

Labour & Trade Union Review

October 2001
No. 108
Price £1.20 (IR £1.20)

US Dumps UN and NATO

US Airport Security

Nozick

Tube

Macedonia

Parliamentary Diary

The Cost of Coalition

The British media is full of blather about a great coalition of states that has been put together for war on Afghanistan, in response to the bombing of the World Trade Centre and the Pentagon. There is in fact no coalition, and Washington is insistent that there will not be. The US Defence Secretary, Donald Rumsfeld, made this abundantly clear in an article in the *New York Times* on 27th September, which was obviously to tell the American people how the US Government envisages the "war" being pursued. He wrote:

"This war will not be waged by a grand alliance united for the single purpose of defeating an axis of hostile powers. Instead, it will involve floating coalitions of countries, which may change and evolve. Countries will have different roles and contribute in different ways. Some will provide diplomatic support, others financial, still others logistical or military. Some will help us publicly, while others, because of their circumstances, may help us privately and secretly. In this war, the mission will define the coalition - not the other way around."

"We understand that countries we consider our friends may help with certain efforts or be silent on others, while other actions we take may depend on the involvement of countries we have considered less than friendly."

The "war on terrorism" will be conducted by the USA by whatever means it chooses, and with whatever allies it selects for particular operations. Its sheer power in the world, and its demonstrated willingness to use its power for immediate ends without regard for longer term consequences, makes it advisable for Governments everywhere to conciliate it at this juncture, and to facilitate it in doing as it pleases.

It will act under the chapter of the United Nations Charter which is a practical negation of the United Nations. Chapter 51, combined with the Security Council Veto, entitles it to do anything it pleases in the world in the name of self-defence without placing itself in breach of the United Nations. And this is not an abuse of the United Nations. It is what the United Nations was carefully designed to make possible.

All five Veto states are entitled to act to the full extent of their power without being held to be in breach of international law. The founders of the UN, Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin, agreed that this should be the case.

NATO imagined for an instant that its hour had come. But the USA will not allow itself to be hampered by NATO interference any more than by UNO interference.

The Bevin Society held a fringe meeting at the Labour Party Conference two years ago with the title 'New Labour—New NATO?' It was filled to overflowing with enthusiastic Blairites. We were taken aback by the depth of their resentment of the USA for having reduced Britain to its dependency. They were sticking to America like leeches and hating it. They envisaged a resumption of British independence of action as the leader of the European Union in New NATO.

New NATO assembled itself after the World Trade Centre bombing, declared it to be the kind of attack which it had been formed to respond to, and prepared for action. It was told by Washington that this was not an attack on NATO but on the United States and that the USA has no intention of letting anybody else take over the response to it. So NATO went home, its hour come and gone.

(It is curious that NATO attempted to activate itself in response to an attack on a couple of buildings when it stood idly by in response to the terrorist overthrow of one of its democratic governments. The Greek colonels were terrorists, weren't they?)

We were told that the bombing of the WTC and the Pentagon was not an attack on the United States. It was an attack on democracy in general, indeed on "civilisation itself". We were precipitated by Tony Blair into the scenario of one of the later James Bond movies, in which Bond was no longer fighting the Cold War, but was saving

the entire world.

Pythagoras said that, given a point of leverage, he would undertake to shift the entire world. The difficulty was to get outside the world in order to find the ground for leverage.

The Bond villain had a Caribbean island and nuclear missiles. Bin Laden has a cave in Afghanistan, a mobile phone and a video camera.

Fortunately the USA did not buy the "civilisation itself" fantasy. It treated the matter as an attack on itself, to which it would respond as it saw fit, arm-twisting some and bribing others into doing what it wanted them to do, and accepting the adulation of the leech as a free gift, and not to be over-valued.

NATO acting under the inspiration of Blair's fantasy would be likely to cause infinitely more damage to its world than the USA will do if it is guided by self-interest.

The first American calculation of self-interest is on Palestine. The White House discovered, after September 11th, that it had been just about to issue a statement in favour of a Palestinian state when the event happened. But John Bruton, the former Irish Taoiseach, who is very far from being anti-American, says that his understanding is that the White House was just about to give General/Prime Minister Sharon the green light to run amok in the West Bank and Gaza when the WTC was struck. It is a face-saving gesture to say that the statement about the Palestinian state, made after the event, had been drafted before the event. But does anybody really believe that it is not in fact a concession to Bin Laden, and a practical admission that the WTC bombing was very far from being an act of madness?

The Muslim states have been arm-twisted and bribed into compliance with US wishes, and the "terrorist" status previously accorded to some of them has been deleted. So there is quid pro quo. Terrorism has been legitimated as a requirement of the "war on terrorism". General Sharon has been provoked into equating "the Arabs" with the Nazis which must act as a stimulus to Muslim morale. Berlusconi blurted out in undiplomatic language the view of Islam which the others are very careful to state only in oblique terms and no doubt the Muslims know it. And Putin is allowed to present his terrorist war on the Chechens as a pioneering effort in the war against terrorist.

Subscriptions

Labour & Trade Union Review

Rates (individuals):
 UK £11 Europe £13 Rest of World £15
 Back issues available at current prices
 Rate for institutions available on request
 I enclose a cheque payable to:
Labour and Trade Union Review
 for £ _____

Name and address:

Postcode: _____

editorial and subscription address:
 No. 2 Newington Green Mansions,
 Green Lanes
 London
 N16 9BT

A progressive strengthening of Islam as a coherent presence in world affairs is a probable outcome of this very confused "war against terrorism", which has to keep reminding itself that it is not a war against Islam. If that happens, it will be a kind of world-historic defeat for Britain which a century ago set about reducing Islam to a hulk.

World Wide Web
 Further information about various magazines, pamphlets and books can be obtained on the Internet. Look up ATHOL INFORMATION at www.users.dircon.co.uk/~athol-st/

The US Is To Nationalise Airport Security

David Morrison

Important visitors to the CIA's headquarters at Langley, Virginia, used to be played a recording of Osama bin Laden talking to his mother by mobile phone. This was to demonstrate that there was no limit to the reach of the US intelligence services. This practice has probably stopped after the events of 11th September.

The attacks on that day were the product of a conspiracy of at least 19 people, and probably many more, a conspiracy that took place over many months within the boundaries of the US. Some of them learned to fly the Boeing aircraft they crashed at training schools in the US itself. Yet the conspiracy went undetected until the awful events of 11th September. That is an intelligence failure of mammoth proportions for a state that spends billions of dollars annually on its intelligence services.

The Worst Failure

But that was not the worst failure. Worse still was the failure of the state to establish and enforce adequate security standards at US airports. Numerous official reports over many years pointed out that inadequate airport security left aircraft vulnerable to being blown up or hijacked, but little was done.

Somewhere within the US intelligence services there must be a body of people whose job it is to think up possible scenarios for attacks on the US, and to propose counter measures to them. It is impossible to believe that one of these was not the hijacking of a commercial aircraft and crashing it into something significant on the ground: a manufacturing plant or a nuclear power

plant, the destruction of which would poison people for miles around, or a building of great symbolic importance to the American state, like the White House. (In fact, the intelligence services didn't need to "think up" the latter scenario, because on 22nd February 1974 an attempt was made to hijack an aircraft with the intention of crashing it on to the White House and killing President Nixon - see below).

A central part of any counter measures to these scenarios had to be enhanced airport security to reduce the possibility of armed hijackers getting on planes. Another part might have been the use of "air marshals" to counter hijackers on planes, as El Al does. It also might have been a good idea to keep an eye on people purchasing flight training in the US on modern commercial aircraft. These may have been proposed by the intelligence services, but they weren't put into practice.

Gaping Holes

An article in the Washington Post on 16th September summarised the state of airport security as follows:

"Before Tuesday's terrorist attack, security at the nation's airports was filled with gaping holes that had been documented for more than a decade in thick government reports and agency files. But attempts to fix the problems again and again met industry resistance or government inaction.

"Plans to equip all 450 US airports with high-tech bomb detection equipment slowed to a crawl over cost. Recommendations to improve the quality of minimum-wage workers manning

Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| LEADING ARTICLE The Cost of Coalition | |
| US Is To Nationalise Airport Security David Morrison | 3 |
| Christopher Hitchens and Causality Brendan Clifford | 6 |
| Rights Gone Mad: Robert Nozick Christopher Winch | 10 |
| Living In The Free & Democratic World David Morrison | 12 |
| Livingstone Fights On David Morrison | 15 |
| Regular Feature PARLIAMENTARY DIARY Kevin Brady | 9 |

passenger screening checkpoints met repeated objections. Security enhancements, from criminal background checks on workers to fortifying cockpit doors against unauthorized entry, either withered or were bogged down in rulemaking.

