

INTRODUCTION

At present in M.L.Q. there is a debate in progress about the nature of the struggle in Ireland. There are two lines being put forward. One line, which could be called the anti-imperialist line, claims that Ireland (both North and South) has been and is being economically exploited by the British nation and that the bourgeois democratic revolution has not been completed in Ireland and that this is due to the involvement with Britain. The second line, which could be called the two-nations line, claims that there is no national exploitation of Northern Ireland by Britain. People advocating this line claim not to have done enough study on the Republic to comment - thus ridiculously not examining the whole of Ireland in the context of the development of British imperialism. This line also claims that due to the economic development of Ulster with Britain, there is now total integration between the two and no national exploitation. Finally, this line ~~claims~~ the bourgeois democratic revolution to be complete.

THE FORCES INVOLVED

The method by which Marxists deal with social phenomena is known as "historical materialism" which is a process of collecting observed data of the phenomena and analysing these in the light of their historical development.

The starting point for observed data for any struggle is the programme of the forces involved in that struggle. What follows is a very brief outline of the main forces.

OFFICIAL SINN FEIN

The document of the Officials to be looked at is the "Manifesto of the Irish Workers' and Farmers' Republic" - 2nd. edition April 1971. (It is now being redrafted.) This programme accepts many ideas of scientific socialism but the needs for the dictatorship of the proletariat and a revolutionary party have not yet been realised. The document states:

"We declare that the aim of the Irish Republican Movement is the establishment of a Workers' and Farmers' Republic in a United Ireland as the basis for the construction of a socialist society The Irish Workers' and Farmers' Republic will be one in which the state is run in the interests of all those who work and in which the means of production and distributing the wealth of society are in the hands of those who labour" (1)

In their theoretical magazine called 'Teoric' they debate subjects of basic Marxism as well as subjects of special interest to the Irish struggle. Many of these articles show a serious attempt to understand and apply Marxist methods of analysis to the struggle as they see it. Through all their writings now there is discussion on the end of imperialist exploitation leading to the Workers' and Farmers' Republic which is the first step towards socialism.

PROVISIONAL SINN FEIN

One of their main documents is "Eire Nua - the Social and Economic Programme of the Sinn Fein", published in 1971. The programme states:

"The constitution of Sinn Fein advocates not merely the complete overthrow of English rule in Ireland but also the setting up of a Democratic Socialist Republic based on the proclamation of 1916." (2)

It is a democratic programme which recognises the role of foreign, and mainly British, capital, in the country as a hindrance to the development of the country and sees the setting up of a 32 county republic under the control of the Irish people as the only way to correct this.

In the section entitled "Economic Resistance" they state:

"Why does Britain pay the subsidy? Because she considers it worth her while to pay out British taxpayers' money to keep Ireland divided and safe for British investors to draw profits. Also, by keeping Ireland divided, and by the device of imposing a unified financial system, she ensures that the bulk of the Irish economic surplus is syphoned off and used to develop the British economy." (3)

The programme points out that there will also be a struggle against the pro-imperialist bourgeoisie:

"Thus the nature of the connection goes much deeper than simply the occupation of foreign troops. It is therefore necessary to resist the forces of the connection in whatever form they manifest themselves; to broaden the scope of the national movement to include a conscious, organised economic resistance to the laws of imperialist economics which are keeping our country underdeveloped." (4)

They continue in further sections to show how industrial development has been hindered by financial, industrial, agricultural, planning, etc., control by foreign (predominantly British) capital.

The two programmes of the republican movement show that they are progressive (although there can be no doubt that the Officials are further to the left) in that both see the nature of British imperialism and the obstacles to the development of Ireland and that both wish to see an extension of democracy in Ireland as a whole. There is no doubt that there are differences in tactics and theoretical development between the two wings but this is not of vital importance to our support of these forces.

In contrast to these forces stand the Loyalist organisations. There are three main ones to be examined:

ULSTER VANGUARD

This is the organisation led by Craig. In "Ulster - A Nation" (published April 1972), they talk about an "Ulster Nation" but wish to remain as a federal part of Britain. They see definite contradictions between the British ruling class and themselves. They seem prepared to declare U.D.I. if Britain refuses to adhere to their demands. The document says:

"It is well that Ulster people should be under no illusion about the foundations on which their constitutional guarantees rest. Ultimately, they rest on the changing mood of the people of G.B. as reflected by their political representatives at Westminster. In the end national self-interest, as interpreted by the politicians in power, determines what national honour requires in regard to any guarantee." (5)

