude it more up to date, more thoroughly modern than its rivals in the Tory press. The latter are clumsy and antiquated in their methods. As befits the exponents of an antiquidated doctrine, they still clumsily adhere to obsolete methods of attack.

Let me explain: If you wish to point out the attitude of the Orange Tory Press towards the aspirations of Labour, you have just to turn to their editorials, and there you will find their hositility openly and undisguisedly expressed to all that Labour holds dear. Having read the editorials you immediately know where you are...

But if you turn to the editorials in the Home Rule organ, you get no such infallible index to the editorial mind.

On the contrary, you find always a sloppy sentiment sloppily expressed in the editorials, but all through the news columns, and in all its headings and sub-headings, you notice that always undue prominence is given to every item that tells against Labour, the views of the most unimportant enemies are heralded forth with the utmost prolixity, and the views of its most eminent partisans are slurred over and made to read as unintelligibly as possible...

The Irish News

has brought to bear against the Labour movement the most refined and insiduous arts of character assassination. It never moves against Labour by direct attack. It suppresses here, exaggerates there, distorts this bit of news, omits this qualifying sentence from some speech, drops casually a favourable paragraph from the report of some strike or Labour meeting, and is ever alert to seize every opportunity to spread the slime of poisonous suggest over the most apparently inocuous report of the activities of Labour. As I have said it is up to date...

And this line of poisonous suggestion is just the line in which the natural instincts of the editor of the Irish News

enables him to excel above his Orange contemporaries. Their line is that of naked, unashamed reaction, stirring up the blackest passions in the lowest depths of human nature. The line of the obscurantist and the bigot. His line is that of the treacherous feline which purrs, and purrs, and purrs, and scratches with poisonous claws when the purr is most seductive... (Forward. 30.8.1913)

(Such things to say about the Home Rule bourgeoisie, who, whatever their faults, at least opposed imperialism no less than De Valera has done these last forty years! Now if poor Connolly had only known what the opportunists know about "tactics", he would have said: "When the Home Rulers purr that is their positive side. When they scratch that is their negative side. We should encourage their positive side for the time being. And when Ireland is free, that will be the time to deal with their negative side." He would not have the shown the function of the purring with relation to the scratching. He would not have shown the essential unity of these two opposites. That was a very "untactical" thing to do.)

In this same period Connolly showed that the Home Rule bourgeoisie had no objections to the working class campaigning vigourously for national independence, and in fact was anxious that it should, provided that it was done in a certain way:

...the Home Rule politician was bubbling over with sympathy for Labour, provided always that Labour knew how to behave it-self, and keep in its proper place.

Its proper place, of course, being as one of the assets of the political movement of some section of its masters. Thus Labour is ever encouraged to revolt against the Orange sweaters of the North, but nothing must be done to encourage any such revolt against the Nationalist sweaters of the South. As the song says:

"Oh no, we never mention them,
Their names we never heard."

The revolt of Labour when it can be manipulated as an asset of the Home Rule movement is all right, but the revolt of Labour against slum landlords and sweating employers who control that movement is a very naughty, unpatriotic, anti-Irish, irreligious, immoral, factionist, traitorous, cloven hoof sort of iniquity that ought to be suppressed. (Forward. 7.6.1913)

....every oppressor of the poor, every heartless sweater, every enemy of progress and champion of reaction feels perfectly safe in Ireland al long as the cry of 'national unity' paralyses the hand of the friend of progress, and forbids open war against the Irish oppressor and reactionist who shelters ...behind green or orange flags. (Forward. 25.1.1913)

But the reactionary nature of the Nationalist bourgeoisie did not mean that the working class should abandon the anti-imperialist struggle. In February 1913 he writes of

> ...the great truth which we of the Socialist Party of Ireland have almost despaired of getting into the heads of English Socialists or their Irish followers, viz. that a man may be a sincere and ardent Nationalist; may indeed be ready to die for nationalism, and yet be an unscuplous and bitter enemy of social progress or enlightenment.
>
> Realisation of that truth should not make us become enemies of national liberty, but should rather urge us to identify its struggles with our own in order that its reactionary champions may be deprived of their last shred of justification and all sincere elements of revolutionary discontent be gathered under one banner: the banner of Socialism. (Forward. 25.2.13)

(None of the articles quoted in this chapter have been republished and made available to the workers of Ireland by Greaves or any of the other mercenary "followers of Connolly", those parasitic propogators and exploiters of political ignorance.)

For Connolly there was never any question of putting off the development of socialist politics until such time as Irish national independence was achieved. On the contrary, he demonstrated that Irish national independence could only be achieved when the forces of revolutionary socialism gained the leadership of the anti-imperialist struggle. If Connolly, as Greaves alleges, was a socialist who said:

> "'Get Ireland free first' --and we can talk about the social system afterwards"

he would never have written the articles from which we have quoted. But, in historical fact, Connolly was a socialist who placed the interest of the working class above all other interests. He opposed imperialism because there was no possible way to bring about socialism without overthrowing imperialism. But he did not imagine that the struggle against imperialism could be furthered by relaxing the struggle against reaction within the Irish nation.

In the time of Redmond, as in the time of De Valera, the socialist forces of the working class could only develop in struggle against "the slimy capitalist organisations" which, under the banner of nationalism, "fight to maintain every kind of reaction and obscurantism in our Irish cities".

When Connolly described the Home Rule Press --the Fianna Fail press of its day-- as "the most deadly enemy of Labour that this country posesses" he spoke only the truth. And the only force which could lead the struggle for national independence to victory, the force of working class socialism, could only (and can only) come into existence through struggle against this "deadly enemy". For Connolly there was never any question of "freeing Ireland first and talking about the social system afterward.

The bourgeois agent Greaves and his mercenary ilk have distorted Connolly's teaching; and they have suppressed his writings in order to be able to distort his teachings.

(Connolly's role in the Easter Rising is well known. It is also well known that future supporters of the Griffith wing of Sinn Fein, such as the Irish Independent, urged the British authorities not to delay his execution, despite his wounds. A more detailed account of Connolly's revolutionary strategy, and of the development of Sinn Fein, will be found in the ICO pamphlet: "The Working Class in the Irish National Revolution".

The response of socialists to the role of the Citizen Army in 1916 is less well known. It is that which we describe in the next section. Since 1898 views on the national question, and of the necessity for the working class to play the leading role in the anti-imperialist struggle, had been stated clearly. In 1916 he acted entirely in accordance with the strategy he had developed in 1898.)

THE RESPONSE OF THE "LEFT"

FORWARD

"Forward", the Glasgow socialist paper to which Connolly had contributed regularly between 1911 and 1915, and in whose columns the contrc.ersy with Walker had taken place, said:

> The mysterious and outstanding part of the insensate rebellion last week was the fact that James Connolly was not only implicated in it, but seems to have been one of its organisers. All Connolly's past history...marked him out as being the last man who should encourage much less mix himself up with, an obviously futile insurrection...in which the inurrec-tionists were apparently being used as pawns and tools by the German Government...
>
> He can have been under no delusion either about the chances of insurrectionary success, or about the value of the success even if it were achieved... None knew better than Connolly that it did not matter two straws whether or not the Usurer, the landlord or the Capitalist exploiter were Irish or British or Jewish or Chinese. It is Usury that is wrong, and Landlor-dism and Capitalism, and no mere change of the form or name of the Executive Government affects the economic system...
>
> Connolly's appearance in the Dublin outbreak is, to Socialists on this side, wholly inexplicable... He may of course have changed his views, he may have shut his eyes to the lessons of history he so ably expounded six years ago; the quiet-manner

-ed, soft, musical-voiced man, who a year or two ago was lecturing in Hutchenstown for the Labour Representation Ctte., may suddenly have run amok for bloody revolution, which, apart from its predestination to failure, could not possibly secure or lead to the securing of the Socialist ownership and control which he had spent most of his life in advocating --he may. But the psychology is a mystery to me." (Signed "T.J.". Forward. May 6, 1916)

HYNDMAN

The Rising was, of course, also condemned in "Justice", Hyndman's newspaper, Hyndman, however, was a straightforward imperialist, who had been campaigning for a stronger Navy for many years before 1914. Hyndman, like Connolly and Lenin, did not change sides at the outbreak of the war. He had been for the Empire all along and continued to be for the Empire, as they had opposed imperialism all along and continued to oppose it during the war. There was no bewilderment or sanctimoniousness in Hyndman's judgement. Connolly, he said,

> has given his life for his ill-balanced opinions without our being able to canonise him as the reckless hero of the Commune of Dublin. (Justice, May 4, 1916)

In this article it was assumed that Connolly was dead. A note was added, which reads:

> Since the above article was in type it is stated that Connolly is alive and a prisoner. Better had the first report been true. Death will come to us all, and death in action is a kindlier fate than being taken prisoner in a futile armed rising.

