

21175
5



Nottingham CND

Bulletin

October 2001

STAND TO shoulder shoulder FOR PEACE AND JUSTICE



No more violence

Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament

The terrorist attacks of September 11th have changed the Western world, but we don't yet know how. It may encourage the US, recently so dismissive of global treaties and agreements, to seek a new active role in the world, sign up to the International Criminal Court, and examine seriously its apparent prioritising of business rights over human rights in its foreign policy. Or it may make the US retreat further into isolation and build missile defense with a new vigour, despite the fact that a missile defense system would have been totally irrelevant to the attacks.

CND has taken an active rôle in the anti-war movement which has sprung to life in the last few weeks. We unreservedly condemn the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Centre in New York and the Pentagon in Washington: they are inexcusable, and the perpetrators should be brought to justice. Contrary to what many politicians claim, they were not attacks on 'democracy' or 'freedom', but on symbols of American economic and military power. We are convinced that military retaliation would be counter-productive and only serve to inflame a cycle of violence and counter violence which increases the risk to us all. As Britain and other countries have experienced in their own situations, terrorist violence will not be defeated by military might, but by tackling the root causes which lead people to support or engage in terrorism. In the current situation, these root causes would appear to include US blanket support of Israel, and western support for pro-west, pro-business governments no matter corrupt they are and how they treat their own people.

It is certainly ironic that the US government now calls for international co-operation with the same fervour it so recently used to dismiss it. While one benefit appears to have been the prevention of immediate military revenge, some kind of military attack still seems probable. And with the usual 'end justifies means' logic, sanctions against India and Pakistan (for developing nuclear weapons), and against Pakistan (for the military deposing a civilian government), have been dropped. We can only hope that such actions don't backfire on us in the same way that American encouragement and backing of Islamic militants in Afghanistan to help 'defeat' communism in the eighties appears to have done now.

Mark Ramsey - Editor

Write to your MP to stop military retaliation - see page 8

Nottingham CND Bulletin #2001/3

The Bulletin is produced quarterly by Nottingham CND, using Serif PagePlus 6.0. Any articles or opinions expressed within are not necessarily the policy of Nottingham CND.

The next issue of the Bulletin is due in January 2002. Articles (preferably on PC computer disk) or other material to be considered for inclusion should be sent to Nottingham CND at the address below or e-mailed to bulletin@nottinghamcnd.org.uk by December 1st.

Nottingham CND, Nottm Voluntary Action Centre, Sandfield House, 7 Mansfield Road, Nottingham NG1 3FB. Tel: 0115 9348459. enquiries@nottinghamcnd.org.uk www.nottinghamcnd.org.uk

Peace must prevail

I write this around the most dramatic period in recent history. September 11th saw the death of more than 6000 people. The peace movement including CND, whilst being appalled by such a dreadful event, is 100% against military retaliation which would further exacerbate the situation. We must bring the people responsible to justice although this may take a long time.

Here in Nottingham we have already had a peace vigil in the Market Square together with other like minded organisations and individuals. This was very well attended with over 250 people present. There will be a vigil every Saturday afternoon between 2pm and 4pm and you are asked to join in whenever possible. In the event of a military strike we will be holding a silent vigil outside the Council House from 5pm onwards. Please bring a jam jar and a candle with you and pass the message on to anyone you know.

National demo in London 13th October - Justice not Vengeance - no Star Wars

Please try to come. We have booked a coach and the cost is £8 full price and £6 concession. We are encouraging as many people as possible to come down but no political posters will be permitted in the bus windows as we do not want to alienate or antagonise anyone who wants to go. Priority is being given to CND members so please make contact as soon as possible.

White Poppy Sales

Let's not forget amongst all the other events that November 11th is fast approaching. White poppy sales will take place on 27th October and 3rd November in Nottingham

The Green Festival went very well thanks to all your help. We raised £96. Finally, Ian Cohen and I went to National CND conference this year. Carol Naughton was elected as the new National Chair.

Diane Lunzer - Secretary

Our sympathies go to John Peck and family on the recent death of Margret who has been a staunch supporter of CND for many years.

The Military Threat to Space – will Europe join in?

Saturday 3rd November. A Leicester City Council Peace Action Group seminar day at New Walk Centre, Leicester. 10.30am-3.0pm.

Speakers: Dr David Webb (Leeds Metropolitan Univ.), Regina Hagen (Co-ord., International Network of Engineers & Scientists Against Proliferation)

Apply LPAG Seminar Coordinator, 32 Westminster Rd, Leicester LE2 2EG 0116 270 5604. Full fee £7.50, concs. £5. Light lunch included. Cheques payable to Leicester City Council.