It adds:

"Disenchantment with union gives Westminster no right to settle the destination of Ulster. If they wish to divorce Ulster in the long run that confers on them no right to choose Ulster's future partner." (6)

ULSTER VOLUNTEER FORCE

They pledge loyalty to Britain and primarily to the Crown. They are violently anti-republican as they point out in a statement of August 1972:

"We are prepared to take into our ranks anyone who is prepared to fight Republicanism which would deprive us of our British way of life. We would die rather than accept an all-Ireland Republic." (7)

They also point out that they would, if necessary, break with Britain to form an independent Ulster:

"The last thing we want or indeed anticipate is any type of conflict with the forces of the Crown. Should this, however, become inevitable we will not shirk our duty." (8)

ULSTER DEFENCE ASSOCIATION

This is another para-military organisation which claims that if Britain lets them down they too will support the setting up of an independent Ulster and will fight all the way against a 32 county Irish state.

"The U.D.A. are not responsible for the whole mess, the ineptitude of British politicians is to a very large extent to blame. It is totally dishonest of British politicians to blame the U.D.A. They are only proving how sound our judgement is in refusing to trust the British Government any longer. We have proved it cannot be trusted at all." (9)

What links all these loyalist organisations together is seen in the following statement by Wm. Craig on behalf of the 'United Loyalist Council' representing Ulster Vanguard, Loyalist Association of Workers, U.D.A. and Loyalist Defence Volunteers:

"The loyalty of British people is not to a government as such, but to our traditions enshrined in the monarchy. This is precisely what Ulster Loyalists will maintain - should all others seek to betray them.

As British citizens we have a right to all the provisions and protection of any other part of the realm. It is because we have no guarantee of these that the Ulster Loyalist demands his own Parliament with powers to maintain the Union. If Westminster does not want the Union then Northern Ireland has a moral right to opt for terms which will maintain its heritage." (10)

What distinguishes the different brands of Loyalists is the extent to which they will go when Britain lets them down.

POLITICAL PARTIES

A few words on each of these parties will suffice as they may claim to have vast differences but by their actions show that they are in fact reactionary pro-union forces.

NORTHERN IRELAND

UNIONIST PARTY

They have ruled Northern Ireland ever since Partition. While supported by many protestant moderates, this party is under the control of the Orange Order - 99% of all Unionist M.P.s are Orangemen. This organisation is very reactionary and pro-British.

NORTHERN IRELAND LABOUR PARTY

It is a branch of the British Labour Party, and is not very strong (before Stormont was abolished it only had one M.P. and it only has one representative in the new Assembly). It has always been Unionist on the question of Northern Ireland remaining part of Britain. It has some limited support amongst the working-class, and has tried to be in the forefront of anti-sectarian economic struggles. It is more or less insignificant.

THE NEW ALLIANCE PARTY

This is claimed to be a non-sectarian organisation, which was to be the answer to Ulster's problems. The only problem was that its leadership was unionist dominated. Their con did not work and they failed miserably at the recent elections.

SOCIAL AND DEMOCRATIC LABOUR PARTY

This tends to get support from the Catholics and the Catholic areas. It is a reformist party, perhaps its nearest equivalent in Britain being our own Labour Party. It claims to be against Partition and for an all-Ireland Republic but wishes a gradual, peaceful phasing out of Partition. It is thoroughly opportunist, selling out and displaying their true nature in the new Assembly.

SOUTHERN IRELAND

FIANNA FAIL

This originated from amongst those who were opposed to the treaty which partitioned Ireland. It has increasingly come closer, mainly due to British economic control of the country, to accepting what the British say and want. From 1932 until the recent elections they were only out of power for 6 years. There is no doubt that they now represent the pro-British bourgeoisie.

FINE GAIL

This party originated amongst those who supported the Partition Treaty. It gets support from the Protestants in the south and from the upper classes. It has a strong conservative wing and tends to be more right-wing than Fianna Fail.

LABOUR PARTY

They have two predominant wings - a right wing and a liberal wing. They are strong political critics of the I.R.A. and its significance in the South. Also thoroughly reactionary.

I have tried to briefly describe the forces in the conflict. It is from here that Marxists must start their analysis. Any other starting point will be subjective and will lead to false conclusions. The observed data shows us that in Ireland there are people fighting against British imperialism and its army. There are also people in the same territory who regard themselves as British or 'Ulstermen', depending on the situation, and pledge undying loyalty to the British Crown. They wish to remain part of Britain on their own terms and threaten to leave her if these are not satisfied.

