

---

THE BERTRAND RUSSELL PEACE FOUNDATION

## PEACE DOSSIER

2001

Number 2

---

### CONFERENCE TO LAUNCH THE EUROPEAN NETWORK FOR PEACE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

*For two years, the Russell Foundation has worked to lay the foundations for the new Network. The Conference to launch the Network will take place at the European Parliament in Brussels on Thursday 31 January and Friday 1 February 2002. There follows a short paper about the issues and questions for the Conference agenda. Further suggestions, proposals and registrations for the Conference are welcome. Please send them, together with any paper, or proposals for a paper, which you wish to submit for consideration at the Conference when it meets. Relevant documentation appears on our web site ([www.russfound.org](http://www.russfound.org)).*

It is already widely understood that President Bush's proposals for Missile Defence, or 'Son of Star Wars' as it is more commonly known, menace existing agreements on nuclear disarmament and the control of nuclear competition between the powers. The Bush Administration intends to jettison the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty which is generally seen as a cornerstone of international security. Its proposals also put at risk the Outer Space Treaty, which seeks to prevent the deployment of weapons designed to wage war in and from space. European peace movements will wish to evaluate the significance of the annulment of these treaties for European security.

National Missile Defence seeks not only to create a shield against nuclear missiles, but also to set in place the material pre-requisites for space wars. Star Wars proponents in the United States regard NMD as one 'layer' in a broad US programme. This is to be 'multi-layered' and to include 'theatre defence' – weaponry used in or in close proximity to an area of conflict – missile defence and space-based weaponry. In December, the Pentagon chose the Stennis Space Centre in Mississippi as the development site for the \$20-\$30 billion 'Space-Based Laser Readiness Demonstrator'. Under this programme it is envisaged that 20 to 30 space-based laser satellites will eventually orbit the earth. They will be able to fire at targets in space, such as other satellites, as well as target earth. And they will doubtless be pressed into service to augment 'Theatre' Missile Defence.

But it is not so widely understood how far these potential changes in military

technology are transforming military doctrine and the policies of the nuclear powers concerning the use of nuclear weapons. Not only do these risk launching a new wave of nuclear proliferation, but they also risk the legitimisation, and then, inevitably, the detonation of 'tactical' nuclear bombs, or mini-nukes, against, for example, guerrilla insurgents. This would undoubtedly call forth paroxysms of lesser terrorism in response.

These changes already threaten all the existing conventions which seek to establish humanitarian standards in the prosecution of wars and to protect civilians, children and the other non-combatant victims of conflict.

The peace movements have always sought ways to join their forces in action against such harmful developments. Sometimes they have been able to do this very effectively, as was shown during the campaign against the installation of intermediate nuclear forces in Europe in the 1980s.

But today, at the same time as campaigning, we need to apply all our resources to achieve a better understanding of the meaning of the new changes in military technology and military doctrine. We now face new threats, against which old antidotes will not work.

What will result from the Russian declaration to terminate the rule of 'no-first-use' of nuclear weapons?

What effects flow from the United States' commitment to domination of space, sea, air, land and communications in pursuit of the horrifying doctrine of 'Full Spectrum Dominance'<sup>1</sup>, or from associated US Air Force thinking on 'The Enemy as a System'<sup>2</sup>?

What is the meaning of NATO's new strategic doctrine, agreed at the 1999 Washington Jubilee Conference, and the effective sidelining of the United Nations?

Relevant action by the peace movements is more and more dependent on clear understanding of the veritable mutations which modern military thinking has undergone.

The present concerns of the peace movements include these and other difficult problems. Can we prevent the imposition of missile defence, and the destruction of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty? What can be done to prevent the deployment of lethal weapons in space? How can we advance the movement to ban illegal nuclear weapons such as Trident, and to prevent the continued manufacture and use of Depleted Uranium (DU) munitions? How can the campaign against the arms trade be strengthened? What steps are necessary to halt the militarisation of the European Union? If military alliances can undermine the Charter of the United Nations, and weaken the sway of international law, what can we do to prevent the continuous expansion of Nato to include more and more formerly neutral states, and its ever more ambitious programme of hegemony over others? Is it not time to dissolve the Alliance?

