

FOR THE
WORKING CLASS -
THE CLASS
THAT HOLDS THE
FUTURE IN ITS
HANDS

COMMENT

FOR TIGHTLY

SHOP STEWARDS COMMITTEE:

4p

Vol. 3 No. 4
29. 3. 74

'Why we left it': B & IGO Shop Stewards

Despite the best efforts of the Left, the Irish workers have accepted the 3rd national wage agreement. If their action was to produce nothing more than a good shaking out in whatever dusty region the said left does its political thinking, then it might yet serve a useful purpose.

For all their alleged radicalism, the Irish Left are the most deeply entrenched conservatives that exist in or around the trade union movement. Their campaign was guided by the idea of defending traditional rights, traditional bargaining procedures etc. There seems to be complete unawareness of the fact that changed conditions breed changed methods of struggle.

Up to the middle of the last century, the "traditional" bargaining methods of the working-class included machine-wrecking, rick-burning and scab-murdering. All very necessary and useful at the time but hardly appropriate to the 1970s; no doubt many of our contemporary "militants" would feel

emotionally more at home with Ned Ludd and Captain Swing. But the sensible workers of these islands had put these methods well behind them by the 1880s and were moving towards the forms of trade union struggle we now know as free collective bargaining.

But the world did not stop still in the 1880s. It progressed and so did the working class. The unskilled workers have progressed from being an unorganised mass constantly living in the shadow of mass unemployment to a situation where they can act directly as a class in defence of their economic interests and of their jobs.

A united working class can achieve much more than a class divided and forced to bargain industry by industry, weighed down by such traditional scourges as the craftsman/labourer division. The obvious vehicle for such united action is national bargaining. It is equally obvious that attempts to go backwards from all-class bargaining are reactionary and serve merely to impede the forward move-

CONTD. P. 6

REVIVALISM OR REFORM FOR THE GAELTACHT?

Language revivalism, with its policy of compulsion has successfully alienated the majority of the population from the Irish language. Its identification with the Gaeltacht, due to cunning propaganda, has blurred the social issues confronting that community, and had an adverse effect on its development. When the revivalists talk about education, facilities for Irish on the media etc, they talk in terms of the forcible introduction of the language into areas where it is unwanted and even resented, by the majority. In the Gaeltacht, where there is a real need for reform in favour of Irish in education etc., no serious campaign is being conducted by any section of the community, because it is accepted that the objectives of the revival are sufficient.

REVIVAL HAS OUTLIVED ITS USEFULNESS

Those who always gain from this macabre situation are the government and the bureaucracy and the losers are the deprived native speakers of Irish who are being kept in a state of virtual illiteracy. The government can now afford to treat the revivalists with contempt as they are no longer a political necessity to the southern state due to economic and social changes; it

has the support of the majority for its hardening attitude, expressed by Cruise O' Brien and others, but such is the effect of revivalism on the society that its deliberate vagueness in relation to the Gaeltacht, has almost gone unnoticed.

References to the establishment of a "Gaeltacht Authority" are worse than useless at present, without a commitment to reform and development of education, health, industrial and social services. While the revivalists and the government argue the toss about whether it is desirable to have five or ten minutes of unintelligible nonsense, which passes for Irish, on Radio Eireann daily, the Gaeltacht is still saddled with a "Radio" which broadcasts for a

CONTD. P. 6

KELLY GIVES AN INCH

THE COMMENT has often attacked C. O'Brien and Garret Fitzgerald for not facing up to the need for a new Constitution with Articles 2 and 3 scrapped. All their mutterings about the need for a democratic position, which we heard from them before they were in government, stopped when the government insisted (in its submissions at the Kevin Boland court case) that Sunningdale was not unconstitutional under Article 3. O'Brien and Fitzgerald continue to funk the issue.

John Kelly, however, was whispering on occasions about a democratic position on the North, a year or two ago. He is now Parliamentary Secretary to the Taoiseach, and on Tuesday March 1st his volume went from a whisper to a roar.

