



**POLITICAL EDUCATION**

# **WHAT IS REPUBLICANISM?**

Reading & Resource Packet

**\***

# **Contents**

---

**1.**

**"Genuine self-determination means acting like republicans now"**

Allan Armstrong

p.3

**2.**

**"Republicanism and the democratic road to socialism"**

Bob Goupillot

p.6

**3.**

**"Why a republican perspective is important"**

Bob Goupillot, Iain Robertson

p.11

**4.**

**"The importance of republicanism"**

Bernadette McAliskey

p.12

**\***

**Further Reading/Resources**

p.16

**Cover:** *The Tennis Court Oath* by David

# 1.

## **“Genuine self determination means acting like republicans now”**

---

Allan Armstrong

Source: [Bella Caledonia](#), 20 November 2012

Most people understand a republic to be a state without a monarch. When socialists are asked why they oppose the British monarchy, they usually concentrate their criticism on the antiquated class structure this upholds, and the high cost of maintaining such a parasitic institution, especially now the rest of us face austerity.

However, the UK is a constitutional monarchy. This means the Queen exerts little power in her own right. The fragility of royal political influence was shown over the Windsors' inept handling of the 'Princess Di Affair' in 1997. Yes, the royal family enjoys obscene privileges in terms of property, income and status, but these are rewards given for its role in supporting and promoting the interests of a wider British ruling class.

Far more important than the royal family itself is the political system it fronts. Despite the existence of a parliamentary democracy centred on Westminster, with its devolved offspring at Holyrood, Cardiff Bay and Stormont, we still face very real constraints. These lie in the state's profoundly anti-democratic Crown powers.

These powers shield a whole host of unsavoury institutions and practices from any public accountability or even scrutiny. They are needed to guarantee continued British ruling class control. This class is made up from the leaders of finance, commerce, industry, the armed forces, judiciary, senior civil servants and key politicians.

In 2004, the New Labour government deigned to publicise some of these powers. However, they still kept others secret – so we don't even know the full extent of what we are up against! New Labour regularly resorted to these powers, most notoriously in the war in Iraq. Tory and Labour governments have used these powers to mobilise troops to break firefighters' strikes in 1997 and 2002.

These powers cloak the activities of the City of London in secrecy. Business leaders have also ensured that bidding and contract details for the government's many lucrative PFI contracts, amounting to billions of pounds of public money, are conducted in secret under the guise of commercial confidentiality. This means that whole swathes of the UK economy, ostensibly under the control or supervision of Parliament, in reality lie way beyond any effective public accountability.

We can also look at other measures sanctioned under the Crown powers. Last month, Guardian journalist, Ian Cobain published *Cruel Britannia: A Secret History of Torture*. This shows how the UK state has been able to cover up its continuous use of inhuman treatment, and falsely claim it is not engaged in such practices.

Under the Crown powers, even democratically elected governments can be toppled. Back in 1975, Gough Whitlam fronted a mildly reforming Labour government, which wanted to keep US nuclear warships out of Australian ports. He felt the long arm of the Crown powers when the British Governor-General removed him from his elected office. The incumbent British Labour government did nothing to help, highlighting Labour's almost total acceptance of the UK's undemocratic state.

However, these powers go even further. They even allow for the suspension of Parliament in 'extreme situations', with resort instead to direct rule by the Privy Council. This very select band of former and existing senior government ministers is chosen for its reliability in upholding ruling class interests. Its members all enjoy close contact with the world of business, whilst some have had direct dealings with military officers, MI5 and MI6.

But surely such a constitutional coup is unlikely to ever happen? Yet, whenever national democratic challenges are made, the British ruling class quickly resorts to the Crown powers. This should send out warning bells now that the prospect of greater Scottish self-determination has been raised.