"The thwarted efforts left a porous line of defense that was exposed to the world Tuesday when 19 Islamic fundamentalist terrorists passed undeterred through security at three airports, commandeered four commercial jets and turned them into the equivalent of 200-ton cruise missiles.

"Although it is not known exactly how the terrorists penetrated airport security, the operation's success underscored failures in at

least three major areas: the long-standing gap in federal rules that has allowed knives aboard airplanes, the protection and security of the cockpit and the systems used to screen passengers before boarding."

The article goes on to give lurid examples of items which got through baggage screening: people who regularly carried fishing tackle including large bladed filleting knives as cabin baggage out of Logan Airport in Boston, where two of the hijacked planes originated on 11th September; an airline security auditor who regularly got dummy guns and hand grenades, and even a bundle of fake dynamite sticks wired to a large clock, past checkpoints.

Skimping On security

The basic problem is that, because of the way airport security is organised in the US, airlines can cut costs and increase profits by skimping on airport security.

In the UK, airport operators are responsible for screening passengers and baggage under rules laid down and monitored by the Department of Transport. The cost of doing it is passed on to airlines via landing fees. With that arrangement, airlines cannot skimp on airport security, since they are not responsible for it.

By contrast, in the US each airline is responsible for screening its own passengers and their baggage. It is therefore a direct cost to the airline, which brings no return in terms of increased passenger numbers and revenue. Indeed, prior to 11th September, being overzealous about security would have driven passengers away to other airlines. It was therefore in the airlines' commercial interest to spend as little as possible on security and to inconvenience passengers as little as possible about security—and to get them onto aircraft as quickly as possible.

Security is contracted out to private firms who hire the cheapest labour allowed by law. Staff turnover is very high, presumably because McDonalds and the like offer better pay and prospects. According to a Boston Globe editorial of 13 September, 90% of the airport security workers have less than six months experience. In those circumstances, the

threat of dismissal for failing to do the job is no threat at all, and therefore the job doesn't get done. Small wonder then that there are "gaping holes" in airport security.

Regulating Airport Security

It is true that the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) regulates airport security: lays down the procedures which have to be gone through and specifies what can and cannot be carried on to aircraft. Theoretically it also monitors that screening is done properly.

To the latter end, it specifies the amount of training that employees are supposed to receive before operating detection equipment in a live situation. On 11th September, the FAA was about to introduce a new set of rules that was to increase operator training time from 12 hours to 40 hours, amongst other things. The drawing up of new set of rules was triggered by an FAA conclusion in 1997 that airport security loopholes needed to be closed lest they be exploited by terrorists. Four years later, having been challenged at every turn by individual airlines, airports and other interest groups (and held up for review along with all other pending regulations by the new Bush administration), they are still not in place.

Of course, contractors can be fined for not obeying the rules. And they are all the time. Last year, Argenbright Inc of Atlanta pleaded guilty to federal criminal charges for falsifying training and background records of employees at Philadelphia with criminal records, including a convicted kidnapper. The firm agreed to pay at least \$1.2 million in fines. Argenbright, which is owned by Britain's own Securicor, has 40% of the screening business at US airports, including security for some airlines at Dulles International in Washington and Newark International, where two of the hijacked planes originated on 11th September.

Nationalising Airport Security

Plainly, as long as airport security is organised so that airlines can cut costs by skimping on security, the problem is not going to go away. The Bush administration has now accepted this and proposed a very large step towards nationalising airport security. Bush announced this and other aircraft security

measures at O'Hare Airport in Chicago on 27th September.

(The other measures mentioned by Bush were an expanded Air Marshal program and \$500 million for aircraft modifications including the strengthening cockpit doors. He also spoke about funding research into developing the ability to override pilot action to land aircraft from the ground, a capability which is apparently within reach).

According to the accompanying White House press statement:

"The President will work with Congress to put the federal government in charge of airport security and screening services.

"The new security will be performed by a combination of federal and non-federal workforce, with federal uniformed personnel managing all operations and maintaining a visible presence at all commercial airports."

The statement goes on:

"The federal government will:

- * Establish new standards for security operations.
- * Supervise the passenger and baggage security at the 420 commercial passenger airports nationwide.
- * Perform intensive background checks and train and test screeners and security personnel.
- * Purchase and maintain all equipment.
- * Oversee patrolling of secure areas and monitoring of the quality of the airport's access controls."

There is a body of opinion amongst Democrats in Congress which favours all employees engaged in airport security (about 28,000 in all) being on the federal payroll (at an annual cost of about \$1.8 billion). That may yet happen since the President's proposals are to be discussed with Congress.

Until this is up and running (in 4 to 6 months, it is estimated), state governors are to be asked call up the National Guard—at a cost of \$100-150 million to the federal government—to assist existing security staff at every commercial airport nationwide after suitable training.

The White House statement makes no mention about who is going to pay for airport security in the long run. However, giving evidence to a Congress committee on 20 September, Treasury Secretary Paul O'Neill (the author of the Bush tax cutting programme) said:

"I believe that we need to socialize the cost of air safety. And by that I mean the federal taxpayers need to pay for the safety that will assure the public that when they get on an airplane they're going to go where they paid to go, without risk of life and limb."

Can New Labour continue to co-operate with these dangerous socialists?

Byck in 1974

The would-be assassin of President Nixon in February 1974 in the middle of the Watergate scandal was an

unemployed tyre salesman named Samuel Joseph Byck, who has a grudge against the Federal Government for rejecting his application for a small business loan. He was obviously deranged.

Byck shot his way on to an aircraft at Baltimore-Washington airport, but he didn't get it off the ground. When he was told that the aircraft couldn't depart without removing the chocks, he killed a pilot and wounded another, and having been wounded by police he then killed himself.

In a letter to a journalist posted a few hours before his hijack attempt, he explained his intentions as follows:

"I will try to get the plane aloft and fly it toward the target area, which will be Washington, DC. I will shoot the pilot

and then in the last few minutes try to steer the plane into the target, which is the White House."

Even if he had managed to get the plane into the air his chances of hitting the White House were slim, since he had no flight training, but he could have killed a lot of people in urban Washington.

As in 2001, the US security services didn't cover themselves in glory: it was later discovered that he had been making himself known to the Secret Service since 1972, after making threats against Nixon's life. It was also discovered that he had been arrested at Christmas 1973 protesting in front of the White House dressed in a Santa Claus suit.

Christopher Hitchens and Causality

Brendan Clifford

I went along to an "Ulster Breakfast" at the Labour party Conference in Eastbourne two years ago. It was given at the Grand Hotel by Kate Hoey and an assortment of other Ulster Unionists. As my intention was to observe, I sat at an unoccupied table. A gentleman who did not appear to belong to any of the coterie came and sat at the same table. He introduced himself as Peter Hitchens. I had never heard of him and he had never heard of me. He asked me what I thought about the trouble in Northern Ireland. I said I thought it stemmed from the exclusion of Northern Ireland from the democratic structures of the British state. He agreed enthusiastically. We spent a pleasant half hour finding that we were both in perfect agreement with the argument I put into circulation fifteen years ago. The experience of being in agreement with oneself through the person of an unknown third party is not disagreeable—not for half an hour.

Then we suddenly came to disagree totally about the very thing we had been agreeing about. When the subject of Sinn Fein came up he suddenly realised that the undemocratic government of Northern Ireland, which until then he had taken to be the cause of everything,

was actually the cause of nothing. Democracy was all-important, and yet undemocratic government had legitimate consequences. There was a moral obligation on the consequences of undemocratic government to be the same as the consequences of democratic government.

I was unable to follow this reasoning and he was unable to clarify it. so that was the end of a brief, but pleasant, relationship.

He had a very plummy voice which put me in mind of Christopher Hitchens, the very fashionable Marxist revolutionary. I asked if they were related. He said they were brothers. But he was a Tory, though, like Christopher, he had begun as a revolutionary.

