



LAWYERS FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY THE NEWSLETTER

VOLUME 10, No. 3

SUMMER, 1998

What Iraq Says is Taking Place with UNSCOM

Interview with Mohammed Rasheed, Iraqi Oil Minister, in charge of dealings with UNSCOM

The following interview is reprinted from The Times of India, September 7, 1998. The interview was conducted by an Indian journalist during the recent visit of the Iraqi Oil Minister to New Delhi in a meeting of the Indo-Iraqi Joint Commission. In the interview the Iraqi Minister raises concerns that the U.S. has been using UNSCOM for espionage activities and has been prolonging the work of UNSCOM in order to ensure the continuation of sanctions.

Q. What is your assessment of UNSCOM's work?

A. As per UN resolutions, Iraq has to destroy its weapons of mass destruction and agree to long-term monitoring to ensure it does not produce such weapons in the future. It is not clear to UNSCOM and the world that Iraq disposed of its prohibited weapons at the end of 1991. A very intrusive and effective monitoring system has been in place since 1994. Why then do we still have sanctions? UNSCOM's technique is to generate questions and suspicions and to keep the weapons files open. For example, by 1992, we had accounted for all the missiles imported from Russia; but in 1996, UNSCOM asked us to dig up every single remnant of these missiles that they had told us to dispose of!

Q. UNSCOM has raised the issue of warheads again ...

A. The warheads were also destroyed in 1991 and were fully accounted for by them. Yet, in 1997, we were asked to dig them up. These examples from the missile file should give you some idea of UNSCOM's technique. They raise a question and suggest to the whole world that if that question is resolved, inspections can end. But when we mobilize our forces to answer that question, they raise some other issue. In

the hope of ending sanctions, we have gone along with them but the process has become unending.

Q. This year, the question of access to presidential sites nearly led to the US attacking Iraq. What did UNSCOM find there?

A. Nothing. The whole idea was to create a crisis. UNSCOM and the U.S. misled world public opinion about the size and nature of these sites. President Bill Clinton even claimed one of these sites was as large as Washington, DC! The aim was to create suspicions so that more is required of Iraq to prove its credibility. They have a hidden agenda to undermine Iraq by continuing the sanctions in the hope – which will never happen – that Iraq will crumble. After a principled agreement between Iraq and Mr. Kofi Annan, the same elements began immediately to say that Iraq would not comply. They forgot Iraq wanted a peaceful settlement. We did not want war.

Q. Iraq alleges that UNSCOM's work is manipulated by U.S. intelligence agencies. Can you give examples?

A. On March 8, UNSCOM sent Mr. Scott Ritter (a U.S. marine who is now being investigated by the FBI for his involvement with Israeli intelligence) to the defense ministry, which, as you know, has significance in terms of the legitimate security concerns of Iraq. He put conditions on his entry, when it is us that should have put conditions! We immediately realized this was a game to undermine our agreement with Mr. Annan and decided to let him enter. Fifteen minutes later, the team withdrew saying Mr. Richard Butler (the UNSCOM head) had said our acceptance of their conditions "is not very clear." Rather than us preventing them, they were begging not to enter the ministry.

cont'd over

It turned out that the inspection team was fully manipulated by the CIA through Mr. Ritter. U.S. Secretary of State Madeline Albright was visiting France at the time and was having a working lunch with Foreign Minister Hubert Vedrine. The CIA wanted to say to the French – who are our friends and understand our legitimate position – that “here is an example of Iraq obstructing UNSCOM.” So they were really very frustrated that we had allowed them in! This shows you that UNSCOM is fully manipulated.

Q. Do you sense that the other permanent members of the Security Council are tiring of the U.S. attitude towards Iraq?

A. Earlier, when we said the U.S. was manipulating UNSCOM, our allegations were accepted with reluctance. But today, many countries know in detail how UNSCOM is being manipulated. When Iraq asked for balanced representation within UNSCOM for countries from outside the Anglo-Saxon world, we had good cause. Now there are more French, Russian and Chinese experts, so the CIA is not able to use UNSCOM as before.

Q. Mr. Ritter has resigned from UNSCOM, accusing Mrs. Albright of undermining the inspection efforts. What do you make of his allegations?