" AN UNREASONABLE NUISANCE "

The following are some extracts from his supplied script:

"...That Article 3, so far from being a venerable banner handed down to us by dead generations of classical Tone Republicans, is a piece of optimistic posturing handed down to us by Mr. De Valera... it is an unreasonable nuisance, and no one need be ashamed, once he had understood its history and full implications, of recommending its amendment".

Later he equates the Constitution with "the primacy of the Catholic church and the Irish language".

These words are stronger than O'Brien or Fitzgerald have ever used. They are evidence of the pressure of events bearing down on the Southern bourgeois politicians. Over the last few months these politicians have been speaking ambiguously about Sunningdale. Listen to them once and they appear to be taking a democratic position, listen again and you get the opposite impression, as when in the Boland Court case they claimed Sunningdale did not affect the claim of the right "to exercise jurisdiction over the whole of that territory". Even when Neil Blaney moved an anti-Sunningdale motion in the Dail, some of the hot shots of the Fianna Fail Party supported him.

So who could blame the Northern Protestants for being confused about the South's position? Any clear-sighted politician in the republic with the courage of his convictions who could see the end of the current republican offensive would consider it important to make his democratic position clear. Obviously, O'Brien and Fitzgerald hadn't the spunk. But if you saw the results of the election of Feb. 28 coming in, and saw the effect of the South's ambiguous position, you might get a little more spunk. And this is obviously the case with Kelly. He sees that in theory Sunningdale appears an ideal solution, but that the fact that the Southern government presented its two faced attitude to Sunningdale was making it more and more difficult for Faulkner to convince the Northern Protestants that they would not be sold out in a Council of Ireland. And so he struggles to put a very definite interpretation on the Government's attitudes.

TWO'S O.K., THREE'S A BOGEY

"In my belief the Dail by its vote on a Government

STATUS SYMBOLS

THE SOLEMNITY was great, you have to grant him that. You could have heard a yawn when Cosgrave "firmly accepted and solemnly reaffirmed" that the factual status of Northern Ireland was that it was part of the U.K., and that that status could not be changed without the consent of a majority in the North.

He could have accepted a few other things while he was at it; for instance, that grass is green, that lead is heavy or that moral courage is in short supply in Dail Eireann. Paisley was quite justified in saying that Southern Governments since 1921 have had no option but to recognise, in practice, that the factual position of the North was that it was part of the U.K. To say otherwise would be to say that the South had both the ability and the immediate intention, to tax, administer and keep order in the North - which would amount to a declaration of war on Britain.

Faulkner was a fool not to tell Cosgrave: "thanks for nothing". The Loyalists did so, and the fact was that, just this once, they had reason on their side.

As for O'Brien and Fitzgerald, the ex-opponents of Articles 2 and 3 - where were they when their loud mouths were needed? O'Brien was playing St. George with the Irish language - a tame dragon, if ever there was one. And on the following Sunday, the self-professed agnostic had himself flown in from Sligo to accompany Fitzgerald, that hard-nosed man of this world, Richard Burke, and Declan Costelloe, on a most important mission. This was to go on a crawl-thumpers tour of Dublin, toting crosses from the GPO to a church, where they planted the 1000 crosses in memory of the Northern dead and "confessed their individual and collective share of responsibility for the violence in Ireland", according to the newspapers.

This hypocrites' picnic was organised, of course, by the Catholic Church, with a few house Protestants thrown in for the non-sectarianism of it. The crack was good, by all accounts; the lashing rain gave the participants a welcome sense of martyrdom. Despite the changing attitudes of our complex evolving society, it probably would have been a little radical as yet to have had nuns with whips there. But O'Brien and Fitzgerald gave their souls a good dry-cleaning, and of course everybody's "aspirations" remained safe and sound.

