



# LAWYERS FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

# THE | NEWSLETTER

VOLUME 10, No. 2

SPRING, 1998

## Johnathan Schell Lecture

**Ottawa - March 26, 1998**

Jonathan Schell has worked as a columnist for Newsday for 5 years and a writer and editor for The New Yorker for 20 years. He is the author of *The Fate of the Earth* and *The Abolition* and a recent double issue of The Nation entitled *The Gift of Time: The Case for Abolishing Nuclear Weapons*.

Jonathan Schell looks back on the century commencing in 1914 as one of unprecedented killing in war, revolution, concentration camps and atomic attack. He believes this century will only truly end when we have abolished nuclear weapons. Schell notes that this century has also been marked by good news – but people are still so pessimistic they “take it for granted that the system of global nuclear terror is unchallengeable...”

But Schell comments: “I’ll tell you what was impossible. Dissolving the Soviet Union, from within, and WITHOUT VIOLENCE, was impossible. Now that was really something that was out of the question.”

Schell suggests we recognize that the work of those who resisted totalitarianism at such great personal cost was in fact part of the work required for nuclear disarmament because it will require governments willing to accept weapons inspections for the abolition to occur. He comments:

“It is a pleasant paradox of our time that the anti-totalitarian movements with the Soviet empire may have done more for nuclear disarmament than we in the West who resisted nuclear arms directly.

“That paradox, however, is only a seeming one, for there is in truth a deep inner logic connecting the two causes. For both were and are rebellions against vast, deeply entrenched systems of terror.”

We must begin by setting aside our pessimism and counting our blessings. We begin at this task with the tools of democracy available and at a time when

international conditions are more favourable to peace than they have been since 1815. We need to be aware of states threatening to acquire nuclear weapons and take action which will force the debate on these weapons. Many distinguished groups are now speaking out for abolition. We need to acknowledge that with the end of the Cold War we have ended the danger of a global nuclear holocaust and have increased the danger of a local catastrophe. Nothing stands in the way of abolition now. For the first time since Hiroshima, we can “call for the abolition of nuclear arms and believe in our hearts that it can happen.... The revolution that has occurred is therefore a revolution in possibility.”

He urges that our strategy now change from being based on fear and moving to a strategy based on love. Schell comments:

“Now when it comes to our program and the character of our appeal, the revolution in possibility makes all the difference. Feeling hope, we can give hope. Full of confidence, we can inspire confidence. Moved by love – love of the life we seek to preserve – we can move others to love. We can stand on the solid ground of faith, not the trembling, uncertain ground of fear.”

Schell notes that the public is not highly concerned about nuclear weapons now but when polled are highly supportive. We need to do something unusual and be self-starting. “Instead of waiting for dreadful events to react to, we must act, pure and simple. This sort of self-starting occasion, whose only occasion is our faith in the cause and belief in its achievement, is entirely appropriate to our goal, which is the guarantee of continued life.”

And, when you make things happen, value the results – the public conversation – regardless of whether the media turns out or not.

Schell concluded by commenting:

“We live in a vacuous, silly time. Trivia and rubbish fill our days. You can just turn on the television to see what I mean. The public square is empty. The new reality – the virtual, electronic reality – that we have created for ourselves foams with nonsense. By acting to secure the lives of future generations we can add substance and meaning to our own lives.

“The gate is open. Let us walk through.”

## **Greenham Women Court Case**

**O**n 26 March 1998 a jury at Reading Crown Court was unable to reach a verdict in the case of two women from the Greenham Women's Peace Camp, on trial for causing 10,000 (pounds) of damage to the fence at Burghfield Atomic Weapons Establishment (AWE) in Berkshire, England, on 5 August, 1996.

Sarah Hipperson and Elizabeth Walford claimed lawful excuse for their action and invoked the 8 July 1996 Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice (ICJ) on the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons in their defence. The Court heard evidence from expert witnesses on the nature of Trident, Britain's only nuclear weapons system, and on the radiological effects on the local population of the nuclear warheads fabricated at AWE. The women furnished each member of the jury with a full copy of the ICJ Opinion and Roger S Clark, Distinguished Professor of Law at Rutgers Law School, New Jersey USA, and took 90 minutes to explain how the relevant paragraphs justified the action taken by the defendants.

This is the first time that a Crown Court has accepted an international law defence involving the ICJ Opinion in a case of action against nuclear weapons. Furthermore, the Court accepted that international law is incorporated into English Common Law.