Please enrol by Wed 31 Oct.

Terrorist attacks on the United States

CND Statement, 15th September 2001

The Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament unreservedly condemns the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Centre in New York and the Pentagon in Washington. We also wish to convey our condolences to the families of those who have died or were injured in this atrocity.

Talk of retaliation and revenge is both counterproductive and dangerous. We urge restraint, a rational and non-military response and time for reflection. Military strike against alleged terrorist bases outside of the restraints of international law must be resisted. An escalating cycle of violent reaction would be the most likely outcome.

The invocation of Article 5 of the NATO Charter must not be used as a 'lawful' excuse for military action by the United States with token support from its western allies.

Disturbingly, Prime Minister Blair has offered full military co-operation for US efforts to punish the perpetrators of the atrocity. Tony Blair must not give unconditional support for the use of US forces based in this country for a military strike. Furthermore, he must not offer British forces as token support for any retaliatory strike as has been done in the past over the air strikes on Libya and Iraq.

The United Nations is the appropriate body for debate and decision about how to deal with this crisis. It is not acceptable for the UN to be made subordinate to decisions taken by NATO.

Furthermore, there is provision within the Treaty of Rome for perpetrators of crimes against humanity to be brought before an International Criminal Court which ironically the US has refused to sign

up to.

Reflection, by the US in particular, but also the other nuclear weapon owning states and NATO supporting states must include a realisation that the foreign and military policies they have been following are significantly contributing to global instability and continuing group and 'state-sponsored' terrorist activity.

For example, despite the rhetoric, US foreign policy has not promoted democracy and freedom in the Middle East and regional instability is spreading, not contained.

This week's tragic events provide a devastating illustration of the futility of pursuing invulnerability through the development of missile defence. Once again, this demonstrates that enormous military and technological superiority is no guarantee of national security.

Respect for international law, treaties, conflict prevention and the search for regional security solutions in the context of the United Nations provide the opportunity for longer lasting security and stability.

CND calls on all concerned organisations and individuals to urge our government to show restraint and to actively dissuade the United States from military retaliation.



Missile defense is no defence

Dan Plesch

Shock, grief and a sense of our own vulnerability sink in with the news of the terrorist bombings, which have caused more deaths on the US mainland than at any time since the civil war.

The attacks have a dreadful air of inevitability. For years such bombings have been the stock-in-trade of terrorism conferences. Almost all western security policy has focused on reaction forces using massively expensive weapons systems. This policy now faces terrible setbacks. The US has already spent vast amounts of money and political will against terrorism. There will be an understandable call from Washington for vengeance, and more military spending. But even if the perpetrators are found it will not prevent future actions.

The answer is not just more of the same. We need to implement a new foreign and defence policy focused on domestic and international prevention. We know that a big police force in our cities is no answer to crime arising from poverty and injustice. Prevention is not a complete cure, but it has been neglected almost completely in the past, as if we tried to run a city with the riot squad and without social security, courts or community policing. We need to reduce our vulnerability and put new effort into working together to prevent a waking nightmare.

There are other nightmares, even worse, that we can prevent. Those planes could have landed on our nuclear power plants. Such plants built along the coast are especially vulnerable to attack from exocet-style missiles hidden on one of the rusty freighters cruising past. They are fragile eggshells full of radiation that make us potential hostages to any adversary.

(And the British government cannot credibly claim to defend Britain and agree to building more such stations.)

Renewable energy poses no security risk, and in fact it can give us more independence internationally. Shifting towards it is also a strategic necessity since by moving to it we can also free ourselves of dependency on Middle East oil and our resulting dependence on US military power to give us access to that oil. Today a large part of Britain's armed forces are in the Gulf to show the US that we are ready to help it control that oil.

The shift will not be quick but it must be pursued urgently. We cannot now just go on in the old way. Such a shift is commonsense but will doubtless be ignored by official thinking in Whitehall.

Old thinking must also be set aside when it comes to nuclear weapons. President Bush vowed to end our vulnerability to attack. But his Star Wars never could cope with terrorist attacks. And a Nato study has now confirmed that missile proliferation is a myth. The only rocket engine rogue states have is the same design as used in the Nazi V-2. The V-2 was used to build the Soviet scud which sold around the world. It has simply been given scary new names by North Korea, Iran, Iraq and Libya. But it can barely reach Europe let alone the US.