Already, many interesting proposals are being elaborated or re-discovered. These include the call for the creation of nuclear-weapons-free zones in Europe; moves to strengthen the links between campaigns for peace and the campaign

against globalisation, including continuing actions against the arms trade; preparing international actions against Star Wars through petitions and demonstrations, culminating in the International Day against the Militarisation of Space on 13 October 2001; helping in the defence of the rights of neutral states to remain outside military pacts; giving appropriate support to those who object to military service, or who object on conscientious grounds to military taxation; developing the international networks to share information and experiences about the effects of depleted uranium; mobilising in the universities against the Academic Military Industrial Complex; addressing continuing problems of peace and human rights – notably the crisis in Palestine, the oppression in Turkey and the defence of the Kurdish people, the problem of Cyprus, and the results of military intervention in the Balkans, amongst all too many other pressing issues.

The launch meeting of the Network will take place in Brussels on 31 January and 1 February 2002. If you want to come, do please register early.

### References

1. See Spokesman 71, pages 71-72.
2. See Spokesman 69, pages 3-4.

## EUROPEAN NETWORK SPONSORS

One hundred and forty people have already agreed to sponsor the new Network, and new names continue to arrive. The sponsors include twelve Nobel laureates: Professor Kenneth Arrow, Professor Nicolaas Bloembergen, Professor Paul D. Boyer, His Holiness The Dalai Lama, Professor Renato Dulbecco, Professor Robert Furchgott, Professor Roger Guillemin, Dr Herbert A. Hauptman, Professor Mario J. Molina, Dr Richard J. Roberts, Professor Jack Steinberger, and The Most Rev'd D. M. Tutu. Peace campaigners and public figures who have agreed to sponsor the Network include Felicity Arbuthnot, John Arden, Pat Arrowsmith, Michael Barratt Brown, Tony Benn, Fausto Bertinotti MEP, Yasmine Boudjenah MEP, Reiner Braun, Dennis Canavan MSP, Professor Ken Coates, Professor G. A. Cohen, Roger Cole, Rev'd Brian Cooper, Jeremy Corbyn MP, Daniel Durand, Jill Evans MEP, Sir Richard Eyre, Hans Feddema, Rev'd Paul Flowers, Pierre Galand, Carla Goffi, Peter Gowan, Gerd Greune, Eirwen Harbottle, Robin Harper MSP, Bob Holman, Jean Lambert MEP, Lea Launokari, Caroline Lucas MEP, John McDonnell MP, Alice Mahon MP, Pedro Marset Campos MEP, Professor Seymour Melman, Joaquim Miranda MEP, Jan Oberg, Harold Pinter, Tom Pistra, Sheila Rowbotham, Elmar Schmaehling, Regan Scott, Mark Seddon, Jaromir Sedlak, Esko Seppanen MEP, Dhirendra Sharma, Tommy Sheridan MSP, Alan Simpson MP, Ralph Steadman, Jonathan Steele, Rae Street, Kalevi Suomela, Luigi Vinci MEP, Robert Wareing MP, and Vivienne Westwood.

### MPs OPPOSE 'SON OF STAR WARS'

*The Early Day Motion on Missile Defence (number 23), put down at Westminster by Malcolm Savidge MP, Convenor of the All Party Parliamentary Group on Global Security and Non-Proliferation on 20 June 2001, had attracted 276 signatures from MPs from all sides of the House of Commons by Monday 23 July. It reads:*

'That this House expresses concern at President Bush's intention to move beyond the constraints of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty in developing missile defence; and endorses the unanimous conclusions of the Foreign Affairs Select Committee, which recommended that the Government voice the grave doubts about NMD in the UK, questioned whether US plans to deploy NMD represent an appropriate response to the proliferation problems faced by the international community and recommended that the Government encourage the USA to explore all ways of reducing the threat it perceives.'