JOHN MINAHANE

amendment to Deputy Blaney's motion last Wednesday night has emphatically declared itself for the spirit of the Sunningdale Agreement. This is reality, and against this reality the legalistic bogey of Article 3 will not prevail".

This in fact admits that Sunningdale is contrary to Article 3, otherwise how could Article 3 be a "bogey"? However he is not in favour of having a referendum to change article 3, because "no one wants to go through the shouting and roaring" which it would entail. Instead he wants the Dail vote already mentioned to stand as the indication of emphatic support for the spirit of Sunningdale.

Contd page 3

KELLY GIVES AN INCH contd

Also he says he sees no importance in Article 2, because it asserts "merely that the Irish people as a whole are entitled to political unity", i.e. it expresses a sentiment for unity but does not make any claims on rule over the North at present.

These two positions show Kelly's shortcomings. A referendum is needed in the South, and could easily be won by the democratic forces if they put up any fight. And Article 2 is important. The whole weight of Catholic Nationalism rests on the position that the whole island should have political unity, consent or no consent. Without a campaign for the removal of these articles and a referendum, Catholic nationalism and the Southern bourgeoisie will be let a little more off the hook. The working class interest is in a thorough campaign against 2 and 3, and the Catholic constitution as a whole. We should be satisfied with nothing less than their removal.

DONAL FLAVIN

WHAT WILL WE DO WITH THE MULTINATIONALS ?

EVERYONE IS COMPLAINING about the multinational companies these days. The main grouse is that they're very hard to control; they can shift production from one country to another when it suits them (within limits, of course). By doing this, or threatening to do it, they can avoid control by governments, and can reduce the impact of pressure from trade unions. They're getting away with murder, say their accusers. But what can we do about them ?

The first thing to realise is that the multinationals are a natural development of capitalism. The system is outgrowing the old national boundaries and becoming more and more international. In the same way as the growth of nations brought into contact small local areas, and made them dependent on each other, whole nations are now becoming increasingly interdependent. Several hundred years ago a household in most parts of Europe would have contained hardly anything which came from more than, say ten miles away. It wouldn't have caused very much economic disruption if an area the size of Cork had been suddenly cut off from the rest of the world. Nowadays it would mean a huge economic crisis for the locals. For your average household or flat now would contain things from Britain, Germany, Hong Kong, Poland and so on; and a worker in most industries now is dependent on supplies and orders from a very wide area as well. As the saying goes, the world is getting smaller; its parts are less and less isolated, more and more dependent on each other.

A WELCOME CHANGE

The multinationals are simply one aspect of this process. It is a development which we communists welcome. If there is increasing development of the economy, we welcome it. If more is produced, it means that there is at least potentially, more for the working class to consume; we welcome the possibility for workers to improve their living standards. If poor farmers, peasants, tribesmen

or whatever, are drawn into industry, we welcome it; because, even if their living standards don't improve immediately, the increased size of the working class hastens the day when that class can transform society. If increasing economic development breaks down national divisions, in the same way as older local divisions were broken down in the past, that's all to the good; it makes possible greater economic and cultural cooperation, and makes workers realise their common interests at an international level. It speeds up the day when national wars will be a thing of the past, in the same way as all the little local wars we used to have are now things of the past. A thousand years ago, there would have been nothing strange about a war between one part of County Cork and another.

But what about the multinationals ? The problem remains of trying to make them subject to pressure from governments and trade unions. Various nationalist solutions are being put forward. An article in the January issue of the United Irishman complains that "these corporations have no national interests, so their activities are guided simply by the desire to make profit", and accuses the Irish ruling class of being "prepared to betray the people of Ireland to the highest bidder". Now we've never noticed that companies with "national interests" are not guided by a desire to make profit; perhaps Official Sinn Fein has. But apart from that, the attempts to oppose the multinationals on a national basis is just a non-starter. They are an international problem, and can only be pressured and curbed on a multinational, or better, an international basis. The attempt to oppose them in a nationalist way is not just hopeless, but reactionary - it is an attempt to go back to an earlier stage of capitalist development.

