

left republican review

RUC: The Monster Must Die!



sept/oct 2000 • £2

Contents

I Say What I Like - page 3

Jackie McMullen speaks his mind.

A New Beginning to Policing? - page 4

Sinn Féin spokesperson on policing Gerry Kelly dissects the proposed policing legislation and asks if it really offers a new beginning to policing?

Joyriding Kills - page 8

LRR outlines Belfast Sinn Féin's new anti-joyriding campaign.

Community Restorative Justice - page 9

LRR talks to Harry Maguire of Community Restorative Justice Ireland about current developments within CRJ.

Irish Republican Economics - page 13

Economists Douglas Hamilton and Ronnie Munck argue for a new debate on what constitutes republican economics.

The Castlerea Five - page 16

LRR looks at the case of the Castlerea Five and calls for their immediate release.

Equality - Duty Shield or Sword - page 18

Una Gillespie of the West Belfast Economic Forum asks who is taking the equality agenda seriously and who is not.

ETA Intensifies Campaign - page 22

Eoin O'Broin takes a brief look at recent developments in the Basque country.

After Camp David - page 24

Writing for Left Republican Review, Noam Chomsky assesses the prospects for lasting peace in the wake of the failed Camp David talks.

Reading South Africa - page 28

LRR reviews a series of books currently in print dealing with the politics of South Africa.

LRR 2: A New Beginning to Policing?

As Left Republican Review 2 goes to print the British government are preparing the final stages of their Policing Bill before passing it through Westminster. The legislation, as explained by Gerry Kelly in this edition, not only falls far short of the recommendations made by Chris Patten, but fails completely in meeting republican and nationalist demands for a new beginning to policing, a demand underscored by the promise of the Good Friday Agreement.

If the legislation goes ahead, both the British government and Irish unionists will be faced with the harsh reality that nationalist Ireland stands united in opposition to what in reality amounts to a repackaged RUC. The demand for radical change in the nature of policing cannot be eroded, and nationalists and republicans will not rest until our demands are met.

Equally, if the SDLP capitulate to British government pressure and deviate from outright opposition to the Mandelson legislation, then they will bear the consequences in May of next year when northern nationalists vote in both local and Westminster elections. Irrespective of their natural inclination to appeasement, political expediency alone should be enough to keep the SDLP on the right side of the legislation.

A number of broader questions arise out of the failure of the political process to deliver on the question of policing, all of which need to be discussed. When will unionists acknowledge their role as protagonists in the conflict in Ireland? When will they move beyond their narrow propagandistic defence of the RUC and recognise the real hurt and suffering inflicted by that force on both nationalists and the community at large? When will the British government place the rights of people in general before the political demands of a small unionist and securocrat class intent on damaging the political process for their own narrow ends?

However, the most important question for republicans at this juncture is to ask ourselves if our campaigns, our positions, our strategies and tactics were enough. Could we have fought better on this issue and secured a better outcome? To what extent is the Mandelson legislation a product of our own limitations and failures?

The point of such a debate is not to explain away defeat, but to regroup and renew our commitment to real and meaningful change in the nature of policing, so that as we rebuild our campaign for the disbandment of the RUC we do so in full knowledge of both the strengths and weaknesses of the campaign up till now.

The question is not if but when the RUC will be disbanded, and only the hard struggle of republicans and other progressive forces can make this happen. A open and frank discussion of these issues can only strengthen our ability to achieve our demands.



I SAY WHAT I LIKE

Jackie McMullen

So much has been happening so quickly in the republican world we could do with some time out to form a shared picture of the new landscape and work out our route to the Republic. There is a crucial need for us to somehow find enough space to reflect on our gains and reorganise before moving towards the completion of the republican project.

We all have our own view of things and mine is that it is a great time for republicanism. There is a pulse within the movement I haven't experienced before. And while there is still some confusion, and we're not yet operating at full capacity, there's a growing energy and excitement welling up within. It's like a sense of being on the brink of something, as if we know our day is coming and can almost touch it. Perhaps it's that we've fought the empire to a standstill and not only remain 'unbowed and unbroken', but are also witness to our own development, eagerly anticipating the next advance.

The IRA has achieved an unassailable position for republicanism and it seems to me that it is time to consolidate and build on this. We are centrally involved in a complex and dynamic process with potential for advancing our political and economic aims. We particularly need to focus on youth, bringing in the next generation of

republicans, in order to achieve this potential.

And as for the opposition - countless little Hitlers and securocrats are contemplating lost ground in post-colonial confusion and regret. Recently I received a great boost when reading a piece by a former Long Kesh prison governor. Bitterly charting 'HMG's' failure to



achieve ascendancy over 'these dedicated terrorist prisoners' he considered how it all might have been had they only taken a more robust approach. He fantasises about the 'perfect prison'; X-blocks instead of H-blocks to maximise supervision; cells with piped tear-gas; each prisoner alone, perfectly individualised unable to communicate. Administered by an army of super screws, this would have been the

ideal machine for "grinding rogues honest".

I find this bareness of imagination inspiring, tinged as it is with such defeat and resignation. He misses the point entirely and I find that heartening too. Colonial administrators cannot match or contain our vitality and strength, and find it difficult to face up to the inevitability of their defeat. For thirty years they tried their best to break the IRA and failed. We, on the other hand, are strong. We are a movement on the march and the destination is Liberty, Equality and Fraternity - political, social and economic transformation. The great and the good desperately want to believe that the war is over. They want us to settle down in conformity and let them enjoy the spoils of corrupt inequality in peace. They would like us to ease up on our demands and seek to placate constantly outraged unionists. They are in for a surprise. We are rebels to the core. The determination, courage and commitment of our activists, forged in the crucible of struggle, is a source of pride and hope for freedom-loving people throughout the world. It is also the most powerful dynamic for change in this country. Let's organise for victory!



A NEW BEGINNING TO POLICING ?

Gerry Kelly

This British Houses of Parliament are currently considering policing legislation initiated in the aftermath of Chris Patten's report into the future of policing in the North of Ireland. The Good Friday Agreement, which was the starting point for Patten, signalled an agenda of widespread change, specifically on the issue of policing which, it said 'is central in any society'. At the heart of this is the collective position of those who signed up to the Agreement, accepting that it 'provides the opportunity for a new beginning to policing' with a police service capable of attracting and sustaining support from the community as a whole.'

Policing is a core issue for everyone concerned with the implementation of the Good Friday Agreement, touching on issues of crucial importance, such as equality, justice and peace. The question of policing is therefore a litmus test for the agreement as a whole. If real and sustained change cannot be delivered on the question of policing, it calls into question the approach and attitude of those who are currently expressing opposition to the Patten recommendations. The importance of this issue cannot be overstated. The history of the RUC as a unionist militia and the role it has played in this statelet since partition have made this so. The 'new beginning' to policing envisioned by Patten is an indispensable and

'Of the 175 original recommendations contained in Patten's report, the legislation subverts 89 of those, lacks clarity on a further 75, and only ensures the implementation of 11.'

absolutely minimum requirement if there is to be any possibility of a successful conflict resolution process.

The sad and dangerous reality of the British government's approach to date is that even the minimum requirements outlined in the Patten report are being subverted. The new beginning hinted at by Patten has been systematically undermined by the continuation of the same old policies of the past 80 years. Instead of moving to satisfy the requirements of the peace process and the Good Friday Agreement the British Government has sought to satisfy the negative demands of the securocrats in its midst, and has actively collaborated with both the RUC and the UUP in order to frustrate the potential for change.

This is obvious given the widespread criticism of the initial proposals in the draft Bill of May 16, and the accompanying Implementation Plan. These diverged to the extent that the Bill and Plan were unrecognisable in the context of Patten. All of nationalist Ireland, the US, the Committee on the Administration of Justice, the new Ombudsperson, and even the old discredited Police Authority were obliged to criticise key elements of the proposed Bill and Plan. In the face of such sustained and widespread opposition the British were forced to make concessions.

It is clear that the British fully expected to

move on aspects of the Bill and disingenuously sought to locate compromise as being somewhere in between their initial proposals and the Patten report when for nationalists, it was already obvious that Patten represented a huge compromise.

In this context Sinn Féin has consistently made the case that a new beginning to policing needs to involve;

- an end to the use of plastic bullets
- an end to repressive legislation
- an unarmed policing service
- the radical restructuring of the judicial system

We initially acknowledged that the Patten proposals, while clearly disappointing to republicans, were a threshold which had the potential to make a new beginning to policing possible, and a new beginning is both desirable and indispensable. We completed and published a rigorous comparative analysis, scrutinising each of Patten's recommendations against both the Bill and Plan combined. Of the 175 original recommendations contained in Patten's report, the legislation and implementation plan subverts 89 of those, lacks clarity on a further 75, and only ensures the implementation of 11. Of the 75 recommendations we judged most fundamental to the implementation of Patten, the Bill and Plan subvert 60 and lack clarity on 15 - failing to implement any of the core Patten recommendations.

That same degree of scrutiny is now being applied to the Bill. The process is due to be completed in November this year. In the interim, we note that any changes to date are, by and large, consistent with those signaled to us in meetings with, and in correspondence from the British government. In broad terms we have identified some progress in relation to:

- the powers of the policing board
- the ability of the Board to initiate reports and inquiries
- the power of the Ombudsperson
- arrangements for recruitment

These represent a slight shift towards the original Patten proposals, and are, of course, welcome although in some cases corrective measures have been further diluted by the inclusion of additional restraints. For example, although the British Secretary of State's ability to refuse an inquiry on the grounds of 'efficiency and effectiveness' has been deleted, it has been replaced with an equally restrictive measure where s/he can deny an inquiry on the grounds that it 'serves no useful purpose'.

There are other areas where even this limited

movement is not in evidence.

- the Chief Constable has too many powers
- the British Secretary of State has too many powers
- the new oath is only to be taken by new recruits, and not by serving officers.

In addition, the Special RUC Reserve are to be retained despite Patten's recommendation that they be scrapped. And of course, the details of how the British government, the NIO and the RUC intend to interpret the Patten report will only be published in a new implementation Plan in Autumn. The British Secretary of State is also responsible for the development of codes and regulations controlling the activities of the Board and the DPPs, these need to be published in order to subject them to public scrutiny.

None of this has been helped by the spectacle surrounding the third reading of the Bill where the British government supported a UUP amendment retaining the name of the RUC in the 'title deeds' of the Bill. This manoeuvre has poisoned the political atmosphere and contributed to a strong sense of nationalist anger. There is a valid suspicion that the RUC name will consequently remain in use, quite apart from the fact that British government approaches on other matters create the suspicion that other underhanded deals have been agreed.