A. The U.S. administration knows the game of prolonging sanctions – under the pretext that there are still some areas which the UN inspectors have to uncover – is finished. This may not be openly said, but in bilateral and multilateral discussions with other members of the Security Council, this has come out. It is clear that UNSCOM has no further case on Iraq and will have to say that Iraq has fulfilled its obligations. But

there are still some elements whose hidden political agenda drives them to continue trying to undermine Iraq and prolong the sanctions. These elements are in struggle against others within the U.S. administration who feel they have to be more pragmatic – not principled but pragmatic. They realize that it is only a matter of time before France, Russia and others openly criticize the U.S. So they have to find a methodology for how to deal with this. What we have seen in the press in the past few days – including the resignation of Mr. Ritter – is part of that struggle within the U.S. administration.

If the present controversy proves anything, it is that Iraq has already fulfilled its obligations under UN resolutions. Even though they were very intrusive, harsh and fully unjustified, we accepted them for the sake of our people. We have tolerated so much suffering and hardship but it was worthwhile because we now are reaching the end of the road.

Q. What is your response to the U.S. claim of an Iraqi connection to the Sudanese medicine factory which they bombed last month?

A. The U.S. should answer one simple question: Why have they refused to send an investigation committee which Sudan has invited? The soil and the remnants of the factory are still there and it could easily be determined whether there was any nerve gas material. Their refusal to allow such a team means the basis of the U.S. allegation is false. Second, they mention the name of one of our important scientists. But he has never ever been in Sudan. I assure you there is no Iraqi connection with the medicine factory in any way. This is part of the campaign to justify their aggression against Sudan. ●

Peace Canada – Legality of Nuclear Warships in Canadian Waters

The Vancouver Island Peace (VIP) Society was founded in order to challenge the Federal Government in court on the legality of nuclear warships in Canadian waters.

With the assistance of lawyer Robert Moore-Stewart, the VIP Society prosecuted a lawsuit all the way to the Supreme Court of Canada. They challenged that the Federal Government failed to obey its own environmental assessment laws when Cabinet approved the transit and porting of foreign nuclear warships in Canadian waters and ports. The VIP Society sought to have the courts overturn the Cabinet Orders, force a public review, and to disallow nuclear ship visits until the review was complete.

The judgment of the Federal Court was made over a year later – an unusually long period of time, indicating that both sides had strong cases worthy of detailed analysis. On appeal, before the Federal Court of Appeal, the judges took just a few hours. In fact, they barely allowed VIP’s lawyer to present their case. The three judges’ decision to uphold the initial judgment was made over lunch hour the first day of deliberations! And the VIP lawyer was not allowed to carry on with their arguments. The Supreme Court of Canada responded that they would not hear an appeal, giving no reasons for their decision (as is usual).

While the court challenge failed, the battle for public opinion was won hands-down. In addition to significant amounts of favorable local, provincial and national media coverage, an unprecedented unanimity of political opinion was found for a full, public environmental review, including:

- eight of ten local municipalities – seven unanimously
- 50 of 51 Members of the B.C. Legislature
- all Greater Victoria Members of Parliament
- many local peace and environmental organizations
- many others

As well, the VIP Society was able to present hundreds of pages of court-accepted affidavits. These documents detail the risks of nuclear ship visits, our inability to respond to a disaster, the unacceptable costs of an accident, and the near unanimous support for a full, public environmental review. As well, they detailed the large majority of public opinion opposed to nuclear ship visits – a majority that is far larger than the percentage of votes that ever elects a federal government.

The VIP Society is proud to now make available to the world court of public opinion, the valuable documentation that was assembled to support this court case. If you are interested in exploring some of the fascinating material uncovered, please visit the VIP web site at:

<http://www.IslandNet.co/~emerald/vip.htm>
Email – emerald@IslandNet.com

Al Rycroft (250) 592-8307
(fax available)
Box 8307, Victoria, B.C.
V8W 3R9, CANADA

Vancouver Island Peace Society
c/o 616-620 View Street
Victoria, B.C., V8W 1J6, CANADA
(250) 380-1887; Fax (250) 380-9134
Email: peace@IslandNet.com

Contacts:
Robert Moore-Stewart
(250) 380-1887; Fax (250) 380-9134

Fred Knelman
(250) 658-2740 ●

Opinion Poll in Germany

*Deutsche Sektion Der Internationalen Aerzte Fuer Die Verhuetung Des Atomkrieges – Aerzte In Sozialer Verantwortung
[International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW)]*

Koertestrasse 10
D-10967 Berlin 61
Tel: +49 (0)30 693 0244
Fax: +49 (0)30 693 8166
IPPNW@VLBerlin.comlink.de
IPPNW@OLN.comlink.apc.org
<http://www.ippnw.de>

Here are the results of a German opinion poll, commissioned by IPPNW Germany, on the subject of nuclear weapons:

1. The nuclear weapon states, in order to create a nuclear weapon free world, should start getting rid of their own nuclear weapons as quickly as possible.