FORWARD TO SOCIALISM

As communists we don't want to go back to an earlier position, we want to go forward, on to a more international, more economically developed system, brought under social control by the working class; to a situation where economic and social development are planned rationally according to the needs of society. The answer to the problems caused by multinationals must be international. That may sound abstract and long term, but the same goes for the short term. Workers are increasingly realising this too; in international trade union federations, and in cooperation between workers employed by the same firm in different countries. You can see it in the international support for the Lip occupation in France, and in the cooperation by the workers in Pirelli-Dunlop. They are in fact reacting to these developments more intelligently and progressively than their would-be leaders in organisations like Official Sinn Fein.

In the short term, these international trade union links must be strengthened, and used; the working class should also put pressure on bodies like the EEC, when this may be useful; we communists will do what we can to encourage these developments and point the way forward to bringing the multinationals under direct social control; socialism. Nationalism can offer no solution.

MARTIN MCGARRY

THE CHILEAN COUP:

WHEN THE POPULAR UNITY government came to power in Chile with the election of Allende as President it suffered from a number of drawbacks. Allende was elected on the votes of a minority of the electorate thus enabling the opposition to accuse him of being unrepresentative when events went against him. Widespread economic sabotage continued up to his overthrow, including strikes by the capitalists, massacre of animals by the ranchers and withdrawal of credit and capital by international capitalism (in particular the U.S.). But the most glaring drawback of the administration was the composition of the coalition that supported Allende. While in many ways capable of working for the development of Chile, their political understanding and analysis was totally inadequate and contributed to Allende's eventual downfall.

"NO TO CIVIL WAR"

As the Communist Party of Chile was one of the two main parties in the coalition, it is of benefit to analyse their reaction to developments. In the aftermath of the attempted fascist coup of June 1973, a document was produced by the CP Chile which owes more to rhetoric than to reality. Luis Carvalán proclaims, "The patriotic and revolutionary slogan must be: No to Civil War! No to Fascism!"

This slogan had more in common with 1970 than with July 1973. By this stage the society had been totally polarised. All the vested interests saw their needs being satisfied by a military coup. In this light the CPC document is even more revealing: "No Sirs! We continue to support the absolutely professional character of the armed institutions. Their enemies are not amongst the ranks of the people, but in the reactionary camp". Within 8 weeks of this statement, 30,000 supporters of the Popular Unity lay dead, the CP was banned, and all the institutions of the working class effectively destroyed. The policy of the CP contributed to the downfall in not perceiving developments in the society.

Although Allende came to power with a certain amount of goodwill from the capitalist parties, this soon switched to opposition when the right and the petty capitalists effectively outmanoeuvred the President. When the lorry owners struck for the first time, the economy ceased to function to capacity, which threw the uncommitted capitalists behind the idea of a coup. This was evident even from capitalist sources in the early months of 1973. The military liberals were being pushed aside by the Colonels and other rightist officers. In this period the CP exercised more and more influence on the Allende government. Their compromise attitude to the Christian Democrats and the military disarmed the working class at a time when vigilance was essential.

THE UNIVERSAL SOLDIERY

The military in Chile as in every other state in the world, are a class force. They normally serve the interests of the class that controls the state

THE ROLE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

AFTER THE CHILEAN COUP OF SEPTEMBER 1973, THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHILE GAVE ITSELF GREAT AIRS AND GRACES, AND CLAIMED THAT IT HAD BEEN FOLLOWING THE ONLY LOGICAL SOCIALIST POLICY. BRIAN GIRVIN ARGUES THAT IN FACT THE CHILEAN C.P. BORE A LARGE SHARE OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE DESTRUCTION OF THE WORKING CLASS MOVEMENT IN CHILE.

apparatus, be they capitalist or socialist. In the 1890s, 1920s and 1930s the military ruled Chile and since then supplemented capitalist rule in breaking strikes, shooting strikers etc. The statement of the CP as to their 'professionalism' is pure fantasy, and was shown to be so in September.