Some in Westminster seem to believe that if 'both communities' are unhappy this represents an appropriate compromise. The position of so-called 'parity of pain' will not work. It is a misguided policy, as was the advice which led Mandelson to deride

widespread nationalist criticism of the Police Bill as being inspired by 'ulterior motives'. The key to achieving new policing will be nationalist and republican acceptance of agreed change. Unionists are already part of the policing structures, some 12,500 of them. And they are not going to walk out. The core task facing the British Government must win nationalist and republican consent to a new policing service.

Irrespective of the outcome of this stage of the Policing battle, Sinn Féin remains committed to our position of the disbandment of the RUC. We will remain opposed to petty reform and will use every means in our power to campaign for real and lasting change. The RUC have no future in a democratic and peaceful Ireland. They must and will go - the speed of their departure however, depends on the direction and energy of republican activists.

PATTEN RECOMMENDATIONS**BLAIR/MANDELSON BILL****HUMAN RIGHTS**

- ▶ Code of ethics to be formulated incorporating the European Convention of Human Rights
- ▶ All officers to take new oath
- ▶ Above would require police officers to 'accord equal respect to all individuals and their traditions and beliefs'

- ▶ This will be done by Ronnie Flannigan

- ▶ New oath restricted to recruits/new officers
- ▶ Deleted: 'Traditions and beliefs', and for new recruits/officers only

ACCOUNTABILITY

- ▶ 'The statutory primary function of the Policing Board should be to hold the Chief Constable and the police service publicly to account'

- ▶ The Board's powers are severely reduced by a series of restrictions of its powers. These powers could even be less than the present Police Authority

COMPOSITION

- ▶ The 1st chairperson of the Board should be appointed with the agreement of the First and Deputy First Ministers
- ▶ British Government should appoint independent members in consultation with First and Deputy First Ministers
- ▶ Independent members should be 'representative of the community as a whole'

- ▶ Agreement not required; consultation only
- ▶ The British Secretary of State has no obligation to consult on appointments
- ▶ The British Secretary of State can veto the appointment of a 'political' or 'independent' member if they have been a political prisoner

Where Patten Report and B

STAFF

- ▶ Board to acquire its own expert staff

- ▶ The British Secretary of State has power to transfer to Board

OMBUDSMAN

- ▶ Should have access to all past reports on the RUC

- ▶ British Secretary of State can prevent investigations

RESERVE

- ▶ Full time reserve to be abolished

- ▶ Not in legislation

RUC FOUNDATION

- ▶ No place for foundation in new service

- ▶ Established on statutory basis in bill

GENERAL FUNCTIONS

- ▶ Role and relationship of British Secretary of State and Board to be made clear. Board to have responsibility over education and training strategy, working with police service and civilian experts, especially human rights experts

- ▶ No clarity. British Secretary of State able to regulate the contents of the annual policing plan, Giving such powers goes against the community based ethos of Patten

PATTEN RECOMMENDATIONS**DISTRICT POLICING PARTNERSHIPS (DPPs)**

- ▶ There should be 4 DPPs in Belfast
- ▶ DPPs should be representative of the district in terms of religion, gender, age and cultural background
- ▶ DPP powers should include monitoring police performance and raising money for community safety

BLAIR/MANDELSON BILL

- ▶ No provision for this
- ▶ Former political prisoners banned
- ▶ Not contained in bill

REPORTS

- ▶ Patten called for specific and limited grounds on which Chief Constable can refuse to report to Board

- ▶ Restrictions placed on this including; if report might prejudice the administration of justice; or if matter is already under investigation by statutory authority

INQUIRIES

The legislation imposes excessive restrictions on the new powers which Patten recommended for the Board essential to the achievement of effective accountability

- ▶ Power to initiate inquiries recommended
- ▶ Board to have capacity to ask other agencies to conduct inquiries on its behalf
- ▶ Retrospective inquiries should be dealt with

- ▶ Weighted majority required (12 of 19) in Board to carry out inquiry
- ▶ Explicit permission of British Secretary of State required
- ▶ Board not empowered to inquire into matters which happened prior to its establishment

Blair/Mandelson Bill Differ

POLICING WITH THE COMMUNITY

- ▶ Patten recommendations, 44-51 are precise and consistent

- ▶ This is not dealt with adequately in bill

PUBLIC ORDER POLICING

- ▶ Patten makes 9 details recommendations

- ▶ None are in legislation

OVERSIGHT COMMISSIONER

- ▶ Patten makes 5 recommendations

- ▶ None in legislation

RECRUITMENT

- ▶ Quotas for 10 years to ensure critical mass
- ▶ Independent recruitment agency recommended

- ▶ Quotas for 3 years only
- ▶ Not guaranteed by bill

NAME, BADGE, FLAG ETC.

- ▶ Should have new name (NIPS)
- ▶ Recommends a neutral working environment
- ▶ Service rather than Force should be used in name
- ▶ New and neutral badge and symbols
- ▶ Union flag not to be flown from police buildings

- ▶ Final decision left with British Secretary of State
- ▶ Not affected in bill
- ▶ Police Force is term used throughout the bill
- ▶ Not adhered to in bill. Decision left with British Secretary of State
- ▶ Decision left with British Secretary of State

'joyriding' KILLS

Belfast Sinn Féin have launched a new anti-joyriding campaign which will run for the next number of months. The initiative, which was formally announced in July is part of a broader strategy for developing new approaches to anti-social behaviour and petty crime within local communities.

The campaign involves two phases. The first aims to highlight the nature of the issue with a series of events and propaganda material. 'Reclaim the Streets' protests, community clean ups, 'Joyriding Kills' posters and leaflets are all designed at provoking a public debate on the issue and raising awareness around the causes of and possible solutions to car theft.

Central to Sinn Féin's approach is an understanding of joyriding as a social problem rather than purely a criminal one. Joyriding and other forms of anti-social behaviour exist because of a range of factors within the social, economic and environmental context of our communities. High levels of alienation among a section of our young people has created a culture where some feel they have no stake in society and turn their anger against themselves and the community.

The new campaign also recognises that punishment, either formal or informal, rather than deterring people from involvement in anti-social behaviour, actually pushes them further away from the community, increasing their alienation and likelihood to re-offend, in more dangerous ways.

In place of punishment, the initiative believes that a two strand approach to the problem is required. The first involves building new relationships with young people involved in anti-social behaviour. Either through Community Restorative Justice programmes, community organisations, peer education programmes or more informally, local communities need to re-engage with this section of our youth in an attempt to rebuild the broken relationships. Additional issues such as the availability of alcohol to minors also needs to be addressed.

Secondly more long term solutions focusing on the social, economic and environmental problems need to be developed. The campaign literature suggests a wide range of initiatives including improving leisure and youth facilities, development of peer education programmes, increasing support services to parents, providing young people with a voice within the local community, campaigning around better education, job creation and increased public spending etc.

It is at this point that the second phase of the new Sinn Féin campaign comes into play. Sinn Féin alone do not have the power or strength to achieve these demands. Although campaign and lobbying for change

is important, a different vehicle is needed in order to ensure that the deep rooted causes of anti-social behaviour are tackled.

In October, Belfast Sinn Féin will launch a detailed document explaining their strategy for achieving precisely these goals. The centre piece of this strategy is the formation of community led task forces, bringing together all of the sectors within the local community including



political parties, community organisations, churches, schools, parents, young people and statutory agencies and service providers. The aim of these partnerships is to develop coordinated strategies, community by community, for determining the specific needs of each community and campaigning effectively in order to achieve them.

Building community led partnerships not only maximises the strength of the local community, it also empowers local people to take control of their own lives, and tell service providers directly what they need and how it should be delivered.

While Sinn Féin is conscious that there will be no easy or overnight solutions to the problems of joyriding and anti-social behaviour, it is non the less crucial to begin to confront these problems in a new and more effective manner. Everyone has a part to play. ✕

Explaining C.R.J.



Left Republican Review talks to Harry Maguire, development worker with CRJ Ireland about the theory and practice of Community Restorative Justice

LRR: Describe what community restorative justice is in lay persons terms?

Harry Maguire: The core of restorative justice is a problem solving method, which has a process attached to it, involving different forms of activity. Essentially it is about bringing people together, and developing and facilitating a forum and an environment in which positive talking can take place.

LRR: The purpose of community restorative justice is to deal with anti social behaviour and other forms of crime. How does CRJ understand those crimes?

Harry Maguire: We would take the view that anti-social behaviour takes place within a special context. We look at the community infrastructure, and through that you can see where many of the problems come from. Its not about 'bad boys', its about our own community, coming through 30 years of conflict in the absence of a policing service. And equally in terms of how we define crime and anti-social behaviour we also take a very broad view of that, because it is really up to the individual who feel that they have been harmed in some way, and we also put that in the context of how the broader community feels.

LRR: So is it your view that joyriding and other forms of anti social behaviour are social and environmental problems?

Harry Maguire: Very much so. At the moment for instance we are looking at issues such as drugs and alcohol abuse which spans the generations, these are not isolated to youth activity. The social norms involved in both activities have been pushed out very radically in the last ten years. We also look at joyriding and other forms of violent activity which seems to be on the increase, such as stabbing and weapon related attacks. And I think that all of that kind of activity has created a certain amount of fear within the community which would have been absent ten years ago.

LRR: What is your view of traditional, punishment based, forms of justice whether formal or informal?

Harry Maguire: CRJ differs from many other systems of justice, in that we do not rely on punishment or retribution, and are more focused on dealing with the behaviour of the individual(s) concerned and the social context in which the crime happened. So the CRJ process is about recognising what has happened and taking ownership of it. And we feel that if a person takes ownership of what



they have done, then a very positive step has been taken in terms of actual resolution.

It also gives the victim(s) who have been injured by a certain act or crime, the opportunity to be part of the resolution, which is again different from the conventional systems of justice. So its about bringing about participation from all parties concerned, the alleged offenders(s) and the victim(s) and the wider community, and harnessing that energy into positively tackling what the problem is. If you look at joyriding and say that's the local 'hoods', there bad boys and there is nothing that we can do, then you're not going to get there. But if you look at it in terms of those young people as our youth, our future, that's our youngest generation and that they are of value, we as older members of the community should hold them in greater esteem, then we are starting to head in the right direction.

LRR: Describe to me the process involved in dealing with an issue. What exactly does CRJ do to resolve issues?