In 1969, the UK state refused to make any serious attempt to dismantle its sectarian 'apartheid' statelet in Northern Ireland when challenged by the Civil Rights Movement. After forcing this movement off the streets by gunning down 13 unarmed demonstrators in Derry in 1972, the full force of her majesty's regiments were brought to bear on Irish republicans and nationalists.

But, surely we can take some comfort from the fact that the British ruling class did not resort to such violent measures when the issue of Scottish self-determination was raised in the late 1970s? However, before the mid 1990s, when the majority of the British ruling class concluded that 'devolution-all-round' (for Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland) was the best strategy to defend its interests in these islands and the wider world, many were bitterly opposed even to very mild constitutional reform.

Therefore, in the lead-up to the 1979 devolution referendum, the 'non-political' Queen was wheeled out to make a Christmas broadcast attacking Scottish nationalism. Senior civil servants were told to bury any documents which could help the Scottish nationalists. Military training exercises were conducted, targeting putative armed Scottish guerrilla forces. The security forces became involved on the nationalist fringe, encouraging anti-English diatribes and actions, to discredit any notion of real Scottish self-determination. But, it was not necessary to resort to more of the Crown powers, because the Labour government was divided, and the SNP's challenge was so mild and constitutionalist, the ruling class did not have to go any further.

Today, the British ruling class is even more united in its opposition to the SNP government's 'independence-lite' proposals. There is no room, at present, for the SNP's wannabe ruling class junior managerial buyout of the Scottish branch of UK plc. This despite their acceptance of the monarchy and hence the continued ability of the UK state to intervene in Scotland; of NATO and hence a continued Scottish commitment to US and British imperial wars; and of the City of London and hence to continued imposed austerity.

So, how will the British ruling class use those Crown powers in the current referendum campaign? Well, they have already achieved their first objective. Alex Salmond, a Privy Councillor, sees his power coming from the devolved Holyrood office he already holds. He does not contemplate any Yes majority in 2014 leading to the setting up of a democratic Constituent Assembly answerable to the people of Scotland.

The Scottish government sees a Yes vote as giving them a mandate to negotiate over how much more power can be devolved from Westminster. Their initial opening negotiating gambit of 'independence-lite', meekly accepts those profoundly anti-democratic powers and practices. They would become hardwired into any future 'Scottish Free State'. And before this, you can be sure that the Unionists will force further retreats. The Crown powers would also lead to certain hidden agreements – and we know that Salmond has a strong penchant for secrecy!

This means that socialists must not relegate the issue of a republic to a possible future referendum. Effective republicanism means opposing those Crown powers today. If we want to achieve genuine self-determination or 'independence-max', our campaign must be republican from the start.

## 2.

# “Republicanism and the democratic road to socialism”

---

Bob Goupillot

Source: *Republicanism, Socialism and Democracy*,  
pamphlet by the Republican Communist Network, 2008

*“The role of communists is to develop an awareness of the utility and necessity of democracy”*  
– Victor Serge

*“As long as democracy has not been achieved, thus long do communists and democrats fight side  
by side”*  
– Friedrich Engels

Republicanism in the United Kingdom describes the movement from below for a radical and militant democracy. For socialists, republicanism addresses those immediate democratic issues faced by the working class in the here and now. It seeks to develop a programme for expanding democracy under capitalism as far as it will go. It concerns itself with progressive and in some senses transitional demands. To the extent that we achieve our democratic demands these strengthen our class and weaken the ruling class and its allies. It is a necessary and unavoidable part of the struggle for socialism.

This democratic struggle is called republicanism in the UK because it highlights that we live in an undemocratic, constitutional monarchy. The term republicanism also connects us to our own radical history.