The US obsession with the Star Wars system has prevented efforts to reduce and eliminate nuclear, chemical and biological arms. The US is far from the only culprit but it gave an alibi to the Chinese and Russians. The greatest horror we must prevent is still nuclear war. Russia and America still keep thousands of nuclear

continued on page 6

National missile defense is no defence

continued from page 5

weapons ready to fire. This is a Hollywood scenario that we allow to continue at our peril: there needs to be an immediate initiative to take nuclear weapons off alert, and a global effort, now led by the EU, aimed at eliminating all these weapons of mass destruction.

The same effort and resources that went into Star Wars must go into inspections and verification. Inspectors uncovered and destroyed Saddam's arsenal through an international consensus. President Clinton squandered that consensus and Bush had no interest in it. It is clear that our own weapons are almost

irrelevant to the threats we may face in the future.

We must hope that the US's experience will make it turn outward and engage the world. The danger is that the events will further encourage the US to go it alone. Bush has been keen to dispense with treaties, his advisors have little time for international law. We in Europe must contain any such tendencies with understanding.

The priority is to build global governance and the rule of law. A policy that sets aside international law will create global anarchy.

Taken from The Guardian Sep 12, 2001

CND rebuts Jack Straw on Missile Defence

CND has written to all members of the Parliamentary Labour Party with a point-by-point rebuttal of Foreign Secretary Jack Straw's PLP Briefing on Missile Defence.

The briefing on missile defence could well have been written in the White House or the Pentagon. Full of inadequate argument and misinformation its most outstanding feature is the lack of reference to British security, which is surely the main responsibility of the Foreign Secretary.

It also fails to deal with the use by the US of the Fylingdales and Menwith Hill bases and the dangers that will pose for the UK. Although the clear support in the briefing for the US deployment of missile defence indicates a willingness to allow them to use the bases, the financial cost to Britain of this support is not discussed nor the strain which it would put on an already over-stretched UK Defence Budget.

Jack Straw should put British security and world stability ahead of the US desire for global military domination. Opposition to President Bush's plans for missile de-

fence is widespread in Britain. There is real disquiet across political parties and growing opposition from the general public. The Chief of Defence Staff's public opposition must be indicative of wider concerns within the military establishment.

Missile Defence could well become the defining issue of the next parliamentary session and Parliament should have a full debate on the issue with a free vote. By refusing the US the use of Fylingdales and Menwith Hill the Government and Parliament will have a real opportunity to make a positive impact on the destabilising foreign policy of the US. As the large majority of countries agree, the alternative – based on treaties, respect for international law, conflict prevention and the United Nations in the context of a multi-polar world – should be pursued with vigour.

Jack Straw's PLP Briefing and the full point-by-point response can be found the CND website www.cnduk.org

Democrats lash 'lunacy' on NMD

The Senate's most powerful voice on foreign affairs, Joe Biden, yesterday denounced President George Bush's defence policies as "absolute lunacy" that threaten to "pull the trigger" on a new arms race.

In the most blistering Democratic attack to date on the planned missile defence system, Mr Biden, who chairs the Senate foreign relations committee, poured scorn on the scheme which he said would starve other military programmes of cash and make the world a more perilous place.

Senator Biden's remarks are expected to mark the start of a concerted campaign, reflecting the Democrats' belief that Mr Bush is politically vulnerable on foreign and defence policy, which has been characterised by a unilateralist approach, and a belief (ridiculed by Mr Biden as "theological") in building a missile defence system against possible attacks from "rogue states".

The future of missile defence, an array of anti-missile missiles likely to cost over \$100bn, is expected to be one of the major political battlefields of the Bush presidency. The Pentagon has requested a budget of \$8.3bn for the scheme next year. The Democrat-run Senate armed services committee has voted to cut that total to \$7bn, which would still mark a \$1.7bn increase over the current year's budget. But the defence secretary, Donald Rumsfeld, said over the weekend that he would advise the president to veto any spending bill that cut the scheme's budget.

Senator Biden said yesterday that the proposed spending on the unproven technology would draw resources away from programmes aimed at confronting other more serious threats, such as the

proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. "The very day they send up a budget that tells they are going to increase by eight-point-some billion our missile defence initiative, they cut the programme that exists between us and Russia to help them destroy their chemical weapons, keep their scientists from being for sale and destroy their nuclear weapons," the senator said in a speech at Washington's National Press Club.

