Murdered by the British state

Irish republican, Diarmuid Ó'Neill was shot and murdered in cold blood. In the aftermath of his killing the police and the state tried to suggest he had been killed in a gun battle but it quickly emerged that not only was Ó'Neill unarmad, no weapons were recovered from the flat in Hammersmith where he died.

Before a police marksman pumped six automatic rounds into him at close range, he was disabled by other officers throwing CS gas into his flat. Although there was never any chance of making the gun battle story stick, the authorities continue to spread lies and disinformation. The claim that Ó'Neill was taken out of the premises on a stretcher is graphically contradicted by the press photographs of blood on the front steps of the house. These suggest that dead or alive, he was dragged out.

Since his death numerous stories about his past activities have been planted in the media. A past conviction for fraud and the alleged diversion of the proceeds to the coffers of the IRA supposedly demonstrate his unyielding commitment to that organisation.

Without any proof being offered it is said that he was intimately involved in the planting of the bomb at Canary Wharf earlier this year. Now the existence of a Basque girlfriend supposedly demonstrates a connection with ETA as well as the IRA.

Such stories not only whip up prejudice against the murdered Ó'Neill but also stir up anti-Irish bigotry. Ó'Neill's brother was arrested at the time of his death but has now been released. Last weekend the men's parents said in a statement: "We are relieved that our youngest son, Shane, has been released from custody ...Diarmuid was never arrested: he can never be tried, nor can he be acquitted or convicted other than by the press who have not waited to have a full and proper picture before judging him. Instead, those who accused him took the law into their own hands and killed him."

What happened to Diarmuid Ó'Neill is the latest tragic incident in a long history of state executions of Irish people. Throughout this the British government has constantly denied any policy of 'shoot to kill'.

Both the Stalker inquiry and the killing of three unarmed IRA members in Gibraltar in 1988 show that such a policy has existed, even if only at certain periods. Such a policy was supposedly justified on the basis of self-defence of the individuals involved - in this case as in many others there is no way this could hold water.

The treatment of those who testified in the Gibraltar case may mean that no witnesses will come forward this time and we will never get the full picture.

Only hours after the events in Hammersmith the police were pressuring neighbours not to speak to the media. The Police Complaints Authority is to investigate the Hammersmith shooting and there will be no official comment until after this.

Some commentators are now suggesting that a mistake may have been made. Sinisterly this is accompanied by a suggestion that in terms of a successful fight against the IRA, such mistakes are inevitable and that the assassination of one or several individuals is only a small price to pay.
Barbara battles for pensions

Terry Conway

PLATITUDES and misuse of statistics by Harriet Harman may not be enough to bring Blair victory on pensions. The leadership will try to get those who have submitted radical motions to remit and set up a commission to draft future policy, apparently with the support of pensions leader Jack Jones.

Barbara Castle, once the prime architect of the victorious anti-union 'In Place of Strife' has become the opposition spokesperson on pensions. She says she is not backing down.

Castle, together with Peter Townsend of the University of Bristol, took up the absence of any commitment to action on pensions in the 'Road to the Manifesto'.

'Their pamphlet 'We CAN afford the Welfare State' powerfully rebuts Labour's slide to means-testing not only on pensions but on benefits more generally.

One million pensioners do not claim the income support to which they are entitled. The pamphlet highlights the high administration costs of means-tested benefits and personal pensions, and exposes how the Tories have rigged the figures to generate a 'profit' on National Insurance contributions which has then been used to subsidise private pensions.

Castle and Townsend argue for a reformed State Earnings Related Pension Scheme (SERPS) with the restoration of all its original features as resources allow. The first measure that should be implemented, they argue, would be the 'best years earning years formula', particularly relevant in today's labour market.

Restoring the link between pensions and earnings destroyed by Thatcher as one of her first acts in government is crucial. Castle and Townsend not only argue for restoring pension levels but to what they would have been had Thatcher not axed the link, at a cost of £6.5 billion.

They also argue for an immediate increase in the basic level, as pledged by Labour in its 1992 manifesto-if it could be afforded then, they claim, it certainly can today.

Castle's stand is in line with that of pensioner's campaigns-10,000 marched through central London on September 14 to voice their demands. Many major unions and CLP's have similar platforms.

Socialist Outlook wants to be able to go beyond these demands and step in doing so if fighting vociferously for their implementation.

The fight for decent living standards in retirement may be a flashpoint in Blackpool but the battle will continue long beyond the conference season.

Labour attacks on Blair's patch

Ian Wilkinson

STIRLING COUNCIL in North London is set to force through a cuts package of £16 million, stating that it expects its government grant to be cut by about £1 million. It also intends not to set a high Council Tax just before the expected general election.