Harry Maguire: We facilitate the resolution, which comes from the parties themselves, and that involves a process of

just wants to get a buzz, but there might be a more deep-seated problem. Maybe someone has been injured by someone on drugs, or had a theft inflicted on them. The issue may be that they just want to feel safe in their own community. They might want to know why they were targeted and if it will happen again. They may need a chance to explain how an incident like that affects them and their family and wider social circle. Maybe also, if the victim can hear the drug abuser's story a healing process can kick in once there's an understanding of it.

There are residual effects as well. A lot of people are being skilled up about how to deal with conflict. We learn to read and write, but in real terms we are never taught to deal with conflict. From where we are sitting, the old social attitudes of using attack, as a form of defence just doesn't work.

LRR: You spoke about involving the wider community. What does that involve, who, how and why?

Harry Maguire: It means tapping into community resources that already exist within the community. We would refer cases out, for instance, to a women's

dialogue; working with people in the street, in their own homes, inviting them to come to the offices; working through and clarifying the issues. It means always trying to work the situation so that you can bring people together. Whatever the issue is, the agreement comes from the people themselves. It cannot be imposed. People must gain a better understanding of each other. It may appear that a drug abuser group. The CRJ may be the first point of contact and we can deal with part of the problem. We may need to refer a person on for more professional treatment. We need to tap into the youth services, outreach workers, the community forums - who all have resources and ideas. There is not much point in replicating what already exists out there. We might encounter a young person or a group of young people who are at risk. Then we would contact an existing group in the area and see if we can do a bit of work with the group. In the case of an elderly person, we might put them in touch with Age Concern or whatever is appropriate.

LRR: Is there a role for statutory agencies and government service providers? What kind of relationship currently exists? Ideally, what should exist with these bodies?

Harry Maguire: To date there has been concern from the statutory bodies or a lack of trust. In some ways, this is understandable, as justice is traditionally seen as a responsibility for the formal justice system. But that situation has been changing as the statutory agencies have begun to work with us. It is our view that the role of the statutory agencies is vital. They have the professional training and it would be our view that we can build a partnership with these people. Hopefully we can help them direct some of their resources into areas of need, and build up a relationship of mutual respect, which is based on a genuine working relationship.

LRR: LRR: You have mentioned the word partnership on a number of occasions. How do you understand that idea and what concrete form should it take?

Harry Maguire: We understand the idea of partnership as sharing information where possible and supporting each other. For instance, one of the traditional responses in the nationalist community to a 'problem' family is that the community just evicts them. For that community, they have taken what they see as a positive step, but essentially what happens is that the problem just moves on. The same scenario kicks in on another street and in another community. But we believe that if we work on a partnership basis on an issue like that, there would be questions for the Housing Executive, for Social Services, for youth providers and other professionals within

the community. There would be issues for ourselves in CRJ, in terms of working with that family and with the broader community. So it's about developing a multi-agency approach.

LRR: In the context of this notion of partnership, who has ownership of CRJ, who does it belong to?

Harry Maguire: You need to place the CRJ projects in their political context. For 30 years, there has been a war situation. There hasn't been an acceptable police service. The RUC and the security services have been part of the war and part of the problem in terms of encouraging anti-social behaviour. In this context, a community response developed in the role of the IRA, who have been maintaining a policing role within the community. Equally, that hasn't gained full community acceptance and is seen by the organisation itself as an approach, which does not work. Restorative justice has been developed within this scenario. If it is to be successful, it will have to have an appeal to the broader nationalist community.

The nationalist community doesn't contain just nationalists and republicans. There are apolitical people, people who are focused on politics, on religion, on culture, music or sport. There is quite diversity within the community, and we feel that CRJ needs to be acceptable to all sections of that community.

LRR: You spoke earlier about the need to change attitudes within the community; to move away from demonising those people involved in anti-social behaviour. For some people, this change is very difficult to understand. How do you explain to people who hold these views the need to embrace CRJ?

Harry Maguire: Well, I think you have to acknowledge that if someone has been hurt or has been the victim of a crime they are entitled to be angry. It is important that people can vent that anger, but you also have to pose the important questions and approach the issue in a logical manner. You look not just at the formal system in the north, which is part of the problem, but at formal systems all over the world. They just don't work. Their own crime figures illustrate that they just don't work. In the six county context, the traditional response of the nationalist community doesn't work. So you are starting from a basic position that

the traditional ways of dealing with these problems just don't work and we need to build alternatives. By broadening it into the social context - for example in an area like Twinbrook or Poleglass - we can empathise with the problems of the local community. Fifty percent of the population there is under the age of 25. You have very few facilities. You have an estate that was built according to military considerations and the community has been badly discriminated against by Lisburn Borough Council. There is no sense of hope for young people living in the district. So the question is, how do we deal with this? When you start to open up that debate, and asking if throwing someone in jail or shooting someone is going to solve the problem, the evidence is saying it is not. So let's try something different; and I have a lot of confidence in the nationalist and republican people.

LRR: To date, how successful has CRR been to date, and what needs to happen for CRJ to improve its success?

Harry Maguire: I think there are several parts to the answer to that. In terms of actual casework, all the projects have been extremely busy. In real terms, they have been fairly successful in dealing with a broad range of issues. To build upon that, we need human resources, as that is the main vehicle, and the right kind of human resources. That is very important. Funding and material resources are equally important and developing our public relations is crucial. There is a fair understanding of what we are doing and how we are going about our work. People generally understand the ideas involved and are warming to it.

LRR: And what about party political support and statutory agency support?

Harry Maguire: We are meeting with the statutory agencies on a regular basis, especially on the ground level, where the daily sloggers from the agencies can see the value of our work. Of the political parties, Sinn Féin has been very supportive. The SDLP have taken a very 'fence-sitting' attitude towards it. In real terms, I think they are looking towards Patten as the key to resolving many of these problems. And I suppose the traditional SDLP gut instinct is that it should be left to the formal system. What we are saying in response to that is, take a look at the formal systems anywhere in the world; take a look at the formal systems which are

“

“CRJ differs from other systems of justice, in that we do not rely on punishment or retribution, we are more focused on dealing with the behaviour of the individuals concerned and the social context in which the crime happens.”

”

trying to develop restorative justice projects; and take a look at the ideas we are using to resolve the issues. When you have digested that evidence then make your decisions.

LRR: And there is an important question here which is how would CRJ relate to a new policing service in the future, if such a service does command the respect of the nationalist community?

Harry Maguire: I think that it is too early to give a definitive answer to that question. But most certainly we would like a relationship with a formal system. There could be positive areas where we would interact, such as with young people who have been through the formal system and convicted, who are trying to be reintegrated into the community. How can they be protected from re-offending? Hopefully we will have, in the future, a policing service that will have the support of the nationalist community, and then we will be able to build up a relationship on areas of common interest.

LRR: So in an ideal situation, CRJ would be a compliment to a new policing service, rather than an alternative to it?

Harry Maguire: Very much so, we feel that both approaches can be taken. We would diverge from some thinking in terms of the ownership issues, as we feel that it should remain within the community. There would be a school of thought that would see restorative justice as just another tool within the criminal justice system. We don't feel that that is appropriate within this context. We feel that CRJ is much more dynamic coming from the community.

LRR: Can CRJ operate in a non conflict context, particularly in terms of the 26 Counties?

Harry Maguire: Yes, it is applicable throughout Ireland, and we see ourselves as a 32 county organisation. The priority has been to develop the project in the north, but there has been a lot of interest from the border regions and areas of Dublin and Limerick. We have had contact with people down there, and there is value in establishing the project in areas of social need throughout the country, especially where there is a good strong, vibrant community who feel that they can actually implement the project and process. We

feel that it is a very valuable tool in many ways in bringing the community life, in giving the community the power and the ability to change people's lives.

LRR: In the last number of years it has become common for the adult community to criminalise young people in general and hold them responsible

for all anti-social behaviour. Is there a debate within CRJ about this, and questions of adult involvement in anti-social behaviour?

Harry Maguire: That is actually a very live debate within our project. When we initially set up these projects we felt that we would be working with the hard end of criminal anti-social behaviour; but increasingly we have been pulled into addressing adult criminal activity. In terms of the debate on young people, we see that it is a minority of young people who are engaging in the destructive, sharper end of things. We have to give weight and credit to the vast majority of young people who engage in healthy local activities that they are not 'problems' causing problems. For example, we have begun a project on the alcohol issue, headed up by the Falls Community Council, and it is clear that alcohol abuse is not solely a youth problem. It's a problem for the whole community. Specifically in terms of access to alcohol by young people, it is adults who are selling it to or buying it for our youth. So we would have a very healthy attitude that doesn't make this just an issue of youth crime.

LRR: Finally what are your hopes for the future development of CRJ?

Harry Maguire: I want to see it becoming stronger, developing better links within the community. I want it to develop in an all-Ireland context. Equally, I would like to see the ethos and approach being taken into schools. I think it's time we went to our young people, and instead of blaming them we must acknowledge that they are our future. We should be saying that if conflicts do emerge, if issues do arise, then here is a method of resolution, and if we use these ideas and methods then we can bring about major change. I would also like to see attitudes and social norms being changed through that process; and especially adult norms changing, because at the end of the day, we have all of these names for those involved in anti-social behaviour - 'hoods', 'bad boys', 'the scum' - and at the end of the day, they are our children. We have created these people; they haven't been bussed in from Mars. We can't even blame the British government, because although they have been part of the problem our own community has played a role in all of this. We as a community have to take ownership of that and if we do then we are on the right road to resolving things.✘

“

We as a community have to take ownership and if we do then we are on the right road to resolving these issues.

”

IRISH REPUBLICAN ECONOMIC THINKING

The need for continuing debate

Douglas Hamilton & Ronnie Munck

Recent years have witnessed fundamental and unprecedented change in the politics of Ireland. While the future remains far from clear, the Belfast Agreement, and all the associated changes it represents in terms of new political perspectives, institutions and constitutional relations, presents a political landscape in Ireland quite different to anything experienced before. In addition to these political changes, Ireland has experienced deep economic transformation over the past two decades. The unprecedented 'Celtic Tiger' performance of the southern economy and its associated problems, the growing economic integration of Europe, the so-called 'globalisation' of economic activity, and the concrete moves that have been made within Ireland to create a genuine all-island economy have all led to discussion and changed perspectives on the form of economic and social development that should be pursued in the new millennium.

There is a strong need for Irish republicans to respond to these changing economic and political realities. A new, informed and open debate around the republican economic way forward is required if economic and political progress is to be for the benefit of all.