BLACKWAY

Hyndman was in no doubt as to where he stood, and he tried to dec-eive no one as to where he stood. Of a very different kind was the Independent Labour Party which tried to camouflage its imperialism. It denounced the rising at the critical moment ("We condemn as strongly as anyone those who were immediately responsible for the revolt"). In objective fact it ranged itself with the imperialists. But it denounced it under pacifist, "anti-militarist" slogans. It equated the militarism of the oppressors with the use of military methods by the oppressed to free themselves. The I.L.P., having denounced the Rising, immediately began to campaign for lenience to be shown to those responsible. Excessive brutality in suppressing the Rising would defeat its own object. In campaigning for leniency, the ILP was only appealing to the enlightened self-interest of imperialism. But, by campaigning for leniency it could always represent itself as the champion of the oppressed.

On July 6th 1916, the Labour Leader (official organ of the I.L.P.), drew this humbugging moral:

> No one of us...can have read of the Sinn Fein rebellion without realising how, as through the ages, the converting power of their martyrdom has been overshadowed by the will they shared with their oppressors to slay.

The Editor of the "Labour Leader" in this period was Fenner Brockway. A few years ago he was rewarded with a peerage for fifty years of stalwart service in the cause of neo-colonialism.

JOHN LESLIE

On May 18th 1916, John Leslie, who had been closely associated with Connolly in Scotland, and who had himself produced a socialist pamphlet on tthe Irish question, wrote an Appreciation of Connolly in "Justice". He wrote that he had been asked to explain "...how came it about that a man gifted with such powers...came to play such a leading part in the recent sad, bad and mad outbreak in Dublin". He stresses "its utter futility even if it had been successful... The truth must be faced. Ireland is not ripe for socialism". His "explanation" was as follows:

> I have reason to believe that Connolly did not place a very high estimate upon the Labour or Socialist movement here... ...despairing of effective assistance from that quarter, and believing that it would act as a drag upon his efforts to form an Irish Socialist Party, he determined at all costs to identify or to indissolubly link the cause of Irish labour with the most extreme Irish nationalism, and to seal the band with his blood if necessary. He grievously miscalculated in many ways, including the moral one. There is no virtue in self-sacrifice in itself... (Justice. May 18, 1916)

THE DISCUSSION IN THE "SOCIALIST"

"The Socialist", the Glasgow S.L.P. paper for which Connolly had written in 1902-4, published nothing about the Rising in 1916. But in 1919 a discussion of Connolly's politics took place in it. This discussion began with an article "James Connolly, Socialist and Revolutionary" by Arthur Mac Manus (April 17). At first glance this appears to be a defence of Connolly. A closer look shows something different. The following are the conclusions reached:

> It is better to FIGHT half a cause than TALK a whole one; and in so far as Connolly was true to himself in this sense, to whom was he false?
>
> ...his participation has given Socialism a standing which it did not previously possess in Ireland --and whatever his associations were, I am convinced he established and justified them in his own convictions.

In fact, these statements were beside the point. What was required was a theoretical clarification of Connolly's actual politics. To

say that "he justified them in his own convictions" has no bearing on the matter. The question is whether they were the politics of scientific socialism, not whether he justified them to himself. There is no doubt that Hyndman, for example, justified his politics to himself although they cannot be justified in terms of scientific socialism. Mac Manus's article was criticised in letters from Peadar Macken and Sean McLoughlin, among others. On May 29, Mac Manus replied to these criticisms. The reply, however, had the same subjectivist character as the original article. It concluded:

> To time can safely be left the task of adding justice to the memory of Connolly, and to time we leave it, satisfied that we have, in our small way thrown our offering of appreciation into the contribution box.

Again, that has nothing to do with it. On March 27, 1919 an article from Sean O'Casey was published which was not subjectivist in the way that Mac Manus's was. It raised the basic political question clearly and sharply:

> Connolly's first love for the Internationale...cooled, and... the National Idea had become the centre of gravity of all his thoughts. His action in donning the green uniform, in hoisting the Republican Tri-colour over Liberty Hall, in fixing the motto, "We serve neither King nor Kaiser --but Ireland", his neglect of the Labour movement, and his corresponding devotion to the creation of a union between the Citizen Army and the purely national organisation called the "Irish Volunteers", demonstrated that Connolly's activity had been deflected from Labour towards Nationalism... subsequently to Jim Larkin's departure...Connolly had begun to see new visions and dream new dreams.
>
> ...when the union between the Citizen Army and the Volunteers became a definite fact, though there was no corporate connection with Sinn Fein, there certainly was created an intimate association with the most virile and and active members of that body, so that their union certainly compromised, to some extent, the principles which the Citizen Army was formed to vindicate.

In his "History of the Citizen Army", also published in 1919, O'Casey wrote:

> A well-known author has declared that Connolly was the first martyr for Irish Socialism: but Connolly was no more an Irish Socialist martyr than Robert Emmett, P.H. Pearse or Theobald Wolfe Tone.

O'Casey's argument required a comprehensive answer from those who held that Connolly had not abandoned Socialism in 1915-16. If it had been answered comprehensively many essential questions on which there is still confusion would have been clarified half a century ago.

LENIN, TROTSKY, RADEK

Trotsky, whom the trotskyists now try to represent as having been essentially in agreement with Connolly's policies, declared in 1916 that the Easter Rising showed that "The historical basis for national revolution has passed away even in backward Ireland". The workers had been led astray by nationalism, and had gone into a futile national revolution under "an out of date banner" (Nashe Slovo, July 4, 1916. Quoted in the British trotskyist paper, "New -sletter", Sept. 19, 1959).

Karl Radek, then and later more or less a trotskyist in an article called "A Played Out Song" described the rebellion as a "putsch".

Lenin in his well known article, "The Irish Rebellion of 1916", written in July 1916, showed that the Rising was a real revolution. It showed in practice, he said, the correctness of the Bolshevik thesis that national revolutions were not "out of date" in the imp -erialist era (as Trotsky held), but that on the contrary imperial -ist oppression inevitably gave rise to national revolutions, which were not reactionary (Trotsky held that they were), and which i n fact gained a deeper revolutionary content in the era of imperialism. Lenin wrote

> Whoever calls such a rising a "putsch" is either a hardened reactionary, or a doctrinaire hopelessly incapable of picturing a social revolution as living thing.

SINN FEIN ON CONNOLLY: 1919-21

(The betrayal of Connolly's principles under cover of revolutionary phrases by the Labour Party leaders, O'Brien, Johnson and O'Shannon, has been described in the ICO pamphlets: "The Working Class in the Irish National Revolution" and "Liam Mellows".)

AODH DE BLACAM

While the leaders of the Irish Labour Party were betraying Connolly's principles, distorting his teachings and averting the danger (to the Sinn Fein bourgeoisie) of a strong socialist movement developing and taking over the leadership of the national struggle, the Sinn Fein ideologists were winning the support of militant wor -kers to the Sinn Fein cause by representing themselves as the fol -lowers of Connolly.

To show what was happening we will look at some of the writings of Aodh de Blacam in this period: "Towards The Republic", 1919, and "What Sinn Fein Stands For", 1921. "Towards The Republic" was ded -icated "To Irish Democracy In the Memory of James Connolly", and it took as its motto: "Pour epater le bourgeois" (To beat the bourgeois).

De Blacam first of all assessed the nature of the Labour Party:

> Mr. Thomas Johnson, a brilliant upholder of Connolly's faith, said but recently that when he was asked whether he was a soc -ialist, he knew not what to answer, for the practical work of rapidly-advancing Labour cause so completely absorbed the att -ention, that the brain was never troubled with the academic problem of whether this or that label was proper to the meas- ures which the course of events directed Labour to take. That is the attitude of Irish Labour --an attitude of complete in- difference to formulas. (Towards The Republic. P34/5)

De Blacam, of course, praised the Labour Party leaders for their pragmatism, and their lack of concern with theory. That made them ideal bourgeois labour leaders. But, while praising Johnson's lack of theory, he himself made a clear theoretical assessment of the nature of the Labour Party's politics; and he showed himself t o have a clear theoretical grasp of certain questions, though he would praise the "practical" outlook of Labour Party leaders who scourned theoretical clarity on these questions, and who scorned theory in general.

For all his talk of "epater le bourgeois" he showed himself to have a very sound bourgeois outlook. The bourgeoisie, while they try to discredit theory in the eyes of the workers, take care to develop theoretical understanding of new developments on the basis of their own class interest.

De Blacam's conclusion with regard to the Labour Party was: "... when we examine the theoretical problem: Is it Socialism?, we find, on the whole, that there need be no particular anxiety on that score." (ibid. P 35)

Then de Blacam went on to dealt with the problem of how to deal with Connolly. In this period every theoretical ambiguity in Con- nolly's position was probed by the theorists of the national bour- geoisie. By laying stress on these ambiguities they produced a version of "Connollyism" which, while as a line of propoganda it would attract the masses to Sinn Fein, would not provide them with a theoretical grasp of the differences between the socialist posi- tion and the position of a national bourgeoisie who, to meet the requirements of the revolution which it was leading, took up very democratic positions on a wide range of questions.