Blair's home Council which once saw itself as a flagpole for the decentralisation of services now intends to re-centralise many of them. It is voluntarily privatising many services, the biggest being Housing Benefits. It also intends to form partnerships with the private sector.

Labour is the latest on a growing list of Labour Councils attacking on service conditions on staff...

March to stop education cuts

October 19

Assemble Victoria Embankment 12-1pm. Coach set down at Waterloo Bridge. Rally in Hyde Park 3pm. Coach pick-up at Park Lane

DEMONSTRATE

Put the spotlight on ScotRail

Greg Tucker
RMT Train Crew Grades Secretary

Trying to build a national dispute in the face of the dominance of British Rail, with all the restraints of the Tory anti-union laws, proved almost impossible. Nevertheless, it was possible to ensure that strike days were co-ordinated and momentum built up.

At the same time, the union had to come to terms with a shift in the seat of power—from the national level to company based representatives.

Management tried their hardest to create a split between the union and leadership and these camps were clearly created. Only in two main areas in the South East were they successful.

While the time still came for an accounting in those areas, the key is now to concentrate on Scotland. ScotRail have offered a 37 hour week—but only if it is free of strikes. The union has rejected this and called further strike days.

Scottish members have stood firm on previous strike days, and will continue to do so, but many members, particularly other grades, in particular ASLEF drivers are afraid of the action. The dispute needs to escalate.

It will only be able to do so with support from the trade unions. In particular a ScotRail Fighting Fund to be set up. RMT members nationwide need to respond positively to the call for support.
The Road to The Manifesto: rotten process and bankrupt politics

New Labour – No Life

THE ‘GREATEST EX-
EREC TION’ in modern British political history is a sham. Labour Party members will soon be receiv-
ing individual ballot papers asking them to endorse the Party’s new manifesto New Labour – New Life.

These are being sent out on the last day of conference – on the assumption the manifesto will have been overwhelmingly endorsed elsewhere and that this will create a wave of enthusiasm among the wider membership. At the moment enthusiasm seems to be in short supply. Very few members have actually seen the manifesto. Before vot-
ing they will only be given a brief. Most people recognise the flaws in a process that does not even allow the Party conference to amend the manifesto.

The main advantage for the leadership is that with an election pending it is not even likely that the membership will not want to leave the Party without a manifesto by vot-
ing against it. As with the previous ballot on the new Clause IV ballot papers that time the Labour Party did not have the opportunity of voting for an alternati-
ve. Party officials are however worried about the potential level of re-
sponse.

All the hope about a mass democracy could be undermined if only a fraction of mem-
bers actually vote. Following the Clause IV ballot party officials did their best to ensure details of the turnout never got into the media.

The manifesto portrays as policy all that Blair has ‘achieved’ over the last few years. While the whole class struggle is out for a Labour government to re-
verse the damage the Tories have done over 17 years, Blair’s priorities are different.

The heart of his approach is an orthodox monetarism, more concerned with restoring the profitability of British capitalism than with addressing the real needs of the working class.

Non-union laws will remain in place; the minimum wage will only be at a level acceptable to the bosses; the attacks on the welfare state will continue.

Some on the left of the party have been debating how to re-
respond to the manifesto.

While agreeing on the need to vote against it, there are different views on how to vote in the ballot.

The only way for the left to counter is to organise a serious campaign against the manifesto.

Ken Livingstone has argued that much of it is so ambiguous that is possible to vote for it – if only the leadership’s interpretation of its ambiguities are the same as his. Thus despite his cam-
paign against the Maastricht convergence criteria for a single currency, he is able to say he agrees with the statement that Britain should enter a single currency if the conditions are right.

Such a stance implies, completely incorrectly, that it would be possible to amend the conver-
gence criteria in a progressive manner.

Others, such as those around Workers’ Liberty, while being clear that the content is unacceptable, argue that the left should not isolate itself by calling for a vote against. They have con-
vined the majority of the steer-
ing committee of the Socialist Campaign Group (New-Porters Network) that it should merely call on peo-
ple ‘not to vote for the manifesto’.

They argued that a call for a ‘no’ vote would al-
ed those on the Left who would rather abstain. The end product of their twisted logic is that we can claim we can claim all those who do not vote as supporters.

The media will also portray abstention as indifference. The tactic of socialism has to be to convince party members that the only way to send a clear message that the politics of New Labour is unaccept-
able is to mobilise the largest possible vote against.

If there is a massive disparity between yes and no votes the leadership and the media will claim that the left has been left to non-exist. The only way for the left to counter this is to organise a serious campaign against the manifesto.