From a republican perspective, a favourable starting point is that genuine economic integration of the northern and southern economies is becoming a reality, however slowly. The forward thinking, former northern civil servant George Quigley made the seemingly innocuous, but far-reaching, statement in 1992 that "I find no difficulty with the proposition that Ireland is - or should be - an island economy". Since that time the concept of an all-island economy has taken off in spite of the predictable political, and at times highly vitriolic, objections from (some) unionist politicians. The 'single island economy project' is not without contradictions, however, as many of its original proponents studiously denied any

political dimensions to the project. Clearly, if economic harmonisation between the two Irish economies is to proceed systematically then political co-operation will be necessary. However, the British government has been slow to respond and policy documents, such as *Strategy 2010*, make next to no reference to north-south development, despite the importance given to it in Strand Two of the Belfast Agreement. Establishment mindsets are clearly slow to change and continue to give out contradictory messages and intentions.

From a republican point of view, economic integration within Ireland, while welcome, is not enough. It is imperative that if truly all-Ireland development is to be sustainable, it needs to be democratic. A move towards genuine economic integration between the north and south of Ireland would be a key component of democratic development in all parts of the island.

To bring this about we believe that a developmentalist perspective for the whole of the island is required. It is insightful to look at the Irish economic experience from the perspective of development theory. In particular, we must start from the premise that the Irish economy, north and south, has been profoundly marked by colonialism. As Liam O'Dowd notes in one of the few approaches which takes the colonial

context seriously, the net result in the north is "an incoherent, disarticulated regional manufacturing economy, with poor linkages between indigenous and multinational industry, which is sustained only by massive state involvement in the local economy".

As globalisation intensifies, these tendencies will become stronger. The global restructuring now underway is having a whole range of effects on the Irish political economy, not least in seriously undermining the prospects of a simple nationalist developmental path. From colonial exploitation to dependent development in the





era of globalisation, Ireland faces severe external constraints on its social development.

Broadening the economic debate, it is now increasingly recognised that the question of economic governance has to be addressed insofar as current arrangements - the whole range of economic policies implemented by the state, including fiscal, monetary and labour market policies - are deeply faulty. At present, there are constraints on what a regional economy such as the north of Ireland can attain in terms of economic governance due to European and global pressures. Over and beyond this is the broader issue of political governance and the consent, or lack of it, of those governed, including, of course, the fundamental issue of economic equality.

The north of Ireland is still very far from fulfilling the basic economic, political and social conditions under which democracy is likely to generate sustainable and politically desired objectives. The Belfast Agreement highlights the fact that the north of Ireland is 'a failed political entity', and, while it offers an important beginning, it has yet to indicate a transition to self-sustained growth and sustainable democratic modes of governance. What we need to see is new forms of democratic development being put in place involving a different type of 'peace dividend', as popular participation increases in all spheres, including the economic. At the moment economic policy making is remote from people's lives, something that is done by 'experts' and frequently to the detriment of ordinary people.

The recent British government document, *Strategy 2010*, and its lack of consultation with local communities, is yet a further example of this mode of thinking. However, the half-hearted programme Targeting Social Need is unlikely to change this. In contrast, the efforts made to prioritise social inclusion in the EU's Special Programme for Peace and Reconciliation, both in terms of policy process and beneficiaries, have offered more positive

possibilities. From a republican point of view, Sinn Féin, in its most recent 1998 policy document on economic policy, explicitly recognised the key role of local communities in economic and social development. As such Sinn Féin, while lacking elaboration, highlighted the need for broader popular participation in economic development - perhaps an indirect reference to, or at least starting point for, a debate around new forms of socialist democracy in Ireland.

A key issue in the debate must be the need for an international perspective on the Irish economy, especially in the north. If current moves towards Irish economic integration prosper, the whole of Ireland will have to look for a more favourable insertion into the international division of labour. This would, necessarily, be accompanied by the development of more adequate governance structures and considerations of how democracy might become sustainable in Ireland.

It is necessary to view the Irish economy from a developmentalist, and democratic socialist, perspective, rather than through the limiting opposites of unionist and nationalist economics which tend to mirror one another. A broad international comparative approach focused on development from a structured and historical point of view seems both more productive and more useful if a radical political perspective is to be adopted.

The dominant development debate today concerns the extent and the implications of globalisation. The early literature presented globalisation as a universal causal agent, the

It is necessary
the Irish economy
a developmentalist
democratic socialist
perspective,
than through
limiting opposites
unionist and
economics



explanation for all transformations, and the definitive end to national development strategies. More recently, authors have placed globalisation in question, arguing that it may not be quite as 'new' as portrayed or as convincing an alibi for not developing national transformation strategies. While management of a national economy is undoubtedly more difficult today, the death of the nation-state is much exaggerated. What is true is that globalisation has signalled an unleashing of market forces at an international level and the very weakness of the market is now being increasingly called into question. The constraints of globalisation are undoubtedly real in the case of a nation such as Ireland. Blind allegiance to the dictates of the market and global competitiveness are not, however, the only possible responses.

An increasingly favoured strategy for development in progressive circles, put forward by the likes of Alain Lipietz, the French Green economist, is one involving promotion of the 'third sector' or social economy. This socially useful third sector would exist alongside the private and public sectors, be community-oriented and play a social integration role. Support for this view of urban and rural area-based partnerships in Ireland has come from republicans who praise the social economy for being people-centred, facilitating cross-community co-operation in the north and for stimulating an innovative approach to developing local enterprise. An important development is that these debates supersede the old dichotomies of public/private and plan/market. However, whether it constitutes a

holistic, never mind socialist, approach to development or a short-term, cosmetic solution to the jobs crisis remains to be seen.

Republicans have a long experience in community economic development. What is now required is a continuation and broadening of the debate. This debate needs to recognise and reflect the fundamental economic and political changes that Ireland has experienced in recent years and the possibilities for positive development that now exist.

With republicans increasingly in positions of power, such discussion will have to engage far more than before with the fundamental issues of economic policy that currently lie outside the remit of local communities in the absence of a complete revolution in political structures and processes. Such economic governance issues include the need for clear republican perspectives on: fiscal policy - the type and nature of public expenditure and taxation policy that should be put in place if the benefits of economic growth are to be more equitably shared; monetary policy - the approach to be adopted with regard to interest and exchange rates; labour policy - the type of training and employment policies which should be implemented to replace the failed policies of recent years, both north and south, and also the forms of pay determination and bargaining structures that should be pursued; and industrial policy - the nature and level of public support that should be made available for individual firms and industrial sectors.

Perhaps above all, this debate needs to impact on policy makers and key economic interests, while policy formulation and implementation by government and its agencies need to allow for the full and effective participation of local communities in economic policy formulation and implementation. It is by pursuing such a debate that a new socialist republican strategy for Irish economic and social development will emerge. ✕

ary to view
economy from
entalist, and
socialist,
rather
h the
posites of
nationalist



RELEASE THE CASTLE

Despite the passing of the Belfast Agreement's deadline for the release of political prisoners, five republicans remain incarcerated in Castlereagh jail in Roscommon. Kevin Walsh, Pearse McCauley, Gerry Sheehy, Mick O'Neill and John Quinn, 'convicted' of the manslaughter of Garda Jerry McCabe, have yet to be freed and the Dublin government are resisting attempts to honour their commitments arising from the Agreement.

Since that Agreement was signed a total of 429 political prisoners have been released in the north of Ireland, and 45 have been released in the south. This includes people sentenced for incidents which happened after that relating to the Castlereagh Five. In fact the Five are the only qualifying prisoners under the terms of the Belfast Agreement who remain in prison.

The Dublin government are on public record stating that these five men will not benefit from the release programme. Their reasons have shifted depending on who they are talking to. The Alliance Party were told back in 1998 that public opposition to the release of the Castlereagh Five was strong enough to undermine the referendum campaign being run at the time. On other occasions

Fianna Fail have simply stated that the Five just do not qualify. Fianna Fail have even suggested that they informed Sinn Féin negotiators in the run up to Good Friday, that the Five wouldn't be included in the release programme, a suggestion hotly denied by Sinn Féin.

In addition to the misinformation bandied about by the Dublin government, the Garda Representative Association have also attempted to muddy the waters stating on a number of occasions that the Adare incident happened while the IRA was on ceasefire. This is clearly not the case, as the incident took place in June 1996 four months after the first IRA cessation ended, in February 1996. The second cessation did not begin until July 1997.

Despite the machinations of securocrats and civil servants the facts of the case are clear. The Adare incident took place while the IRA was not on ceasefire and before the signing of the Belfast Agreement. Four of the five were 'convicted' of manslaughter which under southern law is defined as the unlawful and unintentional killing of a person. The fifth man was 'convicted' of conspiracy to rob. There is nothing relating to these political



CASTLEREA FIVE

prisoners which differentiates them from other prisoners already released under the terms of the Agreement.

While the question of the pain and suffering of the families of those killed by the IRA must be treated in a sensitive and delicate manner, the fact still remains that the Castlereas Five should not be in prison. There are many political prisoners released from jail in the north of Ireland, who under the terms of the law were 'convicted' of more serious offences than the Castlereas Five.

The Dublin government's posturing on this issue is clearly hypocritical, as argued by the Alliance Party on BBC's *Good Morning Ulster* programme during the summer. One wonders what is the real motivation behind Bertie Ahern's refusal to implement the Belfast Agreement. Could it be political expediency or could it be pressure from the securocrats within the Garda Representative Association? And of course the narrow electioneering of Fine Gael and the Progressive Democrats has ensured that the climate is all the more soured against the faithful implementation of the Agreement.

All said, the question still remains as to what will happen with the

Castlereas Five. The answer lies not with Sinn Féin nor Fianna Fail, and certainly not with the Garda Representative Association. It is within the context of the Belfast Agreement that this issue must be solved. And in this respect the Agreement is clear. The definition of a qualifying prisoner in the Agreement is very clear - someone convicted of 'scheduled offences' in the north and 'similar offences' elsewhere. The Castlereas Five clearly fall into this category.

The only clause that sets out who does not qualify for early release is that contained in paragraph 2, which bars those affiliated to organisations that are not on cessation. A criterion which has no bearing on the Castlereas Five.

The simple reality is that the Dublin governments refusal to release the Castlereas Five is a clear breach of the Belfast Agreement. Keeping in mind the overwhelming majority of people who voted for that agreement throughout the country, Bertie Ahern has no mandate to do anything other than release the Five. ✕

EQUALITY - DUTY S

Una Gillespie

The equality agenda and the provisions for it contained in the Good Friday Agreement have sparked off a controversial debate in the north. Whatever the various political opinions on equality the fact of the matter is that equality was enshrined at the heart of the Good Friday Agreement. For the first time it was acknowledged by the British government that the systematic discrimination against Catholics that has been endemic in this state must now be dealt with in a structured fashion. The equality 'agenda' is central to the development of a system of government that respects the diversity of all constituent groups and sees the pursuit of equality of opportunity within the political, social, cultural and economic domains of public administration.