The former have a section in the leadership that is pro-Marxist and their support tends to come from the more progressive sections of the population.

TWO-NATIONS THEORY

The basic concept of Ireland consisting of two nations is not new and exclusive to M.L.Q. It has been stated in a slightly different form before but with similar conclusions and Marxists have always struggled against it.

She ironically put forward the viewpoint that if one were to raise the slogan of the independence of Poland, one should also put forward the slogan of independence of Ireland. The integration of Poland with Russia and Ireland with Britain was the basis of her viewpoint. Lenin replied to this viewpoint in 1914 in "The Utopian Karl Marx and the Practical Rosa Luxemburg", in which he pointed out that Marx's position on the Irish question was very clear. He stood for the separation of Ireland from Britain. At first he thought that this was only for the good of the Irish themselves but later he changed his ideas a little:

"it is in the direct and absolute interests of the English working class to get rid of their present connection with Ireland The English working class will never accomplish anything until it has got rid of Ireland English reaction in England had its roots in the subjugation of Ireland." (11)

Lenin goes on to show how Marx was not in fact "utopian" but always took a proletarian standpoint on the Irish question and that Rosa Luxemburg was selling out to chauvinism and to the British ruling class. Fortunately, the Marxist line prevailed in the international movement.

Lenin understood very well the changing tactics and manoeuvres of the bourgeoisie and how they will do anything to keep control over their colonies. He pointed out that we do not have to accept frontiers or borders drawn up by the bourgeoisie:

"..... the philistines of all countries, colours and languages hurry to declare as "utopian" the idea of changing the frontiers of states that have been established by the violence and privileges of the landlords and bourgeoisie of one nation." (12)

Lenin summed up his attitude to these ideas of Rosa Luxemburg and other "philistines" when he pointed out:

"Should the Irish and British proletariat not accept Marx's policy and make the secession of Ireland their slogan, that would be the worst sort of opportunism, neglect of their duties as democrats and socialists and yielding to British reaction and the British bourgeoisie." (13)

BRITISH AND IRISH COMMUNIST ORGANISATION

Over the last few years a somewhat sophisticated two-nations theory has been put forward by this organisation. To put it briefly, the B. & I.C.O. claim that the reason why the development of Ulster was different from that of the rest of Ireland was not because of any definite policy of the British ruling class but was because:

".....the Protestant tenant-farmers acquired coherence as a class, and forced the landlords to recognise tenant-right through class struggle, before the Catholic peasantry did do." (14)

They thus come to the conclusion that the industrial development was brought on by the Protestants themselves, on their own.

There can be no doubt that the Protestant ethic was a factor in the decline of feudalism and the rise of capitalism but to place it as the *primary* factor is to fall into idealism. Ulster tenant-right was a right granted to the Protestants which made their land holding much more secure. It was an inducement to settlers to go over. In the rest of Ireland, the Penal Laws kept land tenure less secure and thus the decline of feudalism was faster in the North East and the way was open, with Britain's "blessing" for the development of capitalism. What we have to stress is that this was a deliberate policy of the British ruling class who, realising that in the North were people who were brain-washed into regarding themselves as British, started what became a symbol of British rule wherever she went - pitting sections of the country against each other and diverting the struggle from the main enemy, British imperialism, - *Dual Tactics*. Apart from Ireland this policy has worked outstandingly for British imperialists in India with the Hindus and the Muslims. However the B. & I.C.O. play up to this chauvinism by saying that it was not really a tactic of British colonialism but something won by the Protestants. They play to the chauvinist feelings of the Ulster Protestants, who believe that they are in some way superior to the Catholics. Thus we would reject this theory both because of its incorrect historical analysis and for its chauvinist leanings.

D.B. IN M.L.Q.4.

This latest two-nations line admits that industry only developed in and around the implanted area, but due to lack of analysis of the South, D.B. doesn't go into the objective reasons for this uneven development. We just have to accept these tactics of British colonialism and start our analysis from there. This is, in fact, the precise point of view that Lenin was criticising in quote (17) above. D.B.'s line, indeed is very similar to that put forward by Rosa Luxemburg. These latter-day Luxemburgists start from a subjective premise and come to conclusions similar to Rosa Luxemburg's - they believe that Northern Ireland is a part of the British nation state and that it is wrong for socialists to bring forward the question of exploitation of Northern Ireland by the British nation state. The very first paragraph in D.B.'s article shows his general line:

"Some of us have come to believe that the line generally held by the British left, that a national struggle is necessary in Northern Ireland is incorrect, and that it should be replaced by a line recognising the importance of struggling for bourgeois democratic rights, and which bases the main struggle on the fight for socialism." (15)

How like the "practical" Rosa Luxemburg this is! She also accuses Lenin of forgetting the class struggle!