This is also the only way to pre-
pare the ground for a serious opposition to Blair’s programme in government.

Enthusiasm seems to be in short supply. Very few members have actually seen the manifesto.

Counting the mounting cost of the Private Finance fiasco

John Lister

THE TRUTH is out. Far from saving money for the NHS and reducing public spending, the government’s controvers-
ial Private Finance Initiative (PFI) is substantially more expensive.

Theworker-owned private firms to the right to tender

Reversing into PFI

A Labour government is now seen by some busi-
ness chiefs as the potential saviour of the foundering Private Finance Initiative. Shadow Treasury min-
ister Mike O’Brien argues that ‘This idea must not be allowed to fail. Labour has a clear programme to rescue PFI.

This full-scale retreat follows the back-peddling of former Health Secretary Harriet Harman, speaking at a UNISON conference on PFI in June. She offered only that a new Labour government would ‘overhaul’ the PFI.

A year earlier her predecessor Margaret Beckett had dismissed the scheme as ‘totally unacceptable’.

UNISON health conference this pledged the union to fight for PFI to be scrapped, and for any assets and services handed over to private firms to be repa-
issed.
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Ireland after Drumcree.

David Coen explains how Sinn Fein's strategy is shifting after the events at Drumcree earlier this year.

The Orange March at Drumcree was without doubt the most significant turn of the century for the Orange Order in Northern Ireland since at least 1974. As Orange lodges were prevented by the RUC from marching along the nationalist Garvaghy Road on their way back from Drumcree Church. The threat of revolt within the RUC and, more importantly, the blocking of roads across the six counties by the loyalists in the days following the ban, led to an abortive attempt by Chief Constable An- nesley. The march was forced through accompanied by exceptional violence by the RUC, as was another through the Omnah Road in Belfast.

The public relations effort of the RUC is a cut price facade and their imperial police force came to nothing. In fact, some RUC members left Drumcree to join Orange watch and beat their sectarian drums through nationalist areas elsewhere.

So upset was opinion in the south that the normally provoking John Bruton was forced to denounce John Major on the BBC. What upset Bruton most was not so much that Dublin was not consulted about the RUC's change of plan, but the Drumcree debacle about British and unionist attitudes.

It is plain that the unionists will not concede even the most minor reforms necessary to restructure the relationship and the British are both unwilling and incapable of making them do so. Maybe the REAL people of Dublin will come to terms with their colonialist attitudes and probably sign the death warrant of their political career. But most of all there is a total inability to grasp what is at stake.

The Orange Order is not a trusting nationalist in the north of Ireland now believes that there is any possibility of an acceptable settlement within the six counties.

Even though they initially benefited from the exposure of the real role of the RUC, the political fall-out from Drumcree has very serious implications for republicans.

Having failed to drive the British out by force of arms, they formed an alliance with Dublin and Irish America to press the British to reform the six counties. It is clear that even after Drumcree that the British and the unionists will not make even limited concessions; still, the main demand of Sinn Fein's leadership is to be let into all the talks which resumed in September.

However it is the activities of Sinn Fein in the leadership and during the Apprentice Boys March in August which is the important picture in the direction in which the current leadership wishes to go. This is to espouse the Social Democratic and Labour Party as the main nationalist party in the north.

The route of the Apprentice Boys march along the walls of Derry overtook the nationalist hero. In the past, apart from bringing their drums and reality the Union Jack in the faces of the nationalists below, the marchers occasionally throw pennies down into the Bogside.

Orange marches along the walls had been banned in 1996 when the loyalists and the RUC attacked the Bogside but got such a hammering that the British Labour Government had to send in troops to help the besieged and disarmed RUC. It was not until 1995, after the IRA ceasefire, that a march along the walls was again forced through by the RUC.

This year it was clear that the RUC would not be able to smash through the nationalist counter-demonstration and so the walls were closed off by Mayhew. The position of the Sinn Fein dominated Bogside Residents Committee was that the Apprentice Boys could march along the walls without negotiation, but they had to ensure that loyalist marchers in other areas also sought permission from local residents before they marched.

Though in the end negotiations broke down, what Sinn Fein were attempting to establish throughout the north was the principle of consent.

Their thinking seems to be that if a united Ireland can only be achieved with unionist consent, then, equally, an internal settlement in the north requires nationalist consent to unionist rule.

Apart from the gross principle of consent to an internal settlement and, by implication, abandoning the tradi- tional republican demand for a united Ireland, the events in Derry were important in one other respect.