Under the terms of the Good Friday Agreement the Equality Commission was established and tasked with the implementation of the equality statutory duty as well as the extension of the Fair Employment Treatment Order (1998) to cover the provision of goods, facilities, services and the management, and disposal of premises. The Equality Commission's stated aim is "to promote diversity, eliminate discrimination and achieve equality for all." The overriding concern is that the legislation should be properly defined and enforced. Otherwise the opportunity will be squandered and strangled at birth by those civil servants and politicians to whom the whole concept of equality is anathema.

Under the terms of the Good Friday Agreement, enshrined in legislation in the NI Act (1998), public bodies are now required to design and implement equality schemes. Section 75 requires public bodies to produce schemes to ensure promotion of equality of opportunity between different groups specified as:



Persons of different religious belief and political opinion; racial groups, age, marital status, sexual orientation, men and women generally, persons with a disability and those without; persons with dependants and those without. To date almost 120 bodies have been designated under the statutory duty. This list includes the north-south implementation bodies, all Assembly departments and most associated non-departmental public bodies.

These draft quality schemes should be important tools for implementing the equality agenda. However, like other fundamental aspects of the Agreement, the equality agenda and provisions for its implementation have been subject to interference from both the British

government and civil servants within the various departments. They do not want equality to be central within the functions and policy development of departments and related bodies.

It is quite easy to follow the machinations that have gone on around this issue since the signing of the Good Friday Agreement. First of all the UUP, aided and abetted by the SDLP, voted against having a discrete Equality Department with its appointed Minister. Instead we now have the issue of equality embedded within the Office of the First and Deputy First Minister with two junior Ministers given specific responsibility for equality, Dermott Nesbitt and Dennis Haughey. None of these four men have been renowned for their campaigning to

SHIELD OR SWORD ?

Neither Trimble nor Mallon have been renowned for their campaigning to eliminate structural discrimination against Catholics and neither are renowned for their feminist politics, never mind their opinions about equality for people within the other named categories.

eliminate structural discrimination against Catholics and none are renowned for their feminist politics either, never mind their opinions about equality for people within the other named categories. Dermott Nesbitt during a recent debate in the Assembly was quoted as saying:

"There is no *a priori* link between unemployment differentials and discrimination. The sad point about unemployment differentials and equality of opportunity...is that both communities in NI feel ill at ease with one another. In simple terms the Catholic community in NI feels it is discriminated against and at the same time the Protestant community is being told that it is a discriminating group. Both communities are incorrect in their

perceptions. Therefore this aspect of unemployment differentials must be very carefully stated in measured tones on all occasions."

This philosophy is Graham Gudgin inspired, based on the theory that the employment differential exists as a result of Catholic overpopulation and emigration. However this is now embedded in the Department of the Centre and it is interesting to note that such discredited arguments are not being challenged by either the Deputy First Minister or his Junior Minister colleague in this office.

One has only to examine the meagre resources allocated to both the Equality and Human Rights Commissions to understand that there is no serious commitment by the British government to ensure that the two Commissions have the necessary resources to deliver on their statutory obligations. This is ironic given that one of the requirements of public bodies within the equality schemes is that they 'ensure that all necessary resources, in terms of time people and money are made available to ensure effective promotion of equality of opportunity'.

While groups have been inundated with 120 draft schemes from various bodies, the ones that are not yet designated are equally important. Some of the worst offenders in relation to employment of Catholics are not yet required to produce equality schemes. These include the RUC, Queen's University and the University of Ulster. Other organisations within departments with a large chunk of public money at their disposal are not producing their own equality schemes. Therefore organisations with a dismal performance in the promotion of employment opportunities in Catholic areas, such as the IDB, are effectively off the hook and can continue in their discriminatory fashion. There are

indications that other bodies are due to be designated and we will wait with bated breath to see if the worst offenders are included on this list.

'Religion blindness'

A 'religion blind' approach to equality and human rights appears to be the order of the day not only within the civil service and unionist circles but also within the Equality Commission itself. The Commission recently established an advisory support programme to which groups could apply for up to £10,000 to work within their constituencies on capacity building and consultation on the equality duty. Religious belief and political opinion were deliberately omitted. This decision has recently been reversed but without consultation as to how groups in this category will be defined. Further to that the Equality Commission has failed to apply the statutory duty to itself and is limiting advertising of this programme to the Belfast Telegraph. The Equality Commission has also failed to state its support for ex-prisoners and their representative groups.

Even within the Civic Forum the recent publication of the Code of Conduct for representatives of the community sector requires people to make a commitment not to discriminate against people and projects on the grounds of practically everything except religion.

Within the Office of the First and Deputy First Minister the Equality Unit is planning a conference in September "on practical issues in carrying out future consultations with groups which had traditionally been marginalized." It then goes on to cite ethnic minorities, people with disabilities, children, gay, lesbian and transgendered people. Religion is omitted. So the theory either is

that catholics have never been discriminated against in this state or that while catholics may have been discriminated against they have never been marginalized! This is not in any way to suggest that the promotion of equality for other named categories is second to that of religious and political discrimination. The promotion of equality of opportunity between all constituent groups should be mutually supportive. However, within some circles an attempt at 'divide and rule' appears to be the order of the day and is a trap which no one should allow themselves to be drawn into.

Learning from the Mistakes of the Past

The reality of economic discrimination means that catholic men remain twice as likely to be unemployed than their protestant counterparts and are twice as likely to be better qualified. If equality between all of the people of the north of Ireland is to be achieved then discrimination must be challenged and brought to an end. For this to happen the people and organisations charged with overseeing the implementation of the equality and human rights agenda must start from the basis of full knowledge and an acceptance of the past and current situations. Only from an analysis of these can real recommendations for change be implemented. Having said this, it has been very noticeable that in not one of the draft equality schemes has there been any inclusion of FEC returns on numbers of employees. Nor has there been any detailed indication as to how the impact of the equality duty in terms of employment differentials between catholics and protestants especially will be monitored. None of the draft equality schemes contain any mention of sanctions to be imposed on staff failing to comply with or abusing the statutory duty. A complaints mechanism with no effective sanctions means that nothing needs to change. This is one of the issues that the Equality Commission must urgently address.

Given the relative failure of fair employment legislation upon named constituent groups due to the emphasis placed upon individual measures of legislative address new procedures must be adopted. The Equality Commission must now promote the case for generic action, that is, the promotion of legislation



The position given to the Irish language the terms of the Good Friday Agreement completely ignored by

on behalf of constituent groups.

Bureaucracy and Resources

We are in real danger of seeing the equality agenda being buried in paper work and bureaucracy rather than being prioritised as a live issue with the potential to make a real impact on the quality of life for people who have suffered discrimination at the hands of the British government and a unionist civil service.

Groups responding to the initial draft schemes found themselves deluged with 106 variations of the Equality Commission's guidelines. The assessment of these schemes was a sharp learning curve for everybody involved. The mechanics of the draft schemes were largely lost to the local community groups and other organisations that would have a direct interest in the

impact of the equality duty. This has got to be rectified in some way through local capacity building and education. There is a real danger that the equality duty remains an academic debate and exercise with no real input from the people and communities on whose lives it is intended to impact.

Despite the mechanics serious flaws in draft schemes have begun to emerge. The general patterns could be identified as:

- ▶ Failure on the part of bodies to give a stated commitment to the necessary resources to implement the statutory duty.
- ▶ No named senior person within the organisations with responsibility for driving the scheme forward.
- ▶ No inclusion of FEC returns as a baseline analysis.
- ▶ Consultation on the whole was abysmal, with bodies assuming that an advertisement in local newspapers was



Language under Agreement is by public bodies

sufficient consultation.

► Assembly Departments in particular have already screened functions and policies to decide which of these must be impact assessed. There appears to have been neither rhyme nor reason to the policies screened out and there was no consultation with groups or individuals during this process. All functions and policies must be screened and this process must involve open and inclusive consultation.

► Final consultation lists, e.g. for

Departments, remain very narrow. In the case of some departments a pattern has emerged that any group submitting a critical response to their initial scheme has been dropped off the future consultation list.

► There has been a lack of detailed monitoring procedures or baseline indicators to assess the progress of the statutory duty.

► One of the proposals put forward was that members of secret and oath bound organisations must register their membership. All departments and bodies either rejected this proposal outright or simply ignored it. The rejection was based on the notion that people have a right to freedom of expression. Quite so but the right not to be discriminated against overrides this. No one is suggesting that members of such organisations should be

excluded from the work force or discriminated against but the public does have a right to know about their membership of organisations to militate against being discriminated against in the work place.

► The five-year timetable in many cases was inadequate and equality issues appeared to be deprioritised. For instance within the draft scheme of the Office of the First and Deputy First Minister the timetable states that in Year One there will be a review of support for the Community Relations Council and policies on voluntary sector women's and men's organisations, victims and racial discrimination. However, it is not until Year Five that they will review religious discrimination in employment and in the provision of goods and services or the religious differential in employment.

► The position given to the Irish language under the terms of the Good Friday Agreement is completely ignored by public bodies. The Agreement states: "... the British government will in particular in relation to the Irish language, where appropriate and where people so desire it:

- Take resolute action to promote the language
- Facilitate and encourage the use of the language in speech and writing in public and private life where there is appropriate demand.
- Seek to remove, where possible, restrictions that would discourage or work against the maintenance or development of the language.
- Make provision for liaising with the Irish language community, representing their views to public authorities and investigating complaints."

In the draft equality schemes the Irish language is treated in the same way as ethnic minority languages and most bodies have stated that they will only produce schemes in other languages for people 'who are not fluent in English'. This situation has got to be rectified and documents from public bodies produced bilingually. In its own case the Equality Commission has not made its draft corporate plan available in Irish thus setting a poor precedent.

► In the case of many public bodies there has also been an undisguised attempt to equate the statutory duty on equality with the statutory duty on good community relations. This is in flagrant disregard of the legislation which states that the bodies must have 'due regard' to promoting

equality of opportunity and 'without prejudice to the above 'have regard to' the promotion of good community relations.

The Equality Commission is currently assessing the departmental schemes and will decide to accept or reject them or refer them to Peter Mandelson. At the same time other interested groups are assessing the final draft schemes. Any flaws discovered in these schemes by outside groups will not be taken on board by the Equality Commission and once a scheme has been accepted there will be no opportunity to appeal the decision. This is a serious flaw in the Equality Commission's timetabling and its consultation exercise. Seriously flawed schemes therefore, will be in operation before the end of the year and will be rendered useless in actively promoting equality of opportunity.