"Are we really prepared to raise the starting gun in the new arms race in a potentially more dangerous world? Because, make no mistake about it, folks, if we deploy a missile defence system that's being contemplated, we could do just that," he said. "Let's stop this nonsense before we end up pulling the trigger."

The senator from Delaware reserved his greatest contempt for suggestions in the press, attributed to senior administration officials, that in return for Chinese acceptance of the missile defence system Washington would not object to China building up its nuclear missile arsenal and testing new warheads in contravention of the Comprehensive Test Ban treaty. Mr Biden called the policy "absolute lunacy".

The attack is timed to provide Democrats with a theme before campaigns begin for next year's congressional elections. They also come just before a US delegation sets out for London as part of the administration's continuing policy to soften European opposition to missile defence.

Taken from The Guardian 11 Sep 2001

Write to your MP to stop military retaliation

Please join a letter-writing campaign to stop the attacks planned by the US and its allies against terrorism. If the attacks have already started by the time you read this, write demanding that they stop until diplomatic and peaceful methods have been fully exhausted. Write to your MP at House of Commons, Westminster, London, or use www.faxyourmp.com. You may want to base your letter on the points below.

1. *The Taliban have not Refused*

The Taliban have not refused point-blank to hand over bin Laden. The Taliban ambassador to Pakistan, Mullah Abdul Salam Zaeef, has said repeatedly that the request for extradition can be considered, but only after evidence has been provided by the United States. On 21 Sept., Ambassador Zaeef said, 'The Americans should show control, conduct an investigation and show us proof before they attack. The United Nations and Organisation of Islamic Conference should also investigate'. (Telegraph, 22 Sept.) On the same day he said, 'We are not ready to hand over Osama bin Laden *without evidence*' (emphasis added, Times, 22 Sept). The day before, Mullah Mohammad Omar, supreme leader of the Taliban, told the Taliban's Islamic council, 'We have told America that if it has any evidence, give it to the Afghan supreme court, or let the clerics from any three Islamic countries decide his case, or he could be placed under the observation of the organisation of the Islamic conference [representing 52 Islamic countries]. But these offers have all been rejected' (Guardian, 21 Sept). More recently, 'Mullah Zaeef insisted the Taliban were still prepared to negotiate with the US, but only if proof was provided that the prime suspect was guilty of the September 11 attacks.' (Guardian, 1 Oct.) Mullah Zaeef also said that bin Laden was 'under our control'. (Telegraph, 1 Oct.) – clearly to reinforce the Taliban's long-standing offer to negotiate the extradition of bin Laden.

It is standard practice to ask for evidence against a suspect before extraditing them to another country. Why then does the US refuse to follow this normal procedure? President Bush has 'peremptorily dismissed a request from the Taliban for proof that Mr bin Laden was behind the outrages on 11 September.' (Independent, 22 Sept). The Prime Minister says he has independent evidence that bin Laden's organisation was involved in the 11 Sept. atrocities (Telegraph, 18 Sept.). He should commit himself to publishing whatever evidence is available against bin Laden, and then requesting extradition, before any military action is contemplated.

2. *A Lack of Evidence*

On 18 Sept., the FBI case against bin Laden was 'not what a prosecutor in a high profile murder or terrorism case would call an open and shut case'. (Independent, 19 Sept.). More recently, a 'well-informed senior German investigator' 'emphasised that there was still no clinching evidence that would convict bin Laden in a court.' (Times, 28 Sept.). The apparent leader of the hijackers, Mohamed Atta, 'did not completely conform to the ascetic image of bin Laden's followers', (Times, 28 Sept.) and therefore is unlikely to have been a member of Al-Qa'eda, bin Laden's organisation.

3. *The Unreliability of Secret Evidence*

In 1993 and 1998 the US fired cruise missiles at Baghdad and Sudan, respectively, on the basis of US intelligence reports. An investigation established that the 1993

continued on page 11

A Deeply Flawed Judgement

On 23 September 1999 Angie Zelter, Ulla Roder and Ellen Moxley, members of Trident Ploughshares, were charged in Greenock Sheriff Court in Scotland with malicious damage. They had thrown overboard equipment from a floating laboratory, Maytime. The vessel was essential to the running of Britain's four Trident nuclear weapon submarines.

In acquitting the three women on 21 October 1999, Sheriff Gimblett ruled that there was no criminal intent in their action, because it was based on a sincere belief that they were acting against a criminal conspiracy to contravene international humanitarian law.

The Lord Advocate, the Government's legal officer in Scotland, referred Sheriff Gimblett's ruling to the Scottish High Court in Edinburgh for clarification of several points of law relating to the acquittal.