Before we pass on to the real questions it will be enough to mention here that standing on the same premise the B. & I.C.O. and Comrade D.B. reach different characterisations of the Protestant population in Ireland. According to the B. & I.C.O.'s latest position the Protestants are an "Ulster Protestant Nation" (see "The Working Class Solution to the National Conflict in Ireland") but according to D.B. they are a part of the British nation!

THE REAL QUESTIONS

It is very dangerous for us in Britain to get bogged down in academic debate and to lose sight of the two main questions facing us regarding Ireland. Firstly, - How can Ireland as a whole industrialise and why hasn't this happened before? Secondly, - How does Britain exploit Ireland? The two questions are linked and Ireland as a whole must be looked at if the tactics of British imperialism are to be unravelled and examined.

D.B. argues that industry developed in and around the implanted area and that this led to two bourgeoisies and two markets. He doesn't however, say why. But it is not difficult to understand why, as it would be impossible without an analysis of the South, which D.B. has not made. He maintains that his opinions are the facts and that communists have to accept them. We also have to accept the total dependence of the markets in Ireland on the British market. These markets are in fact totally integrated but this does not prove that there is no exploitation. It proves the opposite! India's market was totally integrated into the British market in the 19th century and we can assure D.B. that there was plenty of exploitation there. In fine academic debate over whether Northern Ireland fits D.B.'s dogmatic definitions of a colony or neo-colony or nothing, the central questions are missed or avoided.

QUESTION OF NORTHERN IRELAND'S EXPLOITATION

Comrades D.B.'s and E.K.'s (see M.L.Q.5) proofs that Northern Ireland is not exploited are split into four main parts. The first argument is that Northern Ireland does not fit the definition of a 1930 C.P.G.B. pamphlet or Marx's definition of a colony as used for America in the 19th century. (16) This is utter academicism! When no orthodox definition of a colony could be found to fit South Vietnam, the Vietnamese comrades did not say that that meant South Vietnam was not being exploited but instead, called it a 'special type of colony' (Le Duan: "The Fundamental Problems and Essential Tasks of the Vietnamese Revolution"). The East Bengalis put forward a similar concept for East Bengal when some people suggested that West Pakistan was not exploiting East Bengal as West Pakistan was not a monopoly-capitalist state, (Strategy and Tactics of the Communist Party of Bangla Desh during the War of 1971). This is again academicism of a similar type to D.B.'s. The question of what type of colony Ireland is, is not the main question to us in Britain. This question is of vital importance to revolutionaries in Ireland fighting British imperialism, as their tactics will depend on it. But to us in Britain the listing of types of colonies and seeing which 'fits' Ireland is an academic debate. The question of exploitation is the main debate. We can well now see what happens when we engage in this debate over past Marxist definitions of colonies. We fall into the error, as D.B. has done, of not exposing British imperialism as it stands today.

D.B.'s second argument for Northern Ireland not being nationally exploited by Britain is that Northern Ireland shows symptoms of depression much the same as other parts of Britain. D.B. then carries out his comparison between Northern Ireland, a part of a country partitioned by the British ruling-class and

the Orange Order, and Durham, traditionally a part of the British nation-state. The percentage of industry owned by outside interests, percentage of people employed etc. are compared and found to be very similar. Their goods are also found to have a similar market. The conclusion arrived at from this brilliant piece of investigation is that:

"Northern Ireland is not a colony but a part of the U.K. economy and state." (17)

There is no doubt that this is nothing but economic determinism - accepting that if the economies are totally integrated there is no exploiter-exploited relationship, disregarding the political factors. This approach is mechanistic and could easily be applied to many other countries - e.g. India in the 19th century and the Republic of Ireland now. With this sort of argument almost any imperialist country can stop being imperialist by "integrating" the economies of the exploited country with that of the exploiter country and by there being similar conditions in both countries. D.B.'s theory is indeed an excuse for imperialism. Would we accept that if it could be proved that there was more investment by people from outside Texas in Texas than there was by the U.S.A. in Vietnam, then there is no longer any reason for calling Vietnam a colony and that we should accept that Thieu has a right to become part of America if he wishes or believes himself to be? D.B.'s whole argument is utter nonsense.