Lack of space prevents us from presenting oan extensive criticism of de Blacam's writings on Connolly in this period. But the foll- owing extracts will give some idea of them:

> Connolly, who gloried in the name of socialist, had the most eclectic of minds... Connolly was a follower of Marx, the classic of Socialism, in hoping for the overthrow of the Cap- italist Order. Yet he was also a follower of Thomson, the Irishman who founded Socialism, whose formula was: that the workers must be their own capitalists" (ibid p 35).
>
> Connolly stands or falls, not by the theory of Socialism, but by the ideal of Popular Control, however it be achieved. (ibid p 36)

De Blacam stressed the danger of presenting Catholic workers with the

> suggestion that Connolly was a bad Catholic and a teacher of anti-Catholic doctrine... No course of actions could do more to create distrust in the workers mind... When men of autho- rity and learning accuse him of heresy in theoretic terms that he cannot grasp, he is dangerously bewildered ...It i s then that the Red-flaggery of the jejuine Revolutionist begins to sound reasonable... To preserve our people from rash Red- flaggery... it is much to be desired that an Irish Lacordaire* should arise to champion in high places the workers cause... (P 40)

In "What Sinn Fein Stands For" de Blacam wrote:

> Catholic communities are generally hostile to socialism, and so the socialistic enthusiasm which ran over Ireland during 1919 surprised and puzzled many. Never was Ireland more dev- outly Catholic than today...and yet nowhere was the Bolshevik revolution more sympathetically saluted" (P 105/6)

In the situation existing in Ireland in 1919/20 every objective circumstance favoured the growth of socialism: the internal revo- lutionary situation, the fact that within the Irish nation the nat -ional bourgeoisie dare not take repressive actions against social -ist propoganda, and the role of Connolly and the Citizen Army in the Easter Week Republic. Nominal Catholicism remained widespread: but it was the peculiar kind of Catholicism found in Ireland during the period of revolutionary struggle when "the populace compel the priests to become their leaders or to remain powerless to com- mand political or social obedience" (Connolly. Forward 28.6.1913 Another suppressed article). The content of Vatican politics and Vatican social teaching were powerless in the country, and t h e Church had to survive by its wits.

A genuine socialist movement could have grown by leaps and bounds in this period. But the Labour Party leaders turned traitor a n d became an adjunct of the national bourgeoisie, and no genuine soc- ialist organisation emerged in this period.

Mass pressure and the needs of the independence struggle forced the national bourgeoisie to take on a very democratic colouring in this period. But in 1922 internal reaction began to grow. The revolu- tionary democrats of this period became the reactionaries of the 20s, 30s, and 40s. Enlightened, popular Catholicism, responding to

---

*Lacordaire: A French Dominican liberal theologian of the 19th cen -tury; an admirer of D. O'Connell. jejuine: barren, arid

mass pressures, became reactionary, obscurantist and more or less fascist when mass pressure was relieved and the mass movement sub-sided. (And so long as the masses are led by people who only take "measures which the course of events directed", i.e. who merely respond to mass pressures and do not function as a revolutionary leadership of the masses, the mass movement can do nothing but sub-side.)

The fact that the revolutionary bourgeois-democrats of 1917-20 were the same people as the reactionaries of the later period is most strikingly brought home by the fact that the same man personified both periods. De Valera personified the liberal bourgeois democracy of the period of the Republic. He also personified the black, clerical-bourgeois reaction of the later period.

De Blacam undoubtedly was a sincere democrat in 1919. He undoubtedly made a positive contribution to the anti-imperialist struggle. But he was never a socialist. And his writings on Connolly in 1919 undoubtedly contributed to the development of the clerical-bourgeois reaction of the later period. In 1921 he argued that Connolly was an "eclectic" who stood between socialism and "co-operativism" which was represented as a more popular kind of Socialism. "Co-operativism", he wrote,

> differs from orthodox socialism in being based on private ownership. It is communal but not communistic. It encourages the conception of the common working and enjoyment of property, but it does not obliterate the individuals independence or right of possession. Its policy is, in the formula of Wm. Thompson, the Cork economist ("who was in reality the forerunner of distributism, not collecticism") --that 'The workers must become their own capitalists'. (What Sinn Fein Stands For. P167/8)

De Blacam's was prepared to make use of Connolly's slogans (including the "Workers Republic") provided that they were given a different content. He substituted "distributivist" socialism for "collectivist" socialism. What does it matter which kind of socialism we have so long as we have socialism? What do the relative theoretical merits of collectivism as against distributivism matter to the working man?

Such theoretical differences are no concern to the stage "working man" of the bourgeoisie. So long as the actual workers take their idea of themselves from the stage "working man" of the bourgeois press, (who was specially created in order to be imitated by real workers), then they are going to remain an oppressed class in bourgeois society until the end of time, or of human society.

The difference between these two kinds of socialism is that one is socialism and the other isn't. "Distributivism" is a petty bourgeois dream which can never be realised in actual human society. It is Utopian as opposed to scientific socialism.

The actual history of the past fiftey years has demonstrated in practice what Marx demonstrated in theory in the 19th century: that Utopian socialism is essentially reactionary. In the era of imperialism Utopian socialism is one of the sources of fascism. This has been shown both in Irish and international history.

Because of the damage which Utopian distortions of Connolly's teaching has done in the Irish working class movement, and the damage which modern revisionism is now doing in the international working class movement with the help of Utopian theories, we show in the next section how certain syndicalist elements in Connolly's pamphlet, The Axe To The Root, were exploited in the bourgeois interest after his death in the Catholic Bulletin.

THE AXE TO THE ROOT

> The hurler on the ditch sees most of the game because he is on the ditch, and not intent upon keeping his own end up in the place allotted to him on the field. So the student of history is wise, and can justly criticise the mistakes of men whose powers of judgement may nevertheless have been infinitely superior to his own. He may justly criticise their mistakes, but may also in the part he is playing in the historical crises of his own time be making mistakes a thousand times more serious and less excusable. (Workers Republic. March 11 1916)

Connolly's main syndicalist writing will be found in "The Axe To The Root" (which also makes up the second part of "Socialism Made Easy"). This work was first published in the U.S.A. in 1908, had a wide international circulation in the following years, was published by the S.L.P. of Britain in 1916 (after Connolly's execution) and by the I.T.& G.W.U. in 1934 --a year of great political activity in the Irish Free State.

With an extra half century of history to guide us (including two great socialist revolutions), and with the Collected Works of Lenin at our disposal, we will outline the shortcomings of this work, and show the use to which it has been put by the ideologists of the national bourgeoisie, and by the opportunist leadership of the I.T.G.W.U.

In "The Axe To The Root" Connolly puts forward a semi-syndicalist theory with regard to the relation of politics to economics in the proletarian revolution in the midst of excellent writing on industrial unionism (there is absolutely no necessary connection between the two).

He begins by quoting a statement by an American socialist as a statement of his own position: "Political insitutions are not adapted to the administration of industry. Only industrial organisations are adapted to the administration of a co-operative common-

wealth that we are working for... There is no constructive socialism except on the industrial field." (P.15. Page numbers refer to the 1968 edition of "Socialism Made Easy" by New Writers Press: a photographic reprint of the 1916 edition with a trotskyist introduction.) He comments on this as follows:

> The political institutions of to-day are simply the coercive forces of capitalist society... under a Socialist form of society the administration of affairs will be in the hands of representatives of the various industries of the nation; ... the workers in the shops and factories will organise themselves into unions, each union comprising all the workers at a given industry; that said union will democratically control the workshop life of its own industry... Social-Democracy, as its name implies, is the application to industry, or the social life of the nation, of the fundamental principles of democracy. Such an application will necessarily have to begin in the workshop, and proceed logically upward through all the grades of industrial organisation until it reaches the culminating point of national executive power and direction. In other words, Socialism must proceed from the bottom upward, whereas capitalist political society is organised from the top downward. (P.17)

Industrial Unionism, he wrote

> prepares within the framework of capitalist society the working forms of the Socialist Republic... (P 18)

> On the day that the political and economic forces of labour finally break with capitalist society and proclaim a Workers Republic...shops and factories...manned by Industrial Unionists will be taken charge of by the workers there employed... Then and thus the new society will spring ready equipped to perform all the useful functions of its predecessor. (P 19)

> ...the fight for the conquest of the political state is not the battle, it is only the echo of the battle. The real battle is the battle being fought out every day for the power to control industry. (P 24)

> Let us be clear as to the function of Industrial Unionism. That function is to build up the industrial republic inside the shell of the political state, in order when that industrial republic inside the shell of the political state, in order when that industrial republic is fully organised it may crack the shell of the political State and slip into its place in the scheme of the universe. (P. 26)

> ...the conquest of political power by the working class waits upon the conquest of economic power, and must function through the economic organisation. (P. 27)

Here it should be said that this is not representative of Connolly's

views on politics. It contradicts virtually all his writings and politics outside of this pamphlet.. (His writings have been selectively republished in a way that exaggerates any weakness in them, makes it appear that he overlooked certain things which he did not overlook or made mistakes which he did not make, and omits some of his clearest analyses.) But for the purpose of showing how the bourgeoisie exploits weaknesses in working class politics, we will concentrate on these mistaken paragraphs.