It is the case of SLDP leader John Hume and it is rumoured that he will retire soon, possibly before the next General Election. It is by no means certain that his appointed successor, Mark Durkan, will be able to hold the seat in the face of a challenge from the Fine Gael-McGuinness-Mitchell MacLaughlin Sinn Fein.

Given that in the recent assembly elections Sinn Fein were only 6 per cent and 4 seats behind the SLP and that the fact that a significant part of Sinn Fein's vote is a personal vote for John Hume, it looks very possible for Sinn Fein to become the main nationalist party in the north. They are already the largest party on Belfast City Council.

Those who argue that the republicans have no strategy should beware. Al- though the armed struggle has not suc- ceeded in driving the British out, if it has any remaining purpose it is to hammer on the door to the negotiations. The un-pre-empted attack on Sinn Fein's political influence has largely replaced it with a license failed to deliver.

Now there seems to be a new strategy of overtaking the SDLP by turning Sinn Fein into a conventional bourgeois nationalist party.

This is a logical consequence of a decision to accept the united-nation veto and an internal settlement. It is the real meaning of the decline of the loyalists. The loyalists seek the consent of local nationalists before marching through their areas.

There are historic precedents for the current trajectory of the Sinn Fein leadership. In 1927 an Anti-Treaty IRA leader founded a new party - Fianna Fail.

He took the oath of allegiance to the British Crown in order to enter the Dail and 5 years later became Taoiseach (Prime Minister). It was not long before Eamon de Valera was jailing his former comrades in the republican movement.

The main advantage of Sinn Fein leadership's chances of success with this scheme is not its working class supporters but nationalist intransigence. After Drumcree the saviours 'Not an inch and No Surrender' are even more firmly entrenched.

And in the political vacuum in Brit- ain leading up to the general election, the door to the talks will not be opened for Sinn Fein.

After May 1997 under a Labour or coalition government, Blair may be de- pendent on the unionists for support and, therefore less open to the offer of a ceasefire in return for him wringing concessions out of the unionists.

Out of office the Tories will feel free to give vent to their unionist instincts, especially if they are led by Redwood or Portillo. More likely, Blair will con- tinue with "old Labour" policies in Ireland. In other words more repres- sion.

Dumrree was also a lesson for all of those on the left in Britain who see the Orange marches through nationalist ar- eas as harmless assertions of culture and tradition. The blocked roads, the intimidation and the turning out of Catholic homes, not to mention several sectarian killings by loyalists around the same time, demonstrate the real nature of those so-called festivities.

"Peace process" welcomed by some as creating space for "real class" politics has been shown to lead neither to peace or class politics. All that has happened is that the Sinn Fein leadership has given up the struggle against the British presence. It is now on the point of accepting a partialist settle- ment which has been a bloody failure over 70 years.

The acceptance of partition is the acceptance of working class division. Historically it has been used by the unionists to keep the working class both in the six counties and throughout Ire- land.

Again taken it is impossible to carry out the class struggle through parties which claim to be socialist but represent only the unionist working class.

The experience of the last couple of years exposes one other delusion com- mon on the left - that there was a real- istic possibility of a capitalist united Ireland.

Quite clearly, the bourgeois, north and south, are incapable of bringing this about, whatever the desire of some sec- tors of business to do so.

Behind the unionists stand the British ruling class, determined to crush Re- publicanism, determined to hang on to their last colony until there is no longer any possibility of a resurgent republi- canism developing in a socialistic direc- tion and sweeping through the whole island.

This problem is the historic crisis of the British state itself. As if fragments, the opportunities for socialists will mul- tiply.

What the republicans fail to see with their eyes fixed on Dublin and Washing- ton and the votes of the nationalist mid- dle class in the north, is that their historic compromise will be with a de- cayed and unstable power clinging to the starfish of empire.

The choices for socialists in the re- publican movement are becoming ever more clear.
Zionism flexes its muscles

Palestine aflame

THE LATEST Israeli massacre of Palestinians could not have been predicted in its precise detail. But it has been obvious for some time that the faltering 'peace process' had reached a dead end. Roland Rance looks at an explosion that was inevitable.

The spark which triggered it was the Israeli decision to open a tunnel through the Old City of Jerusalem, supposedly to give Israeli better access to the Western Wall of the ancient Jewish temple. Statements from both Natan- yahu and Foreign Minister David Levy have since made clear they will not concede on this — or any other matter which suggests the future of Jerusalem could be up for negotiation.

Palestinian resentment at Israel's refusal to honour even the minimal con- cessions promised in the Oslo and Cairo accords forced Arafat to call protests but these soon got out of his control. Once again, as at the start of the Palestinian Intifada in December 1987, spokesmen for Zionists have described the Palestinian resistance as planned and co-ordinated. This is a distortion.