I happened to read Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* around the age of sixteen when I was a manual labourer in rural Ireland, and I have never since had cause to question his argument that the structure of causality is ingrained in human understanding and is a necessity of human life. I am therefore intrigued by people who deny the effects of causes or the causes of effects, especially when they begin with a display of reasoning. Peter's brother has now provided me

with another instance of it, in *The Spectator* of September 29th: "*The Fascist Sympathies Of The Soft Left*". Christopher Hitchens says that intellectuals who seek to understand the new enemy are no friends of peace, democracy or human life".

The line used to be that Fascism functioned by blotting out understanding. The new line is that understanding is Fascist?

The bombing of the World Trade Centre and the Pentagon must not be understood in causal terms. That would be Fascist. Indeed, it must not be understood at all, strictly speaking. Thinking is fascist. Only emoting is legitimate.

Envisaging the possibility that the White House, where his neighbours live, might have been shattered by the fourth "death-squad", the conviction came upon Hitchens that it was a sacred building which "has hallowed even its most mediocre occupants". He has finally matured in the way that so many of his kind have done before him. The "rationalising left-liberals" who utter "profanity" about "chickens coming home to roost" are now alien to him. He renounces "Noam Chomsky, who coldly

compared the plan of 11th September to a stupid and cruel and cynical raid by Bill Clinton on Khartoum in August 1998". Who ever heard of the people killed by Clinton's missiles? And Clinton's missiles "were not full of passengers".

It is surely a mistake, if your case is that comparisons are odious and that this event must be felt by all right-minded people to have been unprecedented and unprovoked, to refer to comparisons with anything happened previously in the world, even for the purpose of rejecting them. It encourages thought.

Causal thought appears to have been occurring in the White House, even though it has been given up by the inhabitants of a neighbouring apartment, and the idea of chickens coming home to roost has been tacitly conceded by the eagerness with which the White House has suddenly taken up the idea of a Palestinian state and the anxiety to persuade Muslim governments that there will be no backtracking this time.

But Hitchens knows that the actions of these "death-squads" had nothing to do with Palestine: "the plan was designed and incubated long before the mutual masturbation of the Clinton-

Ararat-Barak 'process'."

James Rubin, a Clinton agent, argued that the attack had nothing to do with Palestine because the planning was done during the Clinton initiative. But Rubin believes, or pretends to believe, that there was something of substance for the Palestinians in Clinton's initiative. Hitchens, however, sneers at the Clinton "process". But if the process was spurious, what bearing has it on the motives of the bombers? He appears to be echoing Rubin while losing track of what Rubin said.

If his point is that it was not a response to the Clinton swindle because it was planned before it, that would only make sense on the assumption that Clinton began the swindling. And that is a very strange assumption indeed.

Hitchens' final sentence is: "It no longer matters what they think"—they being Chomsky and his kind. A more apt concluding sentence would have been: "Thought no longer matters".

Hitchens has become an unbelieving Crusader. That is an incoherent thing to be. He needs to regress the whole way, and bring on the Devil, in order to re-acquire coherence.

How does a lapsed left-liberal

rationaliser find a substitute for the power of the Devil in human affairs? Hitchens gropes for it in the Wahhabi variant of Islam—about which *The Spectator* carried a thoroughly ignorant article by Stephen Schwartz the previous week. Then, having mentioned the "Wahhabi-indoctrinated sectarians" as the source of the "animating ideas" of the "death-squads", he immediately leaps back a further century:

"The grievances and animosity predate even the Balfour Declaration, let alone the occupation of the West Bank. They predate the creation of Iraq as a state. The gates of Vienna would have had to fall to the Ottoman jihad before any balm could begin to be applied to these psychic wounds".

If grammatical analysis was still taught in school, the tenses and moods of that last sentence would provide a real puzzler. Perhaps it was intended to make sense. But if sense is to be made of it, it says that the bombing of the World Trade Centre and the Pentagon (a branch of the civil service, he says) was caused by the failure of the Ottoman Empire to capture Vienna in the 1680s.

He really should try to regain belief in God and the Devil.

Advertisement

Major Street ("I.O."): The Administration Of Ireland (1920) and other writings

Introduction by Pat Walsh. £12 postfree

In 1920 it must have been inconceivable to British governing circles, and British public opinion in general, that Britain could 'lose' Ireland. Large additions had recently been made to the Empire by victory in the Great War. Imperial glory was at its height. And the possibility that the Empire should begin to unravel so close to home was not to be entertained. And so, when England's oldest colony—the other green and pleasant land which had so often been conquered and so often been declared to be irrevocably British—voted to be independent in the 1918 General Election, the British Parliament and Government decided to take no notice of the vote.

Major Street was part of the mighty military machine that had just won the greatest war in history and that was now deployed in support of the British Administration of Ireland against the will of the Irish electorate. He had

specialised in Intelligence and Propaganda in the World War, and he was now deputed to provide propaganda legitimacy for the Black-and-Tan War.

The book he produced is of interest as a coherent statement of the British case, published while the British Government still had the expectation of winning that war. And it has the further interest that Major Street had privileged access to the secret files of the Dublin Castle administration and made informative use of them. The book is thus both itself a historical document and a source of documents not generally available.

It is of course written with propaganda 'spin', which the reader will allow for as he sees fit.

The *Administration Of Ireland, 1920* is reproduced in full, along with the original Index. But we have not reproduced the green cover embossed with crowned harp in which it first appeared.

This is followed by a substantial extract from *Ireland In 1921*—a disillusioned book published in 1922,

when Britain had given up the attempt to maintain direct control of Ireland, had negotiated with the 'murderers' as statesmen, and was attempting to keep Ireland within the indirectly-held Empire, the "Commonwealth", as had been done with the South African Boers. Major Street, the intelligent and purposeful Imperialist, let his pain at this "compromising" turn of events be felt.

That was a time when there was in England an incipient fascist movement, determined to maintain the glory of Empire against the "hidden hand" which was manipulating the "dark forces" of dissolution.

A review of Major Street's other books is provided by Brendan Clifford, showing that much that British propaganda of later times attributed to German Militarism or Fascism was to be found much closer to home.

An Introduction to the *British Administration Of Ireland, 1920* is provided by Dr. Pat Walsh, author of *Republicanism And Socialism* and *From Civil Rights To National War*.

Anatomy of a Victory: CIA's Covert Afghan War

Steve Coll

Below we reproduce an article from the *Washington Post* in 1992, which describes in intimate detail the CIA backing of the mujaheddin against the Soviet-backed government in Afghanistan.

Jonathan Steele (*Guardian*, 6th October) gave a flavour of the end result of this successful US operation:

"In the communist period, Kabul was virtually unscarred by war—and women had rights—but when the mujaheddin moved in, they tore it apart.

"Gulbuddin Hekmatyar, the Pashtun fundamentalist, shelled the city for two years, destroying half its buildings and killing 25,000 civilians because he thought the Tajik wing of the mujaheddin "alliance" was not offering him enough power.

"A year later, Ahmed Shah Massoud, lionised abroad as the greatest leader of the anti-communist and anti-Taliban resistance, turned his guns on his Shi'ite Hazara allies who were concentrated in the western part of Kabul, killing thousands. Yet, in a pattern of cynical warlordism with which Afghan history is replete, Massoud, Hekmatyar and Karim Khalili, the Hazara leader, were allies again within months."

It was against this background that the Taliban came to power as a unifying Islamic force, again supported by Pakistan and the US, which continued to support them up until about 1995/6. The Clinton administration was very much in favour of the Taliban (a) because they were anti-Iranian and it was the aim of the administration to surround Iran with hostile regimes and (b) because the US wanted oil and gas pipelines from Central Asia to be built through Afghanistan to the Gulf.

The US break with the Taliban came, about not because of a reassessment of this reasoning, but because of pressure

on Clinton by the American feminist group, the Feminist Majority, which drew attention to the treatment of Afghan women by the Taliban. Prior to the break, Osama bin Laden was in exile in the Sudan; after it, he moved to Afghanistan.

(The Feminist Majority strongly supported Clinton during his difficulties re Monica Lewinsky. One of the reasons they gave was his decision to break off relations with the Taliban because of their treatment of women.)