A clear break with the policies of compromise with the capitalists could have been achieved early in 1973, and in particular when the second lorry owners' strike occurred. Issues arose that would engender mass support amongst the working class. Their options were not utilised by the Popular Unity. The main threat existed from the military and the only way to counter it was to arm the workers and peasants, form peoples' militias and utilise what power and prestige remained with Allende to rally the country against Fascism. In what could be considered a revolutionary situation (June to September 1973), Allende played the CP card of compromise with the capitalist strikers and integration of the military into the cabinet. The bourgeoisie and the military refused to negotiate and the coup of September 11 ensued.

By mid 1973 civil war could not be averted, all the signs were there. Allende and the CP chose to ignore them and so Fascism was capable of taking power. It may be argued that in the event of civil war Fascism may have still been the result. Fascism has been the result of not making civil war; the death of the 30,000 and the destruction of the working class politics in Chile certainly puts into question the slogan, "No to Civil War".

BRIAN GIRVIN

BROWNE OFF

NOEL BROWNE has for long been the most consistent and capable public enemy of Rome Rule in Southern Ireland.

Now that the Irish people are just beginning to shake themselves free of superstitious control in politics, it is a pity to see him turn against democracy.

Browne is full of the milk of human kindness. He tries hard to get a "fair deal" for the poor. He has said many times that the only way to achieve this is by socialism. But on several occasions lately he has said that he sees no hope of attaining socialism by democratic means. On the TV programme Firing Line on 19/3/74, he was interviewed by the notorious American reactionary

contd. page 5

BROWNE OFF (contd)

William F. Buckley. He told Buckley that he could see no hope in parliamentary democracy. Buckley asked him did this mean that he wanted a totalitarian government. Although pressed for an answer he refused to say just what his alternative was. On another occasion lately he said that the whole system of parliamentary democracy was "discredited".

If Browne has an alternative system of democracy in mind, he is keeping very quiet about it. It is more likely that he thinks some group of good and ruthless men should get their hands on a few guns. After that, it should be easy enough to set up a government which will do all the right things.

If you start from a position of noble-minded disgust at the poverty, ignorance and bad health of Irish people; if you then watch them year after year electing the sort of cowboys they do elect to the Dail, it is not so surprising if you decide in time that it's all hopeless. You begin looking about for another solution. So why not violent revolution? The revolutionary governments of Russia and China did wonders for public health.

We do not disagree with Dr. Browne that Lenin and Mao were what the doctor ordered for their countries. But where is the revolutionary elite hiding out in Ireland? Is it possible that Dr. Browne is getting soft on Gardiner Place? But if the Dail is discredited, what word describes Mac Giolla's brigade? Or is it the looney Maoists? Or the Bible-toting Provos?

Let's face it. There is no revolutionary army waiting in the wings. We must work with what we see. Noel Browne's talk of revolution is the fantasy of a disappointed humanitarian.

It wouldn't matter, only that things are just beginning to happen in a democratic way.

Browne thinks the Jesuits were spot on when they said, "Give us the child and we will answer for the man's opinions". On that reasoning, one generation of Catholic education would enslave a country for ever. But if people cannot break out of their childhood brain-washing, where have all the young anti-clericals come from? The way forward is not through daydreaming about military action, but for all the enemies in this generation of clerical power to get together and let them fight the Church on every issue as it arises.

The struggle against the Church is a struggle for democracy or it is nothing.

TOM BATES

MAKE SURE YOU GET YOUR COPY OF

COMMUNIST REVIEW A NEWLY-PUBLISHED
MAGAZINE OF THE B&ICO, MAINLY DEALING WITH
SOUTHERN AFFAIRS.