Within a few days the women will be told whether there will be a re-trial, or whether the Crown will decide to drop its charges. In due course more details, including Roger Clark's analysis of the case, will be posted.

*Reported by George Farebrother, World Court Project (UK)*  
(geowcpuk@gn.apc.org)

## **IN BRIEF**

### **Report on Nuclear Weapons Policy**

The Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs has been conducting hearings over the last year to determine a Canadian policy toward nuclear weapons. Their report is anticipated in early May. The government will have 120 days to respond to that report.

### **Landmines Treaty Information**

**A**s you know, we are working with ICRC, UNICEF and pro-ban governments to push for rapid ratification of the ban treaty. The Canadian government is keeping a "National Ratification Status Report" data base ... Last I checked, 6 governments had deposited their ratification instruments with the UN (which makes it official): Canada, Holy See, Ireland, Mauritius, San Marino, and Turkmenistan. I believe another 5 had passed ratification legislation, but not yet deposited it: Bosnia, Hungary, Philippines, Switzerland, and Zimbabwe. It is looking like we will have the necessary 40 ratifications for the treaty to enter into force well before the end of the year, perhaps as early as this summer. If so, this treaty will enter into force sooner than any treaty in history. Let's keep pushing!

- (Report from Steve Goose, Chair, Treaty Working Group)

### **Response to LSR from Ministry of Foreign Affairs**

**J**ill Sinclair, Director, Non-Proliferation, Arms Control and Disarmament Division, has responded to our letter urging attention be given to the legal implications of the ICJ Advisory Opinion on the legality of the use and threat of nuclear weapons. Her letter includes these comments:

"Regarding the ICJ advisory opinion on the use or threat of nuclear weapons, the court did not make a definitive statement of the illegality of nuclear weapons. We had fundamental reservations about the advisability and feasibility of requesting the court to give opinions on matters of national and international security that are essentially political in nature. In Canada's view, the surest way towards a world free of nuclear weapons is through carefully negotiated legally-binding verifiable agreements. Such matters must be engaged in and negotiated by governments."

"Through our Ambassador to the U.N. for Disarmament, Canada has called for the establishment of an ad hoc Committee on Nuclear Disarmament to bring substantive discussions with a view to identifying one or more issues for active negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament. We will continue to raise our concerns about nuclear disarmament issues at every available opportunity..."

# May '98 Meetings on the Non-Proliferation Treaty

Report by Douglas Roche,  
former Ambassador for Disarmament for Canada

The second PrepComm preparing for the 2000 Review of the Non-Proliferation Treaty collapsed at midnight May 8, 1998. Though the immediate cause was failure to agree on references to the resolution on the Middle East adopted at the 1995 NPT Review and Extension Conference, the real cause of the breakdown was the intransigence of four of the five Nuclear Weapons States (NWS) who refuse to enter into any comprehensive negotiations for the elimination of nuclear weapons. The Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), citing the unanimous conclusion of the International Court of Justice that nations are obliged to conclude negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament, called once again for the Conference on Disarmament to "commence negotiations on a phased programme of nuclear disarmament and for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons with a specified framework of time, including a nuclear weapons convention."

The atmosphere of NPT PrepComm II, though starting amiably, turned increasingly sour and even acrimonious. Thirteen NGO statements, praised by PrepComm Chairman Eugeniusz Wyzner of Poland for their "professionalism," were presented at a Plenary meeting on the second day. In general, the NGO recommendations and proposals for strengthening the non-proliferation regime were lost in the incessant governmental wrangling over procedures to be followed in developing the PrepComm process.

In the end, PrepComm II failed, though compromise of language on several points, including negotiations on a fissile material cut-off, nuclear weapons free zones, and export controls, was achieved in draft form which eventually fell by the wayside. PrepComm II revealed the crisis the NPT 2000 Review has been plunged into.

Bridge-building can still be done to save the NPT in 2000 but only if the Western NWS recognize that their continued maintenance of nuclear weapons is the core of the non-proliferation problem. The nuclear weapon tests by India and promised reprisals by Pakistan, coming on the heels of the failed NPT PrepComm II, show the weakness of the present non-proliferation regime. A discriminatory regime can no longer hold. The international community must choose: either an enforceable global ban on all nuclear weapons, or nuclear weapons will spread beyond the present club. The crisis, as the Chinese (who vote at the U.N. for negotiations for nuclear disarmament) would say, presents an opportunity.