#### **Signatures**

Malcolm Savidge MP, Tony Lloyd MP, Peter Kilfoyle MP, Clive Soley MP, Menzies Campbell MP, John Hume MP, Anne Begg MP, David Borrow MP, Malcolm Bruce MP, David Chaytor MP, Phil Willis MP, Harry Cohen MP, Tom Cox MP, Iain Luke MP, Austin Mitchell MP, John Cryer MP, Alan Keen MP, Jenny Tonge MP, Patsy Calton MP, Annette Brooke MP, Terry Davis MP, Simon Hughes MP, Brian H Donohoe MP, Gwyneth Dunwoody MP, Jeff Ennis MP, Mark Fisher MP, Barbara Follett MP, Mike Gapes MP, Ian Gibson MP, Win Griffiths MP, David Heath MP, Jimmy Hood MP, Eric Illsley MP, Lynne Jones MP, Piara S Khabra MP, Oona King MP, Stephen Ladyman MP, Jackie Lawrence MP, Terry Lewis MP, Andrew Mackinlay MP, Gordon Marsden MP, Jim Marshall MP, Tony Banks MP, Roger Berry MP, Roger Campbell MP, Ronnie Campbell MP, Tom Clarke MP, Tony Colman MP, Jeremy Corbyn MP, David Crausby MP, John Cummings MP, Ian Davidson MP, Hilton Dawson MP, David Drew MP, Huw Edwards MP, Clive Efford MP, Derek Foster MP, Barry Gardiner MP, Sandra Gidley MP, Stephen Hepburn MP, Norman Baker MP, Kelvin Hopkins MP, Paul Burstow MP, Matthew Green MP, Helen Jackson MP, Paul Holmes MP, Richard Taylor MP, David Laws MP, Martyn Jones MP, Robert Smith MP, David Kidney MP, Andrew George MP, Bob Laxton MP, Alice Mahon MP, Andrew Stunell MP, Alan Reid MP, David Rendel MP, John Thurso MP, John Barrett MP, Robert Marshall-Andrews MP, Charlotte Atkins MP, Michael Jabez Foster MP, Harry Barnes MP, George Galloway MP, Harold Best MP, Mark Lazarowicz MP, Helen Brinton MP, John MacDougall MP, Ian Lucas MP, John Lyons MP, Martin Caton MP, Jim Sheridan MP, Michael Clapham MP, David Hamilton MP, Ann Clwyd MP, Michael Connarty MP, Brian Cotter MP, Ann Cryer MP, Jim Cunningham MP, Denzil Davies MP, Jim Dobbin MP, Julia Drown MP, Louise Ellman MP, Paul Flynn MP, Don Foster