As with the intifada, this rising of the Palestinian masses is as much a challenge to their recognised leadership as it is to the Israeli army of occupation.

This time, the leadership is not in exile, seeking diplomatic channels to negotiate with Israel. The leaders have returned to Palestine, and face mounting anger as the scale of their capitulation to Israel, and the humiliating contempt in which the Israelis hold them, become ever more clear. As Michael Wardlaw of the Alternative Information Centre in Jerusalem pointed out at the summer school of the Palestine Labour Revolutionary Committee, "The Palestinian Authority today has less autonomous room for manoeuvre than the PLO and the Unified Leadership of the Intifada had in 1988."

Furthermore, from the intifada this resistance is armed. The Palestin- ian security forces up to now have faithfully executed the師's aims and repressed the Palestinians as Israeli mercenaries. Now some may be attemping to regain credibility by defending unarmed Palestinian civilians against Israeli 'aggression' while others seem to have concluded that they were deceived into believing the 'peace process' was in their interests.

When armed Palestinians have previously fought back against the Israeli army — from the battle of Kfar Heath in 1968 through to the siege of Beirut in 1982 — they have inflicted heavy casualties, and gained limited political victories. For the first time, such resistance is taking place inside Pales- tine.

It would be a mistake to just blame the new Israeli PM Binyamin Neta- yahu for the collapse of the 'peace process'. Long before his narrow election victory, it was apparent that Israel had no intention of honouring its commitments. Former PM Yitzhak Rabin, having signed a detailed timetable for Israeli military withdrawal from the occu- pied territories, then claimed that "There are no sacred dates". He and his Labour successor, Shimon Peres, reneged on firm premises including the release of political prisoners, the return of refugees forced to flee in 1967, freedom of movement between the West Bank and Gaza, and the withdrawal of Israeli troops from Hebron.

As Wardlaw also noted, "There is no action against peace that the Peres- Rabin scam did not commit". In that sense, Nettanyahu's victory in the Israeli elections, while a defeat for the Labour Party's strategy for contain- ment of Palestine's resistance, was a consequence, not a cause, of the collapse of the aim of the sham 'peace process'.

But this resistance is weakened as a result of the capitulation by its former leaders. In 1987, when the intifada erupted, an entire generation of young activists — many of them schooled and raised in Israeli prisons — rose to prominence at the head of a mass popular upsurge of frustration and anger.

They created a genuine revolution- ary leadership, which took effective control over large parts of the occupied territories, controlling not only security but also economic affairs, education, health, welfare and most other aspects of civil society.

This example threatened not merely Israeli control over Palestine, but the future of all of the undemocratic Arab regimes. It was necessary for Is- raeli leaders to turn to the elected PLO accords, and the agreement to repatriate Palestine and to collaborate in the repression of Palestinian dissent.

Netanyahu and the Likud Party have never accepted this agreement. Even though it guarantees Israeli political and economic domination of the Middle East, it has a price.

Although Rabin and Peres pretended otherwise, the agreement could only be made if the terms of the occupied territor- ies from which Israeli Jews were granted formal recognition, and if most of the Israeli settlers were retained.

The challenge to Palestinian and Israeli socialism alike is to learn the lessons of past defeats. The mobilisations over these last days have drawn in new layers and opened new doors — the opportunity must not be lost.

While the Labour Party delayed meeting its commitments in the hope of profiting politically and further weak- ening a disciplined PLO leadership, before having to pay a much reduced price, the Likud insisted on the price as a reason to reject the entire package. The bulk of the Israeli peace move- ment, which effectively retired from activity rather than press its goverment to honour its commitments in the agreements, contributed to their fail- ure.

This rising of the Palestinian masses is as much a challenge to their recognised leadership as it is to the Israeli army of occupation.

But a struggle based on religious obscurantism can never defeat Israeli occupation and end the partition of Pal- estine and the dispossession of the Palestin- ian people. It cannot even mobilise the whole of Palestinian society, let alone offer a way forward for war- weary Israelis.

The challenge to Palestinian and Is- raeli socialists alike is to learn the les- sons of past defeat. The mobilisations over these last days have drawn in new layers and opened new doors — the opportunity must not be lost.

Mordechai Vanunu

ON 30 SEPTEMBER 1986, Israeli nuclear technician Mordechai Vanunu was kidnapped by Mossad agents in Rome, and clandestinely shipped to Israel. He was later convicted of treason and espionage.

His crime was to tell a Sunday Times reporter what all the world knew — that Israel was secretly building nuclear bombs.