Republican struggles in these islands provide a red thread going back to the Levellers in the English revolution, the Cameronians (radical Covenanters) here in Scotland, the struggle of the United Irishmen, the Chartists, and the prospects of workers’ republics raised by James Connolly and John Maclean. The rise of capitalism and the struggle of the emerging bourgeoisie against the feudal state and church led to a false association between capitalism and the spreading of democracy. In reality wherever they have achieved power, the bourgeoisie have sought to narrow, limit and impoverish democracy, for the majority of the population. Consciously or unconsciously they have recognised in the proletariat their future gravediggers. Hence they have sought to block any democratic path to a genuine republic because, in a truly democratic republic, the bourgeoisie and their system, capitalism, could not flourish.

Socialists see republicanism today as directly linked to the struggle for the socialist republic tomorrow. However, republicanism is not a sentimental attachment to yesterday’s struggles. It

helps us develop a strategy and tactics to directly oppose today's oppressors and exploiters. To declare for the democratic republic is to declare war against the existing bourgeois state.

## **Republicanism in action**

Republicanism in the workplace or trade union means spreading action outwards and upwards from the origin of the conflict or from its most militant site. It is not about waiting until your faction has won the position of the general secretaryship of the union or a majority on the party executive. Industrial republicanism recognises the sovereignty of the members in their workplaces and branches and not the sovereignty of the union head office or full-time officials. Neither is its main purpose to reform the capitalist state and its laws, although it may produce useful reforms such as the legal right to strike or to take secondary action.

Republicanism endorses direct action in the community. It is not about waiting to 'win power' in local or national elections, where power is in the hands of the elected few. Republicanism is about the maximum level of participation in any action with democratic control at the grassroots level. For republicans, contesting local and national elections is not an end in itself. We stand in elections to offer an ideological alternative to capitalism and to challenge the state under which we live. When the Tories tried to impose their hated poll tax in Scotland, tens of thousands (some say hundreds of thousands) took action to resist. This resistance was spread further, by activists, to England and Wales. A struggle initiated in the housing schemes of Muirhouse and Pollok was fought to a famous victory. Tens of thousands of protestors defied the state in Trafalgar Square on March 31st 1990.

When socialists put up candidates for the local elections, it was to legitimise actions being taken or considered, e.g. campaigning in council elections on a 'Don't Pay the Poll Tax' slogan. During that titanic struggle, millions moved from protesting against an unjust tax to breaking the law and organising to prevent the rule of the state operating as it wished. The most militant areas became no-go areas for sheriff officers and representatives of the Labour Party (whose councils were imposing the tax). This is republicanism in action.

Sometimes latent republican struggles in the community become conscious republican struggles. In 1969, tens of thousands demonstrated for civil rights (e.g. equal voting and access to jobs and housing) in Northern Ireland. Their resistance was met by British paratroopers in Derry on Bloody Sunday, January 30th 1972, when 14 peaceful demonstrators were shot down. This was followed by internment without trial. The republican struggle against the UK state took off.

## **Seeing struggles through a republican lens**

A republican perspective politicises issues and illuminates a democratic path that leads us beyond capitalism. It is an energising principle, which brings with it a personal responsibility to think and act like an active citizen rather than a submissive subject. It allows us to come to

grips with the enemy state and thus provides an antidote to passivity in socialist organisations and society at large.

Thus campaigns against homelessness and for the building of more council houses are not just about the demand for more homes. It is an argument about collective rather than private provision of services and about democratic accountability: councillors are elected, housing association executives are not. This then becomes a political, not just an economic demand. Similarly, the struggle around the defence of asylum seekers challenges the state's ability to create and control borders and restrict the free movement of people (in contrast to capital, commodities and profits).

Another example is foxhunting. This can be opposed on the grounds of cruelty to foxes or on the basis of who should control the land. These examples indicate the militant ways in which revolutionary republicans fight for reforms.

Republicanism is about releasing the latent power of the people, and it means recognising the legitimacy of democratically-agreed direct action taken by ourselves at whatever level. In short, republicanism is putting the sovereignty of the people into action in the here and now.