MP, Neil Gerrard MP, Jane Griffiths MP, Mike Hancock MP, David Hinchliffe MP, Nigel Jones MP, Ashok Kumar MP, David Lepper MP, Elfyn Llwyd MP, Judy Mallaber MP, David Marshall MP, Stephen McCabe MP, Eddie McGrady MP, Julie Morgan MP, Edward O'Hara MP, Bill O'ner MP, Linda Perham MP, Stephen Pound MP, Gwyn Prosser MP, Syd Rapson MP, Frank Roy MP, Alex Salmond MP, Brian Sedgemore MP, Gerry Steinberg MP, Ian Stewart MP, Neil Turner MP, Rudi Vis MP, Steve Webb MP, Alan Williams MP, Mike Wood MP, Chris McCafferty MP, John McWilliam MP, Denis Murphy MP, Martin O'Neill MP, Lembit Opik MP, Colin Pickthall MP, Ray Powell MP, Lawrie Quinn MP, John Robertson MP, Chris Ruane MP, Martin Salter MP, Alan Simpson MP, Llew Smith MP, George Stevenson MP, David Taylor MP, Simon Thomas MP, Paul Tyler MP, Joan Walley MP, Brian White MP, Betty Williams MP, Tony Wright MP, John McDonnell MP, Mark Oaten MP, Diana Organ MP, Peter L Pike MP, Gordon Prentice MP, Bill Rammell MP, Ernie Ross MP, Bob Russell MP, Mohammad Sarwar MP, Dennis Skinner MP, Phyllis Starkey MP, David Stewart MP, Matthew Taylor MP, Bill Tynan MP, Robert N Wareing MP, David Winnick MP, Derek Wyatt MP, Joan Humble MP, Doug Naysmith MP, Vincent Cable MP, Valerie Davey MP, Jon Trickett MP, Karen Buck MP, Christine Russell MP, Alan Hurst MP, Andrew Dismore MP, John Austin MP, Richard Burden MP, John Grogan MP, Colin Breed MP, Desmond Turner MP, Paul Farrelly MP, Ivan Henderson MP, Eric Martlew MP, Paul Keetch MP, Anne Picking MP, Russell Brown MP, Jonathan Shaw MP, Chris Mullin MP, Joe Benton MP, Bridget Prentice MP, Tony Cunningham MP, Kali Mountford MP, Anthony D Wright MP, Sion Simon MP, Nick Palmer MP, Ann McKeichin MP, Tom Brake MP, Iain Coleman MP, Glenda Jackson MP, Michael Weir MP, Angus Robertson MP, Annabelle Ewing MP, Pete Wishart MP, Tony Clarke MP, Mark Todd MP, Evan Harris MP, Teddy Taylor MP, Kevin Brennan MP, Albert Owen MP, Brian Iddon MP, Irene Adams MP, Dai Havard MP, Sue Doughty MP, David Chidgey MP, Richard Younger-Ross MP, Roger Williams MP, Norman Lamb MP, Alistair Carmichael MP, Nick Harvey MP, Edward Davey MP, Adrian Sanders MP, George Mudie MP, Shaun Woodward MP, Geoffrey Robinson MP, Khalid Mahmood MP, Diane Abbott MP, Janet Dean MP, Geraint Davies MP, Colin Challen MP, Jim Cousins MP, Paul Truswell MP, Colin Burgon MP, Laura Moffatt MP, Jimmy Wray MP, Tony McWalter MP, Tony Worthington MP, Bill Etherington MP, Clive Betts MP, Frank Cook MP, Andrew F Bennett MP, Helen Jones MP, Jim Knight MP, Phil Sawford MP, Janet Anderson MP, Jon Owen Jones MP, Geraldine Smith MP, Paul Stinchcombe MP, Rob Marris MP, Adam Price MP, Donald Anderson MP, Kevin McNamara MP, Kerry Pollard MP, Stephen Hesford MP, Joan Ruddock MP, Archy Kirkwood MP, Vera Baird MP, John Battle MP, Roger Casale MP, David Clelland MP, Michael Moore MP, Richard Allan MP, Chris Smith MP, David Miliband MP, Frank Doran MP, John McFall MP, Meg Munn MP, Adrian Bailey MP, Patrick Hall MP, Joyce Quin MP, Calum Macdonald MP, and Jean Corston MP.

### UNIONS TAKE AIM AT 'SON OF STAR WARS'

*Seventeen trade union leaders in the United Kingdom published this letter in The Guardian on 14 June 2001.*

'We note with alarm George Bush's plans for an anti-ballistic missile system. This initiative will not make the world a safer place, and will do immense damage to international treaties covering weapons of mass destruction. It will also considerably undermine international confidence in treaties as a system of resolving problems, if the US is to set them aside when it feels it is expedient to do so. We therefore consider it wholly inappropriate for our government to support this initiative, and strongly urge it not to do so.'

**Roger Bolton**, General Secretary, BECTU; **George Brumwell**, General Secretary, UCATT; **Tony Dubbins**, General Secretary, GPMU; **John Edmonds**, General Secretary, GMB; **John Foster**, General Secretary, NUJ (personal capacity); **Andy Gilchrist**, General Secretary, FBU; **Derek Hodgson**, General Secretary, CWU; **Jacqui Johnson**, President, NATFHE; **Jim McCusker**, General Secretary, NIPSA; **Judy McKnight**, General Secretary, NAPO; **Paul Mackney**, General Secretary, NATFHE; **Joe Marino**, General Secretary, BFAWU; **Bill Morris**, General Secretary, TGWU; **Dave Prentis**, General Secretary, Unison; **Mick Rix**, General Secretary, ASLEF; **Mark Serwotka**, General Secretary (elect), PCS; **Gordon Taylor**, Chief Executive, PFA.

