

WORKERS INTERNATIONAL NEWS

Theoretical Organ of the Revolutionary Communist Party, Fourth International.

Vol. 5. No. 8

April, 1945.

THREEPENCE

In this Issue :

*THE I.L.P. AT THE
CROSSROADS*

By Ted Grant.

*THE NATIONALIST
DEGENERATION
OF STALINISM*

By Paul Dixon.

*ULSTER IN
TRANSITION*

By Bob Armstrong.

The I.L.P. at the Crossroads

By Ted Grant

The most important item on the agenda at this year's I.L.P. Conference is the question of its relations to the Labour Party.

The N.A.C. has put down a resolution asking for the I.L.P. to apply for affiliation to the Labour Party on the same basis as existed before the I.L.P. voluntarily disaffiliated from the Labour Party.

In making such a complete reversal of the position which it adopted for so many years, one would expect that the leadership (which occasionally makes references to Marx and Lenin as its guide) would draw up a balance sheet of the period since the separation.

The only leading member of the I.L.P. who has attempted to explain the reason for the change, was John McGovern at the I.L.P. Summer School of August 1944. In dealing with the history of the I.L.P. as reported in the "New Leader" of August 19th, 1944, he made reference to the achievements of the I.L.P. since dis-affiliation:

"He considered the position of the Party at the time of dis-affiliation and confessed that he thought 'The I.L.P.'s case was so clear that every intelligent

worker would have to accept the I.L.P. attitude and philosophy, and desire to build with it a strong working class movement in this country. A large number of people encouraged the Party at that time to believe that this was true, and got it to leave the Labour Party and then proceeded to work their own way back into that Party. In those days we went round the country as an independent working class party, and thought that once the faith of the workers in the Labour Party had been destroyed we would be able to transfer these workers from the Labour Party to the I.L.P. It now transpires that we made errors both in judgment and in policy.'

Comrade McGovern began a critical examination of the party policy after disaffiliation, and stated that 'one early mistake was our association with the Communist Party, especially at a time when there was tremendous antagonism in this country against the C.P. In many areas where the I.L.P. had an agreement with the C.P. a large number of members left the Party. This series of united fronts pro-

duced small effects, but drove out many workers.'

Believing that self-criticism in the Party was necessary, the lecturer went on to consider the internal struggles in the Party, instancing the R.P.C., the Trotskyists, and later the disputes between Stalinists and Trotskyists within the Party, which resulted in "purges" and loss of membership. He stated that he had been asked on many occasions, by those who appeared to accept as logical the Party position, what guarantee he could give that the development of the I.L.P. would not be similar to that of the Labour Party, and he considered that he could give these individuals no guarantee such as they asked.'

Without giving an analysis of the evolution of the I.L.P., McGovern echoes the criticism made by Leon Trotsky long ago. Here Marxist theory demonstrates its superiority over centrist empiricism.

Trotsky had pointed out that the manner, the timing and the issue on which the I.L.P. left the Labour Party were not such as to make the position clear in the eyes of the masses. The issue on which the

split occurred—that of refusing to accept the discipline of the parliamentary Labour Party by the I.L.P. M.P.s—was not sufficiently clear cut to gain the sympathy and support of the masses. The naive confession of McGovern as to his belief in the automatic turning of the masses from the Labour Party to the I.L.P. is a faithful reflection of the illusions of the entire leadership at the time of the break. A belief which was entirely alien to the teachings of Marxism.

The masses do not automatically accept a Party—even if it has a correct policy and programme—but must be won to the programme as a result of correct strategy and tactics. Only if the revolutionary Party has a firm theoretical basis and an understanding of the method of approach to the masses—blurred neither by sectarianism nor opportunism—can it prepare for its historic task, the overthrow of capitalism.

Trotsky warned the I.L.P. that their association in a united front with the Stalinist Party (which had since the capitulation of the German C.P., become a thoroughly reactionary obstacle in the path of the working class) would be disastrous for it. Trotsky suggested that the I.L.P. turn its back on the—at that time—tiny C.P. and face towards the mass organisations of the Trade Unions and the Labour Party. But the I.L.P. leaders paid no heed. They continued their association with the Stalinists and as late as 1935-36 participated, with the Stalinists in the ill-fated "Unity Campaign" together with the Socialist League.

This was at a time when the Stalinists in Spain were already campaigning against the brother Party of the I.L.P.—the P.O.U.M.—as "Trotskyist-fascist" and "Fifth Columnists"! To this day the leadership of the I.L.P. has not made an analysis of the mistakes made in this period.

The last point made in this quotation from McGovern is an entirely sound one. No party in the world, subjected to the constant pressure and corruption of the capitalist environment, can guarantee itself against degeneration, even though it be the most tested revolutionary and Marxist Party developed in history. The possibility always exists of the Party becoming a tool of the capitalists, as are the Labour Party and the Communist Party today. The only precautions that those desiring to

build a revolutionary party have, is to ensure that the Party is based on the principles and the methods of Marxism; to ensure, on that basis, that every point of view within the Party is thoroughly aired and discussed. Only by complete democracy in the Party which permits every member or grouping the right to bring forward their point of view, can a live, watchful and educated rank and file be created which will have full confidence in the leadership and simultaneously guard against the possibility of degeneration. These are the only moral and honest means of ensuring a united party and a correct policy. These were the methods of Bolshevism in its great days, and without which the Bolshevik Party could never have been built and succeeded in achieving the conquest of power. The stifling of democratic rights by Zinoviev, and later by Stalin—in itself a reflection of processes taking place within the country—paved the way for the complete disintegration of the mightiest revolutionary weapon the world has ever known. As McGovern has hinted, unfortunately the leadership has not always allowed the full freedom of criticism which is necessary in any party which desires to transform itself into a revolutionary party. In a bureaucratic attitude on the part of any leadership, is contained an uneasiness in the correctness of its policy, past and future.

In preparing to re-affiliate, nowhere has the leadership of the I.L.P. explained the differences, if any, between the situation either of the I.L.P. or the Labour Party which would justify re-affiliation on the same terms as led the I.L.P. to dis-affiliate in 1932... Much water has flowed under the bridges since those days; but the character of the Labour Party and its leadership has not changed basically in the interim, except perhaps that the leadership has become even more reactionary than formerly.

And while there have been many profound changes in the composition and outlook of the rank and file of the I.L.P. the leadership has remained basically with the same outlook as when it was in the Labour Party. They have never broken with reformism, but have maintained a middle way position between reformism and Marxism. This, and only this, explains their present attitude towards the Labour Party and affiliation to it.

In 1935, Comrade Trotsky wrote in "Once Again, the I.L.P." in reply to the question, "Should the I.L.P. Seek Entry into the Labour Party?"

"At the moment the question is not posed this way. What the I.L.P. must do if it is to become a revolutionary Party, is to turn its back on the C.P. and face the mass organisations. It must put 99% of its energies into building up fractions in the Trade Union movement. At the moment I understand that much of the fractional work can be done openly by I.L.P.ers in their capacity of Trade Union and co-operative members. But the I.L.P. should never rest content; it must build its influence in the mass organisations with the utmost speed and energy. For the time may come, when, in order to reach the masses, it might enter the Labour Party, and it must have tracks laid for the occasion. Only the experience that comes from such fractional work can inform the I.L.P. if and when it must enter the Labour Party. But for all its activity an absolutely clear programme is the first condition. A small axe can fell a large tree only if it is sharp enough."

What Trotsky is developing here is the idea that affiliation or non-affiliation is not a principled question, but one of tactics. For the revolutionary party, the problem reduces itself to one of how best to reach and influence the mass of the workers and win them to revolutionary socialism. But before one can do that, it is necessary to have a Marxian programme which decisively differentiates the Party from all other Parties, especially from Labour reformism.

Yet even in its hey-day of "revolutionary socialism", the I.L.P. never completely broke from parliamentarism and reformism. Today, after 13 years of separation from the Labour Party, the "New Leader" of March 31st, 1945, published on the eve of the Conference to decide the question of affiliation, can write:

"LABOUR FOLLOWS I.L.P.
The I.L.P. Conference meets at Blackpool at Easter. The Labour Party Conference meets in the same place at Whitsun.

The preliminary agenda of the latter Conference has just been issued, and it is interesting to compare it with the agenda of the I.L.P. Conference.

Similar subjects are dealt with, and on domestic issues—housing, monopolies and land, for example—there is little difference in principle between many of the resolutions on both agendas. It is when one passes to the resolutions on the Peace and the treatment of Germany that the difference becomes most marked, though even here the Labour Party agenda includes resolutions which express the international socialist attitude.

The truth is, however, that the Labour Party agenda is always better than Labour Party policies."

This is not at all as the writer of these lines infers: that the Labour Party rank and file is adopting a revolutionary position, and therefore the resemblance. It is because the I.L.P.'s position remains basically reformist that the comparison becomes possible.

The content of the resolutions put before the Labour Party Conference this year do not differ from those put forward on any previous years, including the year of dis-affiliation, 1932. It remains incomprehensible then, why the I.L.P. disaffiliated at all, if this argument is accepted. No more annihilating criticism could be made than that the resolutions are not much different from those on the Labour Party agenda.

We Trotskyists have been attacked consistently by the I.L.P. leaders for our criticisms of their attitude towards the Labour Party, which veered from left to right. Thus Trotsky said in the same interview quoted above:

"The basic error which was made by some I.L.P.ers who withdrew critical support (of the Labour Party) was to assume that the war danger necessitated a change in our appreciation of reformism. But as Clausewitz said, and Lenin often repeated, war is the continuation of politics by other means. If this is true, it applies not only to capitalist parties, but to social democratic parties. The war crisis does not alter the fact that the Labour Party is a workers' party, which the Government Party is not. Nor does it alter the fact that the Labour leadership cannot fulfil their promises, that they will betray the confidence which the masses place in them. In peace time the workers will, if they trust in social democracy, die of hunger; in war,

for the same reason, they will die from bullets. Revolutionists never give critical support to reformism on the assumption that reformism, in power, could satisfy the fundamental needs of the workers. It is possible, of course, that a Labour Government could introduce a few mild temporary reforms. It is also possible that the League of Nations could postpone a military conflict about secondary issues—just as a cartel can eliminate economic crises only to reproduce them on a larger scale. So the League can eliminate small episodic conflicts to generalise them into world war.

Thus, both economic and military crises will only return with an added explosive force so long as capitalism remains. And we know that social democracy cannot abolish capitalism.