Republicanism challenges not just the ruling class but also their knowing collaborators in and out of parliament (e.g., trade union bureaucracies) and their unknowing collaborators (those left organisations that want to restrict class action until it – 'the chosen party' – considers the time and tactic is right). Connolly, for example, acted in true republican fashion when he threw the weight of the Irish Citizen Army behind the Easter Rising despite personally judging the wider organisation to be ill-prepared.

## **Making our own organisations democratic**

Republicanism is fundamentally about the highest form of democracy. That is democratic control held by the basic units of the society – workplaces and effective networks within communities. Elected representatives must always be accountable and subject to recall and dismissal. If elected representatives are paid, then they should receive no more than the average skilled workers' wage. This is a vital weapon against careerism and will help eliminate those powerful forces that drive a wedge between the elected and the electorate, the union member and the full timer.

It is imperative that socialists lead the struggle within society to extend absolute democracy to all areas of our lives. To achieve this it is absolutely essential that our own organisations are democratic. This must include trade unions and socialist parties.

The Republican Communist Network insists on the importance of republicanism and a democratic constitution within the Scottish Socialist Party because we recognise this as the most effective method of decision-making, i.e. it maximises our ability to produce correct



answers to problems we face. It leads to collective decision-making through mutual education and debate. An active, living democracy allows us to harness the creativity of the membership and honestly reflect on the results of our practice and to quickly amend it in the light of this learning.

A democratic party allows the working class to express itself through its structures. It is essential to foster a democratic structure that recognises the value of minority views being expressed. Socialists support elections being conducted on the basis of proportional representation (PR). This is an indispensable demand, both within and beyond our own organisations. It ensures that minority opinions are always heard and are not silenced, and allows debate between differing points of view – the lifeblood of democracy.

This expresses the essence of the Marxist dialectic whereby our practice develops through the open clash of differing ideas on what constitutes the best way forward..This is an important corrective method for any socialist grouping. Failure to allow this results in mistakes like the Socialist Workers Party dismissing the 1984-5 miners' strike and the poll tax as unimportant struggles. An error of a different nature was the Militant tendency's prediction of the 'Red Nineties', i.e. that, as a result of the collapse of the Soviet bloc, there would be a massive upturn in working class struggles and through these a politicisation of the class – in reality, the opposite happened.

In each of these cases, the lack of an effective internal democratic structure reduced the ability of these organisations to adapt their strategies to deal with reality as it actually unfolded and disproved their earlier predictions. This inflexibility made them less effective as vehicles to express the needs of the working class.

Ultimately, democracy is a living thing. It cannot be completely captured by constitutions, etc. It can however be enhanced or hindered by such things. Republicanism embodies such characteristics as openness, egalitarianism and a long-term perspective. Further it recognises that adhering to principle may involve short-term losses. Republicans within any political organisation will always contest the drift toward bureaucratic control of that organisation by dominant faction(s), whether that control is exerted through the power of their block vote, or via rigging the rules and constitution to stifle dissent. Republicanism will always challenge those holding office who put their personal interests above those they are elected to represent.

Although republicanism is not communism or socialism, it is difficult to imagine how either of these will be achieved without a strongly republican movement and thoroughgoing democracy to guard against the many temptations of managerialism, bureaucracy and totalitarianism. The struggle for democracy has the potential to unite our class and points the way to revolutionary change and a new form of society. Indeed, socialism can only develop and be maintained under conditions of active, mass, democratic participation in the running of society. In its absence we have by definition another, non-socialist, form of society as in the former USSR.

Republican consciousness and practice brings the possibility of revolutionary change into the

sphere of everyday life. Revolutionary social change is understood as the culmination of an ongoing and developing revolutionary process rather than a one-off event.

The Paris Commune and the workers' councils (soviets) in the Russian Empire did not spring out of nowhere. They were the culmination of long struggles to assert popular and workers' control over people's lives. Today's workers' and popular struggles to retain control of our own organisations, and to win and try to establish control over reforms which will improve our lives, are the bridge to this socialist or communist future. The republican desire to assert our self-determination is but a step on the way to creating a society based on the principle of "from each according to their ability, to each according to their needs".