Since his kidnapping, Vanunu has been in permanent solitary confine- ment, in conditions denounced by Amnesty International as "cruel, inhu- man and degrading."

This week marks the tenth anniver- sary of his kidnapping. In a process around the world, activists have dem- onstrated his immediate release.

Socialist Outlook joins them in this demand, and recognises Vanunu's extraordinary courage in resisting all the attempts to break his spirit and impair his sanity.

SPECIAL OFFER

A Programme for the Irish Revolution

We are offering a special price of just £4.50.

Send a postal order or cheque payable to Socialist Outlook Fund at: PO Box 1109, London N4 2UU.

Two years in the writing, Socialist Democracy's founding document A Programme For The Irish Revolution is the most extensive Marxist analysis of Ireland since the forties.

Facing mounting anger as the scale of capitalism to Israel.

The challenge to Palestine and Israeli socialism alike is to learn the lessons of past defeats. The mobilisations over these last days have drawn in new layers and opened new doors — the opportunity must not be lost.
Sound the alarm over single currency chaos

Break the conspiracy of silence!

John Lister

THE UNEXPLAINED bomb of British politics is tearing angrily away in the belly of the Tory Party, but few Labour activists and even fewer voters are aware of the scale of the threat they face.

While top Tories stare each other out in the wrangle over a single European currency, the popular press ignores the issue, presenting it as obscure and abstract, while the TUC actively agitates and lobbies for a catastrophically wrong policy.

The reality is that the single currency, and the rigid mechanisms and rules that would enforce it, would seriously hamper the struggle for socialism or even the fight for serious reforms within capitalism in the indefinite future.

The matter which concerns me is the new General Election in Britain (or any other European country), economic policies would be dictated by the six unelected Executive Board members of a new European Central Bank, to be located in Frankfurt.

This Central Bank’s primary objective would be to deliver low inflation and fixed interest rates.

Breach sanctions will be employed against member states which break the rules, including punitive fines payable to the European Community.

The Bank of England would have to comply with the Maastricht rules, to be operationally independent of the Treasury and empowered to participate in the new European system of Central Banks.

The incoming British government will be obliged to take an immediate decision on whether or not to enter the EMU, and if so, to instantly implement the savage cuts in public spending needed to reduce Britain’s budget deficit.

The latest calculation is that the gap to be bridged is £19.5 billion-equivalent to the entire hospitals’ budgets, or the total schools’ budget.

Despite the enormous threat posed by the single currency, Blair’s team, Blair’s team will not declare their policy.

Economic policies would be dictated by the six unelected Executive Board members of a new European Central Bank

like the TUC, appears strongly inclined to join up. With Major’s gauge hopelessly divided on the issue, Blair is seen by Germany’s Chancellor Kohl and other European Leaders as the person to the Central Bank and British capitalists into EMU.

In this stance he is also seeking to lobby the left wing with an influential section of the CBI.

Blair’s big leverage upon the ignorance or indifference of many Labour MPs, few of whom have expressed any coherent view on the single currency. Of course, as on the minimum wage, achievement gives the conditions under which the voting took place.

Media attention has focused on val- dating and pitifully low. If the OSCE will argue the results, not to do so is to legitimate the basis of the Dayton agreement. But it was clear from the start that the elections could be rigged.

For example, the Dayton Agreement insisted that electoral lists from 1992 were used. Since then thousands of thousands of ballots have been rejected.

In addition, none of the conditions set by the OSCE for the elections were met. The specially gerrymandered government, preventing large numbers from voting in their homes, motifs, refugees were not permitted to return to join the lists.

Nor was freedom of the press established. The nationalists’ parties dominated written and broadcast media at almost throughout Bosnia.

Rule of law has been absurdly misused and sanctioned, seen most grotesquely in the funding by OSCE of a number of radical and nationalist Autarky in Republika Srpska. Pro-

The Union List also complained to the OSCE’s representatives in the Bosnian Army in an interview - including a number in which they expected to do well-significant numbers of voters were intimidated.

They originally called on September 17 for the results in the affected areas to be declared invalid, but less than a week later they endorsed the results.

The effect of the Bosnian elections has been to sanction the partition of Bosnia and the enormous risks of ethnic clean-

Bosnian elections bring no solutions

Veronica Fagan

BosNIA refugee in Germany are attempting suicide rather than face expiation. On September 24, in the wake of the Bosnian elections, Germany announced that it will start returning refugees from October 1. Two unsuccessful attempts followed. Last month, one middle aged Bosnian killed himself. Such is the confidence of refugees who fled from ethnic cleansing that the Dayton agreement and the elections have solved nothing.