No, in war as in peace, the I.L.P. must say to the workers: 'The Labour Party will deceive you and betray you, but you do not believe us. Very well, we will go through your experiences with you but in no case do we identify ourselves with the Labour Party programme.'

What a world of difference between this revolutionary attitude, and the open, boastful identification of the "revolutionary" programme of the I.L.P. with the reformist programme of the Labour Party! The I.L.P. objected to giving critical support to the Labour Party in those days because the Labour Party policy was one of support for imperialist war. Today, after the Labour Party has dirtied its banner a second time in support of the capitalists in war, the I.L.P. gives them a clean bill of health as "Socialists". They prepare for the coming General Election by rushing to get on the bandwagon of the Labour Party. Not that the Labour Party will cease to support imperialist wars—that would be too much to expect from the new found socialists—but after all, the attitude towards war is only a mere difference of opinion in the eyes of Brockway these days. The Labour Party inside or outside the Government will continue either as a governing Party or as a "loyal opposition" to support the blatantly imperialist war against Japan in order to aid the capitalists in getting back the loot and the slaves which the Japanese capitalists have grabbed from them.

Yet it is not so long ago that the I.L.P. leaders sought with might and main to differentiate themselves from what they described as the "doomed" Labour Party. During the first phase of the war, Brockway Ridley, Padley and others vied with one another in predicting the collapse of the Labour Party. The I.L.P. then developed the idea that the masses would pass the Labour Party, and come straight to the side of the proponents of the "Socialist Britain Now" campaign. Today, that campaign has been relegated to the limbo of centrist Lost Causes. It has been quietly buried without fuss or explanation. At the time of its inception, it was subjected to a Marxian criticism, and its inevitable demise was predicted in the columns of "Workers International News" and the "Socialist Appeal".

The ultra-left notion, that because the Labour Party had betrayed the workers, all that was necessary was for the I.L.P. to hang out a sign-board "Socialism Now", received its crassest expression in the articles of the sectarian, Ridley. Let us see what he wrote because he gave a finished expression to all the mistakes of the I.L.P. leadership; their inability to understand the problem of the Labour Party and how to face up to it. Criticising the Trotskyists who were demanding that the Labour leaders end the shameless coalition with the capitalists and wage a struggle for power on a socialist programme, as a means of educating the workers through their own experience, Ridley gleefully jibed:

"In fact, everything indicates that this war will mark the end of the Labour Party just as the last one did that of its liberal predecessor, despite the valiant efforts of the Trotskyists, to revive the fast putrefying corpse. The spirit died in it long ago. After all, even Christ gave up the dead as hopeless after three days!"

"New Leader", Feb. 21st 1942. It might be pointed out that this is not the most foolish statement made by leaders of the I.L.P. Padley, Brockway and others all argued that to give support—critical support at that—to the Labour Party, and demand that they take power on a socialist programme, would be to deceive the workers and sow illusions in the Labour leaders who had betrayed the

workers. If there was a grain of sense in their arguments of that time, it was that the reactionary reformists of the Labour Party could not fundamentally alter the conditions of the masses when in power. Now, they have thrown overboard the only correct part of their criticism, and have fallen into the very abyss which they claimed the Trotskyist policy would lead to. They now deceive the workers into believing that the Labour Party can accomplish the Socialist Revolution.

Thus, insofar as their policy can affect events, they smooth the path of reaction, both inside and outside the Labour Party.

Trotsky once wrote that a sectarian is merely an opportunist afraid of his own opportunism. We have seen what Ridley wrote in the past. Let us hear his words of wisdom today. In the "New Leader" of June 20th, 1945, Ridley writes:

"The Labour Party is the mass Party of the British Trade Unions, and, in general, of the more politically conscious workers. It is also "His Majesty's Opposition". For which reasons it occupies an important contemporary role in British politics. It has this great advantage over the Tories that it still commands an extensive reserve of enthusiasm and moral idealism amongst its rank and file. Though it must be added that the present leadership of the Party hasn't a glimmering of a notion as to what to do with this great potentially socialist and revolutionary force. This last fact was very obvious at the recent Labour Party Conference, where not so much a gulf as an abyss, divided the platform from the rank and file."

Not so much a gulf as an abyss separates the Ridley of 1945 from the Ridley of 1942. But let us go further:

"The question of the survival of the Labour Party, and the possibility of its continuing to play any role in the Socialist transformation of British society depends upon whether the rank and file of the Party can throw up a new leadership which adequately reflects, and will continue to reflect in or out of office, its point of view, free from the domination of the Trade Union bureaucracy. And this, in its turn depends on whether the

Labour Party regards itself as a federal structure, including all Socialist trends, revolutionary as well as reformist; or whether, as at present, as an intolerant monolithic top-heavy structure committed to endless compromises, and to the philosophy of a dead age, itself the product of extinct material conditions.

The next General Election may put the Labour Party in power. Then will come its supreme test, for 1945, unlike 1924 and 1929-31, is an age of revolution versus counter-revolution, and any British Government (of whatever shade) must choose one or the other camps."

The miracle is achieved; Ridley has succeeded in bettering the accomplishments of Christ! Whereas Christ gave up hope for the dead after three days, Ridley has revived the stinking corpse after three years! Naturally, under such circumstances, the smell is overpowering.

Think of it. Ridley parades as a Marxian historian, and yet raises the question as to whether the Labour Party in power will support revolution or counter-revolution!

The Labour Party, as a party, will always act to defend the "democratic" counter revolution against the proletarian revolution in a revolutionary situation. In power, the Labour Party, with or without a majority, would act as it did in 1924 and 1929. That there would be splits and revolts within the ranks, even at the top, inside and outside Parliament in such an event, is an entirely different question.

What would be the attitude of a genuine revolutionary party towards the problem of affiliation? In order to disguise its complete and unconditional surrender to the reformism of the Labour Party, the I.L.P. leadership suggests that it will affiliate only after the truce has been broken and the coalition ended. Why? The Labour Party will still be the same Labour Party, except that with a fake "opposition" to the Tories, the leadership will be even more dangerous than before. It can allow itself the luxury of criticising the Tories, which can lead the rank and file to believe that the Labour Party leadership intend to wage a real struggle for Socialism. But at the coming General Election, the Labour Party will not, and cannot put a fighting socialist

case, for fear it may gain a majority. And it fears that a majority would expose its incapacity to carry through any large scale measures against capitalism and in the interests of the working class. Nor is there any absolute certainty that the Labour Party may not enter another coalition after the election, although this is unlikely because of the pressure of the rank and file.

Would the I.L.P. in that case, disaffiliate from the Labour Party? You would search in vain for an answer to this question from the pro-affiliationist wing of the I.L.P.

If the I.L.P. were a genuine Marxist Party, the problem would be approached from an entirely different standpoint. The Labour Party is the mass organisation of the working class. In order to win the workers to the banner of revolutionary socialism, it would facilitate matters if the revolutionaries had the right to put their point of view directly to the workers inside the Labour Party. If, given the right of criticism, affiliation would assist in educating the Labour Party workers. Under such circumstances, the rapid regroupment of the workers in the Labour Party round a revolutionary programme and banner would become a possibility. Fighting side by side in the ranks with the Labour workers, we would be in a better position to convince them of the necessity for a Marxist programme and the futility of reformism.

Thus the leftward swing of the workers would lead to a strengthening of the revolutionary tendencies within the Labour Party, without in any way sacrificing the principles for which we stand.

In approaching the Labour Party for affiliation all negotiations would be conducted publicly, in full view of the workers, and the reasons for such a step honestly explained without in any way abandoning our revolutionary position, or our criticism and exposure of the Labour leaders. On these conditions, we would be prepared to affiliate, even if the Labour Party remained in the coalition.

Basically, our approach towards affiliation is no different than our approach to the problem of the Labour Government. Affiliation would have tremendous advantages in the establishment of a closer bond with the rank and file Labour workers. If the Labour leaders re-

fused to accept us, the workers would see them as the splitters, especially if previously we had waged a campaign on the issue in the factories and trade unions, and secured some support among the Labour workers.

However, in spite of the opportunist approach of the I.L.P. leadership, the affiliation of the I.L.P. to the Labour Party would be a progressive step. Some comrades in the I.L.P. oppose affiliation because they correctly see in the policy of the N.A.C., a capitulation to the reformist Labour leaders. But in opposing the false reformist approach of the N.A.C., they make mistakes of a sectarian character.

Even if the I.L.P. were a revolutionary Party, affiliation would be progressive. But with the present position, affiliation should help enormously in clarifying the situation within the I.L.P. and all the tendencies within it. There is no fundamental difference separating the Labour Lefts from the I.L.P. leaders. The differences between them are entirely artificial. There is no real political reason why they should not be together.

It is true, that the Labour leaders, or a large section of them, have their own reasons for desiring the affiliation of the I.L.P. They realise only too well that in the coming period those organisations which stood out against the war

will become more attractive to the disillusioned workers and soldiers. In face of the coming upsurge of the workers, the Labour leaders will require a "Left" cover in order to retain the support of the masses. In their calculations, the I.L.P. will serve this purpose.

That was how the situation worked out after the last war, and they hope that history will repeat itself. However, the situation is entirely different today. The I.L.P. will enter the Labour Party on the eve of a tremendous ferment and explosion among the masses. Far from the tranquil existence anticipated by the I.L.P. leadership, the I.L.P. would inevitably act as the crystallising point for the awakening Labour workers. Both the fresh recruits, and the older stratum of industrial members will demand a revolutionary policy. Thus the differentiation within the I.L.P. would be intensified between the reformist wing and the revolutionary wing. **The revolutionary wing, if it worked out a Marxist policy and programme, would enormously accelerate the revolutionary regroupment within the Labour movement.**

Whether inside the Labour Party, or outside, the organic left-reformism or at best, centrism of the I.L.P. leadership stands in the way of the I.L.P. adopting a revolutionary position. Entry into the

Labour Party will force them to show their hand. The best members will come to see exactly where the leadership really stands. The new and virile members who will enter the Labour Party would fuse with the I.L.P. Left wing. True, the I.L.P. would be flooded also by Left parliamentarians, pacifists and careerists. But these would rapidly separate themselves from the I.L.P. rank and file and become assimilated with the leadership, dragging it further to the Right. This again, would have its effects on the rank and file.

On the background of tremendous storms on the industrial and political fields, both the Labour Party and the I.L.P. will be shaken from top to bottom. Affiliation of the I.L.P. to the Labour Party seems to be a foregone conclusion: but it will neither avail the reformist leadership of the Labour Party, nor the centrist leadership of the I.L.P. It will act as an accelerator of all the processes of change and movement taking place within both organisations. The revolutionary workers in both parties, in the course of their own experience will begin to perceive that only the programme and methods of Bolshevism, only the programme of the Fourth, International can lead to the overthrow of the capitalist system and the victory of the Socialist Revolution.