### 3.

## “Why a republican perspective is important”

---

Bob Goupillot & Iain Robertson

Excerpt from: [Emancipation & Liberation](#), journal of the Republican Communist Network, June 2015

Returning briefly to the monarchy itself, senior royals can refuse Royal Assent to parliamentary bills (usually only the threat of this is needed and committees will alter the bill in advance of a vote in parliament). The Guardian exposed numerous examples of the royals being ‘consulted’ in this way. This is in addition to the revelation in 2013 that prince Charlie alone had had 36 private meetings with government ministers since 2010. That’s about one a month!

But perhaps the most anti-democratic feature is the operation of the Privy Council. This unelected, 500-member body, comprising of representatives of the military, the established church, peers, and the City of London, as well as leaders of the main parliamentary parties, meets monthly and exercises real power. It only needs a quorum of three, i.e. the monarch and two others.

More serious even than that, it can and does act independently of parliament and even the courts. It has authorised the continuation of phone tapping, justified the use of illegal interrogation techniques (torture) within the UK and NI during the ‘70s and in the late 1960s the inhabitants of the UK controlled Diego Garcia Islands were forcibly removed to make way for a US military base. Twice over the next three decades UK courts declared this illegal and twice the Privy Council overturned the ruling. Not even parliament can overturn a High Court ruling without changing the law itself. The Privy Council has the power to ignore the law and that deeply anti-democratic power will be used against us if we retain the ‘constitutional’ monarchy, the Crown-in-Parliament.

This is a major issue with the SNP. It is not just that they turn a blind eye to this, they are complicit in the system. The leader of the SNP in Westminster has always been a member of this Privy Council. They know exactly how hollow ‘independence under the Crown’ really would be.

Suppose the monarchy were abolished tomorrow, would that give us full control over our lives? What would happen to the Privy Council and the panoply of Crown powers?

## 4.

# “The importance of Republicanism”

---

Bernadette McAliskey

Source: Transcript of a speech at the London Says Yes rally, September 2014

Going back in history there was the Great Debate in English democracy between Thomas Paine and Edmund Burke, which too many people forget. That was a Great Debate around democracy. Although a very early debate, which preceded the more radical discussions on the development of and the debate on the rights of the working class, the debate was around basic democracy, around what constituted the state, what the state's role was and what the citizen's role was within the state.

Edmund Burke, who was actually an Irishman but an English nationalist, argued at that time that once the people had voted for the government and formed the state, the state, as it were, became the permanent voice of the people. It wasn't really within the gift of the people to change that. It was Thomas Paine who said that nobody had a right to set the boundaries for the next generation – that democracy is always evolving and that at any point the citizens who formed society created government and created the state, and that it was the right of the citizens collectively, at any point, to not only dismiss the government but to reconstitute the state.

We see this in the development of what is called parliamentary democracy, which the British think they invented, God love them – actually, the Native Americans had a much better form of that centuries before. But this concept, that once the state and once the government is in place that it supersedes the rights of the people, fits very well in a backward democratic society like England. It's very primitive, I hate to tell you. You have one of the most primitive forms of democracy going around.

After the Great Debate, most people, most countries, most nation states emerging at least gave themselves a written constitution. You could at least see what the rules were. It wasn't all it was cracked up to be, but at least you had a framework around which to organise and to demand your rights. You don't have one.

You have a democracy by the grace of God and the willingness of Her Majesty the Queen. That's why you have a democracy. And if Her Majesty the Queen, or her son or grandson, or whoever else God chooses to run the country, decides you are not entitled to a democracy, it's over – unless you want to fight, to take up arms, or there is a Cromwell amongst you who's prepared to take on the monarchy. You have a democracy by the grace of God and the will of the Queen. Even some of the weakest democracies in Africa manage a written constitution –

as I said, it's not all it's cracked up to be.