BOURGEOIS AND SOCIALIST REVOLUTION

Connolly assumed that on this point "the proletarian revolution will...most likely follow the lines of the capitalist revolutions of the past" (P 26). If that were so he would have been perfectly correct in assuming that, just as the capitalist organisation of production was built up inside feudal society, and the bourgeois political revolution came after the establishment of capitalist production, so the socialist organisation of production would be built up within capitalist society and that the socialist political revolution would be a consequence of the economic organisation of socialism.

But it is precisely in this respect that the socialist revolution can have nothing in common with the bourgeois revolution.

Capitalist production could develop within feudalism because capitalism and feudalism were both based on private property and class exploitation. In the Middle Ages feudal lords benefited materially from capitalist developments in feudal society. And later it was perfectly possible for members of the feudal ruling class by changing their method of exploitation to become members of the capitalist ruling class. (This happened particularly in England). Yet despite this the freeing of capitalism in Europe required two great political revolutions, the English and the French.

But socialist production is not based on private property and class exploitation. It is not based on ownership by individual workers, or by groups of workers, within the market system. It is based on collective ownership by the working class as a whole, the abolition of the market system and the substitution of production for buse by production for profit. It allows for only one class in production: the working class. And, as Connolly often showed, it involves the expansion of the working class to be the whole of society. Class society is abolished when the working class is the only class in society.

There is no question therefore of the ruling class of capitalism going over to socialism in order to retain its priviliged position, as the feudal ruling class went over to capitalism. There is no place for a privileged class in socialist society (or if there is, it isn't socialist). The capitalist class must therefore defend capitalism against socialism by every means in its power. And the means by which it defends itself ranges from mass murder (Germany,

Indonesia, Vietnam etc.) to the setting up of pseudo-socialist movements to delude the workers.

Every last ounce of bourgeois political power will be used to prevent the development of socialism (of a real socialist Party, not to mention socialist production) in bourgeois society. Socialist production, therefore, cannot begin until political power is taken from the bourgeoisie and the political power of the working class takes its place.

Socialism develops within capitalism not as socialist production but in the form of centralisation of capitalist production, the rise in labour productivity and the growth of the working class. These elements of socialism develop within capitalism, but socialist production cannot begin until proletarian political power takes the place of bourgeois political power. Therefore the socialist revolution cannot follow the pattern of the bourgeois revolution in this respect. Socialist production can only follow the establishment of socialist political power.

A PROUDHONIST FROM MAYNOOTH

In his articles on Connolly in the Catholic Bulletin in 1920, Fr. Peter Coffey exploited to the full this weakness in The Axe To The Root. Fr. Coffey began with a radical petty bourgeois attack on capitalism:

> The root evil of the capitalist system is that it has made ownership of private property impossible for the masses of mankind.

Capitalist profits, said Fr. Coffey
> are really the plundered fruits of labour.

Furthermore
> It was a handful of capitalists who plunged the people of the world into the most appalling war in history.

Capitalism was evil and should be destroyed. And Fr. Coffey had no "constitutional illusions": he had not time for the "peaceful transition" policy then being preached by Kautsky (which was identical with the modern revisionist policy). He held that violence would be necessary because

> "the political power of the vote is frustrated" by the state machinery of capitalism. "Capitalism will not relax its monopoly of the world's resources...until that grip if forcibly broken by the superior force of an organised labour onslaught".

And Fr. Coffey was decidedly against compensating the expropriated capitalists, because it is "only in so far as the state does not compensate that it can effectively diminish the monopoly of capitalism". Connolly, he wrote, was a revolutionary socialist who

> steadily watched and planned for a favourable opportunity in conjunction with the advanced wing of Sinn Fein to lead the Irish masses in an armed revolt against the English connection, in the hope that a political emancipation achieved in such circumstances would not be merely political but would also involve the overthrow of the capitalist regime and the setting up of a new industrial, social and economic system in Ireland. He fought and died not merely as a rebel against the economic tyranny of capitalism; not merely as an Irish patriot: but also as an Irish labour revolutionary socialist.

So far so good. But here's the rub
> James Connolly's...own explicit statements, make it quite clear that the economic system he advocated for Ireland was by no means the State Socialism under which the masses would still be the slaves of an omnipotent State bureaucracy, but an industrial guild system under which the producers of the nations wealth would be in real and effective control of the materials and the machinery and the products of labour.
>
> So far from approving of state socialism in the sense of complete nationalisation of all productive wealth under a centralised bureaucracy with the masses as mere state wage earners, he would repudiate such a system as a mere substitution of one capitalist tyranny for another.

Connolly was against "State Socialism": he stood for "industrial or group socialism", for a "form of Guild Socialism" in which "effective property rights are secured for the masses". In short, Connolly stood for a dispersion of private property: not for its abolition. To "prove" his point Fr. Coffey quoted liberally from The Axe To The Root, using the sections that we quoted earlier.

For "State Socialism" in Fr. Coffey's language we can read Bolshevism; Leninism. The gist of Fr. Coffey's articles is that he stood for "Connollyism" against "Leninism". Leninism was "bureaucracy"; was merely a changed form of "capitalist tyranny".

(At the same time that these articles were published a "left" opposition faction known as "Workers Opposition" developed within the Bolshevik Party in Russia. The "Workers Opposition" too described the Bolshevik regime as a "bureaucracy", and characterised Lenin as an agent of this priviliged bureaucracy which was subjecting the Russian workers to a new tyranny. It too opposed "State socialism" and advocated group ownership (i.e. a form of private ownership). Early in 1921, under its influence and slogans a "revolution" was launched in Kronstadt (and was supported by many thousands of subjectively convinced but unscientific socialists). This apparently extreme left "revolution" was supported by imperialism as a whole.)

Fr. Coffey's articles were directed at the left wing intellectuals

and the more advanced workers in the Republican struggle. Their object was to combat Bolshevism. A condemnation of Bolshevism from the pulpits would not have been very effective in the revolutionary situation of 1920. Much more effective was the tactic of declaring Connolly's sole theoretical mistake on a fundamental matter (and one which he corrected within c couple of years) to be true socialism, and of condemning Leninism on the ground that it was not true socialism but merely a kind of bureaucrat capitalism.

There is no doubt that Fr. Coffey's articles did lead many of the more politically advanced revolutionaries astray. (This was made easier by the fact that no Marxist refutation of them was published.) Hundreds of potential Marxist revolutionaries, holding positions of influence were led away from Marxism, and set on a wild goose chase after "guild socialism", "group socialism", socialism based on private property and the market.

In 1934, a year of great social movement in the Free State, a year of growing social-Republican (Republican Congress) and Communist movements, the year in which Fianna Fail began to expose itself to the Irish masses, the I.T.G.W.U. republished "The Axe to the Root". In its introduction it wrote: "The political and industrial lessons Connolly intended to be conveyed by this pamphlet are that economic power precedes and conditions political power" (P 4). Thus the ITGWU bureaucracy sought to invoke Connolly's support for their opposition to the revolutionary political movements of 1934.

And the issue is still a live one. During the past years there has been increasing talk about "industrial democracy" by reformists of every description. This "industrial democracy" is only a watered down version of Fr. Coffey's "group socialism".

THE PARTY

We are often told that Connolly failed to understand the need for "the Party". And we are told this by people who understand it so well that they have set up a Central Committee, Organising Committee, Political Committee, International Committee, Editorial Committee, Control Commission, a host of sub-committees and a comprehensive set of Party Regulations, all on the basis of an organisations of 20 to 50 people (or evel less than 20), half of whom are quite frankly killing time and find politics more diverting than television, and the other half of whom have no programme that has any relevance to the situation they find themselves in, no serious intention of beginning to analyse the situation in earnest, and not even an elementary sense of reality, (their phrasemongering version of Marxism having destroyed whatever sense of reality they had previously instead of sharpening it).

It is absolutely true that Connolly did not engage in that kind of playacting.

But before we deal with the question of the Party let us dispose of the idea that Connolly thought that the growing concentration of trade union organisation was enough to bring socialism:

> Recently I have been complaining in this column and elsewhere of the tendency ofin the Labour movement to mistake mere concentration upon the industrial field for essentially revolutionary advance. My point was that the amalgamation or federation of unions, unless carried out by men and women with the proper revolutionary spirit was as likely to create new obstacles in the way of effective warfare as to make that warfare possible. The argument was reinforced by citations of what is taking place in the ranks of the railwaymen and in the transport. There we find that amalgamations and federations are rapidly becoming engines for steam-rolling or suppressing all manifestations of revolutionary activity, or effective demonstrations of brotherhood. Every appeal to take industrial action on behalf of a union in distress is blocked by insisting upon the necessity of "first obtaining the sanction of the Executive", and in practice it is found that the process of obtaining that sanction is so long, so cumbrous, and surrounded by so many rules and regulations that the union in distress is certain to be either disrupted or bankrupted before the Executive can be moved. The greater Unionism is found in short to be forging greater fetters for the working class... (The Problem of Trade Union Organisation. Forward. May 23rd 1914. Not republished since.)