The Nationalist Degeneration of Stalinism *By Paul Dixon*

From the 1930s onwards the continually increasing degeneration of the Thermidorian Stalinist Bureaucracy has manifested itself in every sphere of Soviet life. Some fourteen years ago the Communist Party of the Soviet Union had already been transformed from a revolutionary party into a bureaucratised appendage of the ruling caste; proletarian democracy had ceased to exist and the O.G.P.U., from an instrument of working class "terror" against the bourgeoisie, had become the Stalinised weapon for the terrorisation of the workers and peasants. Many of

the fundamental teachings of Marx and Lenin had already been revised and distorted and the history of the Bolshevik movement falsified.

But it has been characteristic of the degeneration of Stalinism—as it was of the degeneration of the parties of the Second International—that for as long as possible a façade of Marxist phrases has been preserved as a covering for the abandonment of Marxism in practice. Thus, it is hoped by the Stalinists that the advanced workers will remain unaware of the changes taking place.

However, as the degeneration of

Stalinism progresses, so we witness the ever more open abandonment of Bolshevism in every field. The pace of this degeneration became more rapid from 1935-36 and has been greatly speeded up during the present war. More and more it has become apparent that, in its frantic attempts to maintain its rule over the Soviet masses, the Stalinist Bureaucracy is seeking inspiration in the traditions and institutions of Tsarism. In one after another of the spheres which had been left relatively untouched in the early period of Stalinist rule, we find to-day not only a flagrant

abandonment of Bolshevism but a conscious remoulding on pre-revolutionary lines.

Thus, family life is being remodelled on "traditional" lines; higher education is reserved for the children of the privileged strata; the army is reconstructed upon a hierarchical basis with the deliberate creation of a privileged officer caste divorced from the mass of the population; anti-religious propaganda is replaced by an alliance between the Stalinist Bureaucracy and the Russian Orthodox Church.

This whole reactionary movement has been accompanied by, and, as it were, knit together by, a monstrous growth of nationalism, which now—so far as official Stalinist propaganda is concerned—equals that of any of the Imperialist states engaged in the present war.

THE INTERNATIONALIST POSITION OF BOLSHEVISM — THE NATIONALIST DEGENERATION OF STALINISM

In no other field has the Stalinist abandonment of Bolshevism been more flagrant than in the international one. Nowhere in the writings of Lenin or his associates can there be found the slightest trace of nationalism or of national pride. On the contrary, we find there an internationalist position stated with the utmost clearness and unambiguity.

In his "Farewell Letter to the Swiss Workers" (April 8th, 1917) Lenin wrote:

"The great honour of beginning the series of revolutions caused with objective inevitability by the war has fallen to the Russian proletariat. But the idea that the Russian proletariat is the chosen revolutionary proletariat among the workers of the world is absolutely alien to us. We know full well that the proletariat of Russia is less organised, less prepared, and less class-conscious than the proletariat of other countries. It is not its special qualities but rather the special coincidence of historical circumstances that has made the proletariat of Russia for a certain, perhaps very short time, the vanguard of the revolutionary proletariat of the whole world.

Russia is a peasant country, it is one of the most backward of European countries. Socialism cannot triumph there immediately."

It should hardly be necessary to bring quotations to show that the

attitude of Lenin during the First Imperialist War was one of proletarian internationalism, of revolutionary defeatism. But what was his position after the seizure of power, during the period of intervention and civil war? On the 11th of March 1918 when the young Soviet State was reeling under the blows of German Imperialism and the armies of the Kaiser were advancing into Soviet territory, crushing the revolution as they came Lenin wrote:

"We are defencists from the 7th of November 1917. We are for 'the defence of the fatherland', but that war for the fatherland towards which we are going is a war for the socialist fatherland, for socialism as the fatherland, for the Soviet Republic as a section of the world army of socialism.

'Hate the German, kill the German'—such was and remains the slogan of ordinary, i.e. bourgeois, patriotism. But we will say 'Hated for the Imperialist bandits, hatred for capitalism, death to capitalism' and at the same time; 'Learn from the German! Remain true to the fraternal union with the German workers. They are late in coming to our aid. We will gain time, we will wait for them, they will come to our aid.'

What was the attitude of Lenin towards the achievements of "national culture"? In his "Theses on the National Question" (1913) he gave the answer:

'From the point of view of social-democracy it is impermissible to use either directly or indirectly the slogan of NATIONAL culture. This slogan is false, for all the economic, political and mental life of mankind is becoming more and more internationalised even under capitalism. Socialism will completely internationalise it. International culture, which is already being systematically created by the proletariat of all countries, takes to itself not 'national culture' (from whatever national collective it may come) as a whole, but takes from every national culture exclusively its thoroughly democratic and socialist elements."

The first step in the Stalinist abandonment of the internationalist position was made by Stalin in 1924 when he first formulated the theory of socialism in one country. Henceforth it became an article of faith for the bureaucracy that a completely socialist society could be built in a single isolated country—especially in Russia. This

"theory"—besides being an economic and political absurdity—undermined the whole basis of proletarian internationalism and signified its abandonment by the Stalinist Bureaucracy. If Socialism could be built in Russia by relying upon Russia's internal resources alone without the assistance of the workers of other countries, what was the need for the Russian workers to assist the revolutionary movements of the workers abroad? Thus the Comintern became, under Stalinist leadership an instrument of the foreign policy of the Bureaucracy and betrayed the workers' struggles throughout the world.

But for a number of years after the adoption of the theory of Socialism in a single country, the nationalist degeneration of Stalinism remained incomplete. So far as the traditional attitude of Bolshevism towards pre-revolutionary Russia was concerned, no immediate change took place. For the masses of Russia this past had been one of oppression and suffering and to them and the Bolsheviks it and its still persisting relics were things to be outlived and overcome.

As late as 1930 we find Demyan Biedny, a loyal Stalinist, publicly proclaimed as "the poet of the millions and tens of millions of the toiling masses," writing as follows of Russia's past:

"A country tremendously large,
Ruined, slavishly idle, savage,
Dragging itself along behind
cultured America and Europe,
A grave!
Servile labour—and a predatory
parasitism.

Idleness was the people's
means of defence
Idleness and poverty, poverty
and squandering,
Squandering and boastfulness,
Are all inevitable, eternal
neighbours.

The lash of the master corrupted the labour of the serf.
This then is the inheritance,
Which we have to overcome."

In 1934 this same Demyan Biedny was unwise enough to write a comic opera ridiculing the introduction of Christianity into Russia. However the opera was withdrawn; the unfortunate author was severely rebuked—he had dared to ridicule one of the national heroes of Russia—"Saint Vladimir—who had not only introduced Christianity but successfully defended and enlarged the frontiers of the Russian state! Not only Demyan Biedny

but the whole Soviet population learned, to their astonishment, that they were the heirs to a great national tradition—that of the old Tsarist Empire which had bequeathed to them the greatest achievements of a military and cultural character, which they were henceforth to cherish with pride and to defend with their lives!

THE REVISION OF HISTORY TEXT BOOKS

The most prominent Russian historian of the post-revolutionary period had been N. M. Pokrovsky. His application of the Marxist method of Historical Materialism to Russian history had been sharply criticised by Trotsky in 1922 for his exaggeration of the role of trading capital in medieval Russia. In the inner-party struggles culminating in the defeat of Trotsky and the Left Opposition, Pokrovsky appeared as an ardent supporter of Stalin. He died in April 1932 and his death was commented upon by the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party as follows:

"The Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) announces with deep regret the death of that most prominent representative of the Old Guard of Bolshevism, N. M. Pokrovsky. He was an active participant in the Revolution of 1905 and in the Proletarian Revolution of October, an irreconcilable fighter for the General Line of the Party, a world-famous communist scientist, a most prominent organiser and leader of our theoretical front and a tireless propagandist of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism."

A pamphlet of praise from every quarter for Pokrovsky's work and learning was published immediately after his death. It included a quotation from Lenin, who, in 1921, had described Pokrovsky as "an essential adviser (and guide) in questions of science and of Marxism in general." All his main works were re-issued—some in mass editions.

But not even death could save Pokrovsky. Within four years there appeared a decree of that same Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party on the subject of existing history text-books which, it suddenly discovered contained "attempts to inculcate an anti-Marxist, anti-Leninist, in essence liquidationist, view of historical science." One M. Kammari,

writing in the April 1936 number of "Under the Banner of Marxism" stresses the necessity of:

"... overcoming those obviously false and anti-Leninist conceptions in historical science which have already been repeatedly exposed by the Party and which have as their basis the well-known (!) mistakes of Pokrovsky."

Pokrovsky, states M. Kammari had undoubtedly certain merits, but, unfortunately, he had never understood either Dialectical or Historical Materialism! This is shown, among other things, by the fact that he grossly over-estimated the role of trading capital in medieval Russia!

Pokrovsky's works were withdrawn. But the Bureaucracy found it easier to outlaw the existing history text-books than to produce new ones. In the schools of the Soviet Union the children were provided with a new edition of the History of Russia by Klyuchevsky, who died in 1911 and who, with the school of historians he helped to create had been thus characterised by Pokrovsky:

"Valuing the autocracy, these historians value in no less degree the united realm. The formation of the Russian empire is for them too, the basic fact of Russian history, and they see only its bright sides." (Preface to English edition of "History of Russia").

Thus the historian of Tsarism became the historian of Stalinism, and this fact revealed the real reason for the posthumous disgrace of Pokrovsky—his internationalism. Henceforth the whole past of Russia was to be searched for examples of "patriotism" and for Russian "heroes". The patriotism of Stalinism is not patriotism to the Soviet Union, the vanguard of the World Revolution. It is not even patriotism to the Soviet Union, a national workers' state; it is patriotism to Russia—the fatherland. Let us listen to V. Smirnova in her preface to "The Bard in the Camp of the Russian Warriors" (A patriotic poem by Zhukovsky, written over a hundred years ago and reprinted by the

State Publishers of Children's Literature in 1943 for the inspiration of Soviet Youth):

"In every man there lives the feeling of the fatherland. The fatherland—this is the house, the family, the place where you were born, the factory in which you work, the field which you cultivate, the town in which you live; this is the ordinary sky over the adjacent land; this is the people to which you belong, the language which you speak and think, the culture, the history, the whole past, present and future of your native country.