Stalin pointed out in "Marxism and the National Question" what he believed to be the characteristics of a nation:

"A nation is a historically evolved, stable community of language, territory, economic life, and psychological make-up manifested in a community of culture." (18)

However, Stalin stressed that this cannot be applied dogmatically. If a nation conquers another nation, implants it with settlers and integrates the markets, then we have to realise the twists and turns of imperialism in the context of the imperialist bourgeoisie wishing to exploit the colony. Our analysis must therefore partly rest on what the imperialists have done to hinder development in Ireland.

D.B.'s third 'proof' is his application of the principle of self-determination to the 'rights of the Protestants to secede'. He is quite right to point out that Lenin supported the 'right to secession' (19) but he forgets that Lenin was dealing with the duties of the proletariat of an oppressor nation towards the oppressed. The right to secede is available to the *oppressed nation only* to overcome hindrance to its national socio-economic development. As Marxist-Leninists we must support the secessionist movements of *all* those oppressed by Britain and other exploiter nations. The Protestant population in the North of Ireland is *doubtless oppressed*, (despite its differential privileges over the Catholics), *not* by the 'Catholic nation', but by *British imperialism*. So if the Protestants are to secede, they must secede from Britain and not from Ireland! Our best support to the Protestants, and indeed to the whole population of Ireland, will be to demand complete separation from Britain.

D.B.'s fourth reason for claiming that Northern Ireland is not a colony of Britain is because of the completion of the bourgeois democratic revolution:

"There is no basis for a national movement in Northern Ireland because the bourgeois democratic revolution has basically been completed - as part of the British nation and state." (20)

In fact this is not the case. The economic situation and statistics shown below suggest that Northern Ireland is not an industrially developed society, but even leaving this aside, basic rights which can be granted under the bourgeoisie have never been granted. These rights tend to be of the type of no discrimination of one part of the community on the grounds of colour, race, religion etc. (These rights are, of course, hypocritical and merely tactical as they are granted under extreme economic exploitation.) In most capitalist countries in the world we are witnessing, in the decline of imperialism, the degeneration of these rights and the move towards the corporate state. In Ireland the final stage of democratic rights *has not yet been reached*. The ruling Unionist Orange clique discriminated against the Catholics in most matters and they have never had equal rights with the Protestants - hence, Civil Rights campaigns. D.B., in fact, contradicts himself, as he says also in his article that we should support the fight against Catholic oppression in the North. He cannot have it both ways, and he must show us at what time the Catholics have ever had equal rights. The Unionist bourgeoisie ensured that their rule was continued by not even allowing a bourgeois parliamentary system, such as we have in Britain, to function. They did this by putting forward at every election from Partition until the dissolution of Stormont and again at the recent Assembly elections, the question of remaining part of the British nation or not. Thus, while since 1920 in Britain there have been 6 Labour governments, some coalition governments and the remainder Tory governments, in Northern Ireland the ruling party has always been the ultra-reactionary Unionist Party. This is not, and never has been, bourgeois democracy.

TWISTS AND TURNS OF BRITISH IMPERIALISM IN IRELAND

This is one part that D.B. does not understand. He tends to under-estimate the past and present ruling-class. Having found that they are losing their colonies abroad, in the age of the final defeat of imperialism, the British ruling-class are desperately striving to hold on to Ireland in some form or other. They are not stupid and they, like Marxists, learn from history. They have developed fine tactics for Ireland. The Irish Independence and Home Rule Movement of the late 19th century and early 20th century was a threat to them. If a national bourgeoisie had taken over the whole country, the British ruling-class would have lost the whole of Ireland and their dual tactics would have gone to waste. They tried hard to achieve a United Ireland under comprador classes but could not achieve this due to the fear of the Northern Orange ruling-class that they would be a minor part of the united country and would lose their economic and political power to the Nationalists in the South. Thus, what Lenin called the empty threat of the 'Black Hundreds' was in fact a reality and the

country was partitioned. This was only a makeshift solution by British imperialism, whose interests still lie with a United Ireland under comprador classes, but it ensured that the South could never develop industrially by *depriving the country of the Belfast nucleus of industry*. After Partition Eire's major industry was comb-making!

STATISTICAL EVIDENCE OF EXPLOITATION

Having examined the forces involved and taken a brief look at its historical development, it is now time to look at statistical evidence of direct economic exploitation of Ireland. I believe that the data presented below suggests that Ireland is predominantly unindustrialised and that through living under one of the richest nations of the world, Ireland has remained one of Europe's poorest. It is necessary to look at Ireland as she is in her two parts. It is also important to point out that statistical evidence should be used in addition to, and not instead of (as D.B. has done) investigation of the objective forces involved.