Most Bosnian refugees, however, although "victoriously" cleared from ar- ea, remain unsure of whether they be sent to areas under the Bosnian-Croat federation’s control. This would pro-

We have opposed the adoption of the European Union’s citizenship law, and we continue to support the rights of EU citizens to live, work and travel freely in the European Union. We are committed to building a Europe that is open to all, and to ensuring that the rights of all citizens are protected.
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In the wake of the Bosnian elections, Germany announced that it will start returning refugees from October 1. Two unsuccessful attempts followed. Last month, one middle aged Bosnian killed himself. Such is the confidence of refugees who fled from ethnic cleansing that the Dayton agreement and the elections have solved nothing.

Most Bosnian refugees, however, although "victoriously" cleared from areas, remain unsure of whether they be sent to areas under the Bosnian-Croat federation’s control. This would pro-
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gregue, and the unformulated "lighting" merely a gang of orchestra seating for a moment from the vigilance of all those. This view, held by some on the Italian left, under-estimates the Northern League’s influence.

Four million people, 20 per cent of the northern electorate, voted for the League in April. In Lombardy it won the vote of one worker in three; more than the class-struggle Communist Refoun-
dation Party and the reformist Democratic Party of the Left.

Since the downfall of Christian Democracy, Italy’s middle classes and petty bourgeoisie do not feel their views to be represented by the mainstream employers’ or-
ganisations, financial institutions and politicians. The Northern League benefits greatly from the support of the former bastions of Christian Democracy.

The only way to oppose both Bosnian, and its rich for national pat-
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**Look Back at History: 1956 the Tory Debacle over Suez**

**Bob Pennington**

Many Socialist Outlook readers will be distressed to hear of the recent death of Bob Pennington. Bob made many important contributions to revolutionary politics in Britain. He was a prominent leader of Dockworkers through his involvement in the 'Blue' union in the 1950s. He was also an industrial organiser of the International Marxist Group for many years. The next issue of Socialist Outlook will carry a full obituary.

---

**Socialist Outlook’s politics**

**WHAT WE FIGHT FOR**

Up against mass unemployment, rampant employers with savage anti-union laws, and a war on go-forward public services, the working class in Britain faces a real - an avoidable crisis created by the historic failure of its official leadership.

Socialist Outlook builds a new type of working class leadership, based on the class struggle and revolutionary socialism. The capital, its agents and its bitterest opponents are the Tory Party and the Unions.

The Tory strategy has been to stoke the unions, and so fragment and weaken the resistance, allowing them to pick off isolated sections one at a time. In response, TUC and Labour leaders have embraced the politics of "new realism", effectively total surrender, while biding any pretense of being a socialist alternative. Every retreat encouraged the offensive against jobs, wages, conditions and union rights.

New realism is the latest form of reformism, seeking only improved conditions within capitalism. We reject reformism - we aim to overthrow it. We know that full employment, decent living standards, a clean environment, peace and democracy can never be secured under current British and US rule.

New realism has taken hold on the right and then the centre, with the formation of the Liberal Democrats. But the ofter years have seen a slow erosion of the working class to topple the corrupt and reactionary nature of the British state has not yet been established as a class struggle. We continue to fight against fragmentation by building solidarity, to unite the struggles of workers, the unemployed, of women, of all minorities from the black communities, of lesbians and gay men, of students, of youth - and of those fighting imperialism in the colonies.

Socialist Outlook is available in over 40 countries. Unlike some other groups on the British left, we do not believe a mass revolution can be built simply by proclaiming ourselves to be one. This degenerates into sectarian posturing and makes the struggle for socialism a struggle into right wing hands.

We now believe that the demands of women, black people, lesbians and gays or the demands of people in Scotland, Ireland and Wales should be left to their own struggles. The oppressed must organise themselves and fight for their rights. The movement for socialism will not bring socialism. The fight for policies which can mobilise and politically educate workers in struggle, must be taken into the unions, the Labour Party and every campaign in which workers and the oppressed fight for their rights.

To strengthen this fight we press for union campaigns to support the fighting workers in other countries and to join us in the struggle for socialism, readers’ groups meet in cities across the country. Contact us now, get organised, and get active!

---

**Get organised, get active!**

- I want to know more about Socialist Outlook
- Please send me your introductory pamphlet: 'Socialism after Thatcher'? I enclose a PO or cheque for £1.00
- I enclose a PO or cheque for £1.00 payable to 'Socialist Outlook Fund'.
- Please send me details of Socialist Outlook Fourth International Supporters Association.

