
 THE BERTRAND RUSSELL PEACE FOUNDATION

PEACE DOSSIER

2002

Number 6

TRADE UNIONS OPPOSE WAR ON IRAQ

The agenda of the Trade Union Congress, which meets in Blackpool on September 9, shows great concern about the danger of war with Iraq, and at the same time registers strong disapproval of the new military technologies which are being developed in the United States.

The Transport and General Workers' Union has tabled a motion calling upon Britain to take the lead in eliminating the world's nuclear arsenals. This policy was agreed in the Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, but no action has been taken by the Permanent Member States of the Security Council which possess nuclear weapons to implement it. This failure also causes strong concern to the Vatican (see the report below from the United Nations).

The Transport and General Workers' Union calls upon the British Government to refuse co-operation with President Bush's 'Son of Star Wars' programme of missile 'defence'.

The Transport and Salaried Staffs Association, which organises clerical workers in the railway industry and further afield, has tabled an amendment to this motion, committing the Labour Movement and calling on the Labour Government to 'firmly oppose any attack on Iraq': 'to reduce international tensions and promote peace, Congress opposes the proposed military attack by the USA on Iraq...and urges the British Government to withhold support for such an attack which it considers is contrary to international law and would inevitably destabilise the Middle East.'

Other trade union leaders have registered strong concern about these issues, and pledged support for the initiative of the transport workers. Billy Hayes of the Communications Workers Union said 'I think the TUC should come out against the war. I do not believe that this would be unpopular. It would rehabilitate the TUC overnight.'

HIROSHIMA

Tadatoshi Akiba, the Mayor of Hiroshima, issued this Peace Declaration on August 6, 2002, the 57th anniversary of the atomic bombing of his city by the US Air Force.

Another hot, agonizing summer has arrived for our *hibakusha* who, fifty-seven

years ago, experienced ‘the end of the world’, and, consequently, have worked tirelessly to bring peace to this world because ‘we cannot allow anyone else to go through that experience.’

One reason for their agony, of course, is the annual reliving of that terrible tragedy.

In some ways more painful is the fact that their experience appears to be fading from the collective memory of humankind. Having never experienced an atomic bombing, the vast majority around the world can only vaguely imagine such horror, and these days John Hersey’s *Hiroshima* and Jonathan Schell’s *The Fate of the Earth* are all but forgotten. As predicted by the saying, ‘Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it,’ the probability that nuclear weapons will be used and the danger of nuclear war are increasing.

Since the terrorist attack against the American people on September 11 last year, the danger has become more striking. The path of reconciliation – severing chains of hatred, violence and retaliation – so long advocated by the survivors, has been abandoned. Today, the prevailing philosophy seems to be ‘I’ll show you’ and ‘I’m stronger than you are.’ In Afghanistan and the Middle East, in India and Pakistan, and wherever violent conflict erupts, the victims of this philosophy are overwhelmingly women, children, the elderly, and those least able to defend themselves.

President Kennedy said, ‘World peace... does not require that each man love his neighbour – it requires only that they live together with mutual tolerance....’ Within this framework of tolerance, we must all begin co-operation in any small way possible to build a common, brighter future for the human family. This is the meaning of reconciliation.

The spirit of reconciliation is not concerned with judging the past. Rather, it open-mindedly accepts human error and works toward preventing such errors in the future. To that end, conscientious exploration and understanding of the past is vital, which is precisely why we are working to establish the Hiroshima-Nagasaki Peace Study Course in colleges and universities around the world.

In the ‘spiritual home for all people’ that Hiroshima is building grows an abundant Forest of Memory, and the river of Reconciliation and Humanity flowing from that forest is plied by Reason, Conscience and Compassion, ships that ultimately sail to the Sea of Hope and the Future.

I strongly urge President Bush to visit Hiroshima and Nagasaki to walk through that forest and ride that river. I beg him to encounter this human legacy and confirm with his own eyes what nuclear weapons hold in store for us all.

The United States government has no right to force *Pax Americana* on the rest of us, or to unilaterally determine the fate of the world. On the contrary, we, the people of the world, have the right to demand ‘no annihilation without representation.’