Love for the fatherland is one of the strongest and noblest feelings. It makes a man capable of exploits, makes him a hero. In the history of our country there are not a few moments when the fatherland was, for the Russian man, dearer than everything in life, dearer than life itself. These were moments of the greatest national enthusiasm and of the exertion of all the popular forces, days when the whole people arose, as one man, when every man felt, thought and acted at one with the people.

Thus it was when other states attacked the freedom and independence of Russia, when they tried to subdue her by armed force and foreign troops invaded the Russian land.

Thus it was during the Great Fatherland War of 1912. The memory of this time fills with pride the heart of the Russian man."

POKROVSKY ON THE WAR OF 1812

During the present war the Soviet masses have had held up to them for their inspiration, not the heroic struggles of the Civil War of 1918-20 but this alleged mass resistance to the invasion of Napoleon in 1812. On this latter subject Pokrovsky had written in 1912 the following lines which were accepted without question for over twenty years by the Russian Communist Party:

"More detailed accounts of the war, even those emanating from the Decembrists themselves, completely

C We apologise to readers for the non-publication of the January, February and March issues of W.I.N. This was due to delay in receiving our paper quota.

destroy the romantic picture of the people, as one man, rising to the defence of their fatherland . . . even from such an arch-chauvinist source as the proclamations of Rostopchin one learns that the peasants of the districts occupied by the enemy frequently settled their accounts not with the French but with their own masters, taking advantage of the fact that neither police nor troops for 'pacification' were available to these latter. That Moscow was burnt not by its inhabitants acting in a fit of patriotic zeal but by the police carrying out the orders of this same Rostopchin, that the French army fell a victim not to a popular rising but to the defects of its own organisation—that, in so much as it remained without disorganisation, (such was precisely the case with the Imperial Guard) right up to the end not only partisans, but even the regular Russian troops did not dare to approach it—all these facts are too elementary and too well known for it to be worth going into them here." (History of Russia).

Even the illiterate Russian serfs of the 18th Century who were unfortunate enough to be forced into the armies of that "Great National Hero" Peter the Great (who, in a Soviet film of the same name is made to say, "I have come through tears and blood but all for Holy Mother Russia"), even these serfs are described today as filled with "national enthusiasm" and "giving their strength, their talents, their very lives for the creation of great monuments of Russian culture." (L. Timofeev in his preface to the reprint of the 18th century "Journey from Petersburg to Moscow" by Radishchev, 1944).

STALINISM AND THE CRIMEAN WAR

Every reactionary war in which Russia has ever engaged provides the Stalinists with similar examples of "popular heroism."

Writes N. V. Andreevskaya of the Crimean War of 1854-5:

"This war was one of aggression and was carried on by Russia as an unjust war. The victory of Russia in this war would have led to a temporary strengthening of the system of serfdom within the country. . . . The revolutionary democrats of Russia wished for the defeat of Russia, in the hope that the military downfall of Tsarism would hasten the coming of the revolution. . . ."

For the Russian warriors defending Sebastopol it was a question of the defence of a town of the Fatherland against an enemy who had invaded the Fatherland. The defence of Sebastopol is one of the heroic moments of the military past of the Russian people. . . .

The figures of the defenders of Sebastopol move our hearts even to-day, evoking in us the feeling of deep respect, pride and love." ("From the Heroic Past of the Fatherland" Vol. 1, published by the People's Commissariat for Education, 1943).

Some six years before the Crimean War, the Communist Manifesto had proclaimed to the whole world: "The working men have no country. We cannot take from them what they have not got." There is considerable excuse for the conscripted Russian serfs who fought at Sebastopol being ignorant of this fundamental teaching of Marx and Engels; but what can one say of N. V. Andreevskaya who writes nearly a hundred years later and twenty-six years after the October Revolution! Not to speak of the People's Commissariat for Education which passes and publishes this reactionary nationalistic propaganda.

THE STALINIST CANONISATION OF SUVOROV

The soldiers of the Red Army have to-day held up to them as symbols and models, not the heroes of the Civil War, but Tsars and Tsarist Generals back through the centuries. Actually backward Russia produced very few generals who succeeded in defeating the armies of the more advanced West. But those for whom such distinction can be claimed, enjoy all the greater honour. One of such is Field-Marshal Suvorov, who, during the wars following the Great French Revolution, led his armies even as far as the Alps.

Even the Stalinists are forced to admit that:

"The army commanded by Suvorov stood on the side of the interests of the Russian Landlords' Empire of the 18th Century. And Suvorov himself was an active agent of the will of the Tsarist Autocracy."

But—"in all his activities he was guided by a burning love of his fatherland and the urge to increase the fighting strength of the Russian army, to lead his 'miracle warriors' from victory to victory." ("From

the Heroic Past of our Fatherland" Vol. I, 1943.)

There were, of course, other sides to Suvorov's activities, sides which are little stressed by the Stalinist hacks of to-day. For instance, in granting him the title of Field-Marshal in 1794, the Empress Catherine assured him, that 'you yourself have promoted yourself field-marshal for you have subdued Poland.' Also his reaction to the French Revolution was such that, he petitioned Catherine thus: "O Little Mother! Order me to go against the French!" Thwarted in this wish, he had to content himself with writing to the leader of the royalist counter-revolutionaries in the Vendée, addressing him as "Great Hero of the Vendée! Defender of thy fathers and of the throne of thy kings" and expressing the wish that "may the evil ones (the French revolutionaries) perish and their race disappear!"

To-day Suvorov is the greatest hero of the Red Army and the Order of Suvorov is the highest honour it can bestow.

Examples such as the above could be continued *ad infinitum* and *ad nauseam*.

THE CAMPAIGN OF RACIAL HATRED AGAINST THE GERMANS

Needless to say, the Stalinist attitude of extreme nationalism (which would have shamed a pre-revolutionary Kadet) is not combined with a fraternal approach to the German workers. All Germans, workers and capitalists, anti-fascists and fascists, are all lumped together to be hated racially, as Germans, in a manner which leaves even Lord Vansittart far behind. Let us listen to Alexei Tolstoy, the most honoured writer in the Soviet Union to-day.

"We, the Russians, were always modest from the consciousness of our own greatness and strength, from affliction at our faults. . . . In our spiritual carelessness we even pitied the poor Germans Prince Alexander Yaroslavich beat this race, Ivan the Terrible—beat them; when Peter the Great was in Berlin, King Frederick humbly begged him for some wretched little towns which had been conquered by Field-Marshal Menshikov; under Elizabeth we once again beat this race most severely; under Alexander I the Germans bowed down to him and asked for wretched little towns; Nicholas I out of bravado made a gift of

Hungary to the Austrian Hapsburgs. . . . How could not the Russian heart but pity the poor Germans. . . .

During two and a half centuries the Germans were persistently and planfully crawling into Russian life; Germans commanded Russian armies, managed the estates of the landlords; taught the Russian youth in the schools and universities; Germans settled as colonists on Russian lands; but Russia to their annoyance continued to remain Russia—they had not got enough brains and talent for them to be able to compete with the Russians in literature, in the arts, in politics; even in science . . . it was the Russians who dared and invented, the Germans filched from them and sold the products of Russian genius as their own; from the second half of the 19th Century German capital led a great attack on Russia; the German Tsaritsa during the War was in the centre of an espionage organisation. . . . And suddenly, when Russia, as a colony, was almost in the German pocket—the October Revolution decisively and for ever threw off the German parasites who had fixed their claws in her."

"There is no sense in arguing with them (the Germans)—in our epoch it is only possible to make a German understand by means of a bayonet."

Alexei Tolstoy will not even grant the Germans any racial affinity to the Russians. True, linguistic study long ago proved that Russian and German, like most of the languages of Europe, have a common source. But Alexei Tolstoy, since he ceased to be a White Guard and returned to the Soviet Union, has studied Marxism (!) and thus armed, easily disposes of the science of comparative philology:

"Many roots (of Sanscrit) are common for the languages of certain tribes of India, of Persia, for the Celts, the Germans and the Slavs. But this important circumstance merely proves that on the huge territory from India to the Atlantic Ocean there once lived tribes with similar forms of social development and **BY THAT VERY FACT** (! our emphasis) similar forms of language." (All three quotations from "Whence came the Russian Land", State Political Publishers, 1942.)

Let us take another sample of the present Stalinist attitude towards Germany and the Germans—and, incidentally, of the new

appraisal of the First Imperialist War now put forward by Stalinism: 'Wilhelm II in making his campaign of plunder against Russia had his 'Fifth Column' at the Tsar's Court, The residence of the German Tsaritsa was as full of spies as a sticky leaf is of dead flies. The Tsarist General Staff was under the continual observation of the German General Staff. The rotten regime of Tsarism by its whole existence objectively helped the German imperialists in their aggressive plans. But our multi-nationed people did not reconcile itself with it in the way the German-fascist milk-sops reconcile themselves with their arch-reactionary regime, for our people was a people of heroes and not a people of slaves. It overthrew the Tsarist throne and that social order which hindered it from straightening its powerful shoulders, and thus preserved its fatherland.' ("The Hero-People; the Warrior-People", State Political Publishers, 1944.)

Who is this speaking? None other than D. Manuilsky — the "leader" and the "theoretician" of the Third International in its period of Stalinist degeneration—the man who was the instrument for forcing upon the Communist Party of Germany the notorious theory of "Social-Fascism" which made it impossible for the Communists to win the masses from Social Democracy, and thus ensured the defeat of the German workers and the triumph of Hitler!

Less than two years before Hitler came to power Manuilsky was telling the German workers that "Fascism in Germany, in the Hitler form, is maybe on the downgrade, and, in fact, is already on the downgrade as a result of the activity of our Party" and "that in Germany the chief enemy to-day is the Brüning Government supported by Social Democracy, a Government for the carrying through of Fascist Dictatorship." ("The Communist Parties and the Crisis of Capitalism," March-April 1931). And on the eve of Hitler's victory, that "the united front of struggle cannot be replaced by the Comintern 'from above'. It can only be formed from below." ("Social Democracy — Stepping Stone to Fascism," December 1932.)

Now, as a direct result of his own disastrous policy, the German workers have endured eleven years of Nazi rule, Manuilsky has the audacity to brand them as "a people of slaves"!