REPUBLIC OF IRELAND

This is one of Europe's least industrialised countries. *The figures here refer to 1971.* The top figure in each case refers to the percentage involved in agriculture and the bottom figure refers to the percentage involved in industry.

U.K.:	2.7 45.7	NETHERLANDS:	6.9 38.0	GERMANY:	8.4 50.1
U.S.A.:	4.3 31.0	AUSTRALIA:	8.0 38.0	DENMARK:	10.9 37.2
BELGIUM:	4.4 44.2	SWEDEN:	7.8 37.0	FRANCE:	13.4 38.6
NORWAY:	13.9 37.3	ICELAND:	18.8 36.8	SPAIN:	28.6 37.5
JAPAN:	15.9 36.0	ITALY:	19.3 44.1	PORTUGAL:	31.1 36.3
AUSTRIA:	17.3 41.9	IRELAND:	26.5 30.9	GREECE:	37.3 24.6

(All these figures are reproduced from "Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development Survey on Ireland") (1973)

It is interesting to break these percentages down into figures for the Republic and this is done in the same source.

TOTAL LABOUR FORCE = 1,139,000

Total Employment	=	1,071,000
Agriculture and fisheries	=	292,000
Industry	=	328,000
Manufacturing	=	222,000
Construction	=	82,000
Other	=	481,000

These figures show us that the Republic has a smaller percentage of its population engaged in industry than every other country in the table, with the exception of Greece and that only Spain, Greece and Portugal have a higher percentage involved in agriculture. This is not the hallmark of a modern industrialised state but is an excellent (*if pathetic*) example of an unindustrialised state, which has never been given the chance to develop. Even the percentage involved in industry is misleading, as the breakdown of figures shows us. The number involved in construction industry (i.e. heavy industry) is only 82,000 or approximately 7.6%.

When we look at the trade of the Republic, we also find some interesting facts, although with our previous knowledge of British imperialism they should not seem so startling.

DOMESTIC EXPORT

Total for 1972 = £634.74 million

Exports go to:

U.K. -	£385.22m	Direct Agriculture	=	£220.91m
W. Germany -	29.85m	Metalliferous Ores		
U.S.A. -	59.60m	and soaps	=	20.97
France -	28.85m	Chemicals	=	34.86
		Textiles	=	39.49
		Machines (electric)	=	15.89
		" " (non-electric)	=	19.80
		Transport Equipment	=	15.11
		Clothing and Footwear	=	30.62
		Miscellaneous	=	237.09

DOMESTIC IMPORTS

Total for 1972 = £842.58 million

Imports come from:

U.K. -	£429.07 million
U.S.A. -	64.44m
W. Germany -	63.81m
France -	28.40m

(Quarterly Economic Review
Ireland No.2 - 1973.
Appendix 2. Imports and
Exports)

These figures show the near total economic dependence of the Republic on Britain. We don't have to go into lengthy debate over what type of colony the Republic is, but what we have to show is that the Republic is predominantly unindustrialised and relies almost totally on Britain. These two facts are linked.

NORTHERN IRELAND

Figures for the North tend to be harder to come by as many figures are included with the U.K. figures. However there are some:

As far as agriculture is concerned, the figures suggest that the North is less industrialised and far more agriculturally backward than the British Isles:

NO. OF AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS BY SIZE OF HOLDING (ACRES)

Size of holding in acres	G.B.	N.I.
1-4 $\frac{1}{2}$	26,817	4,038
5-14 $\frac{1}{2}$	39,124	14,552
15-49 $\frac{1}{2}$	59,633	28,556
50-99 $\frac{1}{2}$	50,871	9,970
100-149 $\frac{1}{2}$	29,312	1,861
150-299 $\frac{1}{2}$	35,490	697
300+	20,519	136
Total:	G.B. - 261,766 N.I. - 59,810	

(Abstract of Regional Statistics
1972. printed by the Central
Statistical Office.)

These figures show us that in the North there is approximately one-quarter the number of agricultural holdings as there are in Britain, yet the population of the North is only one-fortieth the population of Britain!

Also, we find that in Britain the majority of farms are fifty acres or above but in Ireland the majority of holdings are below fifty acres. When we look at large farms (300 acres or above), we find that in Britain approximately 8% of farms are in this category but in Northern Ireland only 0.25%, or one in 400 of the farms are large. Of this total number of units (i.e. 59,000) 40,000 are considered 'significant' and approximately 17,000 are viable going concerns.