Articles in the April edition include:

CONTRACEPTION: IS IT REALLY A HUMAN RIGHT?
MICHAEL COLLINS' PATH TO 'FREEDOM'
THE FOOLS — An evaluation of Southern politicians.

COMMUNIST REVIEW may be got from our
sellers at the GPO, O'Connell Street, from 12 to
4 on Saturdays or from: The British and Irish
Communist Organisation, 26 Essex Quay, Dublin 8,
who print and publish the COMMENT.

YOU GOTTA SHOW YER MARRIAGE LICENCE, MISS.

There is a whole load of honesty flying round these days. Northern Ireland is part of the United Kingdom. Irish is not our native language, nor our national one. Now the Sunday Independent calls the government "Cowards" for the dirty bit of legislation they are going to put through about contraceptives. Already Mr. Cooney, Minister for Justice, has explained that the legislation isn't his fault. The Courts passed judgement and the politicians must ratify their decision. Poor old National Coalition isn't to blame.

Of course, they are cowards, almost the whole lot of them. No one wants to get stuck with the contraceptive mentality. But who is to blame? If only we could find a way to blame the British and have an anti-imperialist struggle against contraceptives. There is a fine Republican tradition that could be drawn on.

Rome has spoken...now they are all wetting their trousers over a little bit of sex without kids. The Sunday Independent didn't have much to say about the Pope ..the root cause of all this trouble. We wonder if his eternal reward will be celebrated the way they celebrated Stalin's.

P.S. YOU USED TO GET MARRIED TO HAVE CHILDREN
NOW YOU GET MARRIED TO AVOID THEM.

P.P.S. Of course the Church no longer has any
influence in Ireland.

John O'Brien.

SELF DENIAL AND ARDUOUS STRUGGLE.

Recently the Vatican issued directives to national hierarchies concerning contraceptives. The bishops were encouraged to step up the struggle against the legalisation of contraception and abortion and to provide proof to the Vatican of their endeavours. And proof, in the form of propaganda, would no doubt go to swell the archives of the Vatican archives.

There was some bad news from the Irish front. On the same day, the Irish Bishops announced that they would be making no more public statements on contraceptives. They would continue the struggle with prayers. Since prayers cannot be photocopied for the Vatican, postage will be saved, and the boys in Rome will have to put up with faith. Still, they'll understand; paper shortage and all that.

DOWN WITH THE DUREX IMPERIALISTS

The Catholic Standard is keeping up the struggle with some very left-wing stuff about how the "underlying cause behind world malnutrition is trade imbalance fostered and perpetuated by the West."

"The Vatican's secret document to the bishops is a good start. It points out that starvation in the Third World is not due to overpopulation but to economic exploitation. This must be said again and again."

It is hard to know what this 'trade imbalance' and 'economic exploitation' of the Third World means. One of the things it usually means is that those countries are not receiving 'fair' prices for their commodity exports, and that they are paying too much for their imports. Since 80% of the trade of Third World countries is with the advanced capitalist countries, it would seem that the Vatican thinks that the advanced countries are

CONTD.
p.6

Shop Stewards statement Contd

ment of the working class.

This reactionary attitude was adopted by the Dublin Shop Stewards Committee against the National Wage Agreement, when at their last conference they declared against the principle of national wage bargaining at any time in the future. A progressive attitude would have been to accept national wage bargaining as the new form of industrial struggle (as the working class have in practice done) and fight to have that struggle conducted in the most effective way.

But then the Shop Stewards Cttee. has shown from the start that it is not too interested in the realities of the situation. It has been used as a platform for the fairytale economics and politics of the Communist Party and the various strands of Trotskyists.

At the last Conference, the impossible and socially ridiculous demand that a national minimum wage of 35 pounds a week be paid to the unemployed as well as to the lower-paid workers, was passed as a motion, with only a handful opposed (mainly the B&ICO.) The majority of the delegates, including the CP, abstained, realising that such a motion was ridiculous, yet not having the guts to oppose the revolutionary phrasemongering of the Trots.