Concerning the Party, he wrote

> There is only one remedy for this slavery of the working class, and that is a socialist republic... There is only one way to attain that, and that way is for the working class to establish a political party of its own... In claiming this we will only be following the example of our maters. Every political party is the party of a class. (Workers Republic. P 45)

"Ah yes", it can be said, "so Connolly had an inkling of the need for an independent working class Party: but of course he had no conception of the Leninist Central Committee". Well, let's see.

> I have often thought that we of the working class are too slow, or too loath, to take advantage of the experiences of our rulers...
>
> In the modern State the capitalist class has evolved for its own purposes of offence what it calls a Cabinet. This Cabinet controls its fighting forces, which must obey it implicitly. If the Cabinet thinks the time and opportunity ris ripe for war, it declares war at the most favourable moment, and explains its reasons in Parliament afterwards.
>
> Can we trust our members with such a weapon as the capitalist class trust theirs? I think so. (Forward. May 23, 1914. Not republished since.)

What is this if not a statement of the need for a Leninist Central Committee?

In fact a study of the matter makes it clear Connolly need have made no radical changes in his outlook to arrive at Leninism. It would have needed only to think through certain ideas a bit more thoroughly, and to tie up a couple of loose ends. His thinking, like Lenin's, was concrete Marxist thinking. It was therefore qualitatively of a kind with Lenin's.

Connolly has been compared to Trotsky and other intellectuals who did not accept Bolshevism until 1917 (if they really accepted it even then). The comparison is not valid. Trotsky etc. developed their various notions in opposition to Lenin over a long period of years, in which they engaged on hysterical attacks on Lenin. This could only have happened because their approach was not the scientific Marxist approach. They "accepted" Bolshevism in 1917 when it became clear that the Russian working class were going to free themselves with the weapon of Bolshevism, and that if Trotsky etc. continued peddling their dead-end "theories" they either become as irrelevant to the socialist movement as the Trappist monks, or else would become agents of the counter-revolution.

Trotskyism developed in direct opposition to Leninism; was qualitatively different from Leninism; was unscientific. Connolly had no knowledge of Lenin's writings. His thinking was done in a situation which was less revolutionary, and in which Marxism was taken less seriously, than the situation in which Lenin developed. Yet his thinking was qualitatively of a kind with Lenin's, though less developed than it. And the qualitative identity of the two was never clearer than in 1914-16.

> Since the thought process itself grows out of the conditions, is itself a natural process, thinking that really comprehends must always be the same... (Marx. Letter to Kugelmann. July 11, 1868)

LABOUR IN IRISH HISTORY.

It is generally agreed that this is a work of great merit (for a working man) and that it is assured of immortality (whatever its faults). In fact, if one paid any heed to the intellectuals one would arrive at the conclusion that Connolly was a great Marxist (considering all the blunders he made).

Desmond Ryan provides a typical example of the kind of back-handed compliments that the intellectuals pay to this work:

> Labour In Irish History is a work of genius when the last leisured professor and acute critic has explained its obvious one-sidedness, its errors, omissions and defects. (James Connolly. P 27)

One of the main historical conclusions drawn in Labour In Irish History is denied almost as often as "the work is praised", not in general terms. In fact it seems as if the work is praised so much for the sole reason of making its demolition easier. The bourgeoisie and their agents are prepared to hold the book in high esteem provided that this will help them to discredit its central conclusions. They say: "It is a great book, only this little point happens to be wrong". Very well. We concede the little point and they concede the greatness of the book. But the "little point" is a very big point. It concerns Grattan's Parliament, and the possibility of the economic decline of the Irish nation being halted by any kind of capitalist government:

> At the present day our political agitators never tire of telling us with the must painful iteration that the period covered by Grattan's Parliament was a period of unexampled prosperity for Ireland, and that, therefore, we may expect a renewal of this same happy state with a return of our "native legislature" as they somewhat facetiously style that abortive product of political intrigue --Home Rule.
>
> We might if we chose, make a point against our political historians by pointing out that prosperity such as they speak of is purely capitalistic...
>
> But that is not the ground we mean to take up at present. We will rather admit, for the purpose of our argument, that the Home Rule capitalistic definition of "prosperity" is the correct one, and that Ireland was prosperous under Grattan's Parliament, but we must emphatically deny that such prosperity was in any but an infinitesmal degree produced by the Parliament.

External circumstances, for which Grattan's Parliament was in no way responsible and over which it had no influence, produced a temporary commercial prosperity in Ireland. With the passing of these circumstances the prosperity collapsed.

> A native Parliament might have hindered the subsequent decay as an alien Parliament hastened it, but in either case, under capitalistic conditions, the process itself was as inevitable as the economic evolution of which it was one of the most significant signs...
>
> The 'prosperity' of Ireland under Grattan's Parliament was almost as little due to that Parliament as the dust caused by the revolutions of the coach-wheel was due to the presence of the fly who, sitting in the coach, viewed the dust, and fancied himself the author thereof. And, therefore, true prosperity cannot be brought to Ireland except by measures somewhat more drastic than that Parliament ever imagined. (Labour in Irish History. pp 24-27)

The "criticism" of this begins in Professor George O'Brien's "Economic history of Ireland in the 18th Century", published in 1918. (O'Brien was the political economist of the Irish national bourgeoisie):

> Some years ago an able and suggestive book was published by one who has since laid down his life for his country. This book is chiefly remarkable for the thesis that Ireland's prosperity before the Union was in no way dependent on the existence of an independent Irish legislature, but, so far as it existed at all, was the result of non-political causes. If this theory were supported by facts, it would have very far reaching effects, and would deprive the Irish nation (read 'Irish national bourgeoisie', ICO) of one great argument in favour of the restoration of its parliamentary liberty. (P2.)
>
> It has always been commonplace amongst Irish historians until recent years that the progress made during (the period of Grattan's Parliament) was very great, and that it constituted a strong argument in favour of the re-establishment of an independent Irish legislature in Ireland. A serious doubt, however, was cast on this generally established opinion in a remarkable and suggestive book which appeared in 1910 --James Connolly's "Labour in Irish History"-- wherein it was suggested, in the first place, that the improvement made, if any, was not at all so great as was popularly supposed; secondly, that any improvement that was made was in no sense due to Grattan's Parliament, but to independent causes, which were in no way political; and thirdly, that, in spite of a possible improvement in the trade and commerce of the country, no improvement was felt by the lower classes, whose interests were totally neglected by Parliament. (P393)

O'Brien undertook to refute Connolly, and to preserve the illusions of the nationalist bourgoisie. He made a number of little skirmishes around the question in a very learned manner. He could not prove Connolly wrong because Connolly was not wrong. He could only try to confuse the issue. And having made a lengthy attempt to confuse the issue he gave himself away with a careless admission, when dealing with the question of the poverty of the masses, that: "The causes of Ireland's misery were very largely inherent in the land system", the reform of which "would have been quite beyond the resources of Grattan's Parliament". (P409). This means that Grattan's Parliament was unable to deal with the fundamental internal obstacle (not to mention the external obstacles) to the development of capitalism in Ireland: the land system.

For twenty years, while the favourable (but, as far as it was concerned, entirely accidental) circumstances lasted, Grattan's Parliament amused itself by playing at politics, and making great empty speeches. But when Westminster decided to put an end to the game Grattan's Parliamentarians, showing that they had not been taken in

by their own bluff, took Castlereagh's bribes and vanished. The bubble of "prosperity" had been pricked even before the Union.

(This matter will be dealt with in more detail in a history of the development of capitalism in Ireland which is in preparation. It has been dealt with to a certain extent in The Irish Communist, June 1967.)

O'Brien's criticism was repeated in a biography of Connolly by Noelle Davies, the idelogist of Welsh bourgeois nationalism, published in 1946:

> ...the rigid application of the Marxian "economic interpretation of history" may have sometimes led Connolly into one-sided or unjust judgements in his drastic "debunking" of certain national leaders and movements in "Labour In Irish History". Dr. G. O'Brien...advances reasoned and detailed evidence (tut,tut!) to show that Connolly underrated the beneficial effects of legislative independence under Grattan's Parliament. (P.45)

And of course that well-trained parrot, Mr. Greaves, repeats his master's voice:

> Professor George O'Brien...criticised only ("only"! If Connolly was wrong on this matter his whole strategic view of the Irish revolution was founded on a mistake) only chapter, that on Grattan's parliament, and correctly identified Connolly's weak point. Connolly was inclined to discount the value of 'legislative independence'. (Life of Connolly. P 196)

Well clucked, Desmond!