The number of people employed in agriculture in Northern Ireland is approximately 77,000 and in the U.K., as a whole, there is approximately 700,000 (i.e. 2.7% of the total working population). This means that approximately 9% of the people in the U.K. involved in agriculture come from Northern Ireland. Yet the population of Northern Ireland is one-fortieth of that of Great Britain!

These figures show, I believe, that Northern Ireland has not developed as the highly industrialised part of the U.K. that D.B. and similar "two-nations" people would have us believe, but is rather agriculturally backward. However, this is something that there should be no need to prove by figures. All one has to do is go over to Northern Ireland and one can see with one's own eyes, that the only industry is in Belfast and a small zone around Belfast. This is borne out, again by statistics:

TOTAL LAND AREA of NORTHERN IRELAND = 3,489,000 acres
TOTAL AGRICULTURAL AREA = 2,840,000 acres
 ∴ Total Area for non-agricultural use = 289,000 acres

("Abstract of Regional Statistics 1972" - published by the Central Statistical Office.)

Northern Ireland is the one area of the U.K. that produces separate trade figures. A detailed list is presented:

1971	Imports	Exports
Live Animals and Food	168,442,000	167,233,000
Animal & Vegetable Oils & Fats	1,082,000	886,000
Beverage & Tobacco	47,758,000	1,569,000
Crude Materials, inedibles	27,996,000	46,258,000
Minerals; Fuels; Lubricants	52,913,000	1,770,000
Chemicals	51,267,000	3,579,000
Manufactured Goods	244,573,000	247,938,000
Machinery & Transport Equipment	228,854,000	132,035,000
Miscellaneous	64,439,000	241,731,000
TOTAL:	892,323,000	843,020,000

(Quarterly Economic Review (Ireland No.2 - 1973))

These figures show that approximately 20% of Northern Ireland's imports and exports are made up of agricultural products. Hardly the sign of a fully industrialised economy!

When we look at where the North trades, we find that approximately 71.5% of the imports (654,290,000) comes directly from or through Britain. The other £238,033,000 comes directly from countries outside the U.K. 12.6% of the total comes from the Republic. As far as exports are concerned, we find that £738,732,000 or 86.5% goes to, or through, Britain. The remaining £109,288,000 goes directly to countries outside the U.K. The amount that goes directly to the Republic is 1.8% of the total. (Quarterly Economic Review (Ireland No.2 - 1973)).

Thus, although the Republic and the North both produce goods that the other needs, they have to do the bulk of their trading through Britain. This is, of course, aided by the fact that Britain controls the banks, the insurance, the stock-market, indeed all that is necessary for the capitalist system to work efficiently.

What I hope these figures show is the Britain exploits the whole political entity of Ireland.

WHY HASN'T IRELAND INDUSTRIALISED?

Approaching the question of how Ireland can industrialise, we have to examine why she could not industrialise before. The answer to this is not too difficult. The British ruling-class only allowed a pocket of industry to develop around Belfast and they kept down industry in the rest of Ireland.

Ireland is Britain's oldest colony, first invaded in the 12th century. Probably the most significant step taken by the ruling-class was the implantation of the Scots into Ulster under James I.

"Because the Irish and English-Irish were obstinate in Popish superstition, great care was thought fit to be taken that these new colonies should consist of such men as were most unlike to fall to barbarous customs of the Irish, or the Popish superstitions of the English-Irish, so as no less cautions were to be observed for uniting them and keeping them from other than if these colonies were to be led to inhabit among the barbarous Indians." (21)

In other words, what was wanted was for the people implanted not to make any contact with the natives but to try to keep them tied to Britain. If they feel tied to Britain and feel themselves British, they will not try to separate from Britain and British interests will be saved. Thus Britain granted the formation of capitalist concerns and relations in this implanted part of Ireland but at all times in the rest of Ireland industry was kept down. Even in Cromwell's time the beginnings of a small textile industry were crushed so as not to compete with the British industry and in the North, only, did a small textile industry arise. Marx, of course, realised this and wrote:

"Every time Ireland was about to develop industrially, she was crushed and reconverted into a purely agricultural land." (22)

After the loss of the American colonies, British colonialism found new tactics for keeping control over its colonies. In India this was done through the division of Hindus and Muslims. It was easier nearer home in Ireland, with the division between Protestants and Catholics. With the granting of Ulster Tenant Right and the uneven development leading to industrialisation in the North East, these *dual tactics* became a handy tool to exploit the country. Because of the facts shown above, it became unnecessary to obstruct the industrialisation in the North East. But in the rest of the country it was kept down. It is not necessary to go into this in any greater detail in this article. It is plain that what has happened in Ireland is that the British tactics have worked better than anywhere else.