Yes 87% No 9%

2. Nuclear weapons are basically contrary to international law and should neither be produced nor stockpiled.

Yes 93% No 4%

3. The German government should see to it that the nuclear weapons that are based on German soil are immediately eliminated.

Yes 87% No 7%

1,005 people were asked the questions on June 2nd, 1998. There was not much difference between the answers of people of different age groups, regions or political backgrounds. A slight increase in the “yes” replies could be found in former East Germany, and among social democrats and greens as well as those over 60 years of age.

Xanthe Hall
(Co-Director)

Editor’s Note: A similar question in the UK and US also elicited an 87% response and in Canada 93% support for a ban on nuclear weapons.

IPPNW is a member of Abolition 2000

- a Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons ●

An Anatomy of Terrorism

The Opinion of Egyptian Nobel Laureate Naguib Mahfouz on the US Attacks

“U.S. terrorism,” says Egyptian Nobel Laureate Naguib Mahfouz. “The two attacks staged by the USA against Afghanistan and Sudan are unacceptable. The USA, so concerned with fighting terrorism, could have responded in a way worthy of a democratic country – with actions motivated by a sense of responsibility and inspired by standards of legitimacy. The USA is no different from any terrorist group, violating international law and instead applying the law of the jungle.” ●

– Naguib Mahfouz, Egyptian Nobel Prize winner in Literature

CLINTON KNEW TARGET WAS CIVILIAN

American tests showed no trace of nerve gas at ‘deadly’ Sudan plant. The President ordered the attack anyway.

By Ed Vulliamy in Washington, Henry McDonald in

Belfast, and Shyam Bhatia and Martin Bright in the LONDON OBSERVER.

Sunday August 23, 1998

President Bill Clinton knew he was bombing a civilian target when he ordered the United States attack on a Sudan chemical plant. Tests ordered by him showed that no nerve gas was on the site and two British professionals who recently worked at the factory said it clearly had no military purpose. The disclosure will deepen the crisis, following the American attacks on Afghanistan and Sudan, in relations between the US and its Muslim allies, who have called upon Clinton to produce hard evidence that the attacks had a legitimate relevance to the war against international terrorism. The US claims that the Al-Shifa Pharmaceuticals Industries plant in North Khartoum was producing the ingredients for the deadly VX nerve gas. But Sudan's assertion that it produced 50 per cent of the country's drug requirements is much closer to the truth. Several vital pieces of evidence point to this conclusion. US forces flew a reconnaissance mission to test for traces of gas and reported that there were none. Nevertheless Clinton immediately authorized the attack. He was also told that the absence of gas would avoid the horrifying spectacle of civilian casualties. Sudan has said 10 people were injured, five seriously. Belfast independent film-maker Irwin Armstrong, who visited the plant last year while making a promotional video for the Sudanese ambassador in London, said: "The Americans have got this completely wrong. In other parts of the country I encountered heavy security but not here. I was allowed to wander about quite freely. This is a perfectly normal chemical factory

with the things you would expect – stainless steel vats and technicians." Tom Carnaffin, of Hexham, Northumberland, worked as a technical manager from 1992 to 1996 for the Baaboud family, who own the plant. "I have intimate knowledge of that factory and it just does not lend itself to the manufacture of chemical weapons," he said. "The Americans claimed that the weapons were being manufactured in the veterinary part of the factory. I have intimate knowledge of that part of the [plant] and unless there have been some radical changes in the last few months, it just isn't equipped to cope with the demands of chemical weapon manufacturing. You need things like airlocks but this factory just has doors leading out onto the street. The factory was in the process of being sold to a Saudi Arabian. They are allies of the Americans and I don't think it would look very good in the prospectus that the factory was also manufacturing weapons for Baghdad. I have personal knowledge of the need for medicine in Sudan as I almost died while working out there. The loss of this factory is a tragedy for the rural communities who need those medicines." The engineer, who has said he will be returning to Sudan in the near future to carry out more work for the Baaboud family, condemned the American attack and its resulting loss of life. "It's a funny feeling to think that I had a cup of tea in that place and the security guard on the gate who used to say hello to me is very probably now dead. The Baabouds are absolutely gutted about this. People who they knew personally have been killed - it is very upsetting."●