Anatomy of a Victory: CIA's Covert Afghan War

by Steve Coll, *Washington Post*, 19th July, 1992

A specially equipped C-141 Starlifter transport carrying William Casey touched down at a military air base south of Islamabad in October 1984 for a secret visit by the CIA director to plan strategy for the war against Soviet forces in Afghanistan. Helicopters lifted Casey to three secret training camps near the Afghan border, where he watched mujaheddin rebels fire heavy weapons and learn to make bombs with CIA-supplied plastic explosives and detonators.

During the visit, Casey startled his Pakistani hosts by proposing that they take the Afghan war into enemy territory - into the Soviet Union itself. Casey wanted to ship subversive propaganda through Afghanistan to the Soviet Union's predominantly Muslim southern republics. The Pakistanis agreed, and the CIA soon supplied thousands of Korans, as well as books on Soviet atrocities in Uzbekistan and tracts on historical heroes of Uzbek nationalism, according to Pakistani and Western officials.

"We can do a lot of damage to the Soviet Union," Casey said, according to Mohammed Yousaf, a Pakistani general who attended the meeting.

Casey's visit was a prelude to a secret Reagan administration decision in March 1985, reflected in National Security Decision Directive 166, to sharply escalate U.S. covert action in Afghanistan, according to Western officials. Abandoning a policy of simple harassment of Soviet occupiers, the Reagan team decided secretly to let loose on the Afghan battlefield an array of U.S. high technology and military expertise in an effort to hit and demoralize Soviet commanders and soldiers. Casey saw it as a prime opportunity to strike at an overextended, potentially vulnerable Soviet empire.

Eight years after Casey's visit to Pakistan, the Soviet Union is no more. Afghanistan has fallen to the heavily armed, fratricidal mujaheddin rebels. The Afghans themselves did the fighting and dying - and ultimately won their war against the Soviets - and not all of them laud the CIA's role in their victory. But even some sharp critics of the CIA agree that in military terms, its secret 1985 escalation of covert support to the mujaheddin made a major difference in Afghanistan, the last battlefield of the long Cold War.

How the Reagan administration decided to go for victory in the Afghan war between 1984 and

1988 has been shrouded in secrecy and clouded by the sharply divergent political agendas of those involved. But with the triumph of the mujaheddin rebels over Afghanistan's leftist government in April and the demise of the Soviet Union, some intelligence officials involved have decided to reveal how the covert escalation was carried out.

The most prominent of these former intelligence officers is Yousaf, the

Pakistani general who supervised the covert war between 1983 and 1987 and who last month published in Europe and

Pakistan a detailed account of his role and that of the CIA, titled "The Bear Trap".

This article and another to follow are based on extensive interviews with Yousaf as well as with more than a dozen senior Western officials who confirmed Yousaf's disclosures and elaborated on them.

U.S. officials worried about what might happen if aspects of their stepped-up covert action were exposed - or if the program succeeded too well and provoked the Soviets to react in hot anger.

The escalation that began in 1985 "was directed at killing Russian military officers", one Western official said. "That caused a lot of nervousness".

One source of jitters was that Pakistani intelligence officers - partly inspired by Casey - began independently to train Afghans and funnel CIA supplies for scattered strikes against military installations, factories and storage depots within Soviet territory.

The attacks later alarmed US officials in Washington, who saw military raids on Soviet territory as "an incredible escalation", according to Graham Fuller, then a senior US intelligence official who counseled against any such raids. Fearing a large-scale Soviet response and the fallout of such attacks on US-Soviet diplomacy, the Reagan administration blocked the transfer to Pakistan of detailed satellite photographs of military targets inside the Soviet Union, other US officials said.

To Yousaf, who managed the Koran-smuggling program and the guerrilla raids inside Soviet territory, the United States ultimately "chickened out" on the question of taking the secret Afghan war onto Soviet soil. Nonetheless, Yousaf recalled, Casey was "ruthless in his approach, and he had a built-in hatred for the Soviets".

An intelligence coup in 1984 and 1985 triggered the Reagan administration's decision to escalate the covert program in Afghanistan, according to Western officials. The United States

received highly specific, sensitive information about Kremlin politics and new Soviet war plans in Afghanistan.

Already under pressure from Congress and conservative activists to expand its support to the mujaheddin, the Reagan administration moved in response to this intelligence to open up its high-technology arsenal to aid the Afghan rebels.

Beginning in 1985, the CIA supplied mujaheddin rebels with extensive satellite reconnaissance data of Soviet targets on the Afghan battlefield, plans for military operations based on the satellite intelligence, intercepts of Soviet communications, secret communications networks for the rebels, delayed timing devices for tons of C-4 plastic explosives for urban sabotage and sophisticated guerrilla attacks, long-range sniper rifles, a targeting device for mortars that was linked to a US Navy satellite, wire-guided anti-tank missiles, and other equipment.

The move to upgrade aid to the mujaheddin roughly coincided with the well-known decision in 1986 to provide the mujaheddin with sophisticated, US-made Stinger anti-aircraft missiles. Before the missiles arrived, however, those involved in the covert war wrestled with a wide-ranging and at times divisive debate over how far they should go in challenging the Soviet Union in Afghanistan.

Roots of the Rebellion

In 1980, not long after Soviet forces invaded Afghanistan to prop up a sympathetic leftist government, President Jimmy Carter signed the first - and for many years the only - presidential "finding" on Afghanistan, the classified directive required by US law to begin covert operations, according to several Western sources familiar with the Carter document.

The Carter finding sought to aid Afghan rebels in "harassment" of Soviet occupying forces in Afghanistan through secret supplies of light weapons and other assistance. The finding did not talk of driving Soviet forces out of Afghanistan or defeating them militarily, goals few considered possible at the time, these sources said.

The cornerstone of the program was that the United States, through the CIA,

would provide funds, some weapons and general supervision of support for the mujaheddin rebels, but day-to-day operations and direct contact with the mujaheddin would be left to the Pakistani Inter-Services Intelligence agency, or ISI. The hands-off US role contrasted with CIA operations in Nicaragua and Angola.

Saudi Arabia agreed to match US financial contributions to the mujaheddin and distributed funds directly to ISI. China sold weapons to the CIA and donated a smaller number directly to Pakistan, but the extent of China's role has been one of the secret war's most closely guarded secrets.

In all, the United States funneled more than \$2 billion in guns and money to the mujaheddin during the 1980s, according to US officials. It was the largest covert action program since World War II.

In the first years after the Reagan administration inherited the Carter program, the covert Afghan war "tended to be handled out of Casey's back pocket", recalled Ronald Spiers, a former U.S. ambassador to Pakistan, the base of the Afghan rebels. Mainly from China's government, the CIA purchased assault rifles, grenade launchers, mines and SA-7 light anti-aircraft weapons, and then arranged for shipment to Pakistan. Most of the weapons dated to the Korean War or earlier. The amounts were significant 10,000 tons of arms and ammunition in 1983, according to Yousaf - but a fraction of what they would be in just a few years.

Beginning in 1984, Soviet forces in Afghanistan began to experiment with new and more aggressive tactics against the mujaheddin, based on the use of Soviet special forces, called the Spetsnaz, in helicopter-borne assaults on Afghan rebel supply lines. As these tactics succeeded, Soviet commanders pursued them increasingly, to the point where some US congressmen who travelled with the mujaheddin - including Representative Charles Wilson (Democrat-Texas) and Senator Gordon Humphrey (Republican-New Hampshire) - believed that the war might turn against the rebels.

Continued on p. 15

Kevin Brady

Parliamentary Diary

America right or Wrong

So Tony Blair has seen incontrovertible evidence that Osama bin Laden was behind the attack on the Pentagon and World Trade Centre, but that much of it is sensitive and therefore cannot be disclosed to the public. This is 'evidence' gathered by the American CIA, a body our Prime Minister is prepared to trust, in spite of the incontrovertible evidence that over the past forty years this same body has been behind numerous 'terrorist' attacks in countries across the world.

One has only to think of the CIA-backed coups in Chile and Guatemala, which overthrew democratically elected governments and resulted in the murder of President Allende in Chile. And we know who his successor was, don't we, and of what happened to the thousands of Chilean citizens under his regime? Let us not forget also that the American military carpet-bombed Cambodia, napalmed Vietnamese villages and massacred hundreds of retreating Iraqi soldiers during the Gulf War, an incident described by a well-known general as a 'turkey shoot'.