Connolly's conclusions are thoroughly proven in the only scientific work on the development of capitalism in Ireland produced by a bourgeois economist: "The Rise of the Irish Linen Industry" (1925) by Conrad Gill. And the fact is so undeniable that it was even admitted in the 1968 Thomas Davis Lectures on Radio Eireann. So the opportunist "followers of Connolly" are left defending a piece of lying bourgeois propoganda that the bourgeoisie themselves have abandoned.

Connolly was absolutely right. Grattan's Parliament was a bubble. Irish independence cannot be brought about through the development of capitalism. Capitalism, however green its superstructure be painted, only fastens Ireland to imperialism, and secures the continued plunder of the Irish nation by imperialism. De Valera's "Dail" fared no better than Grattan's Parliament in developing the economy --even though the land question had been solved for it by the mass starvation and emigration of the peasants.

Connolly's "weak point" is as sound as the Rock of Gibraltar. And what was true in 1780 is a thousand times as true two centuries later.

CONNOLLY'S BIOGRAPHERS

Kautsky takes from Marxism what is acceptable to the liberals, to the bourgeoisie...and discards, passes in silence, glosses over all that in Marxism which is unacceptable to the bourgeoisie. (Lenin. The Renegade Kautsky.)

Few men have been as misfortunate in their biographers as Connolly. Without exception, they have concentrated on producing a version of Connolly which ais acceptable to bourgeois liberalism, and which has only a superficial resemblance to the real, historical Connolly.

DESMOND RYAN

Ryan's biography appeared in 1924. It attempted to present Connolly as a man who, if he had lived, would in 1924 have been a Free Stater and an O'Brienite Social-Democrat. Here is a sample:

> ...recalling recent developments,,,, the Anglo-Irish Treaty, the Irish Free State, the tragic Civil War, and partisan claims upon Connolly's name and corpse, one inclines on the whole to define his probable attitude as that of the official Irish Labour Party. Surely his voice, pen and personal influence would have aided that Party in its opposition to the Civil War, its disinterested attempts to avert that folly, its efforts to find a basis for reconciliation between Free Stater and Republican, and its acceptance in all the circumstances, of the machinery of the Irish Free State as a step, and as an appreciable step, towards the co-operative commonwealth of his heart's desire. (P 3-4)

Can you imagine Connolly acting as a pseudo-left camouflage for the counter-revolutionary terrorism of Collins, Griffith, O'Higgins, Cosgrave etc.?

Ryan is sometimes quoted as an authority on Connolly's Marxism. Ryan's knowledge of Marxism can be gauged from this:

> Self-Determination! Years before Trotsky coined the phrase, Connolly had dinned the teaching into the ears of Home Rule Imperialists, British Labourists, and American Marxists. (p10)

Trotsky, in fact, was a fanatical opponent of national self-determination. He denounced the Easter Rising on the grounds that the time for national self determination "even in backward Ireland" had long passed, and in the Russian movement he attacked Lenin's theory of the rights of nations to self-determination. (Ryan continued to admire Trotsky after he became a hireling journalist of the imperialists, attacking "Stalinism" in the Daily Express, Daily Telegraph and other progressive journals. In the Sunday Press, Jan 19, 1964 Ryan told about "...the exiled prophet's fight to the death against the Stalinist dictatorship", and referred to "the miracle

of Trotsky's own History of the Russian Revolution". And on November 15, 1964 he described Lenin in the same progressive newspaper as follows: "Lenin, dull and angry in polemics, so terrible and triumphant in achievement... As for the Marxism of Lenin, he was as great a wobbler, as Marx himself". The bourgeois intelligentsia are great shadow boxers.

As editor of the three volume selection of Connolly's writings, Ryan laid the groundwork of distortion and suppression that Greaves has built on.

Ryan tries to represent Connolly as a man who in the exuberance of his youth was a "dogmatist" (in Ryan's language this means a genuine Marxist) but, who as he became more 'mature' blossomed into revisionism. In earlier years,

> ...his somewhat arid theorising had repelled small coteries, had found little response in the popular consciousness.

But later:

> Although still holding his Marxian principles he became less a theorist. Indeed he had grown somewhat weary of the Holy Trinity of Karl Marx, Lewis Morgand and Darwin...(P45)
>
> Afterwards Connolly modified the somewhat rigid Marxism of his earlier years. (P 9)

But what are the facts? That Connolly was never so much of a "dogmatist"as in his last years. When virtually the whole of W. European social-democracy became "reasonable", and did a somersault on the question of imperialist war when the war actually broke out, explaining that they would take up their principles again when the war was over. Connolly declared: "No; we cannot draw upon the future for a draft to pay our present duties. There is no moratorium to postpone the payment of the debt the socialists owe to the cause: it can only be paid now" (Forward. Aug. 22, 1914)

In 1914 Connolly, like Lenin, declared his intention of meeting imperialist war with revolutionary war, and thereby isolated himself from all the "reasonable", liberal socialists. Ryan's attempt to represent him as a liberal in this period is laughable. Hyndman's judgement is indisputable: Connolly began as an "impossibilist", and with the years he became ever more "impossible" from the opportunist viewpoint.

NOELLE DAVIES

In 1946 Davies published "Connolly of Ireland" in which he looked at Connolly through the eyes of a Welsh petty-bourgeois nationalist. "To admire Connolly whole-heartedly and to find in him a source of lasting inspiration does not imply believing that he was infallible or unqualified acceptance of everything he wrote", said Davies (p44). That is very true. The radical petty-bourgeoisie needs revolution-

ary heroes, which only the proletarian movement can supply. But of course the sharp "dogmatic" edges must be knocked off. The pro -letarian revolutionary must be reduced to petty-bourgeois dimens- ions. The "inspiration" must not be too powerful. Having taken Connolly to task for various manifestations of "dogmatism", a n d having compared him unfavourably with Griffith on the issue of class and nation, Davies concludes:

> However extreme the language he may have used on occasion, one feels that fundamentally Connolly's attitude was not very far from that of Jacques Maritain, who has written: "If the pro- letariat demands to be trusted as an adult, by this very fact it is not to be succoured, ameliorated, or saved by another social class. On the contrary the principal role in the next phase of evolution belongs to its own historical upward move- ment. It is not, however, by withdrawing from the rest of the community to exercise a class dictatorship, as Marxism would have it, that the workers and peasants will be in a posi- tion to play this inspiring and renewing role. It is by org- anising and educating themselves, by becoming aware of their responsibilities in the community, by uniting in their task all the elements, to whatever class they may belong, who have determined to work with them for human liberty." (P46/7)

The petty bourgeoisie imagines that at bottom all good men are petty bourgeois: that true human nature is petty-bourgeois. This view that Connolly did not really stand for class war to the end, and for the building of socialism through the dictatorship of the proletariat --that he merely used words against the the harshness of 19th century capitalism--- that Connolly's view of the world is embodied in the United Nations Charter is being given increasing circulation these days. We will quote what Connolly said. Anyone who cares to can imagine that Connolly, a great master of English prose, was not able to say what he thought, and that he really meant something else.

Connolly described the working class as "the only universal, all- embracing class" (Socialism and Nationalism. p29); and as "... the only class whose true interests are always on the side of pro- gress" (ibid p 116).

He warned the workers against generalised phrases about "human liberty":

> We belong to the working class of Ireland, and strive to exp- ress the working class point of view. Always and ever the working class movement strives after clearness of thought, as a means to the accomplishment of working class aims. The mid -dle class may and does deceive itself with finely turned phrases, and vague generalising of still vaguer aspirations, but the working class can think and speak only in language hard and definite, as hard and definite as the conditions of working class life. We have no room in our struggle for ill- usions --least of all for illusions about freedom. (Labour &

Easter Week. P 71)

> ...we take our stand with our class, nakedly upon our class interests. (ibid. p 122)

His view of how socialism and the abolition of classes would b e brought about is equally definite, as is his view that the working class should not judge itself by the degree to which lives up t o "responsibilities" foisted on it by "society" or the "community", i.e. the bourgeoisie:

> Such a party (ie an independent working class party), resting upon the working class --which is the only class capable o f embracing the whole human race-- must necessarily make of it- self and its class a touchstone by which all other bodies must be tested. It must grow to the dignity of affirming that labour is not on trial; it is civilisation that is on trial --and all the elements of civilisation in Ireland, as else- where, must stand or fall as they are true or not to the cause of labour. (ibid p 91)

> ...socialism will, I believe, come as a result of the contin- uous increase of power of the working class. (ibid. p 101)

Power over what (there is no such thing as power in itself)? Power over the anti-working class social force obviously. And what i s this but the dictatorship of the proletariat?