New Agenda Coalition / Irish Foreign Minister's Statement

From: robwcpuk@gn.apc.org

(Rob Green)

To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

Dear Abolitionists,

The following statement was made by Mr David Andrews TD, Ireland's Foreign Minister, when he launched in Dublin this morning the Joint Ministerial Declaration "A Nuclear Weapons-Free World: The Need For A New Agenda."

Bearing in mind that Rebecca Johnson confirms that Ireland was the initiator of what Mr Andrews dubbed the NEW AGENDA COALITION, she agrees that this is almost more important than the Declaration, because it shows that the political will is there to make the pace for abolition. Apparently, he added in discussion afterwards that it is intended to present this initiative in September as a UN General Assembly resolution.

Incidentally, when I briefed David Andrews on the World Court Project in 1993 (he was then Defence Minister), he was very supportive and, as a lawyer, was prepared to sign the MacBride Lawyers' Appeal against nuclear weapons, as his father had been close friends with Sean MacBride!

For good measure, I've just heard that John Gormley, a Green Party TD (MP) has called for Ireland to be made a nuclear free zone!! I'm sending him a copy of New Zealand's Nuclear Free Act.

Onwards & upwards,
Rob Green
Chair, World Court Project UK

"I indicated to the Dail and Seanad recently that I had been considering an initiative in respect of nuclear disarmament, and I have asked you here today to share with you the fruits of these efforts.

I have been working for some months with my colleagues from New Zealand, Sweden and South Africa on ways and means to rekindle the will of the international community for nuclear disarmament. These efforts have now led to the formation of a new coalition of like-minded countries, including in particular those countries with which we have for many years worked together in the field of nuclear disarmament: Brazil, Mexico, Egypt and more recently Slovenia, a grouping which I shall henceforth describe as the New Agenda Coalition. [He then departed from his text to congratulate South Africa and President Mandela for being the only country in the world to have produced and then dismantled nuclear weapons.]

The collapse of the Berlin Wall and the end of the Cold War provided opportunities for the final thrust leading to the elimination of nuclear weapons. These opportunities have sadly been squandered in the decade since then by the international community.

The nuclear weapon states have found new justifications where none exist for the indefinite retention of their nuclear weapons.

States such as Ireland – eager to grasp the opportunity offered by the end of the Cold War – have proposed ambitious programmes for the achievement of a world

without nuclear weapons. Given the complacency of the nuclear weapon states and their lack of urgency, the results have been meagre and disappointing.

It was in this pitiable and worrying environment that my colleagues and I decided that a new initiative had to be taken now if the prospect of the retention of nuclear weapons was not to continue for the indefinite future.

The Non-Proliferation Treaty process was launched by Frank Aiken in 1958, and Ireland has traditionally maintained a close involvement in nuclear disarmament. We therefore feel a particular concern at moments such as this, when the NPT is under threat.

The Non-Proliferation Treaty is the foundation on which the prevention of the spread of nuclear weapons rests. But more particularly, it is a charter for the elimination of nuclear weapons.

The nuclear weapon states are required to eliminate their nuclear arsenals under the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Their failure to fulfil their legally binding obligations under the Treaty is not the result of any inadequacy in the Treaty itself. It is the result of the lack of political will.

Today's initiative is about securing that political will and putting in motion the actions that will necessarily follow, so that in a few short years we will have consigned nuclear weapons to history both to protect our future and that of our children in a nuclear weapons-free world.

The recent developments in India and Pakistan have not been

(cont'd over)

the motive for the launching of this initiative. The work of my colleagues and myself predates them. However coincidental these developments may be, they can be seen now as justifying, indeed validating, the necessity of this Declaration. The existence of three nuclear weapon-capable states – India, Pakistan and Israel – in regions of the world where some of the worst long-term tension exists, are a demonstration, if any were needed, of the high cost of inaction on the part of the international community.