The monitoring and assessment of the implementation of the statutory duty is a long-term exercise and will require close independent scrutiny and intensive consultation exercises. Despite this neither the British government nor the Department of Finance and Personnel have made any financial resources available to community groups and groups representing the various categories to enable them to engage in this exercise. This is a deliberate attempt to limit or nullify the ability of key organisations and local communities to actively engage in the equality agenda.

Conclusion

Having been critical of the machinations and bureaucracy surrounding the implementation of the equality duty, it does present a huge opportunity to drive the equality debate forward and to enable groups suffering discrimination to have a means of complaint and redress. The approach to the equality duty has exposed two different poles in the debate and approach. The community and interest groups have seized the equality duty as a sword to be used in the battle for equality. Civil servants and some politicians on the other hand have designed their schemes to be a shield against accusations of discrimination. Their approach has been to avoid accusations of discrimination as opposed to actively promoting equality. Thus the battle lines have been drawn. For those who argued strongly for equality to be a cornerstone in the Agreement the battle may have been won but this particular war is far from over. ✕



ETA INTENSIFIES CAMPAIGN

Eoin O'Broin

Following the ending of their 14th month cessation of armed actions, Euskadi Ta Askatasuna have intensified their campaign in search of Basque independence. The cessation, called in August 1998 led the way to an unprecedented agreement between Basque political and social organisations. The Lizarra-Garazi Agreement as it became known, committed the signatories to work for a resolution of the conflict in the Basque country based on the right of the Basque people to determine their own future.

From the outset the Spanish and French governments refused to grasp the opportunity offered by Lizarra-Garazi. Rejecting the historic breakthrough which the agreement represented, they refused to enter into any kind of dialogue with the signatories and accused the Basque Nationalist Party of assisting ETA. Meanwhile arrests and general police

repression continued unabated, as did the maltreatment of political prisoners.

The rejectionism from Madrid was followed by a second problem when the conservative Basque Nationalist Party, who were a major player within the agreement, began to hold the new political process up. Radical nationalists accused the PNV of being unwilling to live up to their

commitments. ETA also accused them of refusing to comply with additional agreements entered into following the Lizarra-Garazi declaration, and of stalling the entire process.

The recrimination between Basque nationalists took place against a backdrop of increased Spanish and French governmental intransigence. More than

500 people were arrested during the same period, and allegations of torture in prisons were registered by a range of human rights organisations. One political prisoner, Jose Luis Geresta was killed while in prison custody. A second prisoner, Estaban Estaban Nieto died from cancer. While imprisoned he was denied access to medical treatment and released only after he reached a terminal stage.

As 1999 came to a close, two decisive factors became clear. The first being that the conservative Basque Nationalist Party was no longer interested in the political process which emerged from Lizarra-Garazi. Secondly, the Spanish right, on the verge of its most significant electoral victory since the death of Franco, believed that it had Basque nationalism, both conservative and radical, on the run. The political climate quickly deteriorated and in November ETA announced the end of its fourteen month cessation.

From the beginning of this year, ETA has mounted a considerable challenge to the Spanish government, undermining the assumptions that ETA's capacity to resist was greatly diminished. In January a Spanish Army Colonel was killed in a car-bomb attack in Madrid. The following month a leading Spanish Socialist politician and his bodyguard were killed in a similar explosion in the Basque city Gasteiz. In March a third car-bomb exploded in the Basque city Bilbo, causing no fatalities.

Against this backdrop, the right wing Spanish Popular Party won an outright majority in the country's general election, giving the right its first straight victory in recent history. While the buoyancy of the Spanish economy was one of the deciding factors in Aznar's success, his hard line position on the Basque question consolidated his position with an electorate renowned for their anti-Basque sentiment. Radical nationalists called on their electorate not to vote in the elections as a symbolic act of separation from the Spanish state.

ETA stepped up its armed campaign in May with a series of attacks which resulted in the death of a spokesperson for the pro-Spanish Spirit of Ermua group -who were formed following ETA's killing of Popular Party councillor, Miguel Angel Blanco in 1997- and a a Popular Party councillor in Malaga, the ninth party member to be killed in recent years.

A series of car bombs were detonated in the weeks following, causing no fatalities

“Unfortunately the Spanish & French governments policy of repression and political intransigence has led both Spain and the Basque country back into the cycle of conflict many had hoped was over.”

but millions of pounds of damage.

On July 29th ETA assassinated the former Spanish Civil Governor of the Basque province of Gipuzkoa. The former Spanish Socialist councillor and senior Spanish intelligence operative with CESID, had survived a previous attempt on his life in 1995. A high profile figure in Basque politics shifting from membership of the Communist Party in the 1970's to the Basque eurocommunists, Euskadiko Ezkerra in the 1980's (which merged with the PSOE later in the same decade). His appointment to the position of Civil Governor was both controversial and divisive within Basque society, making him many enemies on both the Spanish right and radical Basque left. The latter viewed his appointment as a cosmetic exercise aimed to rehabilitate the corrupt PSOE after revelations that government ministers had been involved in recruiting and directing paramilitary mercenaries as part of the Dirty War against the pro-independence movement.

By August ETA were responsible for twenty attacks which involved the loss of eleven lives. Throughout the period the level of civil disturbance reached new heights as nightly attacks on Spanish political and commercial institutions and premises were carried out by groups of young radical Basques. Confrontations

with the Spanish and Basque police returned as commonplace features in the lives of many towns and urban districts.

August and September witnessed the most intense period as four ETA militants were killed in a premature explosion in Bilbo. Their death was closely followed by that of a prominent Basque businessman, a Spanish Army Lieutenant in Irunea and yet another Popular Party councillor. Within a week two members of the Spanish military police were killed when a bomb exploded under their patrol car, close to the border with the French state. Two gun attacks in early September saw a Popular Party councillor killed and another critically wounded.

Madrid and Paris responded swiftly with the arrest of over 30 people, most of whom were political activists from Herri Batasuna and other radical nationalist organisations.

The intensity of the summer violence has left no doubt that ETA has the ability and capacity to carry out its campaign for the immediate future. Comparisons have already been made with the high point of the organisations strength in the mid 1980's. Mass demonstration's have been carried out by a wide range of organisations, some condemning ETA, others calling for the release of political prisoners. And once again Basque society is highly charged as opposing sides square up on a regular basis for confrontations.

What is clear however is that ETA's preferred option lies with the political process as defined by Lizarra-Garazi. The Spanish government refused to engage with that process on the assumption that ETA endorsed the agreement and called a cessation from a position of weakness. The goal of the Popular Party was to defeat ETA militarily and Basque nationalism electorally hoping for the first time in a century to undermine the hegemony of nationalism within Basque society.

Unfortunately Jose Maria Aznar's policy of repression and political intransigence has led both Spain and the Basque country back into the cycle of conflict many had hoped was over. The question which now begs an answer is how long will it take the Popular Party to recognise the need for a political process, which like South Africa and Ireland, would replace conflict with dialogue and intransigence with agreement. While only time will tell, the present tone of the Popular Party's attacks on Basque nationalism do not bode well for the immediate future. ✕

Noam Chomsky

"Peace Process" Prospects after Camp David



A recent Associated Press report from Camp David (evening, July 25th) begins: 'The Middle East peace talks at Camp David collapsed Tuesday over rival claims to East Jerusalem. Disappointed, President Clinton said he tried several approaches but could not come up with a solution.' Clinton expressed hope that the process would continue to a resolution of the East Jerusalem problem, at which point the fundamental outstanding issue would have been overcome.

To have a sense of what is taking place, it is useful to back off a few steps and to look at immediate events from a somewhat broader perspective.

Any discussions of what is called a 'peace process' - whether the one underway at Camp David or any other - should keep in mind the operative meaning of the phrase: by definition, the 'peace process' is whatever the US government happens to be pursuing.

Having grasped that essential principle, one can understand that a peace process can be advanced by Washington's clearly-proclaimed efforts to undermine peace. To illustrate, in January 1988 the press reported Secretary of State George Shultz's 'peace trip' to Central America under the headline 'Latin Peace Trip by Shultz Planned.' The subheading explained the goal: 'Mission Would Be Last Ditch effort to Defuse Opposition on Contra

Aid.' Administration officials elaborated that the 'peace mission' was 'the only way to save' aid to the Contras in the face of 'growing congressional opposition.'

The timing is important. In August 1987, over strong US objections, the Central American presidents had reached a peace agreement for the bitter Central American conflicts: the Esquipulas Accords. The US acted at once to undermine them, and by January, had largely succeeded. It had effectively excluded the sole 'indispensable element' cited in the Accords: an end to US support for the Contras (CIA supply flights instantly tripled, and Contra terror increased). Washington had also eliminated the second basic principle of the Accords: that the human rights provisions should apply to US clients as well as to Nicaragua (by US fiat, they were to apply to Nicaragua alone). Washington had also managed to terminate the despised international monitoring mission, which had committed the crime of describing truthfully what had been happening since the adoption of the plan in August. To the consternation of the Reagan Administration, Nicaragua nevertheless accepted the version of the accords crafted by US power, leading to the Schultz 'peace mission,' undertaken to advance the 'peace process' by ensuring that there would be no backsliding from the demolition operation.



Throughout the several weeks of deliberations, it was regularly reported that the main stumbling block is Jerusalem.

In brief, the 'peace mission' was a 'last-ditch effort' to block peace and mobilise Congress to support the 'unlawful use of force' for which the US had recently been condemned by the World Court.

The record of the 'peace process' in the Middle East has been similar, though even more extreme. From 1971 the US has been virtually alone in the international arena in barring a negotiated diplomatic settlement of the Israel-Palestine conflict: the 'peace process' is the record of these developments. To review the essentials briefly, in November 1967, under U.S. initiative, the UN Security Council adopted resolution 242 on 'land and peace.' As explicitly understood by the US and the other signatories, UN 242 called for a full peace settlement on the pre-June 1967 borders with at most minor and mutual

adjustments, offering nothing to the Palestinians. When President Sadat of Egypt accepted the official US position in February 1971, Washington revised UN 242 to mean partial Israeli withdrawal, as the US and Israel would determine. The unilateral revision is what is now called 'land for peace', a reflection of US power in the domain of doctrine and ideology.

The Associated Press report on the breakdown of the Camp David negotiations, cited above, notes that the final official settlement, 'in a gesture to Arafat,' said that 'the only path to peace was resolutions adopted by the U.N. Security council after Middle East wars in 1967 and 1973. These call for Israel to relinquish territory won from the Arabs in exchange for secure borders.' The resolution of 1976 is UN 242, calling for full

Israeli withdrawal with at most minor and mutual border adjustments; the 1973 resolution merely endorses UN 242 without change. But the meaning of UN 242 has crucially changed since February 1971, following Washington's dictates.