Davies reckons that Connolly would be appalled by the use of viol- ence against the enemies of the working class: that he would have become a liberal "if he had lived to see the results of the exper- ment in Russia" (P 47.). Here we will content ouselves with quoting one of the less publicised passages from Connolly, written at a time when, according to Ryan, he had mellowed into liberalism:

> In times of peace human life hangs heavily in the balance, and the most brutal of our rulers shrink from too readily shedding human blood. But in times of war all such considerations van -ish, and the spilling of a torrent of blood in the city str- eets would cause the ruling class no more compunction than the slaughter of game on their estates."

If Ryan's contention were correct Connolly's argument would now turn to pacifism: against bourgeois violence the proletariat, dis -playing its moral superiority, opposes non-violence, because vio- lence is evil. But it doesn't happen. Connolly continues:

> Indeed that lesson has been all too tardily learned by the people and their leaders. One great source of the strength of the ruling class has ever been their willingness to kill i n defence of their power and priviliges. Let their power be once attacked either by foreign foes, or domestic revolution- ists, and at once we see the rulers prepared to kill, and kill,

and kill. The readiness of the ruling class to order killing ...is in marked contrast to the reluctance of all revolutionists to shed blood.

The French Reign of Terror is spoken of with horror and execration... And yet in one day of battle at the Dardanelles there were more lives lost than in all the nine months of the Reign of Terror.

Should the day ever come when revolutionary leaders are prepared to sacrifice the lives of those under them as recklessly as the ruling class do in every war, there will not be a throne or despotic government left in the world. Our rulers reign by virtue of their readiness to destroy human life in order to reign; their reign will cend on the day when their discontented subjects care as little for human life as they do. (November 1915. Workers Republic. P 111/2)

How's that for liberalism!

R.M. FOX

R. M. Fox's biography, "James Connolly: The Forerunner" was published in 1946. It is not a Marxist work. In the "Irish Democrat", May 1946, Fox was referred to as 'Ireland's potential 'revisionist'." That may be. But if it is accurate to call Fox (who has not attempted to spread opportunism under a guise of orthodox Marxism) a revisionist, then it must be said that he is a revisionist by conviction. He has absolutely no understanding of Connolly's strategy of revolution (and he treats the establishment of the Free State as the achievement of Irish national independence). But he said what he thought openly twenty years ago.

The Irish Democrat, in which Fox was described as "Ireland's potential 'revisionist'" twenty years ago, has become the most insidious revisionist force in Irish politics (even though it makes a pretence of not 'interfering' in Irish affairs). And D. Greaves has become Connolly's fully fledged revisionist biographer. Greaves has become what he has become by abandoning virtually every political position which he held (or pretended to hold) twenty years ago, and adopting its contrary. He has not done this openly, explaining why he was doing it. He has done it treachorously and dishonestly, not acknowledging that he was doing it, and spreading political confusion to hide his treachery.

In becoming Connolly's revisionist biographer Greaves has taken up many positions held twenty years ago by Fox (and 45 years ago by Ryan). This does not mean that Fox is of a kind with Greaves. Fox is a subjectively honest biographer of Connolly, although objectively he is not a scientific one. He is what he is, and does not pretend otherside. As for Greaves: the only polite word that comes close to describing him is "renegade".

DESMOND GREAVES

Greaves' "Life and Times of James Connolly" (Lawrence and Wishart 1960), the main modern revisionist attempt at a comprehensive misrepresentation of Connolly's life, has been almost universally hailed by opportunists as a masterpiece. It has even been acclaimed by the trotskyists, who are supposed to be the deadly enemies of Greaves' revisionism.

In the British trotskyist newspaper "Newsletter" it was welcomed as follows: "the new life of James Connolly by Desmond Greaves has been rightly praised for its comprehensiveness and its corrections of earlier works on the same inspiring subject." (May 27, 1960)

And D. O'Connor Lysaght (a member of the trotskyist Irish Workers' Group) writes of Greaves, in his introduction to the New Writers Press edition of "Socialism made Easy", as "Connolly's best biographer".

We cannot undertake a comprehensive review of Greaves' book here. We have already shown a few of the ways in which he has distorted Connolly. (For documented proof of Greaves political duplicity the reader is referred to the ICO pamphlet, "The Connolly Association.)

Greaves' method is not to state his position openly. His method is the method of the Home Rule ideologists of sixty years ago, as described by Connolly in one of the suppressed articles we have quoted. It is the method of omission, suppression, and distortion, all wrapped up in tedious, ambiguous prose. (The book has not even the elementary literary quality of presenting a clear chronology of the events in Connolly's life. It generates vagueness in every sphere.) Here we will go briefly through some of the more obvious distortions.

> Connolly had been for many years working out a modus vivendi between scientific socialism...and Christian beliefs.

Greaves cites no evidence of this. He could not since no evidence exists. Connolly never tried to reconcile the scientific socialist outlook with the religious outlook. Nor was he an agnostic. In "Roman Catholicism and Socialism", 1908, he clearly explains religion as a product of man at a certain stage in the development of human society, (religion explains man, and natural forces, as a product of supernatural forces). Nor did he derive socialism from Christian principles. He continuously urged the workers to put their class interest above everything else and not to be held back from socialism by the denunciation of socialism by the religious leaders. He did not try to make it a condition that workers coming did not abate his own materialist position one iota in order to conciliate religious views. His sole condition was that the furtherance of the class interest of the workers in the class war

should be made the final test of what was right and wrong.

In "The New Evangel" he said that religious discussion was prohibited in the S.P.I. Many years later in an article (which has been suppressed) he vigorously opposed "attempts in Ireland to introduce this evil spirit of religious discussion into the labour movement..." ("Yellow Unions in Ireland". Forward, 20.6.1914). And in another (also suppressed): "The day on which the Catholic clergy can no longer use the cry of Home Rule to hide their usurpation of political influence will see the beginning of the end of their domination of the intellectual life of the Irish people. And the day on which the Orange aristocracy can no longer use the same cry will see the sturdy working class of the North reaching out the arm of friendship to their fellow workers of the South". (Forward. 28.1.1913)

"He had no conception of a political party as the general staff of a class" (Greaves. P179). We have shown that he had. What he had no conception of is a little Greavesian sect cut off from the class, suppressing working class political thought, and having to organise as a highly centralised bureaucracy (despite having only 20 or 30 active members plus 100 or so who can be rustled up for social occasions once or twice a year) for fear of being "taken over". Connolly certainly had no conception of this miserable hot-house parody of the Leninist Party. But it is easy to imagine what his comments would have been if he had lived to see such an organisation calling itself by his name.

Greaves of course finds Connolly's outlook "a trifle inflexible" (p 280).

In the end Greaves joins the revisionist intellectual pygmies afflicted with megalomania who in the past decade have taken to investigating the "mistakes" of the great Marxists, first of all Stalin, then of Lenin and Marx (the essence of their conclusion with regard to Capital is that it was, of course, the work of genius, but regrettably one of his gigantic mistakes). Connolly

> was not primarily a theoretician. He lacked the philosophical equipment for the fine analysis of concepts... What marked him out...was his instant recognition of revolutionary practice... (P 345)

Balderdash!

On P. 178, "explaining" the term "dictatorship of the proletariat" Greaves engages in this blatant distortion of Marxism:

> Let this phrase gives rise to misunderstanding, let it be noted that Marx identified the "dictatorship of the proletariat" with "democracy" --government by the people. It does not, of course, imply an era of repression.

Marx of course did no such thing. Dictatorship is dictatorship, and is the negation of democracy. If Marx had mean "democracy" he would not have said dictatorship (unless Greaves will have it that this great master of language was not able to say what he meant on such a fundamental matter. Maybe Greaves is telling us what Marx reaaly meant to say!). The dictatorship of the proletariat is precisely an "era of repression".

Class dictatorship is inevitable in class society. Every bourgeois society is a class dictatorship of the bourgeoisie even though the form of government be Parliamentary democracy. This dictatorship is exercised collectively by the bourgeoisie through the bourgeois state, but it is also exercised in a less obvious form by every individual bourgeois. The bourgeois dictatorship is unceasingly active, forcibly implanting in the minds of the workers in their youth ideas which serve the class interests of the bourgeoisie, trying to intimidate in one way or another every worker who arrives at class consciousness and attempts to arouse the class consciousness of his fellow workers, and trying to intimidate with direct, brutal methods, to corrupt with bribes of one sort or another, or lead astray with opportunism, workers who arrive at socialist political consciousness and work at developing a Communist movement.

Greaves holds that the Free State is "the most progressive state in Western Europe". In this "most progressive state" the bourgeois dictatorship is quite naked and brutal. A worker who makes use of his "democratic freedom" to become a Communist, state openly that he is a Communist, and show his fellow-workers why they should become Communists will, in any area outside Dublin (and even in Dublin things are not much different) by faced with the simple choice: starve or emigrate. That is bourgeois democracy i.e. democracy for the bourgeoisie, freedom to express bourgeois views; dictatorship against the working class and suppression of views which the bourgeoisie find dangerous.