The development of nuclear weapons in the Middle East and South Asia repeats all over again the folly which was used to justify their development by the five nuclear weapon states during the Cold War.

The nuclear weapon states have let slip the opportunities for the elimination of their own nuclear arsenals. We now face further proliferation. The only valid response to this situation or any situation involving the retention of nuclear weapons is to eliminate them for all time.

There is only one logical step for mankind now. That is to see to the abolition of these weapons once and for all. In the first instance we require a renewed commitment. The nuclear weapon states already entered into commitments as Parties to the NPT. But, however much they reduce their nuclear arsenals, they persist in developing, modernizing and deploying nuclear weapons. These actions circumvent the hard choice needed, if we are to achieve a world free of nuclear weapons. We must now break through this obduracy and secure a firm political commitment on the part of the nuclear weapon states and nuclear weapons-capable states to proceed with the rapid elimination of nuclear weapons. Nothing less than a straight and unambiguous political commitment will do.

Once we have secured that commitment, we will look at nuclear disarmament in a totally new way. Let me explain. In the case of other weapons of mass destruction such as chemical and biological weapons, genuine commitment was followed by serious negotiation premised on that commitment. Nuclear force reductions will take on a very different complexion if they are scrutinized from the perspective of a commitment to eliminate them totally.

At the same time, we can use existing bilateral and multilateral mechanisms or invent new ones, as required, so that we can achieve rapid negotiating results. The Conference on Disarmament was created in 1961 as a centrepiece in the nuclear disarmament machinery. The refusal of the nuclear weapon states even to discuss the prospects of nuclear disarmament at the Conference on Disarmament, would of necessity have to change.

Our final goal must be to abolish nuclear weapons and to prohibit their development, production, stockpiling, transfer and use, just as we have done in the case of chemical and biological weapons. We have criminalized any activities associated with chemical weapons. We must now reach a stage where any activity relating to the development, production and use of nuclear weapons will likewise be prohibited.

Let me close by reiterating a statement of the obvious: nuclear weapons if they are retained will be used – whether by accident or design. While we have no doubt about human ingenuity, we must equally have no doubt about its frailty. With the development and use of nuclear weapons, humanity has gone one step too far. Nagasaki and Hiroshima are enduring and terrible witnesses to this. We must pull back from the brink; or the price may be humanity itself. ●

MACEDONIA, UN CONFIRM MINING OF BORDER WITH YUGOSLAVIA

SKOPJE, Macedonia (AP) – Yugoslavia has planted mines along its border with Macedonia in Kosovo province, apparently to prevent Albanian militants from crossing illegally and smuggling arms, media and foreign observers reported Wednesday.

“We have spotted the mines and we asked Belgrade and Skopje for clarification,” said Marc McEvoy, a spokesman for the U.N. peacekeeping force in Macedonia. The Macedonian media said the antipersonnel mines, which are banned by some international conventions, have been placed at two spots near Jazinec, one of the main border crossings, on the Yugoslav side of the border.

from John Head re MECOSUR:

To all addressees – this region has been declared a peace zone free from Mass Destruction Weapons. Please let me know if you want further information.

Greetings. The Argentine Ambassador sent me a copy of the “Political Presidential Declarations of Mecosur Bolivia and Chile as a Peace Zone” and the Ushuaia Protocol on the Democratic Commitment in Mercosur, Bolivia and Chile signed on the 24th July 1998 at Ushuaia.

I sent the following letter to the Chilean Ambassador and a similar letter to the Argentinian Ambassador to support their stand on landmines.

John Head
6 John Sims Drive
Broadmeadows
Wellington 6004
New Zealand

10 August 1998

H E Fernando Reyes-Matta
Ambassador
Embassy of Chile
P O Box 3861, Wellington

Your Excellency,

I have received a copy of the recent Political Presidential Declarations of Mercosur Bolivia and Chile as a Peace Zone.

The establishment of the first peace zone in South America is a significant and important step towards peace and security in general, and the abolition of weapons of mass destruction. As Spokesperson for the New Zealand Campaign Against Landmines (CALM) I particularly welcome Paragraph 6 of the Declaration which states:

“Advance towards the establishment of Mercosur, Bolivia and Chile as an area free of anti-personnel and land mines looking to extend it to the whole western hemisphere.”