Name: 
Address: 
Post Code: 
Tel: 
Post to: Socialist Outlook, PO Box 1109, London NW4 2UJ.
Dorrell's pre-election disaster

John Lister

STORMY times are ahead for Health Secretary Stephen Dorrell as health authorities and trusts across the country break cover to reveal record-breaking deficits and devastating cuts in the run-up to the next election.

The Tory tactic of squeezing NHS funding to pay for tax cuts last November is producing bitter fruit as health chiefs gear up to applying the Patents' Charter, reducing the NHS in many areas to a skeletal, emergencies-only service.

In South West London, two health authorities propose to slash up to 80 per cent of non-urgent work and let contracts to achieve cuts of over £200m next year.

In Lambeth, Southwark and Lewisham, with cuts totalling between £16m and £27m next year, the chief executive of Kings Healthcare Trust has openly admitted that the consequences will be a "two-tier service", discriminating between patients on the basis of where they live and whether their GP is a fundholder.

In east London & City, £1.4m real this red the this year, health chiefs are delaying a £20m cuts package including a massive £1.3m from mental health services, which would mean sacking consultants and front-line staff in an area where bed occupancy in psychiatric services is already 110 per cent.

Across London planned cuts exceed £100m.

In others and cities are also under the hammer.

Manchester faces a £14m shortfall, Oxford £7 million. In Cheadle: one Trust, East Rivers, faces a £3.5m deficit this year.

The cash crunch is one reason for the delay in setting this year’s NHS pay round, and the public low offers being put forward: only a minority of Trusts are even offering three per cent to nurses and support staff, while some are already preparing for redundancies.

Now, hospitals are bracing themselves for a long, hard winter of headline scandals and misery for patients, many sickly, who will be waiting even longer for the beds they need.

No wonder the Tories are worried.

The cuts that are now threatened are the biggest since the NHS was established in 1948.

They could effectively destroy comprehensive healthcare in many areas.

A concerted campaign by health workers and the labour movement is vital to keep these issues at the top of the pre-election agenda, and make Stephen Dorrell's nightmares come true.

Greg Tucker

THERE ARE Twenty million registered unemployed in the European Union today, and fifty million people living below the poverty line.

Rather than trying to address the real social problems underlying these statistics, governments across Europe are uniting to adopt policies which will deepen the crisis, pushing up unemployment and increasing poverty.

They are engaged in a process of discussion, probably reaching a climax at the Intergovernmental Conference in Amsterdam next June, on the next stage to be taken on the road to monetary convergence.

Estimates suggest that ten million more unemployed will be created by their plans. For the governments, the EU's unemployment is a weapon to help control working people, not a problem. Welfare spending is an obstacle to profit, not a response to the needs of society.

Their proposals are about protecting the interests of capital at the expense of our living conditions.

Across Europe, opposition to this ruling class offensive is on the increase, through the wave of strikes in France last winter, and the mass demonstrations in Italy and Germany. European activists have come together to plan a series of marches to converge on the Amsterdam Conference.

Launched in Florence this summer, the Appeal for European Marches against Unemployment took a big step forward last weekend when a hundred representatives of unions and unemployed organisations from over a dozen countries met in Paris.

They combined political discussion with practical proposals on routes of marches, timetables of activity etc.

Delegates from a range of organisations in Britain attended, including representatives of major regional trade union committees and the National Unemployed Centres Combine. Organising committees are being set up in most EU countries, with an international organising centre in Paris.

There will be a major conference in Brussels at the start of February. The marches begin in mid April, and converge in a mass demonstration in Amsterdam on June 14.

Books, pamphlets and an international newsletter will be produced. Already web sites are up and running.

In Britain, plans are emerging for up to three separate feeder marches across Britain, from Scotland, Wales and the North West. Irish unemployed groups are considering whether, having marched across Ireland they can then join one of the British legs.

While these plans are undoubtedly ambitious, this reflects the importance of the issues at stake.

Currently Labour and the TUC leadership remain committed to supporting the ruling class European project.

Coming, hopefully, almost immediately after the election a Labour Government, a response to the threat posed by further integration of European capital will be crucial.

We have to focus on the issues of full employment and defence of welfare spending and above all Labour's government agenda.

British delegates to the Paris conference called a meeting in Manchester on October 26th, open to all those interested in becoming involved, where all decisions relating to a British initiative can be taken.

As Euro MP Ken Coates said in support of the project, "next year's planned European marches against Unemployment will make Europe's jobs crisis critical for all to see." We need maximum public support to bring off this exciting project.

The initiative in alerting public opinion to the spreading scourge of unemployment offers everyone an opportunity to participate in some way and register their visible opposition to a Europe of mass unemployment and exploitation.

Make sure you are represented at the meeting in Manchester - Build the EuroMarch for Jobs.