Article 99 of the Japanese Constitution stipulates that ‘The Emperor or the Regent as well as Ministers of State, members of the Diet, judges, and all other public officials have the obligation to respect and uphold this Constitution.’ The proper role of the Japanese government, under this provision, is to avoid making Japan a ‘normal country’ capable of making war ‘like all the other nations.’ The

government is bound to reject nuclear weapons absolutely and to renounce war. Furthermore, the national government has a responsibility to convey the memories, voices, and prayers of Hiroshima and Nagasaki throughout the world, especially to the United States, and, for the sake of tomorrow's children, to prevent war.

The first step is to listen humbly to the *hibakusha* of the world. Assistance to all *hibakusha*, in particular to those dwelling overseas, must be enhanced to allow them to continue, in full security, to communicate their message of peace.

Today, in recalling the events of 57 years ago, we, the people of Hiroshima, honour this collective human memory, vow to do our utmost to create a 'century of peace and humanity,' and offer our sincere prayers for the peaceful repose of all the atomic bomb victims.

'REGRESSION' ON NUCLEAR WEAPONS SAYS VATICAN

On April 10 in New York, Monsignor Francis Chullikat of the Holy See Delegation to the United Nations Panel on Nuclear Arms addressed the Preparatory Committee for the 2005 Review Conference of the signatories to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

As the international community begins preparation for the 2005 Review of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, my Delegation notes the deep concern that is widely felt about the state of nuclear disarmament. At the 2000 Review it was felt that progress was being made. The Review obtained a clear-cut commitment from the nuclear weapon states that systematic and progressive efforts to implement Article VI would include: 'An unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear weapon states to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals leading to nuclear disarmament to which all states parties are committed under Article VI.' This commitment was embodied in a list of 13 practical steps the conference unanimously agreed to take. However, the progress made in implementing the 13 steps over the past two years has been indeed discouraging. In fact, the prospects for future implementation are alarming.

As an examination of the 13 steps shows, there has not only been a lack of sufficient progress, there has been regression. Although, thankfully, there has been no nuclear testing in this period, the entry-into-force of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty cannot be seen on the near horizon. The Conference on Disarmament is paralysed. One of the parties to the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty has given notice of withdrawal. Nuclear weapons are still kept on alert status. The admonition of the International Court of Justice for the completion of negotiations towards elimination is ignored.

Even more serious than the lack of progress is the overt determination of some nuclear weapon states to maintain nuclear weapons in a critical role in their military doctrines. While the international community rightly welcomes the willingness of those with the most nuclear weapons to reduce their stocks of operationally deployed warheads, what is the real effect of such unilateral disarmament when it

is not made irreversible, i.e., when such stocks can be remounted again quickly?

My Delegation is deeply concerned about the old posture of nuclear deterrence that is evolving into the possibility of use in new strategies. This must be stoutly resisted. The Holy See has constantly recalled the fact that the strategy of deterrence can be envisaged only as a stage in the process aimed at disarmament, even of a progressive nature. So long as it is taken as an end in itself, deterrence encourages the protagonists to ensure a constant superiority over one another, in a ceaseless race of over-arming.

The concern of the Holy See mounts in seeing the non-proliferation regime, with the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty as its cornerstone, in disarray. The old policies of nuclear deterrence, which prevailed in the Cold War, must lead now to concrete disarmament measures. The rule of law cannot countenance the continuation of doctrines that hold nuclear weapons as essential.

There can be no moral acceptance of military doctrines that embody the permanence of nuclear weapons. That is why Pope John Paul II has called for the banishment of all nuclear weapons through 'a workable system for negotiation, even of arbitration.' Those nuclear weapon states resisting negotiations should therefore be strongly urged to finally come to the negotiating table. In fact, in clinging to their outmoded rationales for nuclear deterrence, they are denying the most ardent aspirations of humanity as well as the opinion of the highest legal authority in the world. In this regard, my Delegation wishes to reaffirm its well-known position: nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the twenty-first century; they cannot be justified. These weapons are instruments of death and destruction. The preservation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty demands unequivocal action towards their elimination. Only when such a noble goal is attained can the international community be assured that nations are acting in 'good faith'.

My Delegation is confident that the Preparatory Committee will seize this opportunity to develop a sharpened sense of urgency to root out nuclear weapons that are the biggest threat to mankind. To keep developing weapon systems that can jeopardise the natural structure upon which all civilisation rests seriously undermines the genuine quest of the family of nations to build a culture of peace for the present and future generations.