Sadat warned that US-Israeli rejection of UN 242 would lead to war. Neither the US nor Israel took him seriously, on remarkable triumphalist and racist grounds, later bitterly denounced in Israel. Egypt did go to war in October 1973. It turned out to be a near disaster for Israel, and for the world: the prospects of a nuclear exchange were not slight. The 1973 war made it clear even to Henry Kissinger that Egypt was not a basket case that could simply be disregarded, so Washington shifted to the natural back-up strategy: excluding Egypt from the conflict



so that Israel, with mounting US support, could proceed to integrate the occupied territories and attack Lebanon. The result was achieved at Camp David in 1978, hailed ever since as the grand moment of the 'peace process.'

Meanwhile the US vetoed Security Council resolutions calling for a diplomatic settlement incorporating UN 242 but now also including Palestinian rights. The US also voted annually against similar General Assembly resolutions (along with Israel, sometimes one or other client state), and otherwise blocked all efforts at peaceful resolution of the conflict initiated by Europe, the Arab states, or the PLO. This consistent rejection of a diplomatic settlement is the 'peace process.' The actual facts were long ago vetoed from the media, and have largely been barred even from scholarship, but they are easy enough to discover.

After the Gulf War, the US was finally in a position to impose its own unilateral

rejectionist stand and did so, first at Madrid in late 1991, then in successive Israel-PLO agreements from 1993. With these measures, the 'peace process' has advanced towards the Bantustan-style arrangements that the US and Israel intended, as should have been obvious to anyone with eyes open, and is entirely clear in the documentary record and, more important, the record on the ground. That brings us to the present stage: Camp David, July 2000.

Throughout the several weeks of deliberations, it was regularly reported that the main stumbling block is Jerusalem. The final report reiterates that conclusion. The observation is not false, but it is a bit misleading. 'Creative' solutions have been proposed to permit symbolic Palestinian authority in Jerusalem - or as the city is called in Arabic, Al-Quds. These include Palestinian administration of Arab neighbourhoods (as Israel would prefer, if rational), some arrangement for Islamic

and Christian sites, and a Palestinian capital in the village of Abu Dis near Jerusalem, which might be renamed 'Al-Quda,' with a little sleight-of-hand. Such an endeavour might have succeeded, and might still succeed. But a more intractable problem arises as soon as we ask a basic question: What is Jerusalem?

When Israel conquered the West Bank in June 1967, it annexed Jerusalem - not in a very polite fashion; for example, it has recently been revealed in Israel that the destruction of the Arab Mughrabi neighbourhood near the Wailing Wall on June 10 was done with such haste that an unknown number of Palestinians were buried in the ruins left by bulldozers.

Israel quickly tripled the borders of the city. Subsequent development programmes, pursued with little variation by all governments, aimed to extend the borders of 'greater Jerusalem' well beyond. On June 28, Israel's leading daily, *Ha'aretz*, published a map detailing 'Israel's proposal

for permanent settlement.' It is virtually identical to the government's 'Final Status Map' presented a month earlier. The territory to be annexed around the greatly expanded 'Jerusalem' extends to the south well past Bethlehem, and two major nearby Palestinian towns. They are to be left under Palestinian control, but adjoining Israeli territory, and in the case of Ramallah, cut off from Palestinian territory to the east. Like all Palestinian territory, both towns are separated from Jerusalem, the centre of West Bank life, by territory annexed to Israel. To the east, the territory to be annexed includes the rapidly growing Israeli town of Ma'ale Adumin and extends on to Vered Jericho, a small settlement on the Jordanian border. The entire Jordanian border is to be annexed to Israel along with the 'Jerusalem' salient that partitions the West Bank. Another salient to be annexed farther north virtually imposes a second partition.

The intensive construction and settlement projects of the past years have been designed to 'create facts' that would lead to this 'permanent settlement.' That has been the clear commitment of the successive governments since the first 'Oslo agreement' of September 1993. Contrary to much commentary, the official doves (Rabin, Peres, Barak) have at least as faithfully dedicated to this project as the much-condemned Binyamin Netanyahu, though they have been able to conduct the project with less protest; a familiar story, here as well. In February of this year the Israeli press reported that the number of building starts increased by almost one-third from 1998 (Netanyahu) to the current year (Barak). An analysis by Israeli correspondent Nadav Shragai reveals that only a small fraction of the lands assigned to the settlements are actually used for agricultural or other purposes. For Ma'ale Adumim, for example, the lands assigned to it are 16 times the area used, and similar proportions hold elsewhere. Palestinians have brought petitions to the Israeli High Court opposing the expansion of Ma'ale Adumim, but they have been rejected. Last November, rejecting an appeal, one High Court judge explained that 'some good for the residents of the neighbouring [Palestinian] villages might spring from the economic and cultural development of Ma'ale Adumim,' effectively partitioning the West Bank.

The projects have been carried out thanks to the benevolence of US taxpayers,

by a variety of 'creative' devices to overcome the fact that US aid is officially barred for these purposes.

The intended result is that an eventual Palestinian state would consist of four cantons of the West Bank: (1) Jericho, (2) the southern canton extending as far as Abu Dis (the new Arab 'Jerusalem'), (3) a northern canton including the Palestinian cities of Nablus, Jenin and Tulkarm, and (4) a central canton including Ramallah. These cantons are completely surrounded by territory to be annexed by Israel. The areas of Palestinian population concentration are to be under Palestinian administration, an adaptation of the traditional colonial pattern that is the only sensible outcome as far as Israel and the US are concerned. The plans for the Gaza strip, a fifth canton, are uncertain: Israel might relinquish it, or might maintain the southern coastal region and another salient virtually dividing the Strip below Gaza City.

These outlines are consistent with the proposals that have been put forth since 1968, when Israel adopted the 'Allon plan,' never presented formally but apparently intended to incorporate about 40% of the West Bank within Israel. Since then specific plans have been proposed by the ultra-right General Sharon, the Labour Party, and others. They are fairly similar in conception and outline. The basic principle is that the usable territory within the West Bank, and the crucial resources (primarily water), will remain under Israeli control, but the population will be controlled by a Palestinian client regime, which is expected to be corrupt, barbaric, and compliant. The Palestinian-administered cantons can then provide cheap and easily exploitable labour for the Israeli economy. Or in the long run, the population might be 'transferred' elsewhere in one or another way, in accord with long standing hopes.

It is possible to 'imagine' creative schemes that would finesse the issues concerning the religious sites and the administration of Palestinian neighbourhoods of Jerusalem. But the more fundamental problem lies elsewhere. It is not at all clear that they can be sensibly resolved within the framework of nation-states that has been imposed throughout the world by Western conquest and domination, with murderous consequences within Europe itself for centuries, not to speak of the effects beyond until the present moment. ✕

“

The basic principle is that the usable territory within the West Bank, and the crucial resources (primarily water), will remain under Israeli control, but the population will be controlled by a Palestinian client regime, which is expected to be corrupt, barbaric, and compliant.

”

READING

SOUTH AFRICA

A review of books currently in print dealing with the politics of South Africa.




ANATOMY OF MIRACLE

Patti Waldmeir

Penguin, £10.35 pb
ISBN 0-14-024941-9

Patti Waldmeir was the *Financial Times* South African correspondent in Lusaka and Johannesburg throughout the turbulent years of South Africa's democratic revolution. In what has become a standard journalistic account of the time, she traces the events and the personalities which brought the apartheid state from a moment of anarchy and instability through the first democratic elections in its history and into majority rule.

Her detailed and engaging book brings together a journalist's eye for fact with a novelist's sense of storytelling, which combined make *Anatomy of a Miracle* a thrilling read. She also utilises a number of techniques which bring



home the human side of what can only be described as historic transformations. Through the use of biographical sketches and tangential anecdotes, Waldmeir gives what is an essentially macro-political book a real sense of the local impact of change.

One gets a sense from this book of having not only learned about the history but also the personalities, what motivates them, concerns them and in many cases prevented them from acting in certain ways. The book's only failing is that, as with many journalistic accounts of the period, Waldmeir does not provide the reader with an analysis of what happened, only an exciting description of events, which is probably why it all seems like such a miracle. Nonetheless this is a valuable and educational read.

COUNTRY OF MY SKULL

Antjie Krog

Vintage, £7.99 pb
ISBN 0-099-28979-2

Following the first democratic elections in South Africa, the new ANC government established a Truth and Reconciliation Commission under the stewardship of Archbishop Desmond Tutu. The remit of the commission was to establish the truth of the country's recent history, to determine whether applicants were due an amnesty from prosecution for human rights abuses, to assist the process of national and communal reconciliation and to design and promote mechanisms which would ensure that such human rights violations and abuses of power would never happen again.

What followed was a complex, detailed, fraught and highly contested process lasting several years, hearing more than 20,000 statements from victims and receiving more than 8,000 applications for amnesty. Politicians, police, soldiers, liberation activists and ordinary people flocked to the Commission in order that their story be heard and their demands met.

Antjie Krog headed the South African Broadcasting Company's radio team covering the two years of hearings and proceedings.



During that time she lived 24 hours a day with her country's tortured and tragic past. Her reports contained the cowardice and hypocrisy of perpetrators alongside the brave and humane voices of their victims, but often the clear line between the two became blurred.

Country of my Skull is Krog's account of that period, mixing sections of reportage with personal memoir and reflection. It is a book not just about the work of the Commission and the response of the South African people, but about the impact on the consciousness and psychology on the Afrikaner soul upon hearing the truth of Apartheid.

This is truly a great book. It is compassionate, compelling but most of all it refuses to ignore the manifold ambiguity and greyness which exists in a country riven by racial inequality. Questions of truth, blame, responsibility and reparations are never easy to answer. But what comes streaming out of the pages of this book, are not answers, but the voices of ordinary South Africans, struggling to have their stories told. Of all of the benefits of the Commission, maybe this is its most lasting legacy.

THE LADY

The life and times of Winnie Mandela

Emma Gilbey

Vintage, £7.99
ISBN 0-09-938801-4

For more than two decades Winnie Mandela was the face, if not the spirit of South African resistance to Apartheid. Her political, personal and physical power provided the liberation movement with a potent symbol of the refusal of Africans to accept second class citizenship in their own country. From her marriage to Nelson Mandela and her experiences as a political prisoner, through to her prominent political leadership roles in the ANC and ANC Women's League her life was a testament to her own ability, courage and determination as a Black woman in the struggle for freedom.