### "A TERRIFYINGLY DESTRUCTIVE BEAM" — TAM DALYELL MP

*During the British General Election campaign of 2001, Tam Dalyell, the senior Labour MP who represents the Linlithgow constituency in Scotland, published the following letter in The Scotsman newspaper.*

'In this election, one issue dwarfs, or ought to dwarf, all others and that is the proposed militarisation of space by President Bush. If a Blair Government endorses the Bush Son of Star Wars the chance of halting the Americans in their tracks will be zero. They will be able to claim at least one friend in support. If Blair denies endorsement to the Americans then there is at least a chance that even Bush could have second thoughts.

I say Bush because there are many, many, senior Americans, including Admiral Eugene Carroll, Vice President of the Centre for Defence Information in Washington – the most senior naval officer to serve as the director of the United States military operations for Europe and the Middle East – are in opposition to Star Wars.

In this election, 'wait and see' simply won't do. On this supreme, important issue the electors of the Linlithgow constituency and the constituency Labour

Party must have no misunderstanding of my position. If re-elected by both voice and vote I shall seek to persuade Tony Blair to persuade President Bush to think again. America now favours a form of warfare by which missiles hurtle down on another country with little fear of reprisal.

I've been to Belgrade and seen the bombing, and I've been to Iraq where the bombing entrenched Saddam Hussein. Now the Bush entourage proposes to replace missiles with a terrifyingly destructive beam. Nothing is more urgent and important than this. The British Labour Movement must make its opposition unambiguous. I am heartened that many in the Scottish Labour Party not normally associated with the Left or the awkward squad share this view.'

## PEACE MUSEUM IN BRADFORD

The building in Bradford of the first Peace Museum in the United Kingdom (one of around 100 worldwide) has taken a significant step forward. After many years of waiting, the site went on the market in June. In a joint deal with the Bradford City Council, a selected private developer and the International Peace Centre Ltd (IPC), the three-part outcome will be The Peace Museum premises, a set of rooms for like-minded organisations, and a hotel/conference centre.

The Peace Museum will be fitted out with both its own displays and with visiting exhibitions, an education room, and an office. Finance, hopefully from the European Regional Development Fund, is needed for that. With a start on site likely this year, an opening in two years' time is planned.

In the meantime, from its 'temporary' premises, The Peace Museum continues to develop its collection, display and outreach work. Peace from the personal, community and national/international points of view is covered. The collection of 3,300 items is steadily increasing and more are very welcome.

There are regular exhibitions, for example, looking at the contribution of women to peacemaking in the early 20th century (especially of the Women's International League for Peace & Freedom). More on conscientious objection is planned. A Nobel Peace Prize Centennial display is planned for the autumn, which will also be available for borrowing free of charge. There are two other travelling exhibitions available, all with educational packs. 20,000 people across the UK (and abroad) saw the main travelling exhibition during 2000. Local school peace artwork is also encouraged and displayed. The outreach work underpins all that is done. This also includes facilitating training in the museum on conflict resolution techniques for teachers. Helping other museums to reflect on how they display conflict also forms part of this work.

A newsletter (01274-754009) offers updates on the work. Website: [www.peacemuseum.org.uk](http://www.peacemuseum.org.uk) Email: [peacemuseum@bradford.gov.uk](mailto:peacemuseum@bradford.gov.uk) contact: Peter Nias.



**A COMMUNICATION FROM GEORGE SZAMUELY**

The enlargement of NATO, which the US government is pushing assiduously in the face of Russian opposition and European coolness, is to serve two purposes. First, by stopping dead in its tracks the European Union plan to develop an independent military capability, it will prevent the emergence of a rival superpower in Europe. Second, by expanding NATO to within a few hundred miles of St. Petersburg, the US hopes to provoke conflict between Europe and Russia, which, as dishonest broker, it can then mediate.