STALIN REVIVES PANSLAVISM

The ideologists of the old Tsarist Empire did more than propagate the type of nationalism now so faithfully copied by Stalinism; they were also the advocates of a "wider" form of nationalism—Panslavism. In its attempt to get under its rule the various Slavic races, then mostly under Austrian or Turkish rule, Tsarism in the 19th Century spoke loudly in praise of the Slavs as a racial unit. In particular it advocated the unity of the Slavs against the Germans. Marx characterised Panslavism as follows:

"Bohemia and Croatia (another disjected member of the Slavonic family, acted upon by the Hungarian, as Bohemia by the German) were the homes of what is called on the European continent 'Panslavism'. Neither Bohemia, or Croatia was strong enough to exist as a nation by herself. Their respective nationalities, gradually undermined by the action of historical causes that inevitably absorb into a more energetic stock, could only hope to be restored to anything like independence by an alliance with other Slavonic nations. There were twenty-two millions of Poles, forty-five millions of Russians, eight millions of Serbians and Bulgarians; why not form a mighty confederation of the whole eighty millions of Slavonians and drive back or exterminate the intruder upon the holy Slavonic soil, the Turk, the Hungarian, and above all the hated, but indispensable Niemetz, the German? Thus in the studies of a few Slavonic dilettanti of historical science was this ludicrous, this anti-historical movement got up, a movement which intended nothing less than to subjugate the civilised West under the barbarian East, the town under the country, trade, manufactures, intelligence, under the primitive agriculture of Slavonic serfs. But behind this ludicrous theory stood the terrible reality of the Russian Empire." ("Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Germany".)

To-day Stalinism has "extended" its nationalism to embrace Panslavism.

"During over a thousand years, beginning with the 7th Century", writes Nikolai Derzhavin ("The Eternal Struggle of the Slavs against German Aggressors", published by the All-Slav Committee, Moscow 1943) "the freedom-loving

Slav peoples stood as an insurmountable obstacle in the path of the rapacious expansion of the German conquerors, who were pushing towards the East from the rivers Elbe, Oder and Vistula, and always offered the aggressors the most obstinate and stubborn resistance, as they still continue to do.

The greatest of the Slav peoples, which in the course of many centuries in the struggle for its just cause, for its freedom and independence, gave the most annihilating resistance to the plundering propensities of the German barbarians in the Middle Ages and the German Imperialists in modern times, was and remains the Russian people, the eldest brother, the defender and friend of all the Slav peoples."

Since the German invasion of the Soviet Union an "All-Slav Committee" has been set up in Moscow, needless to say, completely under Stalinist control. On the 23rd and 24th of February 1944 it called in Moscow a "Meeting of Warrior-Slavs". This latter issued a manifesto addressed to its "Brother Slavs" and which ends with the following slogans:

"Long Live the fighting unity of the Slav peoples!

Long live the manly, the brave Warrior-Slavs!

Long live the great Russian people, which has inspired all the Slav peoples in the self-sacrificing struggle for honour, freedom and the independence of their fatherland!

Long live the heroic Red Army, the liberator of the Slav peoples! Long live the genius-leader, the true friend and defender of the Slav peoples, Marshal Stalin!"

Thus the slogan "Workers of the world unite!" has to-day been replaced by the Stalinists by that of "Slavs of the world unite!"

RUSSIAN NATIONALISM AND THE NATIONAL MINORITIES OF THE U.S.S.R.

It will have been observed from the quotations that have been given that the U.S.S.R.—despite occasional references to "our multi-nationed people"—is regarded by the Stalinist propagandists as a creation of the "great Russian People." Now in the U.S.S.R. of 1941—after the inclusion of the western parts of Poland and the Baltic States—as in the old Russian Empire, the Russians proper are in a minority. True it is possible for

the Stalinists to perform the same jugglery as the statisticians of Tsarism and to include as Russians, the Ukrainians and White Russians. By this doubtful expedient it is possible to claim that the "great Russian people" have a numerical preponderance in the U.S.S.R. But even so there are many millions of other—entirely non-Russian races also present—Turkomen, Kazakhs, Tadjiks, Georgians, Mordvinians, Armenians, Esthonians; Latvians, etc. etc. What part have they in the "heroic past" of the "warrior-people"?

In his preface to the English edition of his "History of Russia" (Martin Lawrence, 1931) N. M. Pokrovsky wrote:

"We (i.e. the Bolsheviks) alone, finally have abandoned the idyllic picture of the unification of a mass of 'backward' peoples under the 'enlightened' guidance of the Russian Tsars—because it has become possible for these peoples to tell how the 'propagators of enlightenment' tortured, oppressed and exploited them."

To-day the non-Russian peoples of the U.S.S.R. are expected to regard as "national heroes" those very Russian Tsars and their generals who "tortured, oppressed and exploited them."

Nor is this all. Up to the middle of the 1930s, the rights gained by the national minorities as a result of the October Revolution had not been seriously infringed upon. One of the achievements of the Revolution consisted in the fact that in the case of the Asiatic nationalities the traditional practice of writing their languages in Arabic characters had been abandoned in favour of new alphabets based upon Roman characters, which were much more easily learned. But with the new Stalinist turn towards Russian nationalism these new Roman characters were ousted in one Asiatic language after another, to be replaced by Russian characters, which are quite unsuited to any non-slavonic language. This change was officially explained as making it easier for the non-Russian peoples to learn "the great Russian language"—the fact that at the same time it was made more difficult for them to learn to read and write their own languages was not considered worth mentioning.

During this same period numerous arrests of prominent local leaders took place in the non-Russian republics and autonomous areas on charges of "local nationalism".

But the most striking example of the new attitude towards the non-Russian national minorities is furnished by the treatment of the Volga Germans. The ancestors of these Germans came to Russia in the year 1762. Together with the other nationalities of the Soviet Union, the Volga Germans passed through the October Revolution, the Civil War in which they furnished not a few brave fighters for the Red Army and the whole subsequent period, during which their loyalty remained unquestioned. Nevertheless, in August 1941 the whole of the population of the German Volga Republic—some 1,400,000 Soviet people—were forcibly removed from the land which they had occupied for nearly two centuries and deported to Siberia. The Stalinists had ceased to regard the Volga Germans as workers and peasants; now they were considered as "Germans"—and as such potential agents of the then advancing armies of Hitler!

THE INEVITABILITY OF THE NATIONALIST DEGENERATION OF STALINISM

The development of the worst manifestations of Stalinist nationalism dates from the middle 1930s—from the time when it had become obvious, even to the Bureaucracy, that the German bourgeoisie had called Hitler to power not merely to crush the German working class movement but also to attempt to solve the problems of German capitalism by external expansion—and expansion primarily at the expense of the Soviet Union.

The Stalinist Bureaucracy saw itself faced with the task of ideologically mobilising the Soviet population for the coming war. But it could not do this upon the old, Bolshevik lines. In the Civil War from 1918 till 1920 the Bolshevik Party under the leadership of Lenin and Trotsky had rallied the workers and peasants behind it under slogans concretising the defence of the conquests of the October Revolution, and the preparation of the World Revolution. At the same time it had broken the morale of the armies of intervention by appealing to the workers in those armies upon the basis of international class solidarity. Thus they appealed to the British soldiers sent to Northern Russia: "You are working men too. What interests have you in fighting for the gang of Russian counter-revolutionaries and international capitalists? As workmen your

business should be to support your fellow workers in those places where they succeed in taking power, for the victory of the workers in one country is a step toward the emancipation of the workers in all countries."

Such could not be the approach of Stalin. The Bureaucracy cannot call upon the masses of the U.S.S.R. to defend the conquests of the October Revolution lest it should arouse memories of the pre-Stalinist period when these conquests were still fully enjoyed by the masses. Nor can it risk arousing the internationalist sentiments of the Soviet workers since the Bureaucracy rightly sees in these a threat to its own domination. Therefore the official Stalinist propaganda has almost completely avoided all reference to the heroic memories of the Civil War though these must be still fresh in the minds of the masses. It has preferred to concentrate rather upon such events as the defeat of the Teutonic Knights of the Sword by Prince Alexander Nevsky in the year 1242!

Likewise it has been impossible for the Stalinists to call upon the German workers to overthrow Hitler and establish a workers'

state. For it fears, and once again rightly, that the setting up of a workers' state in Germany or anywhere else would lead to the destruction of its own rule in the Soviet Union which is based precisely upon the isolation of the first workers' state. For years now Stalin has therefore consistently sabotaged the workers' movement throughout the world.

Living parasitically upon the Soviet masses, the Stalinist Bureaucracy has naturally come to regard itself as the heir to the old ruling classes of Russia and their traditions. The heroes of these former ruling classes have become the heroes of the Bureaucracy. In their leaders — in Alexander Nevsky, Dmitry Donskoy, Peter the Great etc. etc. — the present rulers of the Soviet Union see but earlier and less perfect prototypes of the present Leader—Stalin. Though itself not a class but merely a parasitic caste, the Stalinist Bureaucracy attempts to ape the methods of the old Tsarist Empire, and in so doing hopes to consolidate its own rule. Faced with the threat of war it could only appeal to the masses in the same way as its Tsarist predecessors did—upon the lines of Russian nationalism.

This ideology of the Stalinist Bureaucracy does not, of course, fall from the skies. It flows inevitably from its position as a parasitic caste in an isolated workers' state in a backward country. While the basis of the workers' state—the social ownership of the means of production—still survives in the Soviet Union, political rule has passed into the hands of the Bureaucracy, which absorbs an increasing proportion of the wealth produced by the socialised economy. It has thus certain features in common with the old ruling class of Tsarist Russia which it attempts to ape.

But this contradiction between the political rule of a parasitic bureaucracy and socialised industry cannot be of indefinite duration in the post-war world. Either the Stalinist Bureaucracy will succumb to the pressure of World Imperialism — headed by U.S.A. — and socialised industry will be destroyed in the U.S.S.R.; or the Soviet workers with the assistance of the workers of the rest of Europe and the U.S.A. will overthrow the Stalinist Bureaucracy and re-establish Soviet democracy once more.

Ulster in Transition

By Bob Armstrong

PART I:

THE NATIONAL QUESTION

The Protestant ascendancy caste, which forms the majority of the population in the six North-Eastern counties partitioned from the rest of Ireland and ruled by Britain, originated in the successive plantations of disbanded Scottish and English mercenaries from Elizabethan times onwards. These "settlers" occupied the best land and, when modern capitalism arose, most of the decisive industries were owned by Protestant capitalists who ruthlessly practised sectarian discrimination against Catholics; keeping them out of the skilled occupations whenever practicable and, when business was bad, boycotting them from employment altogether.