That Great Debate which preceded the understanding of class in society still is relevant here. It separated out the difference between nationalism and national identity. Everybody is entitled to a national identity. The nation is not a structure. A nation is a collective of people – a Scottish nation, an Irish nation, any nation is a cultural representation. But a state is simply an administrative function. It ought to have a constitution and the people living within that jurisdiction should be the people who decide the rules.

That is what Scotland are trying to do, and why wouldn't they? If the United Kingdom was such a wonderful place for everybody outside the City of London to be in, why would people spend so much of their time looking to get out of it? It is not a united kingdom. It was, in fact, the first steps of the creation of British imperialism. My father taught me that British imperialism went on to rape, to plunder and to steal throughout the whole world and build its wealth. Go by all the museums – everything you walk around and see, you stole from other people. The nation, the state, built itself on the slavery of Africa, on the mineral wealth of South America, on the genocide of Native America, on the destruction of Aboriginal Australia. Get over it! There is nothing great, there's nothing united about the kingdom.

When you look to the Scottish debate, if you're up there as I have been, what is exciting about it is that it's a different conversation. It's not a conversation amongst young people, amongst the working class, amongst women, amongst communities about Scottish nationalism being better than English nationalism. That's not the conversation that is happening. It is a conversation about taking power into localised hands [...] about seriously challenging the 21st century concept that's going about: 'the reason we don't have a national health service is we haven't got enough money, the reason we can't keep young people in education is we haven't got enough money, the reason we don't have anything for people with mental health problems is we don't have enough money'.

We have plenty of money in the country. The country isn't poor. If you were in Guinea-Bissau, you could say you don't have any money. But this country, these islands, are wealthy. The reason we don't have enough money to look after the citizens of this country is that the state and the government have become nothing but the whipping boy of capitalism. It has become nothing but the slave of the banks and private corporations.

The country has plenty of money. But if you want to build a society fit for human beings to live in, with a proper health service, education service, that looks after its elderly, that pays its workers, that shares its wealth, then you have to have a government that has a large public purse. For a government to have a large public purse, the government must have an ability to tax the rich and support the poor. You must have a government that, if the rich don't want to part with their money, must nationalise the resources that the country needs.

What has the UK given to all of us? It has taken away our public transport system. It has destroyed our NHS. It has destroyed and weakened our unions. It has created sectarianism and

racism. It has divided man, woman, child against each other. For what reason? To preserve the wealth of the wealthy and to make us believe that it is somebody else's fault. It's this poor person's fault that this poor person is sick. It's this poor person's fault that this poor person don't have an education.

That is what they are asking us to preserve against a new conversation of more localised democracy, of people beginning to take power into their own hands, of having conversations in community halls about Trident, in universities about immigration, in the street with ordinary people in Scotland. That's the conversation people are having. It's not a Braveheart conversation. It's not a tartan gift conversation. It's not an anti-English conversation. It's an energetic conversation about a new democracy in the hands of the people.

The person who has to be most worried about a Yes vote isn't old Cameron. Do you know who it is? Mr Salmond: the man who has to be most frightened of the Yes vote. When the Yes vote comes, the very modest demands of Salmond to create a separate system not unlike the system that Blair had down here won't work [...] That conversation, if Scotland voted Yes, becomes not an abstract conversation of hope but a real conversation, because you have to make it work, because now it belongs to you. It's very easy to have a conversation about Trident when it doesn't belong to you. But when you have to make the decision to shift it or not shift it, a whole new world of conversation opens up. This will make a difference in every part of the United Kingdom.

Will Scotland drift off into the melting ice of the North Sea? Will some chasm emerge? Will some wall grow up in the middle of the night, and people say 'Where's Scotland? Oh, I can't see my relatives in Glasgow!?' They'll still be there. Does anybody seriously believe that if Scotland votes Yes that on September 20th, people will say, "Oh, what will I do with this pound? I cannae go to the shop!?" Do you think the shop man's going to say "Oh, I couldn't take that pound off you!?"