PEACE CONVOY TO KASHMIR

A haulage company, Arabian Sights Ltd, has despatched a convoy of lorries emblazoned with texts from the Koran which emphasise Islam's commitment to Peace. It is en route from the United Kingdom to Kashmir.

A convoy of up to 250 trucks and trailers commenced its journey from the United Kingdom on 14th August 2002. It is travelling throughout the UK and elsewhere in continental Europe, and then on to Kashmir. The purpose is to raise awareness of the real issues behind the Kashmir and Palestine conflicts, and at the same

time to increase public understanding of Islam. By printing the facts about these conflicts on trailer sides, each covering over 350 square feet, together with relevant texts from the Koran, the organisers can ensure that their message in favour of peace is relayed without distortion.

‘Arabian Sights is contributing its whole fleet of trucks and trailers, and suspending its commercial activities for up to 90 days to complete the project,’ says the company’s managing director, Shahbaz Sarwar, ‘The War on Terror is turning into a war on Islam. But the Islamic religion teaches us to spread peace not terror.’ Mr Sarwar is particularly worried about the nuclear stand-off between India and Pakistan over Kashmir. ‘Though it appears that the nuclear threat has diminished today, the problem has not been removed,’ he says. ‘A nuclear war in South East Asia will affect the whole world, not just its epicentre.’

SOLIDARITY WITH VANUNU

Mordechai Vanunu has been in captivity in an Israeli gaol for nearly 16 years for blowing the whistle on Israel’s nuclear weapons programme. Mary and Nick Eloff (his American adoptive parents) visited him recently.

We were full of anticipation as we finished the security search and gift tally at the prison. For the first time, everything that had been brought was recorded and a copy made for Mordechai. Included was the beautiful award presented to Mordechai on May 4th by the Lakes and Prairies Life Community at their semi-annual gathering near LaCrosse, Wisconsin. Mordechai received the first ever Sam Day Memorial Peacemakers Award in a very moving presentation by Joe Gump. Kathleen Day and her son, Josh, were present, and Nick and I received the award on behalf of Mordechai. The framed award had been designed by Bonnie Urfer while she served time in prison for an anti-nuclear action. How we would have loved to have shown it to him ourselves!

We walked with the male social worker, Ronen, towards the small visitation room where Ronen would record every word that we said. From a distance of a short half block we spotted Mordechai, looking fit and tanned. It was a surprise to see that he is letting his hair grow long – something he intends to do until his release. Then we were able to hug him, and tell him how wonderful he looked. Very thoughtfully and graciously, he set out bottled water, chocolate wafer cookies and Pringles for us, and gave us two bags of candy to give to our grandchildren. All of these he had purchased at the prison canteen.

We talked about his days – a good part of which he spends walking. He refuses to work, since they didn’t allow him to work for 11/12 years. He also decides when he will eat lunch – at 2 pm, even though it is delivered at noon. There is so little about which he has a choice. The guards awaken him at 6 am for count, after which he goes back to sleep. When he is not walking, he naps, reads and writes letters. He has to be present for count twice more during the day. More and more we appreciate how

controlled and boring his prison life is. We learned that he receives the London *Sunday Times*, but not the *Washington Post*. He had received a renewal notice for *Newsweek* magazine, which we send him, and since it had an identification number, we requested permission to take the notice with us. No way. Prison officials wouldn't even let us copy down the number. It's a cruel world in there.

Gail Vaughn had sent him the book *Angels Don't Play that Haarp*, a critique of nuclear and other weapons (see below), and he was thoroughly enjoying it. Another friend had sent a copy of Beethoven's only opera, *Fidelio*, and he could identify with the story and its central character, who is unjustly imprisoned. Mordechai said that when he is discouraged, listening to opera lifts his spirits.

He told us that he was scheduled to go to Jerusalem the following day to petition for a copy of the protocol of his trial. We phoned his attorney to see if we would be allowed in the courtroom, but, not surprisingly, Avigdor Feldman told us that it would be a closed court. When we returned on the 14th, we found a jubilant prisoner. Mordechai was exceedingly pleased with Feldman's representation of him in the courtroom. Feldman had argued that the law was supreme, not security. The judge has taken it under advisement.