Although the nuclear testing by India and promised reprisals by Pakistan occurred after the conclusion of PrepComm II (India and Pakistan are not members of the NPT), it would be totally unrealistic to present an analysis of PrepComm II that ignored the actions by India and Pakistan. India's five underground tests,

## 93% of Canadians Support a Nuclear Weapons Ban!

An Angus Reid public opinion poll was commissioned by the Canadian Peace Alliance. 93% of Canadians agree that Canada should negotiate an agreement to abolish nuclear weapons. 92% agree that Canada should take a leadership role (as it did with landmines) in promoting an international ban on nuclear weapons. 75% believe that the existence of nuclear weapons makes the world more dangerous.

55% support Canada being part of alliances which include the use of nuclear weapons in their military strategies. The Angus Reid people say this figure of 55% support for NATO is down from the usual Canadian level of 70% support for NATO.

including that of a hydrogen bomb, should be seen as a "wake-up call" to the world: the status quo, in which the five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council keep their nuclear weapons while all others are proscribed from acquiring them, is unsustainable.

There are 186 States Parties to the NPT; 97 attended PrepComm II. Brazil recently signed and, while awaiting ratification, attended as an Observer, as did Israel which, along with India, Pakistan and Cuba, remain the principal holdouts. Representatives of 76 Non Governmental Organizations attended.

China made the most remarkable speech, criticizing forthrightly their fellow members of the nuclear club: "Some countries cling to the Cold War mentality, stick to the military doctrines of the Cold War era, and adhere to the nuclear deterrence policy. They keep on expanding their military blocks, strengthening their mili-

tary alliances, and developing sophisticated hi-tech weapons. Making use of multilateral arms control treaties and international non-proliferation mechanisms, they attempt to restrain and weaken other countries' military capabilities, so as to seek absolute security for themselves. Such mentality and practices run counter to the trend of the times, spoil the atmosphere of multilateral arms control negotiations and hamper further progress in the field of international arms control."

Criticizing the U.S. and Russia for retaining large numbers of warheads even after the implementation of START II, China then attacked countries conducting research on and development of advanced strategic missile defense systems and outer space weapons "in an attempt to consolidate and even expand their strategic advantage acquired in the Cold War era, and to seek absolute security for themselves." This activity may trigger a new nuclear arms race, the Chinese spokesman, Ambassador Sha Zakang added. The warning to the United States was unmistakable.

China called for the "complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons at an early date," and appealed for the early conclusion of a nuclear weapons convention "like the conventions banning chemical and biological weapons," along with a legally binding international instrument on negative security assurances.

The NGO presentations to Prep-Comm II took the large view of reminding all parties to the NPT of their responsibilities to humanity. They also made concrete suggestions. On this page are some excerpts from the texts.

Ambassador Roche's full report can be read at <http://watserv1.uwaterloo.ca/~plough/98prepcom.html>

**Merav Datan, Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy:**

*"A recurrent response to the demand for a Nuclear Weapons Convention is that it is premature to consider and discuss a framework for the prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons. It is indeed premature to expect agreement on the objectives of the NWC or the details of its verification regime. But it is not premature to begin devising a plan for complete nuclear disarmament, to be ready when the political climate is favorable. Nor is it premature for States to begin developing the verification mechanisms for nuclear disarmament."*

*"For many years, a CTBT seemed beyond reach; yet verification mechanisms were studied by a scientific group of the C.D. and this helped the negotiations once they began. In light of the ongoing threat posed by nuclear weapons, and the damage, both direct and indirect, that they cause, discussions of a Nuclear Weapons Convention should be seen as an urgent need rather than a premature wish. The model NWC is offered to States and NGOs in the hopes that it can inspire and enrich this discussion."*

**Jonathan Dean, Union of Concerned Scientists:**

*"The united strength of over 180 countries behind a joint program would be a powerful, irrefutable voice to which the nuclear weapon states will be compelled to listen. Up to now, that force has been divided between those governments which focus on demands for total elimination of nuclear weapons and those which advocate specific steps. Only when these two strands are united, only when the people of the world can back a message which sets forth what they want, total elimination of nuclear weapons, together with a clear program of how that objective can be achieved, will the objective in fact be reached. It is a dangerous anachronism that the nuclear strategy of Russia and the United States continues based on deterrence of surprise attack through deployment of hundreds of missiles ready for rapid launch. This is a situation where human or technical error can bring accidental or unauthorized launch of a few missiles followed by massive exchange that could still obliterate most of the Northern Hemisphere, with possible fall-out extended to a still wider area."*