Such an organisation cannot contribute to the advance of the working class. Therefore the B&ICO has decided to withdraw its support from it. We print below the letter of resignation of the B&ICO members of the Shop Stewards Cttee :

"In opposing E. O' Farrell's amendment to the policy resolution to disband the Dublin Shop Stewards Committee in the event of an acceptance of

the 3rd National Wage Agreement, Chris Gibson gave a number of reasons for his opposition. These included: the need for democracy within the unions, the need for a committee whose members would cut across existing trade union and job divisions, and the need to combat bureaucracy within the trade union movement. We agreed with these reasons and voted to reject the amendment to the motion.

However, the Committee, in overwhelmingly supporting Paragraph 4 of the main resolution which committed it to "ensure that Congress is never again mandated to negotiate such agreements" thereby committed itself to a dogmatic adherence to free collective bargaining and closed its mind to any possible developments of centralised or Class Bargaining which we, the undersigned, stated to the Conference we believed to be the way forward for a trade union movement which now finds itself in a strong bargaining position.

Such dogmatic and sectarian restraints on the meaningful discussion of future developments in trade union bargaining is certainly uncharacteristic of a rank-and-file movement of shop stewards and we believe that they were introduced by academic and political elements on the committee, many of them with little practical experience. Further, we believe that they will prevent the Committee from making any further useful contribution to the progress of Irish trade unionism. Accordingly, we are left with no alternative but to resign from the Committee.

SIGNED: SEAN BARRETT, Shop Steward,
Pye Limited.

BRENDAN RUSHE, Shop Steward,
McInerney Ltd.

PAT MURPHY, Shop Steward,
Telecommunications Ltd.

The Gaeltacht Contd

for a mere two hours every evening. The Gaeltacht people took the initiative and made demands distinct from those of the revivalists. It, and the other services, can only be developed to meet the needs of the community when that initiative has been regained by the Gaeltacht.

THE "FEACH" POSITION.

This can only be done by systematic exposure of revivalism, the seizure of its resources and privileges by the Gaeltacht community and the confrontation of the government with realistic demands.

An example of how the language and the revival are treated as one and the same was given on the R.T.E. 'Feach' programme on March 11th. A Jesuit priest, Fr. O Cathain, who has recently been critical of revivalist objectives was bluntly asked why he was anti-Irish language. The poor man explained that as he had been brought up an Irish speaker and had devoted a substantial portion of his life to it, it would be almost impossible for him to be anti-Irish. Nevertheless, even though he emphasised that it is the revival he opposes, the point was relentlessly pursued; this bourgeois position is conveniently adopted by C.C.O'Brien and others in authority to absolve them of any responsibility to those who speak Irish in the West, and it effectively demonstrates the dis-service done to the language by those who have always pretended to support it.

MUTILATION.

Because of the revival movement the living language has been distorted out of all recognition, its

sounds unintelligible to the ear of the native speaker; literature no longer has flavour, due to the mutilation of spelling, grammar and even script. So much so that, when the government stopped printing essential basic text-books many years ago, no-one in the Gaeltacht even noticed.

It is clear, therefore, that the revival movement poses as great a threat to basic rights in the Gaeltacht as the establishment. The latter has always exploited the Gaeltacht with the aid of the revival, and of not combatted seriously will attempt to destroy it on the pretext that they are both indistinguishable.

SEAN O'CEARNAIGH.

DOWN WITH DUPLEX (CONT.)

exploiting the less developed.

It certainly looks like the Vatican and the "Catholic Standard" (whatever about the Irish Hierarchy) are in the vanguard of an anti-imperialist struggle against contraceptives. Since the Vatican now realises that it has lost the European working class (whatever about the Irish), it's not surprising that she is looking for other causes to influence.