Blair (and Bush) should not be surprised, therefore, if some of us do not share his trust in the CIA and his eagerness to support America's 'war against terrorism'. But if war has been declared against terrorism—a difficult, if not impossible, objective—then we are right to ask if this extends to all terrorists, or just those whom America decides are its enemies? If all terrorists are on the list, then it will be interesting to see the reaction of Saudi Arabia when the ruling family is asked to hand over Idi Amin, so that he can be brought to justice for his crimes. He has lived in

exile in Saudi Arabia since his fall from power in Uganda, a country whose people he persecuted and terrorised—300,000 citizens are known to have been murdered on his orders, and many more were forcibly expelled as a result of his paranoia. But as America needs Arab oil and Saudi Arabia is therefore a 'friendly' state, we won't hold our breath.

Parliament has been recalled, conveniently curtailing Labour's annual conference, to discuss the UK's response to America's call for war. But as Blair has already made clear his support for America, what is the point of the recall? Parliament is impotent. It cannot order Blair to discontinue support for America. What it can do is challenge the notion that America and its allies are actually at war. War can only be declared against a country or group of countries, and as Osama bin Laden is being harboured by the ruling Taliban in Afghanistan then, effectively, the West is at war with that country.

Blair clearly implied this when he said that unless the Taliban hand over Osama bin Laden, they too would be the enemy and, presumably, face the consequences. It hardly needs to be said that if force is used against the Taliban government and military, the West will come under greater threat from Taliban supporters across the Arab world. Military force to compel the handing over of Osama Bin Laden will increase the possibility of further terrorist attacks in America and Britain. Peter Hain—who else?—has already warned of such planned attacks on the West, although he wasn't prepared to say where he got his evidence, or if indeed he had any that was incontrovertible. But he was quickly rebuffed by Downing Street, not wishing

to cause unnecessary public alarm.

And the press and television have been complicit in all this. With the exception of the *Morning Star*, which few people read, the whole of the press, some more so than others, have supported Blair and Bush. To its credit, the *London Evening Standard* has banned the use of the term 'war against terrorism' on the instruction of its editor, Max Hastings, but it, too, supports military action. Press coverage is so extensive that it is easy to believe that something is actually happening, perhaps that is the intention. What is not easy to believe if one reads the tabloid press, and most newspaper readers do, is that the Taliban came to power as a result of American opposition to the Russian invasion of Afghanistan. This simple fact says a lot about American foreign policy, but it has not been revealed to Britain's tabloid readers.

Opponents of the 'war', like George Monbiot, have argued that the immediate priority should be to get aid to the millions of Afghans in imminent danger of death by starvation, and they were ridiculed for this. Now we are told that aid has been sent to Afghanistan as a priority measure. Blair and Bush have said that any military action will be targeted specifically at Osama bin Laden and his backers, but there has not been a war in recent years in which there has been no 'collateral damage', and this will be no exception.

What happened in New York and Washington has led to Western politicians declaring war against all terrorists—does this include the Real IRA?—wherever they are. For the time being they will have their hands full in tracking down Osama Bin Laden and bringing him to justice. If he was responsible for the attack in America, if the evidence is incontrovertible, then he should be brought to justice before an international court, where the evidence is revealed. That ought to be the purpose of the 'targetted' action. Let him be judged in the world's court, not bombed in Afghanistan's desert.

The Labour & Trade Union Review is entirely dependent on subscriptions and sales for its continued existence. It is on sale in London in Dillon's, The Economist's Bookshop, and Housman's at King's Cross. It is also obtainable at Books Upstairs, Dublin and in Eason's, Botanic Avenue, Belfast.

Rights Gone Mad

Robert Nozick's Libertarianism

Christopher Winch

If John Rawls lays a plausible claim to be the patron saint of the Third Way, Robert Nozick, whose *Anarchy, State and Utopia* was published in 1974, may be said to be one of the main inspirations of the anti-statist political ideas of Keith Joseph, Ronald Reagan and Ian Duncan Smith. Unlike Hayek, who made out a case for the primacy of individual liberty on the premise that it promotes material prosperity, Nozick attaches an absolute value to individual human rights.

The first two sentences of his book go as follows: "Individuals have rights, and there are things no person or group may do to them (without violating their rights). So strong and far-reaching are these rights that they raise the question of what, if anything, the state and its officials may do." No argument is offered for this view, it is just stated as a bald fact, so obvious as to need no further justification. Nozick is not dismissed as a madman and indeed, many take his truths to be as self-evident at those asserted by the founding fathers of the USA concerning life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. In other words, Nozick's claim is in tune with the spirit of the times and the self-evidence of ungrounded absolute rights is accepted by a wide variety of groups, including feminists and other champions of unbridled individualism, as well as anarcho-capitalists such as Nozick. In this respect, John Rawls, despite the social democratic gloss of his rhetoric, shares the same assumption as Nozick, who at least cannot be accused of a lack of clarity about what he advocates.

The starting point for Nozick is a critique of Locke's claim that property rights originated when men mixed their labour with natural assets such as land. According to Nozick one might just as well claim that when I make tomato soup and throw it in the ocean, I own the

ocean. It would be more accurate to say that I have wasted my soup. But Nozick appears to share Locke's view that no one owns any part of the Earth until individuals start to appropriate it. It just is a fact that if someone uses the natural assets of the planet without violating anyone's rights then they acquire the absolute privileges of private property ownership of those assets and what they produce from them. Furthermore, for Nozick, just as for Locke, a man owns his own person as a piece of property. More ruthlessly and consistently than Locke, Nozick maintains that this entitles him to sell himself into slavery if he so wishes. Just as self-ownership seems to be beyond question, the idea that Earth's assets are the common property of mankind and cannot be alienated from anyone by the acts of acquisitive individuals is not even given a second's consideration. On such shaky foundations is the edifice of libertarian capitalism built. However, the whole thing is written with such verve and technical brilliance that these matters are easy to overlook.

Despite initial appearances, however, this is not an anarchist philosophy. A minimal state whose sole functions are defence against rights violations, the enforcement of contracts and the punishment of rights-violators is necessary for a civilised existence. But how does one get to the minimal state? Nozick tells a fairy story in which private organisations called 'protective agencies' are contracted by groups of individuals to protect their rights. Market forces ensure that the most effective of these protective forces in any geographical area drive rival protective agencies out of business. Eventually there is one protective agency in one area, called the Dominant Protective Agency (DPA). This constitutes the ultra-minimal state. However, within the jurisdiction (or should one say the

manor?) of the DPA, continue to live some hardy souls who feel that they can do without these protective services. This is intolerable. Suppose that one of these hardy souls takes it into his head to punish someone contracted to the DPA for some imagined rights violation. He then violates the rights of that second party. This is clearly something that the DPA cannot allow. Therefore the hardy souls are made an offer that they cannot refuse. In exchange for the protection of the DPA they have to stump up for the services and give up their right to punish those whom they perceive to be wrongdoers. Although this sounds like an account of the origin of the Mafia, it is, in fact, an account of the origin of the minimal state.

One might be forgiven for thinking that this is inconsistent. If it is problematic whether there is anything that the state can do to individuals against their will, why should it be able to force them to pay money and submit to a private vigilante force, whether or not it calls itself the State? The only justification that one can see in this is that the rights of the majority paying their subs to the DPA have greater weight than those of the few hardy souls who choose not to. But if rights can be weighed in the balance in this way, then they lose the absolute character that Nozick seems to think is so important to them. However, once the minimal state has been arrived at, no further state activity is allowed. In particular, taxation for anything other than DPA fees is forced labour, according to Nozick. So no health, education, housing or transport funded by taxation then.

But this is curious. Supposing that the hardy souls live in a swamp, have poor hygiene and spread bacteria amongst the population in general. Why

Continued on p. 12

Living In The Free And Democratic World

David Morrison

Our Prime Minister tells us that the events of 11th September were not just an attack on the US, they were an attack on the whole "free and democratic world" by evil men who don't believe in democracy like us. And he volunteered himself to stand "shoulder to shoulder" with George Bush in response and volunteered Britain to join in a war against terrorism in defence of our common democratic values.

NATO has, for the first time in its 50-year history, invoked Article 5 of its Charter, and declared that the events of 11th September represented an armed attack on a member, requiring other members to rush to its aid.

Democracy in Macedonia

Meanwhile, in Macedonia the NATO Secretary General, Lord Robertson of Port Ellen, has been spelling out to Macedonian MPs what it actually means to be a small country in the "free and democratic world":

"Macedonian MPs were warned by the NATO secretary general, Lord Robertson, yesterday that their failure to ratify the peace agreement with the ethnic Albanian National Liberation Army could throw the country into civil war."