**Janet Bloomfield, Abolition 2000 and Oxford Research Group:**

*"Effective solutions [for global security] will require cooperation, imagination and vision, not nuclear threats and coercion. The 'hardware' approach of the Cold War must change to a 'software' solution which replaces present military-based notions of security with cooperation, confidence-building, transparency, disarmament, conversion, demobilization and demilitarization."*

**Myrla Baldonado, People's Task Force for Bases Cleanup, Philippines:**

*"We come here to the table as victims of the nuclear age. While it is difficult to transcend the nature of what it is to be the sacrificial lambs of military imposed "peace," we seek to transcend mere victimization in demanding and calling for a final cessation to these genocidal acts of nuclear colonialism."*

## India to Build Nuclear Weapons

*By Rahul Bedi in New Delhi*

The Electronic Telegraph, 17 March 1998 reports that the new coalition government in India, led by the Hindu nationalist Bharatiya Janata Party, "will build nuclear weapons and step up testing and production of long range missiles."

The foreign spokesman said the party believes India should be a nuclear power.

[India] "has built 10 commercial nuclear power stations. Seven others are under construction and another 10 planned. It also has four research reactors, is building a nuclear-powered submarine and has an advanced missile programme which has been kept on hold to contain a military build-up in south Asia."

The paper reports that "the Hindu nationalists claim that nuclear weapons will discourage "military adventurism" by neighbouring Pakistan and China, both of whom are nuclear weapon states and have fought wars with India since independence 51 years ago..."

With respect to international law, they report "India has refused to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty aimed at containing nuclear weapons and the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. It claims that both agreements are discriminatory and favour the five nuclear weapon states – the United States, China, Russia, Britain and France – by allowing them to retain large nuclear arsenals."

# REPORT FROM THE U.K.

Prior to the decision of the International Court of Justice (ICJ), an informal opinion from Captain Humphrey, Judge Advocate General, Royal Navy, wrote to Commander Rob Green of the World Court Project (UK) and commented:

"Much will depend on the rationale ICJ's [International Court of Justice's] interpretation of the law. If the Court were to deliver an adverse opinion, it would be ignored by the nuclear powers and the servants of the states concerned, including Trident commanding officers, would not be acting illegally in obeying the orders and carrying out the policies of the state in which they were citizens."

Rob had pointed out that this was the Nazi defence.

Last December, the World Court Project (UK) sent an Open Letter on Nuremberg and Trident to the Prime Minister, the First Sea Lord, and to all the senior politicians in the government and the commanding officers for the Trident submarine. It is a challenge to all under the Nuremberg principles. The Prime Minister's office referred it to the Minister of National Defence. Rob replied pointing out that inasmuch as the Prime Minister has, under Nuremberg Principles, personal responsibility as head of state and as the one who controls the release codes, that the Prime Minister's personal view was required. This prompted a more careful reply from the Prime Minister's office indicating that the Prime Minister was not trying to avoid his responsibilities. The Prime Minister stated that they are:

"confident that the United Kingdom's nuclear deterrent is consistent with international law. It follows that those who are engaged in the operation and support of the Trident are acting legally under the Nuremberg principles."

### Open to Chemical Weapons Inspections?

The NATION (Dec. 22, 1997, p. 5) reports that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has restricted the rights of UN weapons inspections in the US under the Chemical Weapons Convention Implementation Act of 1997 (s. 610). Apparently Section 307 states "the President may deny a request to inspect any facility in the United States in cases where the President determines that the inspection may pose a threat to the national security interests."

Challenge inspections are required for full compliance under the treaty. Further restrictions are specified.

### Citizens' Weapon Inspection Teams

Peter Coombes of End the Arms Race in Vancouver has reports that a Canadian citizens' weapon inspection team led by Vancouver M.P. Libby Davies has done an inspection of the Bangor Trident submarine base and determined that significant numbers of nuclear weapons are stored there. Signs were posted on the fence indicating "Caution: Weapons of Mass Destruction." Good media coverage resulted.

# **Joint Declaration by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of: Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Slovenia, South Africa and Sweden**

---

1. We, the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Slovenia, South Africa and Sweden have considered the continued threat to humanity represented by the perspective of the indefinite possession of nuclear weapons by the nuclear-weapon states, as well as by those three nuclear-weapons-capable states that have not acceded to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, and the attendant possibility of use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. The seriousness of this predicament has been further underscored by the recent nuclear tests conducted by India and Pakistan.