There were some astonishing features of the judgement handed down by the High Court on 30 March 2001. Among these were:

Trident is an indiscriminate weapon of mass destruction but it nevertheless might be used legally.

This is unsustainable because:

- the Court contradicted itself by saying that "a particular threat or use" would be unlawful if it "breaches any of the principles and rules of international humanitarian law (IHL)." One of these basic principles, which is stated in paragraph 78 of the ICJ Opinion, is that "States must never make civilians the object of attack and must consequently never use weapons that are incapable of distinguishing between civilian and military targets".
- it is contradicted by a Government statement. On 25 March 2001 Dr Lewis

Moonie MP, the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Defence, wrote to Dr Kim Howells MP about the legality of Depleted Uranium (DU) weapons. (Reference D/US of S/LM 1136/01/M). He argued that all weapons are subject to International Humanitarian Law which "requires that weapons be used during armed conflict in a discriminate manner". He then went on to say: "Nuclear, biological and chemical weapons are indiscriminate weapons of mass destruction specifically designed to incapacitate or kill large numbers of people ...". Clearly nuclear weapons, as a class, are indiscriminate, specifically designed as such, and therefore fail to meet the requirements of IHL.

- it seems to suggest that IHL could be set aside under an extreme circumstance of self-defence. This possibility was not raised by any state making submissions to the ICJ. It is firmly rejected by commentators such as Christopher Greenwood, who advised the United Kingdom before the ICJ. Writing in *The International Review of the Red Cross* (no 316, p.65-75, 1 January 1997) he argues: "To allow the necessity of self-defence to override the principles of humanitarian law would put at risk all the progress in that law which has been made over the last hundred years or so". Professor Greenwood's views should not be taken as representing the position of the United Kingdom, but his role in the ICJ proceedings gives them considerable authority.

The rules of international humanitarian law apply only in war.

This can be countered by arguing that:

- the use of UK Trident nuclear weapons would be illegal in armed conflict,

continued on page 10

A Deeply Flawed Judgement

continued from page 9

because the explosive power of each warhead (100 kilotons, equivalent to 8 times that of the weapon which devastated Hiroshima) makes them incapable of use without violating IHL.

- in its 8 July 1996 Advisory Opinion, the ICJ concluded (para 47): "If the envisaged use of force is itself unlawful, the stated readiness to use it would be a threat prohibited under Article 2, paragraph 4 (of the UN Charter)." The UN Charter is applicable at all times: thus the argument that IHL only applies in armed conflict is irrelevant with respect to threat of use. It is only applicable to use, when by definition there is a situation of armed conflict.

- UK Trident is deployed under a policy of "stated readiness to use", in order that nuclear deterrence is credible. By definition, deployment in peacetime fails to meet the ICJ criteria of "an extreme circumstance of self-defence, in which the very survival of a state would be at stake", even if the Trident warheads could be replaced by ones so small that they complied with IHL.

- Nuremberg Principle VI states: "The crimes hereinafter set out are punishable as crimes under international law: (a) Crimes against peace: (i) Planning, preparation of a war in violation of international treaties, agreements or assurances; (ii) Participation in a common plan or conspiracy for the accomplishment of any of the acts mentioned under (i)". Thus, the fact that the threat is made in time of peace is immaterial.

Under the ICJ's analysis, a state may no more threaten unlawful military action in time of peace than in time of war.

The deployment of Trident does not constitute a threat.

This might be valid if deterrence simply

entailed innocent, threatless possession of weapons the use of which was recognised as irrational and untenable. The reality is, however, that nuclear deterrence doctrine involves being ready to threaten overwhelmingly disproportionate and indiscriminate damage. Its credibility rests on an operational policy of weapon system procurement and readiness, personnel training, contingency planning, pre-targeting and continuous deployment as evidence of the government's resolve to actually use these weapons if it so decides.

On 10 May Kevin Pollard of the Directorate of Nuclear Policy, MoD, wrote to the World Court Project UK. The letter included the Government's assessment of High Court's Judgment

- The High Court was not persuaded that even accepting the respondents' description of Trident (that its size and effects would result in uncontrollable and indiscriminate suffering and damage), that a threat to use it, or its use, could never be seen as compatible with the requirements of International Humanitarian Law (IHL).