"The political process is still incomplete, and the Macedonian parliament must set aside any petty political interests, and complete its part of the settlement that was struck at Lake Ohrid, he said."

"He also urged the government to pass an amnesty for all NLA members who have surrendered their weapons, as President Boris Trajkovski promised more than a month ago."

"The amnesty must be delivered because the president of the republic has given me in writing the assurance there will be an amnesty, he said."

"I expect that the authorities in this country will deliver on the commitment made by their president." (Guardian, 26th September)

This is only the latest phase of EU/NATO bullying of Macedonia. The Macedonian government was put under very great pressure to sign the Ohrid settlement, which provides for constitutional changes giving Albanians greater political and language rights, and around 30% of public sector jobs, including jobs in the police force. In return, the NLA agreed to give up weapons and a NATO force is on the ground in Macedonia to collect them, and it members are due to be granted an amnesty by the Macedonian state in return. NATO came to an arrangement with the NLA to collect close to 4,000 weapons from them. However, nobody believes that this represents the sum total of the NLA's hardware.

Whatever about the merits of the proposals for political change, there is no doubt that they came about as a result of what would normally be called a terrorist campaign waged by the NLA. Not, it should be said, on anything like the scale of the KLA campaign across the border in Kosovo against the Yugoslav state, but a number of Macedonian policemen and soldiers were killed and thousands of Slavs felt the need to move from Albanian areas (and are still away from their homes). Unkind people might describe this as "ethnic cleansing".

In response, the Macedonian Army

shelled Albanian villages in a manner strongly disapproved of in the West when the Yugoslav Army did something similar in Kosovo in response to much more vicious and sustained attacks by the KLA.

Unlike the KLA in Kosovo, the NLA did not need a long drawn out terrorist campaign: they merely had to look threatening, whereupon EU/NATO took up their stated grievances and bullied the Macedonian government into accepting them. Unfortunately for EU/NATO, the Macedonian Parliament has not acted as a rubber stamp in the way it was supposed to and although it has not voted down any aspect of the settlement it has been dragging its feet. Hence, the frustration of Lord Robertson of Port Ellen.

A few weeks earlier, Chris Patten, the EU's external relations commissioner, expressed similar frustration and made it clear that "future aid from the EU, as well as the World Bank, depended on a co-operative attitude in Skopje" (Guardian, 10 September). And an international donor's conference for Macedonia planned for this month will provide a further opportunity for bullying.

It should be said that the NLA, like the KLA before them in Kosovo, have acted with consummate skill to manoeuvre EU/NATO unto their side. And, having given up the weapons agreed with NATO, the

leader of the NLA, Ali Ahmeti, has now announced the disbandment of the NLA, which means that there is no excuse for the Macedonian Parliament not delivering. Expect more bullying from the EU/NATO and more NATO troops

in Macedonia.

Such are the benefits of living in the "free and democratic world".

Democracy in Belarus

On 14th September the Guardian carried a long article by Ian Traynor describing US intervention in the recent presidential election in Belarus, where the incumbent Alexander Lukashenko managed to get himself re-elected, allegedly by very dubious means. According to the article, this intervention was similar to the intervention in Yugoslavia presidential election last year. All this is reported in an entirely approving manner, as if intervention in the democratic affairs of another state in a bid to install a sympathetic leader is an entirely laudable activity.

The story began as follows:

"Michael Kozak specialises in winning other countries' elections. So when he arrived in Minsk last year as the new American ambassador to Belarus, it was clear that Washington was embarking on a strategy of trying to topple the one-man regime of President Alexander Lukashenko through the ballot box.

"The nine-month battle of wits between the American "democracy-builder" and Europe's last hardline authoritarian ended in last Sunday's presidential election. The regime confounded the west's plan to open up Belarus to free elections, free markets and civil liberties with Mr Lukashenko proclaiming a landslide victory.

"Mr Kozak, a veteran of Washington's campaigns to install sympathetic leaders in Nicaragua, Panama and Haiti and undermine the Castro regime in Cuba - he headed the US mission in Havana for four years before moving to Minsk - has been left licking his wounds."

And what did Mr Kozak do:

"The US International Republican Institute was asked to do new polls and analyse other opinion data in Belarus. The US analysts found there was no obvious figure to challenge Mr Lukashenko.

"The Americans then switched funding away from Semyon Domash, an

opposition leader they had previously supported, a western source said. His funding was cut and the money tied to support for a real coalition. ...

"By law American aid money may not go to foreign political parties. But Vladimir Goncharik, who was Mr Lukashenko main challenger on Sunday, does not head a political party. About \$50m (£35m) in US aid has gone to various Belarus opposition organisations in the past two years.

"Two days before the fragmented opposition agreed to unite behind Mr Goncharik, its five main leaders were called to the US embassy to have their heads knocked together. ...

"Western officials say that the meeting was the key moment in launching the Goncharik bid, and that he was chosen as a safer, 'less radical' option, in the hope that part of Mr Lukashenko's constituency would vote for him.

"The same calculation coloured the earlier choice of Mr Kostunica to challenge for the presidency in Belgrade, since many Milosevic supporters were comfortable voting for a Serbian nationalist of pronounced anti-western views.

"Another part of the Minsk strategy was to use opinion polls to shape voters' perceptions. West European diplomats in Minsk say the Americans paid anti-Lukashenko pollsters to doctor their survey data to create a sense of momentum behind Mr Goncharik."

Mr Kozak was not successful on this occasion. But he has had his successes:

"In 1988 Mr Kozak was a special White House envoy in Panama intimately engaged in the planning to get rid of General Manuel Noriega. In 1990 he was instrumental in getting the fragmented anti-Sandinista opposition in Nicaragua to unite behind a single election candidate."

Democracy in Yugoslavia

And then there was the Yugoslav presidential election last year. Although Mr Kozak does not appear to have been involved personally, but the same strategy was applied:

"Last year it was American pollsters

who found that President Vojislav Kostunica was the sole opposition figure in Serbia who could beat Mr Milosevic in an election, and US diplomats who then persuaded rival figures such as Zoran Djindjic, the Serbian prime minister, to bury their ambitions temporarily."

This democracy is really worth fighting for!

Continued from p. 11

shouldn't the majority sanction the DPA to drain their swamp and vaccinate the lot of them? Why shouldn't they go even further and extract compulsory insurance to ensure that everyone remains free from infectious diseases, thus stopping them from threatening the rights of everyone else not to be harmed by the rugged individualism of a few? The same arguments that justified a minimal state can be deployed to justify something much more comprehensive. Generally speaking, if a minority harms the majority and in so doing damages their rights, it is permissible to take appropriate action against that minority. This could be an interesting idea if applied consistently.

One other feature of Nozick's libertarianism is worth mentioning. He acknowledges that it is frequently the case that someone's rights are violated and, as a result, their private property or their self-ownership is violated. In these circumstances, according to Nozick, rectificatory justice, or the righting of past wrongs, is required. In certain circumstances he reluctantly acknowledges, this could lead to mass redistribution, almost akin to socialism. However, when one looks at the world around one, it seems that it is one that cries out for rectificatory justice. There may be a lot of humbug expressed by those who demand an apology for slavery, but rights-oriented liberals are scarcely in a position to complain about it; they should be digging into their pockets. Likewise, those champions of private property should be among the first to applaud the confiscation of white-owned farms in Zimbabwe—is this not

Concluded on p. 14

Livingstone Fights On

David Morrison

On 30th July, Ken Livingstone's legal challenge to the implementation of the PPP scheme for London Underground failed.

Livingstone had sought a judicial review of the Government's plans, on the grounds that it made it impossible for him to meet his statutory obligations on transport laid down in the Act that established the GLA, in particular, the obligation to provide a safe, integrated, efficient and economic transport system for London.

In the High Court on 30th July, Mr Justice Sullivan, ruled that the Government has the legal authority to impose the PPP contracts, whether or not it was wise to do so. The judgement made it clear that the court was not ruling on whether the government's PPP scheme is safe or provides value for money.

Short of a popular uprising in London, it now looks as if the Government has won and the PPP contracts will be signed by the end of the year. Responsibility for the underground will then be handed over to GLA and it will be up to Bob Kiley, as Ken Livingstone's Transport Commissioner, to operate a system, which he rightly abhors. Londoners, and visitors to London, will have to live with consequences for the next 30 years.