2. We fully share the conclusion expressed by the commissioners of the Canberra Commission in their Statement that “the proposition that nuclear weapons can be retained in perpetuity and never used – accidentally or by decision – defies credibility. The only complete defence is the elimination of nuclear weapons and assurance that they will never be produced again.”

3. We recall that the General Assembly of the United Nations already in January 1946 – in its very first resolution – unanimously called for a commission to make proposals for “the elimination from national armaments of atomic weapons and all other

major weapons adaptable to mass destruction.” While we can rejoice at the achievement of the international community in concluding total and global prohibitions on chemical and biological weapons by the Conventions of 1972 and 1993, we equally deplore the fact that the countless resolutions and initiatives which have been guided by similar objectives in respect of nuclear weapons in the past half century remain unfulfilled.

4. We can no longer remain complacent at the reluctance of the nuclear-weapon states and the three nuclear-weapons-capable states to take that fundamental and requisite step, namely a clear commitment to the speedy, final and total elimination of their nuclear weapons and nuclear weapons capability and we urge them to take that step now.

5. The vast majority of the membership of the United Nations has entered into legally-binding commitments not to receive, manufacture or otherwise acquire nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices. These undertakings have been made in the context of the corresponding legally binding commitments by the nuclear-weapon states to the pursuit of nuclear disarmament. We are deeply con-

cerned at the persistent reluctance of the nuclear-weapon states to approach their Treaty obligations as an urgent commitment to the total elimination of their nuclear weapons.

6. In this connection we recall the unanimous conclusion of the International Court of Justice in its 1996 Advisory Opinion that there exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control.

7. The international community must not enter the third millennium with the prospect that the maintenance of these weapons will be considered legitimate for the indefinite future, when the present juncture provides a unique opportunity to eradicate and prohibit them for all time. We therefore call on the governments of each of the nuclear-weapon states and the three nuclear-weapons-capable states to commit themselves unequivocally to the elimination of their respective nuclear weapons and nuclear weapons capability and to agree to start work immediately on the practical steps and negotiations required for its achievement.

8. We agree that the measures resulting from such undertakings

leading to the total elimination of nuclear weapons will begin with those states that have the largest arsenals. But we also stress the importance that they be joined in a seamless process by those with lesser arsenals at the appropriate juncture. The nuclear-weapon states should immediately begin to consider steps to be taken to this effect.

9. In this connection we welcome both the achievements to date and the future promise of the START process as an appropriate bilateral, and subsequently plurilateral mechanism including all the nuclear-weapon states, for the practical dismantlement and destruction of nuclear armaments undertaken in pursuit of the elimination of nuclear weapons.

10. The actual elimination of nuclear arsenals, and the development of requisite verification regimes, will of necessity require time. But there are a number of practical steps that the nuclear-weapon states can, and should, take immediately. We call on them to abandon present hair-trigger postures by proceeding to de-alerting and de-activating their weapons. They should also remove non-strategic nuclear weapons from deployed sites. Such measures will create beneficial conditions for continued disarmament efforts and help prevent inadvertent, accidental or unauthorized launches.

11. In order for the nuclear disarmament process to proceed, the three nuclear-weapons-capable states must clearly and urgently reverse the pursuit of their

respective nuclear weapons development or deployment and refrain from any actions which could undermine the efforts of the international community towards nuclear disarmament. We call upon them, and all other states that have not yet done so, to adhere to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and take the necessary measures which flow from adherence to this instrument. We likewise call upon them to sign and ratify the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty without delay and without conditions.

12. An international ban on the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices (Cut-off) would further underpin the process towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons. As agreed in 1995 by the States Parties to the NPT, negotiations on such a convention should commence immediately.

13. Disarmament measures alone will not bring about a world free from nuclear weapons. Effective international cooperation to prevent the proliferation of these

*(cont'd page 8)*

---

## **The Canadian Network to Abolish Nuclear Arms**

**T**he CANADIAN NETWORK TO ABOLISH NUCLEAR ARMS met on March 26, 1998 in Ottawa. Doug Roche announced that the "Middle Powers Initiative" has been started and the International Steering Committee has been organized. The goal of this group is as follows:

"MPI will urge the leaders of a number of key middle-power States to form a new coalition to press the Nuclear Weapons States (NWS) for an unequivocal commitment to complete nuclear disarmament as demonstrated by the immediate commencement of negotiations leading to the elimination of nuclear weapons and by practical steps such as De-alerting and pledging No-First-Use."