Bigotry, marriage, economic ties and the need for protection bound the Orange capitalists, along with the bureaucrats of Church and State, to the

British. In the years preceding the first World War when the British Liberal Government, dependent on the votes of the Irish Party at Westminster for survival, made clear its intention of granting a moderate measure of Home Rule to Ireland the Ulster Orangemen, led by Sir Edward Carson, made preparations for an armed rebellion to resist the exclusion of Ulster from the United Kingdom. The conspiracy was backed jointly by German Imperialism, preparing for war with England, and by the British Tory Party and the General Staff which engineered a mutiny of officers on Carson's behalf at the Curragh, near Dublin.

Lenin described the Carsonites and the aristocratic Curragh mutineers as men who acted like revolutionaries of the Right. Carsonism has often been spoken of as the first European fascist movement; and certainly the methods and practices of the Carsonite chiefs sound startlingly familiar to-day and

reveal how unoriginal was the later fascist technique. The unbridled demagoguery which flowed from their lips thanks to a complete absence of the "gentlemanly" inhibitions which cramped the style of their bourgeois liberal opponents (Churchill and Lloyd George excluded); their hero cult, spectacular bluff, penchant for flashy ceremonies; their drilled bands of drunken pogromists; their contempt for parliamentary law and order and their alliance with the High Command show them to have been the authentic forerunners of the future fascist leaders. Nevertheless, socially the two movements were quite distinct, for the fascist hordes were trained to smash the organisations of the working class whereas the Ulster Volunteers consisted to no small extent of Protestant workers belonging to the Trade Unions.

Despite the menace of Germany's exports British capitalism was still firmly entrenched within the Empire and strong in the world market; and

the Orange working-class, steeped in class-collaboration, was loyal to the core. The Orange Order aimed not at a naked class dictatorship but at a Protestant caste domination which, backed by British bayonets, would hold at bay the spectre of Irish Nationalism and the loss of profits and bureaucratic perquisites that would be the consequence of its triumph.

The British Tories, for their part, were motivated to incite the Carsonites and seduce the Army officers by their panic before the wave of militant syndicalism which swept across Britain in the first years of George V's reign; and they were prepared even to establish an open military dictatorship in order to shatter it. However, the first World War intervened before the class struggle in England reached culmination point; and, in the years which followed, the super-annuated Liberal Party shrunk into the sidelines while the function of serving bourgeois democracy like a piece of blotting-paper, absorbing and drying up working-class militancy, was much more efficiently performed by the Labour leaders. Feeling safer for the time being, the Tories resumed the mask of parliamentary legality.

VESTED INTERESTS AND THE BORDER

The foregoing is important not merely as an historical background, showing the initial reasons for Britain's partition of Ireland. Rather it leads us straight to the heart of the contemporary Irish question, explaining why British Imperialism's financially unprofitable partnership with Orange reaction has held fast despite years of diplomatic jockeying by Eire statesmen and British liberals. The German guns landed at Larne in 1913 are not forgotten. Britain keeps a friendly clasp on "Ireland's Right Arm" lest it help to grip her by the throat.

Britain, far from deriving super-profits out of her occupation of N.E. Ireland, suffers a considerable financial loss; for, while it is true that there are British business-men with interests in Ulster, it is also certain that these interests would be completely compensated, and a residue retained, if the British Exchequer were to withdraw its subsidies towards the upkeep of the swollen Orange Bureaucracy and the maintenance of social services in Ulster at the British level. Even in wartime, Ulster is a depressed area. Despite the 40,000 skilled workers driven to find work in British war industries there are still 25,000 officially unemployed out of a total population of a million and a quarter. Peacetime unemployment is considerably higher than in any other part of the United Kingdom. Several million pounds sterling is

mulcted annually from the English taxpayer for the upkeep of the Orange puppet statelet.

The fact is, however, that British overhead expenses in Ulster fall into precisely the same category as do grants to the armed forces, or the police—even when these expenses take the form not of direct outlays on behalf of the colossal Ulster police force, and other sections of the State, but of maintenance of social services and the provision of orders to Ulster industry during the "normal" depression periods. Britain maintains its garrison in Ulster, not primarily as a means of coercing the Irish people, but to counteract the possibility of a rival imperialism establishing a military bridgehead in the British Isles. The occupation engenders sentiments of revolt, however, and necessitates the preservation of order, i.e. the coercion of the nationalist population. As the example of bourgeois Zionism in Palestine also shows, it is more convenient to rule with the help of Gauleiters with a certain mass basis than through outright military force alone. It is probably cheaper, and certainly safer politically; especially when it is borne in mind that if Britain dispensed with its subsidies to the Carsonite crew it would have a simultaneous (though far from united) Orange and Nationalist revolt on its hands.

The Orange bosses and bureaucrats, for their part, need to have their fingers directly dipped in England's economic pie. That is why they are given representation in the Westminster Parliament. At a time when great monopolies largely derive their super-profits by a barely-concealed plundering of the Exchequer, and when worth-while orders come only to those directly in the swim, it is a life and death question for Ulster capitalists to maintain a direct connection with the British State. This is why all De Valera's promises of virtual autonomy for the North within a United Ireland, if only Stormont would agree to sever its direct connection with Britain, have gone unheeded. Without State representation at Westminster their industries would die; for out of sight is out of mind. If Britain sacrificed them in a deal with De Valera they would look for a new imperialist paymaster. Orange "loyalty" has its world market price.

EIRE AND THE BORDER

As her neutrality in the war underscores, Eire is de facto a sovereign Irish Republic, notwithstanding the slim pretence of British Dominion status kept up by Westminster. British Liberalism bought out the absentee landlord class (with the Irish peasants' own money to be sure!) to stave off a

revolutionary seizure of the land. The Easter Week rising and the Anglo-Irish war brought an end to the foreign occupation of the South. Under the De Valera regime fiscal autonomy has enabled a host of petty manufacturing industries to struggle into being. Saddled with exorbitant interest rates on capital borrowed from British investors, and dependent on British monopolies for all primary materials, costs have been excessively high; and the dwindling, impoverished population cannot provide a market sufficient to absorb at a profitable level the output of labour-saving machinery in use elsewhere. Already the pathetic "industrialisation" period, begun only a few years ago, is at a close.

A chronic unfavourable balance of trade, rapidly dwindling foreign assets, a falling birthrate, mass unemployment and wholesale immigration to England revealed that the incurable maladies of world capitalist economy were eating at the vitals of the new sovereign statelet of Eire. The world war has only accentuated this disintegration. To-day there are a hundred thousand unemployed within the 26 Counties of Eire; while scores of thousands of others have been forced by unemployment into British war industries or the British armed forces. The export of men, sending home part of the proceeds of their earnings, has come to rival the agricultural export industry in importance.

Irish bourgeois nationalism had already exhausted its mission as a vehicle for the development of the productive forces before any real development took place. International socialism alone can ensure a fresh upswing in production for Ireland; and it is precisely for this reason that the one uncompleted task of the bourgeois revolution, national unification, can only be solved by the proletarian revolution. The inclusion of the six Ulster counties within the framework of the national state would only hasten the decline of the already stagnant heavy industries of the North without furthering the development of Southern industry to any appreciable degree. National unification under the capitalist system, by plunging the hostile protestant proletariat of the Northern industries into permanent unemployment, would either lead straight to the victory of the social revolution or to fascism. There could be no middle way. It is easy, therefore, to understand why the Eire bourgeoisie, who will have to face a revolutionary situation at home when the workers employed in the British war effort are thrown in the scrapheap, must dread the social consequences of the ending of partition.

Against that dread, however, must be set the fear of a new imperialist oppression. Britain needs Northern Ire-

land, and would like to occupy the whole of Ireland, because of its naval bases and general military importance to her. The Eire bourgeoisie, for its part, is acutely aware of the danger threatening it from the British bastion in the North, and the campaign of the British Press for the Eire Ports must have thrown them into a cold sweat. For in the epoch of the industrial revolution England used her political control to stifle Irish industries at birth and in the period of the declining world market, it is quite natural to assume that Britain would make use of a military reoccupation in the interests of her own manufacturers. She would break down the agricultural export price level and crush the small-scale urban industries, the fruits of tariff autonomy, out of existence. Or so the Irish bourgeoisie fears. Primarily, then, it is not as a means of acquiring new vested interests, but of better protecting the existing ones against imperialist encroachment, that the Eire bourgeoisie crusades against the Northern occupation.

However, the anti-partition campaign cannot be viewed in the simple light of a struggle for improved military positions for the Eire Army. Certainly that has some importance. But not even a genuine believer in the superior qualities of the "Celtic warrior breed" could doubt the outcome of a full-scale Anglo-Irish war, even if the British were deprived at the outset of the advantage of their base in the North.

Like the ruling classes everywhere, the Irish bourgeoisie's patriotism is inseparable from its property interests. Partition is a crime crying to heaven for redress because their Imperialist enemy is at the gate. Partition is a virtue because it keeps the working class—the supreme enemy—divided. That is why class-conscious workers have always reacted to bourgeois anti-partition oratory with a healthy scepticism. Nevertheless the anti-partition campaign is something more than platform tub-thumping, although something less than a constructive aim. As a matter of fact it is the common property of almost all political parties in Eire. It is the national ideology—the class-collaboration cement of a recently oppressed people.

At times in the recent past the nationalist fervour of the common people of Ireland must have seemed dim, or dead, not only to the casual observer but to the workers themselves. But it only lay dormant, ready to blaze into life again. For the famous patriotism of the Irish people is something more than a traditional hang-over, or a state of mind induced by bourgeois propaganda. It is an emo-

tion of revolt, engendered by centuries of national degradation, kept alive by the knowledge that yesterday's powerful imperialist oppressor still occupies a part of the national territory and may yet again lay a claim to the South of Ireland.

When Tom Williams was hanged by the Stormont regime in 1942, flags were flown at half mast throughout Eire, the shops of the main Dublin thoroughfares closed as a mark of respect and protest rallies, organised by the Reprieve Committee, were held throughout the country. The threat to conscript Ulster in 1941 created a crisis in Eire overnight and a wave of anti-British sentiment swept over the Southern workers. The workers' patriotism is their pride in their age-old fight against imperialism. This is an ennobling sentiment, notwithstanding the poisonous bourgeois chauvinism mixed into it by the capitalist politicians and their reformist and Stalinist hangers-on who at all times seek to manipulate the freedom-loving aspirations of the workers for their own reactionary ends.