In order to bring about socialism, Marx explained, this class dictatorship must be replaced by a proletarian dictatorship. This in the first place, involves the establishment of proletarian state organs. But the proletarian dictatorship will not be limited to the state organs any more than the bourgeois dictatorship was. In 1921 when the proletarian state was actively engaged in obstructing, thwarting and suppressing bourgeois politics, Lenin urged the masses of workers to follow the pattern of the individual bourgeois and exercise the dictatorship continuously in their everyday relationships with bourgeois elements. The workers, he said, should learn to hound their enemies unmercifully. ("We are not able to wage the class struggle in the newspapers as skilfully as the bourgeoisie did. Recall the skill with which it hounded its class enemies in the press, ridiculed them, disgraced them, and swept them away." The Character of Our Newspapers. Sept 1918)

Connolly too was clear as to how classes would be abolished:

> socialism...will come as a result of the continuous increase

of power of the working class.

Because the class interests of the workers and capitalists are ant-agonistic democracy for the one must necessarily be dictatorship over the other. The period of socialism, according to Lenin, is a period of struggle between bourgeois and Communist society under the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The "dictatorship of the proletariat" is precisely "an era of repression" --of bourgeois society. It can only end when bourgeois social relationships have been destroyed. But then, as Lenin pointed out, "democracy" too will come to an end, since democracy is only a form of the state, i.e. a form of oppression. Greaves has committed an outrageous distortion of Marxism on this matter.

Connolly's views on this are of a kind with Lenin's, though less developed.

These are a few of the treasures that are to be found in the work of "Connolly's best biographer".

CONCLUSION

The writings of Connolly on the Home Rule bourgeoisie in 1911 - 14 which have been reprinted in this pamphlet make it clear that, in Connolly's view, recognition of the fact the Irish nation was exploited and oppressed by imperialism, and preparation to co-operate with non-Socialist anti-imperialist forces in the struggle against imperialism, did not in the least imply a toning down of the class struggle of the workers against the nationalist bourgeoisie or a slackening of the struggle to develop a strong socialist movement. On this question, as on many others, Connolly's position was the same as Lenin's (See, for example, Lenin's "Two Tactics of Social Democracy in the Democratic Revolution". 1905).

Modern revisionism and trotskyism have utterly distorted Marxism on this question. On the one hand the trotskyists allege that to recognise that the anti-imperialist struggle has not been completed in Ireland leads to a subordinating of the working class interest to the class interest of the bourgeoisie: involves becoming the tail end of Fianna Fail. They therefore make the absurd assertion that the national-democratic struggle in Ireland has been completed: that the Irish nation is independent of imperialism ("Ireland has had her February revolution", the trotskyist Irish Workers Group has declared. An Solas No 8. Editorial)

On the other hand, as if to prove the trotskyists right, the modern revisionists actually do subordinate the working class interest to the bourgeois interest in the name of "anti-imperialism": actually do become the tail of Fianna Fail (and they reduce the anti-imperialist question to the question of the

Border). A pamphlet on this question which will include the Connolly-Walker controversy of 1911, is in preparation by the ICO.

The ICO has been criticised for not glossing over certain fundamental class questions in the name of "anti-imperialist unity". The name of Connolly has been invoked in this connection. But Connolly's suppressed writings make it absolutely clear that the position taken up by the ICO is identitical with Connolly's. We trust that in future these "followers of Connolly" will apply their strictures to Connolly as well as the ICO.

It has been suggested that Connolly was not aware of the nature of opportunism. Here are his remarks on the Dublin Labour Party in 1910.

> We have not any knowledge of any country in which the working class more readily rallies to an appeal to its class feeling than in Ireland. Whilst knowledge of theoretical socialism is but meagrely distributed among the workers, that feeling or knowledge which the socialists call class-consciousness is deep-seated, wide-spread and potent in its influence...
>
> We have said that the Irish worker while thoroughly true to his own class, lacking in socialist knowledge. This alone offers an explanation of the... set-back to the labour cause in Ireland.

The men elected to the municipal councils

> instead of forming a distinct and independent party of their own in the various councils,... allied themselves to one or another of the capitalist political kites... The honest Irish working man...honest himself and inclined to believe in the honesty of others-- was no match for the political traitors of the capitalist parties. When he found himself flattered and courted, invited to dinners and private gatherings of Home Rule councillors, plied with drink by his associates and asked to favour them by seconding the resolutions affirming their position on certain debatable matters ..., he did not realise that his genial hosts were destroying his independence...
>
> Yet it was so. The labour party was a party only in name; it came to signify only certain men who could be trusted to draw the working class support to the side of certain capitalist factions.

This led to the defeat of Labour Party candidates at the subsequent election:

> Though they were not perhaps able to frame it in so many words the Irish workers realised that a working man member of a capitalist party is not necessarily any better than a capitalist member..., perhaps not so good. (Workers Repub-

lic. P 87/8).

On the "democratic reform" of the capitalist state through "welfare" schemes etc:

> The state must be made completely our instrument, or else all the legislative results of our activity will inevitably grow into fresh and more perfect chains for our own enslave -ment. (Ireland And the Insurance Act. Forward. May 31, 1913. Not republished)

As a final comment on the idea that Connolly was a liberal socia -list who would have been shocked by Bolshevik 'intolerance', we quote the following:

> In every country socialism is foreign, is unpatriotic, and will continue so until the working class make socialism the dominant political force... By their aggressiveness and intolerance the possessing classes erect the principles of their capitalist supremacy into the dignity of national safeguards; according as the working class infuse into its political organisation the same aggressiveness and intoler- ance it will command the success it deserves, and make the socialist the only good and loyal citizen. (Workers Republic. P 48)

And finally:

> In the labour movement we long ago learned that it is the worker who is convinced of the power of the capitalist, who believes that 'the big fellow is sure to win,' it is he who really keeps labour in subjection... The problem in the labour movement is always to find out how this hopeless feel -ing can be destroyed, and confidence implanted in the bosom where despair usually reigns. The moment the worker no lon- ger believies in the all-conquering strength of his employer is the moment when the way opens out to the emancipation of our class.
>
> The master class realise this, and hence all their agencies bend their energies towards drugging, stupefying and poison- ing the workers --sowing distrust and fear amongst them... (Workers Republic. October 1915)
>
> Once and for all it must be understood that he who strikes at labour in Ireland will get blow for blow in return. It may be necessary to wait patiently for years, but when the opportunity comes the blow should be swift and decisive and merciless. (Workers Republic. June 1915)

Our masters all, a godly crew
  Whose hearts throb for the poor,
Their sympathies assure us too,--
  If our demands were fewer.
Most generous souls! But please observe
  What they enjoy from birth
Is all we ever had the nerve
  To ask, that is the Earth.

*

The "Labour Fakir", full of guile,
  Base doctrine ever preaches,
And, whilst he bleeds the rank and file
  Tame moderation teaches.
Yet, in his despite, we'll see the day,
  When, with sword in its girth,
Labour shall march in broad array
  To seize its own, the Earth.

*

For Labour long, with sighs and tears
  To its oppressors knelt,
But never yet to aught save fears,
  Did heart of tyrant melt.
We need not kneel, our cause is high,
  Of true men there's no dearth.
And our victorious rallying cry
  Shall be, "We Want The Earth!"

***

IRISH COMMUNIST ORGANISATION LITERATURE

Pamphlet No

1. Irish Communist Reprints (1934)
   (temporarily out of print)
2. Frederick Engels: History of Ireland (to 1014) 4/-
   (translted by A. Clifford. First Publication)
3. The Irish Republican Congress /in English 1/6
   (a history of the 26 cos, 1931-36)
4. The Working Class in the Irish National Revolution 1/6
   by I.C.O.
5. Connolly by I.C.O. 6d.
6. The Republican Struggle In Ireland by R. Connolly 1/-
   (Reprinted from The Communist International, 1922, with Introduction by I.C.O.)
7. Karl Marx: The Fenians 2/6
   (Translated by Angela Clifford)
8. Liam Mellowes (including Jail Notes and Introduction by I.C.O) 1/-
9. Capital and Revisionism by I.C.O.
   (exposure of revisionist attacks on Capital) 1/-
10. The Connolly Association (A historical review of its degeneration by ICO) 1/-
11. On Stalin's "Economic Problems", part one by ICO 2/6
    (An investigation of revisionist economic theory and Stalin's refutation of it)
14. The Marxism of James Connolly by ICO 2/-
15. In Defence of Leninism by ICO (an exposure of trotskyist and modern revisionist theories) 1/6

The New Evangel, by James Connolly 1/6
(with Introduction by ICO)

The Irish Communist, monthly, 9/- for 6 months postfree

Also available: Stalin: Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR. 2/6
Mao: Quotations 2/6
Revisionism and Imperialism (on revisionist economic theory) 6d

Available by post (add 6d for postage) from

Connolly Books,
116 Lots Road,
London S.W.10