Meetings in Geneva on May 1 and 2 will determine the order in which middle power governments will be approached. The Steering Committee hope that

funding will be in place to allow delegations to begin in the fall of 1998. They hope to organize conferences in the spring and fall of 1999.

### **Can You help – with nuclear abolition?**

Lawyers for Social Responsibility seeks your support in finding community, service, church and professional groups to endorse the following statement: "I believe that the use and threat of use of nuclear weapons are abhorrent and morally wrong. I call on the Government of Canada to work with other nations to initiate immediately and conclude by the year 2000 a convention which will set out a binding timetable for the abolition of all nuclear weapons in the world."

Please contact the office if groups you are in contact with are willing to endorse this statement. THANKS!

---

weapons is vital and must be enhanced through, inter alia, the extension of controls over all fissile material and other relevant components of nuclear weapons. The emergence of any new nuclear-weapon state, as well as any non-state entity in a position to produce or otherwise acquire such weapons, seriously jeopardizes the process of eliminating nuclear weapons.

14. Other measures must also be taken pending the total elimination of nuclear arsenals. Legally binding instruments should be developed with respect to a joint no-first-use undertaking between the nuclear-weapon states and as regards non-use or threat of use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon states, so called negative security assurances.

15. The conclusion of the Treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok

and Pelindaba, establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones as well as the Antarctic Treaty have steadily excluded nuclear weapons from entire regions of the world. The further pursuit, extension and establishment of such zones, especially in regions of tension, such as the Middle East and South Asia, represents a significant contribution to the goal of a nuclear-weapon-free world.

16. These measures all constitute essential elements which can and should be pursued in parallel: by the nuclear-weapon states among themselves; and by the nuclear-weapon states together with the non-nuclear-weapon states, thus providing a road map towards a nuclear-weapon-free world.

17. The maintenance of a world free of nuclear weapons will require the underpinnings of a universal and multilaterally

negotiated legally binding instrument or a framework encompassing a mutually reinforcing set of instruments.

18. We, on our part, will spare no efforts to pursue the objectives outlined above. We are jointly resolved to achieve the goal of a world free from nuclear weapons. We firmly hold that the determined and rapid preparation for the post-nuclear era must start now.

**Interesting Web Site!**

Link To:  
<http://www.pgs.ca/pages/iraq91.htm>  
 for information on Iraq together with links to the Nuremberg, Vietnam and Persian Gulf War Crimes Tribunals

*Yes, I would like to support this Newsletter and the valuable ongoing work of*

## Lawyers for Social Responsibility / Avocates en Faveur d'Une Conscience Sociale

*for peace and security through the rule of law.*

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Firm, Agency or Law School

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mailing Address

\_\_\_\_\_  
P/C

\_\_\_\_\_  
Office Phone      Home Phone

\_\_\_\_\_  
Fax #      EMail Address

I am a \_\_\_\_\_ Lawyer \_\_\_\_\_ Judge \_\_\_\_\_ Law Professor

\_\_\_\_\_ Law Librarian \_\_\_\_\_ Law Student \_\_\_\_\_ Legal Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_ Paralegal \_\_\_\_\_ Other (please specify)

My area of specialization is \_\_\_\_\_

Enclosed please find my cheque payable to LAWYERS FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY. Please enroll me as a:

- \_\_\_\_\_ \$35 Sustaining Member (Judges, Professors, and Lawyers in practice more than 2 years).
- \_\_\_\_\_ \$25 Member (Lawyers in practice less than 2 years, legal secretary, paralegal or law librarian).
- \_\_\_\_\_ \$15 Law Student.
- \_\_\_\_\_ \$1,000 Life Sustaining Member (may be paid in ten annual installments of \$100 each).
- \_\_\_\_\_ Enclosed is my additional contribution of \$ \_\_\_\_\_ to support LSR's work.
- \_\_\_\_\_ I prefer not to be a member of LSR but wish to receive its Newsletter. I enclose a subscription of \$15 for one year (4 issues).
- \_\_\_\_\_ I would like to establish an LSR Chapter in my area. Please send me information.

Please remit this form and your cheque to the nearest LSR/AFCS Chapter or to  
 LSR c/o Beverley J.T. Delong, 5120 Carney Rd. N.W., Calgary, AB, T2L 1G2