However, it is clear that Livingstone and Kiley are not giving in yet. They are continuing to argue fiercely and cogently that the PPP scheme should be dropped both on safety and on value for money grounds.

Chairman Of London Transport
On 2nd May London Transport did the Government's bidding and announced that they had chosen preferred bidders for two of the three PPP contracts.

They did so in the teeth of opposition from Bob Kiley. But two days later the Government made Kiley Chairman of London Transport Board, replacing their lapdog, Sir Malcolm Bates. Not only that, they gave him the authority to negotiate with the preferred bidders to modify the contracts to accommodate his objections. The invitation to do this came from Blair himself at a private meeting.

There was never any prospect of Kiley reaching a workable compromise with the bidders, who had even less incentive to bend now that they were "preferred". The Government was fully aware of this when they removed their lapdog and appointed Kiley. Their purpose in doing this had got nothing to do with resolving the issue. It was simply a ploy to keep the issue out of the headlines in the run up to the election on 7th June, a ploy which allowed them to answer any question by saying that they were seeking a compromise with the GLA by allowing Kiley to negotiate with the bidders personally.

Kiley lasted as Chairman until 17th July when the Government sacked him. He had written to Blair in late June reiterating his view that the PPP scheme was unworkable and unsafe. But the trigger for his dismissal was a letter from Sir Malcolm Bates to the new Transport Minister, Stephen Byers, saying that he and the rest of the London Transport board could not work with him. With the election over, Kiley could be dismissed. Bates was reappointed in his place.

Byers claimed that Kiley had ordered London Transport staff to cease negotiations with the bidders, and that's why he was dismissed. That may very well be true—he may have been trying to provoke the Government into dismissing him, understandably, since he was in the anomalous position of

leading negotiations about a scheme to which he had fundamental objections, which could not be negotiated away.

Safety And Standards Regime

During his time as Chairman of London Transport, Kiley employed the services of Parson-Brinckerhoff Ltd (PB), an international firm of engineering consultants, to examine London Underground's Engineering and Safety Standards Regime during June 2001 and to respond to the following question:

"Is the current London Underground Standards Regime adequate to control the standards of workmanship and safety related activities of the Infracos under the anticipated PPP contracts?"

PB produced a massive report in July and the first paragraph of its findings is as follows:

"The due diligence assessment of the Standards Regime performed by PB reveals that the standards are comprehensive and prescriptive but there are also instances where there are material gaps in the coverage of the standards, the standards themselves are not conformed, and - on an overall basis - they are in need of a comprehensive update. Furthermore, they are not written in a style appropriate for a performance-based working regime such as the PPP. This applies not only to standards but also to manuals of good practice, procedures and guidance notes. We conclude, therefore, that LUL's Standards, in their current form, are inappropriate and inadequate to serve as an effective management control mechanism to protect the public interest in performance-based PPP contracts with privately owned Infracos."

The findings go on to emphasise the need to a comprehensive standards regime written down in advance of the contracts being signed, because it might

prove impossible to establish them thereafter, and London Underground may end up with three sets of "standards", one for each Infraco. The obvious difficulty is that once contracts are signed the Infracos are going to resist any attempt to impose more exacting standards, which may end up costing them money.

This is obviously a serious issue with safety implications, which would seem to be an issue for the Health & Safety Executive (HSE) and which one might have thought would have been raised by the HSE before now. It must be a source of great embarrassment to the Government and to their lapdogs on the London Transport Board, who should obviously have been attending to this matter in preparation for handing over the underground infrastructure to the Infracos.

It would be interesting to know if Kiley got permission from the Board to embark on this investigation or whether he did it off his own bat as Chairman of London Transport—the wording of the first sentence of the PB report seems to imply the latter. He obviously knew in advance the general tenor of the answer he was going to get, and he commissioned the report with the clear intention of establishing a reason for delaying the implementation of the PPPs.

But at the end of the day it is at best a delaying tactic since it is obviously possible to do what the PB report suggests by way of revising the standards prior to signing the final contracts, though it might take months to do it.

The Deloitte Touche Report

In his role as Ken Livingstone's Transport Commissioner, Kiley employed Deloitte Touche to examine the so-called Public Sector Comparator (PSC) for the underground PPPs.

A PSC has to be done for every PPP/PFI scheme. As its name implies, a PSC is supposed to establish a reasonable prediction of what it would cost to do the same job by traditional public procurement, and if the PSC cost is lower than PPP/PFI cost, the traditional method is supposed to be used.

But it never happens that way. As would be expected, since the cost of

public borrowing is always less than private borrowing, the traditional method always comes out ahead, until what seems to be an entirely arbitrary amount is added to the PSC cost because of the supposed "transfer of risk" to the private sector. And, hey presto, the PPP/PFI route wins.

The Deloitte Touche report said some very uncomfortable things for the Government and London Transport — so they tried to get the courts to suppress it, on the grounds that it contains material that is commercially confidential. On 31st July Mr Justice Sullivan ruled that it was in the public interest that it should be published. But London Transport took it to the Court of Appeal, which finally ruled on 24th August that it should be published in an edited form with the names of the bidders removed. It also ruled that an unedited version of the report be sent to the National Audit Office, which is supposed to make the final judgement on the PSC.

On the question of value for money, the report points out a rather fundamental flaw. The PSC purports to do a comparison over the full 30-year term of the PPP contracts, even though the PPP costs are not known for the full 30-year period. The costs that are in the process of being agreed are only for the first seven and a half years, at which point the costs are renegotiable for the next seven and a half years, and so on. In other words, the PPP costs will be renegotiated at least three times during the 30-year term of the contracts. This makes it rather difficult to make a sensible comparison with the public sector alternative over the 30-year period. But, apparently, that is what London Transport is doing - and on the basis of this "comparison" they have decided that the preferred bidders have passed the test!

The report also enters a large question mark against a figure of £2.5 billion, which has been added to the predicted cost of the public sector route. Of this £2.5 billion, the report points out that at one stage in the development of the PSC an extra £900 million had appeared from nowhere for no apparent reason.

When London Transport nominated preferred bidders in May, significant

commercial and technical matters were still to be resolved. Kiley objected to this at the time, on the grounds that London Transport would lose invaluable leverage in the resolution of these matters and therefore it would be much more difficult to get value for money—since a preferred bidder is to all intents and purposes in a monopoly position. The report accepted that point.

It is obvious why the Government did not want this report to see the light of day.

Note: all the documents referred to above are at the time of writing available from the GLA and Transport for London web sites

Concluded from p. 12

an example of the restitutive justice that is a natural consequence of liberal ideas of rights? Libertarian liberals shy away from these unpalatable consequences of their doctrines, preferring to complain about the violated rights of those who currently hold property, rather than those who, long ago, had theirs appropriated.

Libertarianism looks like a very simple, attractive doctrine. It has been used as a clever means of defending the privileges of the rich and of dismantling the welfare state. If its supporters took it seriously, however, it would either lead to genuine anarchy or a genuine expropriating welfare state.

Announcement

Open meetings of the Bevin Society/Labour & Trade Union Review are held on the first Wednesday of every month. The next meeting is on February 7th, and will be a continuation of last month's discussion of the new world situation. *Next Meeting: 7th Nov.*

7.30 p.m. Printer's Room,
Red Rose Club,
Seven Sisters Road,
London N.7

Nearest Tube:

Finsbury Park

Buses:

4, 29, 153, 259, 279

Continued from p. 8

The new Soviet tactics reflected a perception in the Kremlin that the Red Army was in danger of becoming bogged down in Afghanistan and needed to take decisive steps to win the war, according to sensitive intelligence that reached the Reagan administration in 1984 and 1985, Western officials said. The intelligence came from the upper reaches of the Soviet Defense Ministry and indicated that Soviet hard-liners were pushing a plan to attempt to win the Afghan war within two years, sources said.

The new war plan was to be implemented by Gen. Mikhail Zaitsev, who was transferred from the prestigious command of Soviet forces in Germany to run the Soviet war in Afghanistan in the spring of 1985, just as Mikhail Gorbachev was battling hard-line rivals to take power in a Kremlin succession struggle.