That day we had been severely reprimanded by a young prison officer for talking about the kidnapping during our first visit. The discussion had centred around the lack of intervention by the Italian Government after his kidnapping in Rome. The officer warned us that if we spoke of it again, or about Dimona, the visit would be ended abruptly. Needless to say, the three of us obeyed the orders.

We talked about the future, and learned that Mordechai would like to teach American history when his English is adequate. He has read volumes about it, so he has a good background. He repeated that he would not agree to a secrecy agreement upon release, because his greatest achievement has been to demand that the court recognise his right to freedom of speech. Sadly, Mordechai feels betrayed by the London *Times*, which did not come to his aid during the early years of his imprisonment. Probably all of us wish that we had acted sooner.

He receives fewer letters now, so in addition to a real appreciation of those who write to him, he would love to hear from others. Our visits were warm and always too short, but we carry his words in our hearts.

HAARP – WEAPON SYSTEM TO DISRUPT CLIMATE?

Early in 2003, the United States plans to test a new kind of military facility in Alaska, Greenland and Norway. The High Frequency Active Auroral Research Project, HAARP for short, affects climate, among other things. These plans have already provoked significant opposition within the Russian State Duma. More than 90 members have signed an appeal for an international ban on such large-scale geophysical experiments. But what is HAARP? In 1999, Maj Britt Theorin MEP reported to the European Parliament on The Environment, Security and Defence Policy. This is what she told the Parliament.

On 5th February 1998, Parliament's Sub-committee on Security and Disarmament held a hearing, the subject of which included HAARP. NATO and the United States had been invited to send representatives, but chose not to do so. The Committee regrets the failure of the USA to send a representative to answer questions, or to use the opportunity to comment on the material submitted.

HAARP is run jointly by the US Air Force and Navy, in conjunction with the Geophysical Institute of the University of Alaska, Fairbanks. Similar experiments are also being conducted in Norway, probably in the Antarctic, as well as in the former Soviet Union. HAARP is a research project using a ground based apparatus, an array of antennae each powered by its own transmitter, to heat up portions of ionosphere with powerful radio beams.¹ The energy generated heats up parts of the ionosphere; this results in holes in the ionosphere and produces artificial 'lenses'.

HAARP can be used for many purposes. Enormous quantities of energy can be controlled by manipulating the electrical characteristics of the atmosphere. If used as a military weapon this can have a devastating impact on an enemy. HAARP can deliver millions of times more energy to a given area than any other conventional transmitter. The energy can also be aimed at a moving target which should constitute a potential anti-missile system.

The project would also allow better communications with submarines and manipulation of global weather patterns; but it is also possible to do the reverse, to disrupt communications. By manipulating the ionosphere one could block global communications while transmitting one's own. Another application is earth-penetrating tomography, x-raying the earth several kilometres deep, to detect oil and gas fields, or underground military facilities. Over-the-horizon radar is another application, looking round the curvature of the earth for in-coming objects.

From the 1950s the USA conducted explosions of nuclear material in the Van Allen Belts² to investigate the effect of the electro-magnetic pulse generated by nuclear weapon explosions at these heights on radio communications and the operation of radar. This created new magnetic radiation belts which covered nearly the whole earth. The electrons travelled along magnetic lines of force and created an artificial aurora borealis above the North Pole. These military tests are liable to disrupt the Van Allen Belt for a long period. The earth's magnetic field could be disrupted over large areas, which would obstruct radio communications. According to US scientists, it could take hundreds of years for the Van Allen Belt to return to normal. HAARP could result in changes in weather patterns. It could also influence whole ecosystems, especially in the sensitive Antarctic regions.

Another damaging consequence of HAARP is the occurrence of holes in the ionosphere caused by the powerful radio beams. The ionosphere protects us from incoming cosmic radiation. The hope is that the holes will fill again, but our experience of change in the ozone layer points in the other direction. This means substantial holes in the ionosphere that protects us.

With its far-reaching impact on the environment, HAARP is a matter of global concern, and we have to ask whether its advantages really outweigh the risks. The environmental impact and the ethical aspect must be closely examined

before any further research and testing takes place. HAARP is a project of which the public is almost completely unaware, and this needs to be remedied.