- The Court pointed to two fundamental flaws in the respondents' contention that the UK's deployment of Trident is in breach of Customary International Law (CIL). Firstly, the relevant rules of CIL, and in particular the rules of IHL, are not concerned with regulating the conduct of states in time of peace. They specifically relate to warfare and times of armed conflict, and are designed to regulate the conduct of belligerents, against one another or against some neutral state. The rules are not applicable or capable of application in time of peace. This is true even where a particular State

continued on page 11

A Deeply Flawed Judgement (contd from page 10)

has a policy of deterrence, and deploys nuclear weaponry in execution of that policy. Secondly, the deployment of nuclear weapons in time of peace is very different to the kind of specific threat which is equated with actual use in those rules of CIL which make both use and threat illegal. Broadly, deterrent conduct, with no specific target and no immediate demands, is quite different from a particular threat of practicable violence, made to a specific target. The deployment of Trident lacks the links between threat and use, and an immediate target, which are essential to a threat of the kind dealt with by CIL or IHL.

- The Court concluded by saying that they saw no basis for a contention that the general deployment of Trident in pursuit of a policy of deterrence constitutes a continuous or continuing threat of the

kind that might be illegal as equivalent to use. Therefore, the conduct of the UK was in no sense illegal.

- The Court also noted that the principles of domestic law are clear: a person may not take the law into his or her hands. A person may not commit an offence in an attempt to stop another. The Court emphasised that Scots law provides no justification for damage or destruction unless such damage or destruction is justified by the Scots law of necessity. The crucial requirements for a defence of necessity – there must be a pressing need for action that the person has no alternative but to do what would otherwise be a criminal act under the compulsion of the circumstances in which he finds himself – in the case of Trident do not exist.

Taken from the World Court Project website www.gn.apc.org/wcp

Write to your MP to stop military retaliation

continued from page 8

intelligence assessment was 'seriously flawed', and that the Administration's claimed "evidence" was 'factually inaccurate'. (New Yorker, 1 Nov. 1993). No evidence was ever produced to support the 1998 attacks.

4. Evidence before Action

A Gallup poll in the US and UK shows the public demand for evidence before action. The overwhelmingly popular choice (62% support in the US, 82% in the UK) was, 'The US and its allies should only conduct military strikes against the terrorist organisations responsible for the attacks on the US even if it takes months to identify them.'

5. Negotiate Now

The US and UK governments are breaking international law by refusing to negotiate. The UN Charter explicitly states that the resolution of 'any dispute, the continuance

of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security', shall, first of all, 'seek a solution by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice' (Article 33). Bizarrely, it is not the hard-line fanatic Taliban who are rejecting negotiation and compromise, but the White House which says there will be 'no negotiations, no discussions'. (Telegraph, 22 Sept.)

6. Open the Pakistani Border

As part of its plan to capture bin Laden and destroy his organisation, Washington forced Pakistan to close its border with Afghanistan, so that no suspects could escape. (Telegraph, 15 Sept.) But this is a major obstacle to caring for the hundreds of thousands of refugees.

Diary Dates

- Sat 13 Oct **CND March and Rally in London: peace and justice for all**
See below for details
- Wed 17 Oct **'Sept 11 – has World Politics Changed Forever?'**
Prof John Hoffman at Friends' Meeting House, Queens Rd, Leicester.
- Mon 22 Oct **Blockade at Faslane**
If anyone is interested in going to Faslane, contact 0141 423 1222
- 27 Oct & 3 Nov **White Poppies**
As always we will sell white poppies in Nottingham. Anyone who can help please phone Diane on 0115 9812034.
- Sat 3rd Nov **'The Military Threat to Space – will Europe join in?'**
Leicester City Council Peace Action Group seminar day. Details on p3.
- Sun 18th Nov **Nottingham CND AGM**
2pm at the International Community Centre, 61b Mansfield Rd, Nottm.

Peace Vigil

There will be a vigil every Saturday during the current crisis, in Market Square by the Council House between 2pm and 4pm.

If there is a military attack

There will be silent vigil outside the Council House from 5pm on the day of the attack.

Nottingham CND AGM

Sunday 18 November, 2pm

at the International Community Centre,
61b Mansfield Rd, Nottingham

CND March and Rally in London: Peace and Justice for All

Saturday 13th October

Coach from Nottingham. Tickets £8/£6(concs)

To book a ticket phone Diane Lunzer (0115 9812034) or Ian Cohen (0115 9213242)

Saturday 13th October is the International Day of Protest to Stop the Militarisation of Space. Organised by CND in co-operation with Palestine Solidarity Campaign (PSC). CND calls for support from all opposed to further violence and military retaliation