Cracking the Kremlin's Strategy

The intelligence about Soviet war plans in Afghanistan was highly specific, according to Western sources. The Soviets intended to deploy one-third of their total Spetsnaz forces in Afghanistan - nearly 2,000 "highly trained and motivated" paratroops, according to Yousaf. In addition, the Soviets intended to dispatch a stronger KGB presence to assist the special forces and regular troops, and they intended to deploy some of the Soviet Union's most sophisticated battlefield communications equipment, referred to by some as the "Omsk vans" - mobile, integrated communications centers that would permit interception of mujaheddin battlefield communications and rapid, coordinated aerial attacks on rebel targets, such as the kind that were demoralizing the rebels by 1984.

At the Pentagon, US military officers pored over the intelligence, considering plans to thwart the

Soviet escalation, officials said. The answers they came up with, said a Western official, were to provide "secure communications [for the Afghan rebels], kill the gunships and the fighter cover, better routes for [mujaheddin] infiltration, and get to work on [Soviet] targets" in Afghanistan, including the Omsk vans, through the use of satellite

reconnaissance and increased, specialized guerrilla training.

"There was a demand from my friends [in the CIA] to capture a vehicle intact with this sort of communications", recalled Yousaf, referring to the newly introduced mobile Soviet facilities. Unfortunately, despite much effort, Yousaf said, "we never succeeded in that".

"Spetsnaz was key", said Vincent Cannistraro, a CIA operations officer who was posted at the time as director of intelligence programs at the National Security Council. Not only did communications improve, but the Spetsnaz forces were willing to fight aggressively and at night. The problem, Cannistraro said, was that as the Soviets moved to escalate, the US aid was "just enough to get a very brave people killed" because it encouraged the mujaheddin to fight but did not provide them with the means to win.

Conservatives in the Reagan administration and especially in Congress saw the CIA as part of the problem. Humphrey, the former senator and a leading conservative supporter of the mujaheddin, found the CIA "really, really reluctant" to increase the quality of support for the Afghan rebels to meet Soviet escalation. For their part, CIA officers felt the war was not going as badly as some skeptics thought, and they worried that it might not be possible to preserve secrecy in the midst of a major escalation. A sympathetic US official said the agency's key decision-makers "did not question the wisdom" of the escalation, but were "simply careful".

In March 1985, President Reagan signed National Security Decision Directive 166, and national security adviser Robert D. McFarlane signed an extensive annex, augmenting the original Carter intelligence finding that focused on "harassment" of Soviet occupying forces, according to several sources. Although it covered diplomatic and humanitarian objectives as well, the new, detailed Reagan directive used bold language to authorize stepped-up covert military aid to the mujaheddin, and it made clear that the secret Afghan war had a new goal: to defeat Soviet troops in Afghanistan through covert action and encourage a Soviet withdrawal.

New Covert U.S. Aid

The new covert US assistance began with a dramatic increase in arms supplies - a steady rise to 65,000 tons annually by 1987, according to Yousaf - as well as what he called a "ceaseless stream" of CIA and Pentagon specialists who traveled to the secret headquarters of Pakistan's ISI on the main road near Rawalpindi, Pakistan.

There the CIA specialists met with Pakistani intelligence officers to help plan operations for the Afghan rebels. At any one time during the Afghan fighting season, as many as 11 ISI teams trained and supplied by the CIA accompanied the mujaheddin across the border to supervise attacks, according to Yousaf and Western sources. The teams attacked airports, railroads, fuel depots, electricity pylons, bridges and roads, the sources said.

CIA and Pentagon specialists offered detailed satellite photographs and ink maps of Soviet targets around Afghanistan. The CIA station chief in Islamabad ferried US intercepts of Soviet battlefield communications.

Other CIA specialists and military officers supplied secure communications gear and trained Pakistani instructors on how to use it. Experts on psychological warfare brought propaganda and books. Demolitions experts gave instructions on the explosives needed to destroy key targets such as bridges, tunnels and fuel depots. They also supplied chemical and electronic timing devices and remote control switches for delayed bombs and rockets that could be shot without a mujaheddin rebel present at the firing site.

The new efforts focused on strategic targets such as the Termez Bridge between Afghanistan and the Soviet Union. "We got the information like current speed of the water, current depth of the water, the width of the pillars, which would be the best way to demolish", Yousaf said. In Washington, CIA lawyers debated whether it was legal to blow up pylons on the Soviet side of the bridge as opposed to the Afghan side, in keeping with the decision not to support military action across the Soviet border, a Western official said.

Despite several attempts, Afghan rebels trained in the new program never brought the Termez Bridge down, though they did damage and destroy other targets, such as pipelines and depots, in the sensitive border area, Western and Pakistani sources said.

The most valuable intelligence provided by the Americans was the satellite reconnaissance, Yousaf said. Soon the wall of Yousaf's office was covered with detailed maps of Soviet targets in Afghanistan such as airfields, armories and military buildings. The maps came with CIA assessments of how best to approach the target, possible routes of withdrawal, and analysis of how Soviet troops might respond to an attack. "They would say there are the vehicles, and there is the [river bank], and there is the tank", Yousaf said.

CIA operations officers helped Pakistani trainers establish schools for the mujaheddin in secure

communications, guerrilla warfare, urban sabotage and heavy weapons, Yousaf and Western officials said.

The first antiaircraft systems used by the mujaheddin were the Swiss-made Oerlikon heavy gun and the British-made Blowpipe missile, according to Yousaf and Western sources. When these proved ineffective, the United States sent the Stinger. Pakistani officers traveled to the United States for training on the Stinger in June 1986 and then set up a secret mujaheddin Stinger training facility in Rawalpindi, complete with an electronic simulator made in the United States. The simulator allowed mujaheddin trainees to aim and fire at a large screen without actually shooting off expensive missiles, Yousaf said. The screen marked the missile's track and calculated whether the trainee would have hit his airborne target.

Ultimately, the effectiveness of such training and battlefield intelligence

depended on the mujaheddin themselves; their performance and willingness to employ disciplined tactics varied greatly. Yousaf considered the aid highly valuable, although persistently marred by supplies of weapons such as the Blowpipe that failed miserably on the battlefield.

At the least, the escalation on the US side initiated with Reagan's 1985 National Security Directive helped to change the character of the Afghan war, intensifying the struggle and raising the stakes for both sides. This change led US officials to confront a difficult question that had legal, military, foreign policy and even moral implications: In taking the Afghan covert operation more directly to the Soviet enemy, how far should the United States be prepared to go?

(c) 'Washington Post', 1992. Posted for Fair Use Only

Advertisement

Albrecht Haushofer:
Moabite Sonnets (1944-5)
with an English translation

Introduction by Angela Clifford:

The Haushofers, Geopolitics
And The Second World War

ATHOL BOOKS £7.50 post
free

Albrecht Haushofer's Moabite Sonnets, which were written in a Nazi Jail in 1944-45, appear here for the first time in English translation, along with the original German text. In these 79 personal, philosophical and political Sonnets Albrecht mourns the fate of his country under Hitler from the viewpoint of a thoroughly German Jew who chose to serve the National Socialist State with a view to modifying its policies,

or later, of overthrowing it.

But how did a Jewish anti-Nazi get into such a position? Angela Clifford, the translator of the poems, tries to answer that question in an Introduction which shows the linkage between the Geopolitics developed by Sir Halford Mackinder, long-term Director of the London School of Economics; General Professor Karl Haushofer, who took up and developed the Mackinder ideas; Rudolf Hess, military aide-de-camp and student of Haushofer's, who became Adolf Hitler's Secretary; and, finally, Adolf Hitler, who fed his expansionist vision for a German East European Empire on these strategic principles. No doubt Mackinder came to wonder whether he had been too open when theorising the British strategic experience of Empire and developing new Imperial perspectives for his British audience, especially when it was suggested in

America during the Second World War that he had provided a programme for Hitler.

It was Karl's unique position with the Nazi hierarchy which gave his son, Albrecht, his chance—or, rather, which put him in a dilemma. Albrecht played for high stakes and reckoned on being either forced to become Hitler's Foreign Minister or being executed. In the event, he was rounded up with others in the German Resistance in the wake of the misfired assassination attempt of 20th July 1944, imprisoned, and then shot just as the Russians were entering Berlin. However, he saved his Sonnets, which were clutched in his dead fist, and in many ways, they speak for him.

ATHOL BOOKS
2001
0 85034 092 6