The rich ranchers and the rentiers are pro-British. The small farmers and the basic section of the bourgeoisie which is interested in production and trade for the domestic market look to England with strong forebodings. Britain is still a bourgeois democracy and it is not so easy just yet to get down to seizing the Eire ports; for besides the huge numbers of Irish in British industry and the Army, the English workers in uniform would not go willingly into an aggression against the "almost English" people of Eire.

But in a short space of years either the social revolution will have triumphed in Britain or a fascist dictatorship will have come to power. The English socialist revolution would almost certainly be the world's end for the Eire bourgeoisie. But a fascist England would have only less catastrophic consequences. For fascism would ensure a new lease of life, on a lower level, for British capitalism and in the struggle for dwindling markets, the red clouds of a new Imperialist war would gather over the Atlantic, and the need of fortifying Ireland would imperatively present itself to the English bourgeoisie.

To sidetrack the class struggle by focussing attention on the external danger and thus, at the same time, to keep the masses in a state of patriotic readiness to resist aggression: to preserve green the memory of England's crimes against Ireland in the minds of foreign publicists, especially Yankee, so that Britain's imperialist rival may never be embarrassed by the lack of a sufficiently altruistic, democratic motive to justify its intervention

should the need for stretching its "protective" wings across the Irish Sea present itself. Therein lies the threefold significance of the Eire bourgeois crusade against Partition.

CATHOLIC CHURCH'S MASS BASIS

If Ireland has hitherto proved to be the most impregnable of all the Vatican's citadels, this is not due to accident. During centuries of national degradation the social classes were mixed into a common Catholic cement by the British, who persecuted the native Irish ostensibly on account of their Catholicism. Moreover, their Catholic faith helped generations of pariahs to keep their heads erect by imbuing them with a sense of being superior in the sight of Heaven to the semi-athiest English. Sentiment against the foreign imperialists was always uppermost and the masses encased themselves in the rituals and doctrines of the mother Church as in a suit of armour, in lieu of more material means of defence. Catholic fanaticism the more easily became synonymous with the spirit of outraged nationality because, unlike in other countries, the Irish priesthood never directly functioned as an exploiter.

For 700 years Ireland was a colony. Against this, for barely two decades an uncertain independence has lasted for the South; and, during this time, the fledgling Eire statelet has been sedulously inculcating a psychology of national exclusiveness among the masses by fostering all those ideological distinctions and cultural pursuits which set the Irish apart from the neighbouring English nationality. It is well to remember in this connection that in its long-drawn-out trade war with Britain the Fianna Fail Government received the backing not only of the bourgeois and peasant interests involved, but also of the majority of the workers. So long as imperialism remains intact in the North and a serious threat to the South, and until the workers find a revolutionary socialist leadership, we will have to reckon with the power and prestige of the priesthood.

In Northern Ireland the pogrom atmosphere of the "troubled times" combined with the policy of sectarian education to bring about the segregation of the workers into Protestant and Catholic districts. It is only necessary to take a cursory glance at the windows to tell the politics of the street. In the proletarian republican quarters there is a mass display of Catholic icons; while in the adjoining Orange areas portraits of their Imperial Majesties are ostentatiously in view. The queen of England here, the

Queen of Heaven there! Christ and his mother hung up at the windows and outside the doors of the workers' houses in the Falls Road area are Irish flags, flaunting their irreconcilable hatred for imperialism.

On the surface the Catholic Church looks unassailable. Yet its coming eclipse can be discerned precisely where the appearance of strength seems greatest. A picture of Christ on the cross pinned to a Falls Road window is a demonstration against the Imperialist status quo, but the Church cannot lead the Change. The republican workers will throw away their icons as soon as the ideas of socialist internationalism begin to take shape among them.

To expose the treacherous role of the allegedly neutral Christian ideology is an essential part of the struggle to develop a revolutionary consciousness among the workers. However, it is by demonstrating the political line-up of the Churches with capitalism, rather than by attacking the Christian ideas in a vacuum, that this task can best be performed. Owing to the lack of an Irish Marxist literature scattered advanced workers, standing out in lonely isolation to an environment of religious backwardness, have frequently been closer to the ideas of the Secular Society than to dialectical materialism. Confounding base with superstructure they have magnified Catholicism into a system revolving on its own axis, independent of capitalism and demanding an equal opposition. Here simple atheism is seen to be no more than an inverted form of the religious attitude, for it can only explain the hold of the Church by attributing a power superior to all reasoning to the Word. Catholic theology is such a potent poison that those who swallow it rarely recover. It is forgotten, however, that once the whole of Christendom was Catholic.

Certainly all our party comrades, as well as the advanced workers generally, must be instructed in the materialist philosophy of which atheism is an integral part. Yet it cannot be doubted that even a good proportion of class-conscious workers will continue to perform nightly genuflections to the God of the priests, if no longer to the priests themselves, for some period even after the proletarian dictatorship has been achieved. Only when the last traces of the old soil are finally ploughed under will the materialist philosophy grow to full bloom and the old religious nonsense be vanquished for ever.

In the meantime the main enemy to be overcome is the capitalist state. It is natural for an isolated worker, influenced by the formidable experience of an encounter with Catholic fanaticism in the flesh, to feel that nothing

can be done until we first "storm Heaven", but any political party which tried to make a programme of this idea would be only a part of the petit-bourgeois reformist wing. The League of Militant Atheism, which functioned for a brief spell under Stalinist auspices, only played into the hands of the Catholic Action rabble-rousers while at the same time diverting the vanguard from the essential task of mining capitalism at the base. A League of Militant Atheism could no doubt perform an important pedagogical service in a society based on socialised property, because then superstructural survivals would have become the main object of attack, but it is a piece of arrant nonsense to make a frontal attack on religious doctrine under the present social circumstances in Ireland.

The cowardly Eire Labour Party, on the other hand, has consistently pursued a shameful policy of appeasement towards the Catholic Church, even going so far as to claim that its programme is in conformity with the Pope's Charter of Labour.

Certainly political Catholicism must be fought. The Church will be a colossal weight on the side of counter-revolution. It is one of the main propaganda tasks of our movement to explain this to the workers. Every insolent interference with the affairs of the labour movement must be combated. In particular the role of the Vatican in the present European situation must be mercilessly exposed. It would be treason to socialism to keep silent on grounds of expediency.

In every important strike the bourgeois press is forced to drop its spurious neutrality. So likewise, in the hundred-and-one minor sorties leading up to the decisive revolutionary struggle, hunger marches, strikes, during every spate of which the bourgeoisie and its henchmen will take panic and cry "wolf", the role of the clergy will become more and more obvious. Thundering denunciations of plots to burn the chapels, of the impending nationalisation of women, etc., will pour from the pulpits. Naturally we are not naive enough to believe that this will have no effect on the side of the counter-revolution. It will dispel illusions concerning the neutral role of the Church among large sections of workers, but others will be impressed. The Church will find it easy to incite bands of street-corner Vendéans to break up meetings and wreck the property of the working-class movement. It is even probable that in Eire the Church will take the initiative in setting up its own fascist party.

But there is no unbridgeable gulf between the peasant smallholders, the backward City masses and the class-conscious workers. As a matter of fact the unorganised layers of the oppress-

ed, the down-trodden slum-dwellers of town and country, have a burning sense of the injustice of things and the instinct to rebel. They are not dumb and cowed like sheep. If they were, fascism with its gospel of violence and its pseudo-radicalism could not appeal to them. It is reformism, holding out no hope of escape from the drab routine of poverty, that turns the backward masses over to conservatism and clericalism and in a crisis makes them storm-troopers of the reaction. Notwithstanding its tirades against the Stalinist bureaucracy, to which it attributes the original sin of the Bolshevik Revolution, it is precisely thanks to the opportunist politics of Stalin that the Papacy is still a world power despite its notorious role in Spain and elsewhere.

However, the era of Stalinism and reformism is drawing to a close. The great class struggles impending throughout the world will find an echo in the remotest corners of rural Ireland. Certainly reactionary clericalism will still retain a formidable following, but the majority will be won for the revolution.

THE ORANGE BASIS AMONGST THE WORKERS

Lord Craigavon, the late Premier of Northern Ireland, once described his Government as "a Protestant Government for a Protestant people". This remark was not let slip by accident. The inculcation of sectarian bias is a major task of government. Cabinet Ministers have to conscientiously set the tone. The present Prime Minister, Sir Basil Brooke, once declared that he would not have a Catholic about his place.

The Orange demonstration of 12th July, which commemorates the routing of the native Irish at the Boyne, has none of the light-hearted tolerance of mere historical pageantry. Rather it is a roll-call of the fanatical dupes of Orangeism, officially backed by the Stormont State to keep alive sectarian hate. On the 12th only a spark is needed to kindle the pogroms.

As in the days of the Boyne, conflicting social interests continue to masquerade in the guise of religious bigotry. Protestant clergymen must thank their God for the caste set-up established by the British which gives them not only an influential voice in State affairs but even big congregations. More than a third of the six-County population is Catholic. In relation to the whole of Ireland from the Protestant standpoint Irish republicanism is a near and real danger. While the alternatives confronting the Protestant workers seem limited to a choice between fraternising with the nationalist workers in the soup-kitchens of a capitalist Irish republic, or upholding

the continuance of the British connection, preference for remaining within the Imperial state frontiers is a simple matter of commonsense bread-and-butter politics. In the past it has meant employment for the majority and maintenance for the out-of-work at the cross-Channel rates of unemployment benefit. Stripped of religious trappings the Protestant workers' Orangeism is at basis no different from ordinary social-patriotism. It is only cruder and more bellicose because the "foreign" danger is acute and more constant.

The Northern Ireland Labour Party is a political wing of the Protestant ascendancy caste. In a crisis involving the regime itself its leadership would unhesitatingly range itself on the side of the big battalions of the British. However, in the past all the major gains of British reformism have been almost automatically applied to Northern Ireland, paid for out of the subsidies of the Imperial Exchequer without the intervention of the Northern Ireland Labour Party. Thanks to this the Protestant proletariat dispensed with the need for independent Labour politics. Prior to the Willowfield bye-election, in 1942, the handful of parliamentary victories won by Labour in 20 years of electioneering were made possible only by the votes of nationalist workers eager to keep out the Unionist candidate. This compelled the Labour Party to veil its Orangeism, to whittle it down even under the leadership of the die-hard Midgley until the time of his open apostasy drew nigh. An ambiguous stand on the Irish question was fatal to Labour's reputation amongst the Protestant workers who had been badly frightened by the nationalist victory in the South and whose state of nervousness continued when, with the rise of the new I.R.A., the aftermath of the 1916-22 "troubles" grew into the incipient stages of a second Civil War. Fear of republicanism was the basis of the rock-like Unionist majority. The petty improvement advocated by the Northern Ireland Labour Party weighed less than this ledown compared to the danger of losing everything in a bourgeois Irish Republic. The Tories were resolute Orangemen, eager for repressions. The milk-and-water Orangeism of the Labour Party looked like watered-down Fenianism to the panicky protestants. When there exists no basic difference in the politics of rival political parties the masses will cleave to the more determined, especially in face of an external menace. Armed with a Press monopoly and a clear-cut programme of action the Tories easily stampeded the Protestant workers into believing that every victory for the wavering Labourites brought nearer the dangers of the economic anarchy of Republicanism.