The European Union is already the largest market in the world. Its version of capitalism, despite the high levels of taxation and welfare, is at least as productive as that of the United States. If the Europeans were now to have Russia's vast mineral wealth at their disposal – the 'strategic partnership' that Russian President Vladimir Putin has offered – the EU could soon surpass the United States in sheer economic power.

The Bush Administration has no higher priority than to stop this from happening. The mechanism to ensure permanent European subordination to the United States is NATO. Anything that strengthens NATO tightens the US grip on Europe. In 1999, Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic joined NATO. Next year in Prague, a further nine countries may be invited to join, including such stalwart adherents of democracy and 'human rights' as Albania and civil war-torn Macedonia.

The expansion of NATO is an outrageous violation of solemn pledges made by the United States at the time of German unification. 'There would be no extension of NATO's current jurisdiction eastward,' Secretary of State James Baker told Gorbachev in February 1990. Former US ambassador to Moscow Jack Matlock has admitted that when the Russians 'say that it is their understanding NATO expansion would not happen, there is a basis for it.'

NATO expansion happened because the rational alternative – NATO dissolving itself – was something the US military-industrial-media complex would not countenance. So NATO had to be reinvented. Expansion went together with its transformation into an aggressive alliance. In its 1991 Strategic Concept NATO was still belching out standard 'defensive' pap: 'the Alliance is purely defensive in purpose: none of its weapons will ever be used except in self-defence. The forces of the Allies must be able to defend Alliance frontiers, to stop an aggressor's advance as far forward as possible. The role of the Alliance's military forces is to assure the territorial integrity and political independence of its member states.' There was as yet no mention of NATO expansion.

NATO's recently published handbook reads chillingly differently, however. Gone is talk of an 'attack on one is an attack on all.' NATO is the one that will do the attacking. 'The most likely threats to security,' the document drones, 'come from conflict on Europe's fringes... As a result, NATO must now be ready to deploy forces beyond Alliance borders to respond to crises.' Future military operations, it goes on, 'will probably take place outside Alliance territory; they



may last for many years.' There is much talk of 'operations involving the participation of nations outside the Alliance, [of] improving NATO's ability to deploy, at short notice, appropriate multinational forces matched to the specific requirements of a particular military operation.' NATO must have 'the ability to deploy forces quickly to where they are needed, including areas outside Alliance territory,' not to mention 'the ability to maintain and supply forces far from their home bases and to ensure that sufficient fresh forces are available for long-duration operations.'

Here then is a military alliance that arrogates to itself the right to bully countries that are not even members of the Alliance into taking part in its operations. It deploys its forces 'far from their home bases' for extended periods of time whether anyone likes it or not.

NATO expansion thus has nothing whatsoever to do with offering security guarantees to small countries terrified of the return of the Russian bear. The handbook does not even bother to take a supposed Russian threat seriously. To be sure, for propaganda purposes, NATO still wheels out its useful idiots to rhapsodize about the Western 'values' over which NATO supposedly stands guard. The ever more ridiculous Czech President Vaclav Havel who, these days, devotes most of his energies to resuscitating anti-Soviet clichés, recently declared that NATO's territory 'extends from Alaska in the West to Tallinn [Estonia] in the East.' But not farther East. Albania belongs to the West, but not Russia.

The Russians must realise, he went on, 'that if NATO moves closer to Russia's borders, it brings closer stability, security, democracy and an advanced political culture, which is obviously in Russia's essential interest.' The 'advanced political culture' is a particularly nice touch. Communism Czech-style, as he well knew before becoming a hack, was for many years considerably nastier than the version practised in Moscow. In any case, if NATO will have such a beneficial effect on the Russians, why not go all the way and invite them to join? Havel summarily rejects such a notion. Endless expansion of NATO, he explained, would render it toothless. So Havel, like his masters in NATO, wants his military alliance to have sharp teeth.

The purpose of this NATO with sharp teeth is to establish forward bases on Russia's periphery from which it will then unleash ethnically based guerrilla armies on the Russians. One objective will be to exhaust the Russians in fighting endless secessionist wars. An enfeebled Russia will then be only too eager to sign away mineral concessions to the rapacious multinationals hovering behind NATO.