HAARP has links with 50 years of intensive space research for military purposes, including the Star Wars project, to control the upper atmosphere and communications. This kind of research has to be regarded as a serious threat to the environment, with an incalculable impact on human life. Even now, nobody knows what impact HAARP may have. We have to beat down the wall of secrecy around military research, and set up the right to openness and democratic scrutiny of military research projects, and parliamentary control.

A series of international treaties and conventions (the Convention on the prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques, the Antarctic Treaty, the Treaty on principles governing the activities of states in the exploration and use of outer space including the moon and other celestial bodies, and the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea) casts doubt on HAARP on legal as well as humanitarian and political grounds. The Antarctic Treaty lays down that the Antarctic may be used exclusively for peaceful purposes.³ This would mean that HAARP is a breach of international law. All the implications of the new weapons systems should be examined by independent international bodies. Further international agreements should be sought to protect the environment from unnecessary destruction in war.

References

- 1 Dr Nick Begich, speaker at the hearing (see www.earthpulse.com/haarp/).
- 2 In 1958 the US Navy exploded three devices containing nuclear material 480 km above the South Atlantic. Designed by the US Department of Defence and the Atomic Energy Commission under the code name Project Argus. Source: Dr Rosalie Bertell.
- 3 Article 1, the Antarctic Treaty.

CORDOBA PEACE AND HUMAN RIGHTS MEETING

In February 2002, the European Network for Peace and Human Rights was established in Brussels to bring together the various non-governmental organisations concerned with these issues. In addition to many participants from different corners of Europe, there were also representatives of NGOs from the Middle East/ West Asia region: notably, of course, from Palestine and Israel, but also from the Gulf region and Turkey.

One of the tasks the new Network set itself was to open a dialogue with organisations concerned with peace and human rights across the Middle East / West Asia region. In pursuance of this objective, an agreement was negotiated with the City of Cordoba, where the Mayor, Ms Rosa Aguilar, has agreed that the City will host a seminar to facilitate exchanges between appropriate peace and human rights movements.

A large number of relevant organisations throughout the region have been consulted about the Cordoba conference. Their advice has been sought on two main questions:

1. What should the agenda of the conference include?
2. Who should be invited to participate since places are limited?

Many helpful responses have already been received, and more continue to arrive. They come from many countries, including Egypt, Iran, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, Palestine, Turkey and Yemen in the West Asia region. It is proposed to ask the participants in Cordoba if they can agree an appeal for peace and human rights, which can attract wider support, and help to organise opposition to new wars which threaten the entire region.

DECLARATION AGAINST WAR ON IRAQ

Pax Christi in the United Kingdom issued this declaration on 'The Morality and Legality of War against Iraq'. It has attracted widespread support from Christian leaders and communities in Britain. The declaration was presented at Downing Street, Tony Blair's London residence, on 6 August 2002, the anniversary of the first use of nuclear weapons at Hiroshima in 1945.

September 11th, 2001 demonstrated the new threat posed to the international community by groups seeking to achieve their political ends through violence and terror, outside the framework of the nation-state. This is an urgent problem that calls for a far-sighted and effective response through the authority of the United Nations and the processes of international law, bearing in mind that 'terrorism' lends itself to different interpretations in different contexts. We deplore any military action that regards the deaths of innocent men, women and children as a price worth paying in fighting terrorists, since this is to fight terror with terror. We call upon the world's leaders to seek a just and peaceful solution to the problem of terrorism by setting in place an international system of law supported by all states, including the United States of America, that would allow for the arrest and trial of terrorist agents in properly appointed courts of justice.

The so-called 'war on terrorism' is an act of political rhetoric that must be distinguished from a military campaign against a sovereign state. It cannot be used to justify an attack on Iraq, and any offensive planned to counteract the perceived threat posed by Iraqi weapons of mass destruction should not be represented as a war against terrorists. We are pleased to note that Prime Minister Tony Blair has assured Parliament that Britain will not support any military action against Iraq without the authority of the United Nations. With this in mind, we make the following observations concerning the morality and legality of any such proposed action.