This is very good news.

I was in Chile last month and met residents of Arica who gave me a lot of information about landmines in their region. I am sure that they too will welcome this political initiative.

Please pass on our thanks and congratulations to your President Eduardo Frei Ruiz-Tagle for his initiative and for what he has done to make the world a safer place.

Yours sincerely,

John V Head, Spokesperson for CALM

John Head
CALM New Zealand
6 John Sims Drive, Wellington 6004, New Zealand
<http://www.protel.co.nz/calm/>

Yesterday, August 8, 1998 Ban Landmines Campaign Nepal (NCBL) organized an “Interaction Program” among the parliamentarians on “ROLE OF PARLIAMENTARIANS ON BAN LANDMINES.”

In that interaction program Hon. Bhim Rawal, Hon. Ganga Chaudhari, Hon. Padma Ratna Tuladhar, Hon. Jeevan Prem Shrestha, Hon. Padma Ratna Tuladhar, Hon. Chin Kaji Shrestha, Hon. Surendra Pandey, Hon. Shanta Manawi, Hon. Shiva Bahadur Deuja, Hon. Mitha Ram Sharma Bajagaim, Hon. Majhi Lal Tharu Thanet and Hon. Rajendra Prasad Pandey gave a speech in favor of banning landmines and they committed to put pressure the government to sign the Ban Treaty and will raise voice in running parliament. The program was chaired by Hon. Sarada Pokharel. Detailed report to follow. This time we are preparing for the delegation to the Prime Minister with MPs and Human Rights Organizations. Thank you.

Sincerely yours

Purna Shova Chitrakar ●

IS IT TERRORISM TO ATTACK TERRORISTS? Noam Chomsky says “YES”

The Toronto Star, Saturday August 22

Author and U.S. political critic Noam Chomsky is among those who contend that some of the main practitioners of terrorism are countries like the United States, which regularly use violence for political motives, to intimidate and terrify. In explaining the American strikes on targets in Afghanistan and Sudan, U.S. President Bill Clinton told Americans he was determined to strike back at terrorists, to send a message that such attacks won't be tolerated and to try to head off further violence. Chomsky says that if the Clinton doctrine on retaliation is to be taken literally, “then all around the world there are countries that have a perfect right to set off bombs in Washington.”

He points to the recent publication in the New York Times of evidence that a Miami-based organization was involved in bombings in Cuba that claimed civilian lives. And he says that by the same token, Lebanon would have the right to set off bombs in Israel, “which is constantly carrying out terrorist attacks north of what it calls its security zone” in southern Lebanon. “Nobody takes this principle seriously. It is a doctrine for the strong, and what it says is that the strong are allowed to attack the weak and defenseless any time they want to,” Chomsky says. “In response to terrorism, further terrorism is not authorized. If Cuba or Nicaragua or Lebanon or whatever were to drop bombs in Washington – although it would be justified under the Clinton doctrine – it wouldn't be justified in any other sense. It's all blatantly illegal; there's nothing more clear than what the U.N. Charter says about this [use of violence].” Chomsky says law-abiding states should refrain from using violence and try to prosecute the perpetrators of terrorist attacks, rather than resorting to the same tactics. “People who carry out terrorist attacks are culpable and should be punished just like any other crime. The way to deal with the perpetrators of such violence is to gather evidence, track them down and seek extradition for trial.” ●

The Editor, Globe & Mail, Toronto

23 August 1998

Re: U.S. Cruise missile response to embassy bombings

Dear Sir:

Were the cruise missile attacks against a factory in Nairobi and military bases in Afghanistan justified?

The bombing of the U.S. Embassies in (Nairobi) and Dar Es Salaam were outrageous acts of terrorism that must be dealt with collectively by the world community. Article 51 of the U.N. Charter allows "the right of self-defense if an armed attack occurs." But the United States must now, under the Charter, immediately report to the Security Council "the measures taken in its self defense" and justify its military responses. The Security Council can then take collective action.

The U.N. remains the best vehicle for world security. All military action taken outside the U.N. Charter is, in the very clearest meaning of the word, outlaw. This applies to the smallest terrorist organization and also to the world's mightiest power.

Yours truly,
David Morgan, National President
Veterans Against Nuclear Arms

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