There will be a discussion about currency. There will be a discussion about membership of the EU. There'll be a discussion about all those bits and pieces. More important is the nature of the discussion and how it begins to change the nature of the discussion south of the border.

Because once you have a localised conversation that is based on the needs of local people, the majority of whom are working class people, then you have a localised conversation on this side of the border. You don't have an English conversation – you have a Liverpool and Manchester conversation, a Yorkshire conversation about how people are surviving in their regions. You don't have a conversation that is led and controlled by the interests of the City of London. You have conversations that are led and controlled by working people on this side of the border.

It opens a whole new conversation, like immigration does in the north of Ireland. It opens a whole new basis of a conversation in Northern Ireland: 'How do we relate to a United

Kingdom that no longer exists?’ How do you build up this false loyalty and fear based on sectarianism and based on bigotry, how do you sustain that loyalty when the core basis of it is being whittled away?

You have a whole new conversation around the needs of Scotland, for example, for more people, so you have a more progressive immigration policy already in Scotland. You have a more progressive conversation on immigration in the north of Ireland, you have a more progressive conversation on immigration in the south of Ireland, because these people know that we need them. I keep saying to people that if you know anybody who’s thinking of immigrating to the UK, please send them to Belfast. We need more. We used to have eight-and-a-half million until Britain starved us and now we’re still three million short in population, so just keep sending people.

The Yes vote in Scotland is not simply important because of what it will do for Scotland over the period of the next year, two years, three years. It allows us to deconstruct the colonial, imperial relationship that has always existed on these islands, take it apart and put together a collaborative federation, a collaboration of soviets if you like – I would! – a collective grouping of equal, regional bodies that represent the needs of the people who live there. That’s why it’s historic. You cannot build a fair, united British Isles, Celtic Isles – I don’t care what you call them – until you dismantle that aberration of democracy that’s misnamed ‘united’, that anti-democratic entity of a kingdom.

My mother told me that the queen of England was a noble and gracious lady, and so she is. But my father said ‘so she is, but notwithstanding that, she is the receiver of stolen goods and the inheritor of the butcher’s apron’. That doesn’t make her a bad person, doesn’t make her personally responsible, but the nature of the relationship you people in this room have with your monarch is that she owns you and you have to behave like British subjects. I am not, never was and never will be, of my own free will and consent, anybody’s subject and certainly not a British one.

The Scottish conversation is about democracy. It is about untangling the undemocratic colonial knot and building for ourselves on these islands a fair society, a democratic society of equals. In that conversation, if what we want to do is eradicate poverty, eradicate racism, eradicate the narrow nationalism represented by UKIP, the Orange Order and the DUP ... [then] the democratic discussion is not simply political and social, it is economic. Unless the means of production of wealth is in the democratic hands of the people, the distribution of wealth will never be.

\*

## Further Reading/ Resources

---

Bernadette McAliskey speaking at the Radical Independence Conference 2013

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=biwdlxREII4>

Tummon, J., "The Crown Corporation and the Royal Family Ltd.", *Emancipation, Liberation & Self-Determination*, (2017). [<http://republicancommunist.org/blog/2017/09/20/the-crown-corporation/>]

Gallacher, J., "What is the Crown and what is republicanism?", *Emancipation, Liberation & Self-Determination*, (2020). [<http://republicancommunist.org/blog/2020/12/28/what-is-the-crown-and-what-is-republicanism/>]

Armstrong, A. & Gallacher J., "Republican Symbolism", *Emancipation, Liberation & Self-Determination*, (2020). [<http://republicancommunist.org/blog/2021/01/20/republican-symbolism/>]

Vincenzi, C., *Crown Powers, Subjects and Citizens*, (London: Pinter 1998).