Conflict resolution must seek to address the historical circumstances that create and perpetuate hostilities. Apart from the effects of having lived for a generation in states of war of various kinds and under the cruelty of their own government, the terrible toll exacted on Iraq's civilian population by a combination of UN sanctions and US/UK bombing (including the premature deaths of hundreds of thousands of children) has contributed to the devastation

of Iraq's infrastructure. Denis Halliday, former UN Assistant Secretary General and Humanitarian Aid Co-ordinator for Iraq, resigned in October 1998 in protest against the continued use of sanctions. In his resignation speech he said, *'We are in the process of destroying an entire society. It is as simple and terrifying as that. It is illegal and immoral.'* However necessary sanctions may be, both humanitarian measures and diplomatic overtures are needed if the Iraqi nation is to be reincorporated into the international community – even if its leaders must retain their current pariah status. International contacts often serve to weaken totalitarian regimes more than isolation. The people of Iraq must not be made to suffer further because they are living under a dictator who in his early years in power enjoyed the collusion and support of the western nations.

Christian reflection on the justice of going to war has always insisted that only duly constituted public authorities may initiate war. Since the signing of the UN Charter in June 1945, the only body with the authority to initiate military action is the United Nations Security Council, except in the case of self-defence when an armed attack has actually occurred against a sovereign state. Even then, the exception of self-defence, like all exceptions, is to be strictly construed. All signatories are bound by Article 2.4 of the Charter which says that *'all members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force ...'* Today, in the light of the UN Charter, especially Articles 2 and 51, it is plain that the only circumstance under which a sovereign state might invoke the authority to go to war is when an armed attack occurs; even in self-defence, it may do so only *'until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security'* (Article 51). It follows that, however dangerous Iraq's mass destruction weapons programme is claimed to be (though the evidence has yet to be produced), there can be no justification for war by another state unless and until the Iraqi government itself launches an attack. Pre-emptive war by one state against another is not permitted by the UN Charter, no matter how much evidence there may be of a potential for violence. Short of actual attack, *'all Members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means'* (Article 2:3).

The above conditions must all be met when considering the possibility of a war against Iraq. They are based upon the traditional 'just war' requirements of Lawful Authority, Just Cause and Right Intention. They also illuminate the principle of Last Resort, given that the parties to a dispute *'shall first of all seek a solution by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement ... or other peaceful means'* (Article 33:1).

Re-introducing UN Inspectors to Iraq must be a necessary early step in this process and the call for the return of UN inspectors to Iraq is a reasonable one, granted current allegations. As a sign of good faith, it would be helpful if those countries calling for the return of inspectors, especially the United States and Britain, were to open their own nuclear, chemical and bacteriological facilities to the same process of international inspection. The demands made on Iraq should be matched by the actions of the existing eight nuclear weapons states. Moreover, it is essential that these countries abide by their own legal obligations. In 1996, the International Court

of Justice declared there to be an obligation on the nuclear weapon states to bring to a conclusion negotiations aimed at the abolition of such weapons, but to date Britain has done little to achieve this. Moreover, it is a matter of grave concern that Geoffrey Hoon, Britain's Secretary of State for Defence, has threatened the use of nuclear weapons against Iraq, if an attack with weapons of mass destruction were to be launched against British forces deployed in the region. The use of nuclear weapons would violate all accepted international standards concerning the conduct of war, and it would constitute an act of indiscriminate violence not only against Iraqi civilians but against future generations living in the Middle East.

It is our considered view that an attack on Iraq would be both immoral and illegal, and that eradicating the dangers posed by malevolent dictators and terrorists can be achieved only by tackling the root causes of the disputes themselves. It is deplorable that the world's most powerful nations continue to regard war and the threat of war as an acceptable instrument of foreign policy, in violation of the ethos of both the United Nations and Christian moral teaching. The way to peace does not lie through war but through the transformation of structures of injustice and of the politics of exclusion, and that is the cause to which the West should be devoting its technological, diplomatic and economic resources.



**TRANSPORT & GENERAL
WORKERS' UNION**
South East & East Anglia

For peace and disarmament

**Justice for the Palestinians
demands a
political process -
not military action**

Eddie McDermott
Regional Secretary

Patsy Payne
Regional Chair

(phone)
020.8800.4281

(e-mail)
emcdermott@tgwu.org.uk

(fax)
020.8802.8388