HOW IS IRELAND TO INDUSTRIALISE?

This is perhaps the crucial issue to revolutionaries. It would be very hard for a small country like Ireland to industrialise from nothing but she already has a nucleus of British-owned industry in the part politically annexed to Britain. For Ireland to industrialise and the way to be open to socialist construction then, these industries must be taken out of the hands of foreign owners (who take advantage of the 10 year tax-free profit incentives to invest in Ireland and then take the money out to Britain, ensuring that it is not reinvested) and reinvested in Ireland *as a whole*. The reason for keeping Ireland predominantly agricultural is simple - it is easier to maintain control over a predominantly agricultural country.

CONCLUSION

All through this article there has been references to the development of North and South Ireland and to the tactics of British imperialism with reference to *both parts of Ireland*. The reason for this is that it is necessary to examine the tactics of British imperialism in the context of the wishes of the British ruling-class to exploit *the whole of Ireland*. But D.B., in his article suggests that he does not accept this approach. His approach is to examine the two separate parts of Ireland in relationship with Britain, and with total disregard for their inter-relationships. Thus he has just looked at the North and Britain. He claims:

"The argument that the Irish Republic is a neo-colony is certainly one to be studied carefully, but on the other hand, the claim that Northern Ireland is a colony is not supported by any serious Marxist analysis" (23)

By splitting like this, D.B. in fact shows that he is not engaging in any serious Marxist analysis! He is falling into the trap that makes his article social-chauvinist and a left apology for the British army and British imperialism staying in Ireland to combat "the terrorist campaign" (24) of the people fighting them. This is indeed an argument of the bourgeoisie! What his line claims is that if implantation of part of a colony takes place and the market can be integrated into the imperialist market, then the imperialist relationship can eventually vanish if a reactionary force so desires.

There is no doubt that this subjective, economic determinist, pro-imperialist line must be countered and I hope this article has gone some way to do this. Unfortunately this line is very attractive to some sections of the working-class both in Britain and Northern Ireland who, duped into chauvinism in the heyday of the Empire in the late 19th century and early 20th century, also accept that Northern Ireland is a part of the British nation. When Marxists begin to believe this, it shows how influential and successful the tactics of the British ruling-class have been. However, the duty of Marxists is not to pander to chauvinism (neither British nor Ulster) but to smash it. Perhaps it is correct to end this article with a quote from Lenin, who spent much time combating the type of social-chauvinism that D.B. falls into:

"The proletariat must demand the right of political secession for the colonies and for the nations that "its own" nation oppresses. Unless it does this, proletarian internationalism will remain a meaningless phrase; mutual confidence and class solidarity between the workers of the oppressing and oppressed nations will be impossible; the hypocrisy of the reformist and Kautskyan advocates of self-determination who maintain silence about the nations which are oppressed by "their" nation and forcibly retained within "their" state will remain unexposed."
(25)

H.M.

NOTES

1. Manifesto of the Irish Workers' and Farmers Republic (2nd edition) p.1.
2. "Eire Nua - the Social & Economic Programme of Sinn Fein" p.3.
3. Ibid. p.7.
4. Ibid. p.7.
5. Ulster - A Nation, April 1972, p.4-5.
6. Ibid, p.12.
7. "Orange Cross", 25th August 1972, p.8.
8. Ibid, p.8.
9. U.D.A. News, 31st July 1972, p.5.
10. "The Future of Northern Ireland", last page.
12. Ibid, p. 208.
13. Ibid, p. 208.
14. "Economics of Partition", p.7.
15. M.L.Q.4, p.18.
16. Ibid, p. 25-26.
17. Ibid, p.26.
18. "Marxism and the National and Colonial Question", Stalin, 1935 Moscow Edition, p.8.
19. M.L.Q. 4, p. 25.
20. Ibid, p.23.
21. D.B.Quinn - "The Elizabethans and the Irish", p.119.
22. "Karl Marx and Frederick Engels on Ireland", p.132.
23. M.L.Q.4, p.25.
24. Ibid, p.24.
25. Lenin, "On the National and Colonial Questions", Peking Edition 1970, p.7-8.
11. "The Utopian Karl Marx and the Practical Rosa Luxemburg", Printed in 'Lenin on Britain', Moscow Edition, p.207.