However, in addition to solidifying with the Tories in defence of a joint vested interest in the Border the organised workers have also class interests to defend against these self-same Tories. Even simple Trade Union politics involves struggles with the bourgeoisie. The mass of organised workers, although prone to betray sectarian bias at a time of genuine danger to the "common" interests, are not so readily duped as to fall for the "republican menace" invoked by the bourgeois Press during every strike.

The situation of the unorganised masses is different. Unprotected by a craft monopoly the competition for jobs is fiercer. Furthermore, amongst the poorest workers physical poverty is supplemented by a corresponding low level of culture. It is in the mixed districts of the slums, therefore, that sectarian strife runs highest; and, as we found in the case of Catholicism, so likewise with Orange sectarianism it is the impotence of reformism which throws the unorganised masses into the arms of the Reaction. If the present social system is not considered subject to any radical transformation there is nothing left to do but to cling jealously to every pittance of privilege the system yields.

SECTARIANISM A MAJOR WEAPON AGAINST THE LEFT

War conditions have immensely heightened working class political consciousness and a hitherto unknown spirit of solidarity exists, made possible by relatively full employment. The mounting wave of strikes, engendering a revulsion from Tory-Unionism among the Protestant masses for the first time, has resulted in a corresponding abatement of sectarian feeling. A small but growing band of the most advanced workers are already influenced directly by the Fourth International propaganda of the "Socialist Appeal". The Stalinist membership has expanded hugely, entirely owing to the fight of the Red Army, and the Labour Party has the support of masses for the first time in its history. But the great majority of left-swinging workers still stand on the outskirts—naïve advocates of "unity", puzzled by and impatient of the antagonisms rending the labour movement because they have not yet accumulated sufficient experience to make programmatic appraisals. However, notwithstanding this inevitable confusion over banners it is clear that a new stage of working-class development has been attained, qualitatively different from the pre-war Trade Union mentality because it is tending towards a conscious rejection of the capitalist system. It is revolutionary feeling lacking a programme to crystallise around.

The workers are proud of their new proletarian solidarity. Neverthe-

less, even now partial retrogressions to the old sectarian psychology are by no means excluded. It is easier to break with political Unionism than with Unionist ideology. The umbilical cord tying the workers to the old sectional interests can only be cut clean through by a process of revolutionary surgery. However, the Trotskyist movement is too weak organisationally to undergo any lightning development in the immediate future. Meanwhile the Labour leaders are forced to make radical grimaces to suit the rising militancy of the workers—indeed, more than that; they objectively aid the revolution by their campaign for a majority Labour Government which, by exposing their own programmatic bankruptcy, will pave the way for the victory of the Fourth International. Nevertheless, these are not leaders but bureaucratic empiricists stuffed in the old prejudices which they are thus organically incapable of assisting the workers to overcome.

That the old caste spirit still persists is shown by the stingy, resentful, suspicious attitude of a number of the workers towards the Eire war workers. To our knowledge, apart from the Trotskyists not a single unit of the labour movement—not even a solitary Trade Union branch—protested against the iniquitous legislation passed by Stormont against the Eire workers who must now renew their permission to reside in Northern Ireland every six months. This Act, which on paper also embraces British residents in Ulster, will, it is elementary to deduce, be applied exclusively against Eire workers. By mutely condoning this piece of sectarian legislation the Labour leaders prove that they are completely lacking in an alternative to the Unionist policy of discrimination.

Only a programme for a united Workers' Ireland as an integral part of the Socialist United States of Europe, by opening up an entirely new vista of material well-being and international co-operation, can eradicate this grudging, miserly fear of being swamped out by the Southern workers in the post-war struggle for jobs. However, the reformist leaders are incapable of even programmatically transcending the capitalist system and the national state.

Meanwhile the Stormont rulers, who see in this upsurge of Labour militancy the greatest menace they have yet faced, will fight desperately and cunningly to insert a sectarian wedge into the serried ranks of the workers. The possibility that they will meet with a certain measure of success cannot be gainsaid, especially if the decisive struggle for power is extended for long into the post-war period for, with the coming slump in employment and the maturing of the Anglo-U.S.A. antagonism, there will be plenty of inflam-

mable material lying ready to be set ablaze by the bigots and sectarian-spongers. Already the counter-offensive is under way. The recent governmental crisis led to the formation of a completely reconstructed Cabinet composed of the most notorious Orange die-hards. One of the first steps taken to revive the spirit of sectarianism was the decision of the Minister of Public Security, the renegade Labour leader, Midgley, to rescind the ban on the 12th of July procession, which was prohibited at the outbreak of the war.

The Stormont Tories will fight to the death to retain their posts and perquisites. The Labour leaders, competitors for office, are a nuisance to them. The Labour Party is a safety valve diverting the leftward surging masses into the safety zone of reformism, and to that extent it is a blessing. But it is also a menace, for it can be utilised as a recruiting ground and as a cover by the revolutionary cadres. The Stormont C.I.D. has already instituted enquiries into this possibility, for naturally they prefer to strike down the Trotskyists in the open while they are yet small. If the Tory junta is forced to limit itself to verbal attacks on the Labour leadership for the moment this is not on account of its strength but rather through fear of exposing its intrinsic weakness, thereby driving the masses behind the revolutionary banner. Sooner or later events will compel the Stormont junta to strike out on the path of Franco and Hitler, but the time is not yet opportune. Right now its main pre-occupation is to keep the Trotskyists small and isolated, stabbing at them surreptitiously through job victimisation, and to weaken the Labour movement as a whole by a flanking movement rather than by a frontal attack. Stormont fears the tide of revolutionary labour and likewise stands in mortal dread of a resurgence of militant nationalism. Both the one and the other are inevitable, however. To use the republican danger to smash the menace of the left: To strike at the nationalist population: To fan every trifling incident into a crisis, to hound and stam pede the Catholic community until the direct-actionists are goaded into terrorist reprisals which Stormont can use to sow distrust and discord among the workers: To divide the ranks of organised labour and to galvanise the backward Orange workers into pogromist activities. That is Stormont's plan of campaign to defeat the challenge of the working-class.

THE NATIONALIST WORKERS

The revolt of the Six-County nationalist workers is not occasioned directly

by economic causes. They are neither the drudges nor starvelings of British Imperialism, though certainly the badge of Catholicism exposes them to an undue share of peace-time joblessness owing to the operation of the Special Powers Act and the policy of boycott practised by many employers. Still, the larger part of Catholic unemployment is attributable to the "normal" impersonal decay of the capitalist system and equally affects the Protestant and British workers. For the rest, the same working conditions and unemployment benefit scales exist for both sections of the workers.

At present the living standards of even the Southern workers depend in the last resort upon the British Empire. It is the Colonial Empire which bolsters up profits, salaries and wages in England, thus permitting the absorption at a relatively high price level of Eire's agricultural export, on which the remainder of the economic structure rests. Freedom of access to the British market and state independence, especially in regard to fiscal policy, are the twin needs of the Eire bourgeoisie and, so long as they cannot surmount capitalism, also of the workers. The Northern nationalist workers, on the other hand, are as economically dependent upon direct incorporation into the United Kingdom as are the Protestant workers. In the days of self-sufficient peasant tillage the Catholic masses had an economic stake in fighting for an Ireland freed from the British grip on the land. To-day, however, when all trades and occupations draw their life blood from the heavy industries which only survive by virtue of Ulster's political unity with Britain, a bourgeois United Ireland could only bring pauperisation to its most ardent partisans—the Northern nationalist workers.

Falls Road nationalism is not a constructive programme for an alternative form of government. The I.R.A. seldom, if ever, think in terms of production, exchange and distribution or forms of government. It is their profound hatred for the existing regime which spurs the Republican youth into belligerent action. The whiplash of the Special Powers Acts, the victimisation and indignities meted out by the Stormont State, lie at the bottom of the Republican revolt. Under these special powers all but the meekest, most ineffectual nationalist organisations have been driven underground or browbeaten out of existence. Warned by experience of the futility of attempting to build an open organisation to voice their challenge, the Republican youth

turn from politics to the philosophy of direct action.

The Tory regime at Stormont is the oldest in Europe—preceding Mussolini's assumption of power it has outlasted the Roman Duce. The main props of its rule are: (a) its mass following amongst the Protestants based on Britain's financial bribes and the spectre of Republicanism; (b) constituency gerrymandering; (c) the Civil Authority (Special Powers) Acts which give almost unlimited power to the colossal army of police.

Ireland was partitioned by the British in such a way as to assure the Tory Unionist Party of a fool-proof majority over its nationalist opponents. Stormont in its turn gerrymandered the Six County electoral seats so effectively that the nationalist voters can only obtain a mere fraction of the representation to which their numbers entitle them. In consequence abstention from the vote has become a tradition in many Republican areas, so much so that a Unionist can get into Stormont by mustering the merest handful of Protestant votes.

Only a few of the far-reaching powers vested in the Civil Authority can be listed here:—

(a) By police proclamation publications may be banned, meetings and demonstrations forbidden and a state of curfew imposed.

(b) The police hold the right to enter and search premises without a warrant and to confiscate or destroy property.

(c) Arrest and internment may be ordered on suspicion.

(d) Habeas corpus is suspended and internees and their relatives may be prevented from either seeing or communicating with one another.

(e) One of the most sinister clauses relates to the right of the Civil Authority to withhold the right of inquest.

A jailed or interned Republican is automatically disqualified from obtaining his family allowances under the Unemployment Insurance Acts on the grounds that he is not available for work. A former political prisoner or Republican suspect finds it extremely difficult to keep employment owing to the police practice of warning employers against them. An isolated incident may kindle with unexpected suddenness into a crisis during the course of which hundreds of suspects are rounded up and scores of families, deprived of a breadwinner, are menaced by the spectres of hunger and debt. This explains why the barometer of parliamentary contests registers such startling overnight changes.

(Continued in next issue.)