But controversy was never far from the surface of her life. Her strengths as a person were also her weaknesses, as power often slipped into dominance and determination became arrogance. Both in her personal, professional and political life there were always two versions of the Mother of the Nation.



This is the portrait painted by New York based journalist Emma Gilbey in her 1994 biography of Mandela. Tracing the rise of Winnie from her life as the daughter of a rural school teacher, Gilbey combines a wide range of sources with an intimate understanding of the realities of a multi racial South Africa.

Although the biography covers every stage of its subject's life, from childhood into adult maturity, it was the alleged role of Winnie Mandela in the kidnapping of four young boys and the death of one -Seipei Stompi- which occupies almost half of the book. And important as this story is, the absence of similarly detailed treatment of Winnie's political or personal life is Gilbey's only fault.

The Lady is an autobiography which neither judges nor adores its complex and contradictory subject. Gilbey not only brings Mandela's life a little closer to her readers, but in doing so teaches us many things about where South Africa came from and where it is heading.

THE ANC AND THE LIBERATION STRUGGLE

Dale T. McKinley


Pluto Press £11.99

ISBN 0-7453-1277-2

Dale T. McKinley's succinct critical biography of the ANC offers the reader much food for thought. Written from a Marxist theoretical perspective, it examines the leadership strategies of the ANC from its birth through to the formation of the Transitional Executive in the lead up to the first democratic elections of 1994. McKinley also brings an activist based approach to his text as someone who was part of the grass roots movements which played such a vital role in undermining apartheid.

His conclusion is that the outcome of the negotiations between the ANC and DeKlerk's National Party, while changing the formal political structure of the country, failed to undermine the economic basis of apartheid, and as such constituted a failure for the liberation movement and its demand for a transfer of power to the people. He believes that 'incorporation' rather than liberation was the outcome.

McKinley's argument is thorough and



rigorous, and raises many important questions for supporters of the ANC and similar liberation movements around the world. In particular the absence of real economic transformation is hard to escape. However what McKinley fails to acknowledge is that the elections of 1994 were not seen by the ANC as the end of the struggle for liberation, but rather a moment in a longer term process of political and economic transformation. Passing judgement on the ANC at such a juncture is both unfair and politically naive.

McKinley's book is like much Marxist scholarship on liberation politics in that it lacks any real understanding of the ways in which movements such as the ANC view the strategic nature of struggle. It also fails to explore the tensions and differences within a movement as broad based as the ANC, thus reducing what are often dynamic and diverse strategic and tactical moves, into a more monotone narrative. Nonetheless *The ANC and the Liberation Struggle* is a valuable book despite its limitations.

ELITE TRANSITION

From Apartheid to Neo-liberalism in South Africa

Patrick Bond

Pluto Press £15.99 pb

ISBN 0-7453-1023-0

Published this year, *Elite Transition* takes the reader through the ANC's two terms in government. Focusing specifically on social and economic policy, the book compares the stated intentions of the ANC from the Freedom Charter, and subsequent policy documents through to their actual delivery in government. And in conclusion, the book's author Patrick Bond argues that despite a clear policy mandate from both the electorate and the mass organisations in the Democratic Movement, the 'leadership elite' within the government allowed itself to be seduced by big business and neo liberal economists and lobbyists, thus altering the direction of policy.

In what is both a challenging and well researched book, Bond takes us through every key area of policy formation, and with a mixture of radical economic analysis, investigative journalism and personal anecdote, brings to light the full and at times frightening impact of the 'Elite Transition'. He is also careful to engage, rhetorically, with possible counterattacks from



ANC and South African Communist Party supporters, and gives much credit to those left academics in both organisations who are working to change the tide away from neo liberalism.

Bond also spends much time examining the position of the mass movements, from the ANC Youth and Womens League, through to the Non Governmental Organisation's, churches, human rights organisations and trade unions. And it is here that he places his hopes for the future. With a strong belief in the radical and democratic power of these sectors, his final chapter, '*Beyond Neo-liberalism*' outlines possible scenarios through which a radical transformation of South African society is still possible.

The book's single weakness, albeit an important one, is that he offers no explanation as to why two successive ANC government cabinets 'Talked Left' while 'Acting Right'. This is a question which needs answering, if those of us in liberation movements elsewhere in the world are to learn any definitive lessons from Bond's analysis.

MANDELA

The Authorised Biography

Anthony Sampson

Harper Collins £9.99 pb
ISBN 0-00-638845-0

Published in 1999, Anthony Sampson's authorised biography of Nelson Mandela is, and will remain the standard text of the ANC leader's life. It is a magestic book whose style matches its content, providing the reader with a vivid insight into the life which created one of the greatest liberation leaders of the 20th century.

Stretching across 600 pages, Sampson probes the minute detail of Mandela's life from tribal childhood, through early education and university, and then into the legal and political worlds which would change his life forever. In addition his prison and post prison life are examined. Equal attention is paid to the personal side of a man who has kept his private life at arm's length from public scrutiny.

As Sampson makes clear from the outset, his ambition is to get to the man behind the myth and in this he succeeds brilliantly, as Mandela does not come out as a saint, but as a flawed and complicated human being whose greatness



is matched by the people and circumstances surrounding him. But Sampson's book is much more than the story of Mandela the political leader. It also tells the epic tale of 20th century South Africa, through the eyes of the Black communities. And it is here that Simpson excels. Black society is brought to life, as a vibrant, complex and often conflictive political and cultural space. The many differences, political, social and economic between Africans, Indians and Coloureds, - as well as within each of these groups- is as important a factor in the history of South Africa as those between Black and White. It was this complexity which enabled a man like Mandela to emerge and play his part in the development of a democratic South African nation.

Sampson, who spent many years in South Africa and was one of the first foreign journalists to be banned, was the right choice to author this book. His knowledge, skill and understanding have given us a biography that will stand the test of time.

SOUTH AFRICA IN TRANSITION


Adrian Guelke

I.B. Tauris £39.50 hb
ISBN 1-96064-343-4

As the book's sub-title suggests, the focus of Queen's University academic Adrian Guelke's *South Africa in Transition* is to explain the 'misunderstood miracle'. In what starts out as a rather dense and at times dull text is in fact an important analysis of the key factors which enabled the democratic transition in South Africa to pass off with relative peace and ease.

Guelke highlights a range of factors which contributed to the successful transition, all of which are aimed at demonstrating that the alleged 'miracle' which caught the international and indeed academic community off guard, was not such a miracle afterall.

Central to his argument is the inter-relating questions of political violence, the end of the Cold War, the elections of 1994 and in particular their outcome, and the impact of international interventions. Interesting, however, is the way in which Guelke challenges many of the assumptions in existing literature regarding the above issues.



Of particular interest are the chapters on the Inkhata Movement and the question of the extreme right. Both are issues often ignored in other texts, but are nonetheless central to any rounded understanding of the transition.

Guelke also examines, albeit briefly, the economic policies of the ANC in government, and reaction to those policies. Unlike Bond and McKinley, he blames the shift to neo-liberal on international limitations such as the absence of a credible left economic alternative, the need to attract inward investment and to secure market stability. His conclusion is that any South African government would face the same constraints and probably develop similar policies.

There are also some short but interesting observations about the relationship between the ANC and Sinn Féin which deserve mention.

In the end, *South Africa in Transition* is an interesting book, although more for the academic reader. At a price of £39.50 with no paperback in sight its accessibility is severely limited but it should be available in some libraries.

GUILTY




of MURDER
and Torture
Hypocrisy Collusion

is this what you call a new beginning to policing ?

MANDELA

The Authorised Biography

Anthony Sampson




is matched by the people and circumstances surrounding him. But Sampson's book is much more than the story of Mandela the political leader. It also tells the epic tale of 20th century South Africa, through the eyes of the Black communities. And it is here that Sampson excels. Black society is brought to life, as a vibrant, complex and often conflictive political and cultural space. The many differences, political, social and economic between Africans, Indians and Coloureds, - as well as within each of these groups - is as important a factor in the history of South Africa as those between Black and White. It was this complexity which enabled a man like Mandela to emerge and play his part in the development of a democratic South African nation.

Sampson, who spent many years in South Africa and was one of the first foreign journalists to be banned, was the right choice to author this book. His knowledge, skill and understanding have given us a biography that will stand the test of time.

SOUTH AFRICA IN TRANSITION

Adrian Guelke



Of particular interest are the chapters on the Inkhata Movement and the question of the extreme right. Both are issues often ignored in other texts, but are nonetheless central to any rounded understanding of the transition.

Guelke also examines, albeit briefly, the economic policies of the ANC in government, and reaction to those policies. Unlike Bond and McKinley, he blames the shift to neo-liberal on international limitations such as the absence of a credible left economic alternative, the need to attract inward investment and to secure market stability. His conclusion is that any South African government would face the same constraints and probably develop similar policies.

There are also some short but interesting observations about the relationship between the ANC and Sinn Féin which deserve mention.

In the end, *South Africa in Transition* is an interesting book, although more for the academic reader. At a price of £39.50 with no paperback in sight its accessibility is severely limited but it should be available in some libraries.

SUBSCRIBE to left republican review

YES, I want to subscribe to Left Republican Review

Name

Address

City

E-mail

Post code

I enclose a cheque / cash for £ _____

6 Editions per year:

- ▶ Ireland, England Scotland, Wales £15
- ▶ Rest of EU £17
- ▶ Rest of world £19
- ▶ Organisations £30

Fill in the form and send it to : Subscriptions Office,
Left Republican Review, 13C Grainne House, Belfast
BT15 2EH.
Cheques payable to Left Republican Review.

RUC: The Monster Mu



Left Republican Review is an independent political platform bringing together left republican voices from across Ireland in a spirit of open debate. We aim to provoke discussion on political and organisational issues of concern to Irish republicans. We also aim to provide a platform for those forces and voices from across the globe who are struggling for independence and socialism. Our motto is, 'those who have lost the ability to criticise themselves, have lost any idea of who they are' and in that light we hope to create a space for open, free and constructive criticism, the aim of which is to strengthen republicanism and further our goals of Irish independence, political and cultural equality and economic and social justice.

All contact should be directed to;
Left Republican Review
13C Grainne House
Belfast
BT15 2EH

Articles are welcome for consideration. Length should be approximately 2000 words and written in a non academic or non technical manner. All offers will be given due consideration. We also welcome comments, criticisms or ideas for improvements. If you don't like what we are doing then let us know and help us improve.

All articles are the opinions of the writers and do not reflect the editorial policy of Left Republican Review.

Editor: Eoin O'Broin

Art Work: Libel Inc.

Design: Ihintz Oliden

Printing: Molotov Press