

material is simply irresponsible. For instance in Bulgaria at the moment engineers and scientists involved in building a nuclear power station say the government are risking a Chernobyl type catastrophe because they are trying to get the power station working sooner than it would be safe to do. They are doing this for straight commercial reasons, to combat the price of oil.

Another instance of the inappropriateness of commercial criteria in dealing with this material is the sinking of the Komsomolets, the soviet submarine which went down with all hands after fire broke out in the engine room. The enquiry blamed the use of commercially produced equipment in the engine room rather than specially produced high grade equipment.

A DANGER TO SECURITY

The US government recently approved a measure to allow the CIA to establish commercial 'front' companies to help their operations abroad. It's probable the CIA have been doing this for some time. It is also probable that other governments have been doing the same thing. This creates the hypothetical possibility of this system being used to gain information on how to operate the production of nuclear weapons, either by other

nuclear states or more importantly, by states who would want to find out how to produce them.

Such information could become a saleable item and there would be considerably less control over the people with that knowledge under the GO/CO systems than there was while the management was run by the civil service. For instance in the past managers etc from Britain's nuclear power programme have moved to South Africa and provided a considerable boost to that countries nuclear weapons programme.

THE DANGERS ARE PROVEN

Making the management of nuclear material a commercial concern is a very dangerous step indeed. It could be argued that this system delayed the production of weapons in the US and



Medium Atomic Demolition Munition (MADM)

One of Aldermasten's current products.

made them more expensive and that that would be a good thing. But the dangers of cost cutting short cuts making accidents a possibility and of other governments gaining the ability to produce nuclear weapons on a large scale. This sort of thing has happened in the past with the structures this government are setting up at Aldermasten. Its frankly irresponsible of the government to press this through

TRADE UNION AFFILIATION FORM

Fees are for branches with up to 300 members and for Trades Councils £10, branches with between 300 and 1,000 members £15, 1,000 to 5,000 members £40, between 5,000 and 10,000 members £60. For over 10,000 enquire at the office
The Branch
wishes to affiliate to CND. We enclose a cheque for £..... Payable to CND

Amount £.....
BLOCK LETTERS PLEASE
Name _____
Address _____
Postcode _____

BULK ORDERS FOR TUCND NEWS

Why not take a bulk order of TUCND News for distribution at your branch? The annual subscription rates, including postage, are given below. TUCND News, published six times a year, is an invaluable tool for spreading information about the peace movement and disarmament issues amongst trade unionists.
It costs for six issues and for
10 copies: £3:90 - 20 Copies: £7:50 - 50 Copies: £19:50 - 100 Copies: £38 -
200 Copies: £61 - 500 Copies: £142 - 1,000 Copies: £272
Please make cheques payable to TUCND.

Amount £.....
BLOCK LETTERS PLEASE
Name _____
Address _____
Postcode _____

INDIVIDUAL MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION FORM FOR CND

Household membership £15, Waged £10, Unwaged £3,
Youth (21 or under) £3. Payable to CND.

Amount £.....
BLOCK LETTERS PLEASE
Name _____
Address _____
Postcode _____

Please return this form to TUCND's National office

TUCND



NOVEMBER/DECEMBER 1990

CND CAMPAIGNING AGAINST A WAR IN THE GULF

There are a number of options for the various parties in the conflict in the Middle East. It is still very likely that a war will break out in the Middle East with a number of politicians apparently doing what they can to make one happen.

Margaret Thatcher and Bush have likened Saddam Hussein to Hitler and have made demands that he be placed on trial for war crimes. Much of the rest of the world are viewing the situation with a great deal of caution.

The United States is continuing the build up of troops and equipment in the area. Hospitals in Britain are being asked to prepare for large scale casualties from the war and troops being posted to the Middle East are being advised to take out substantial insurance policies in case they get killed out there. The Iraq's on the other hand are consolidating their defensive positions. If the US is building up forces in this way to put pressure on Iraq it is possible that it could go tragically wrong for them. Bush could get himself into a position where he had no option but to begin a war with Iraq.

It is possible, on the other hand, that the situation is resolved with Iraq withdrawing and a pro-Iraq government being elected in Kuwait and the US retaining forces in

● Continued page 1



CND's leaflet on the gulf crisis

Saudi Arabia for the foreseeable future. Both the Hussein and the US would have gained a great deal from such a solution. The losers would of course be the people of the Middle East. There would be no resolution of the situation in the Lebanon, no resolution of the Palestinian question, no resolution of the crisis created by Israel's occupation of its neighbours territory and of course no real harm done to Hussein.

Even if there isn't a war the situation for ordinary people in that part of the world remains the same, they would still be subjected to the rule of gruesome dictators such as Hussein or the Saudi royal family. For instance the number of people put to death annually in Saudi Arabia has doubled since 1989 to somewhere in the region of 300. These are public executions, beheading in the case of men and stoning in the case of women.

CND are campaigning for the resolution of this situation through sanctions under the aegis of United Nations. There is no need what-so-ever to sink ships or to shoot down aircraft in order to impose these sanctions. Modern technology means that any aircraft or ship can have its route monitored and the passengers or cargo intercepted at the destination port. The international financial system is such that the finances operated by the companies trading in hard currency can be monitored through the world banking system. There are mechanisms which could therefore impose such sanctions without the need for troops to invade or to intercept traffic in and out of Iraq. Both the opposition forces in Iraq and the peace movements in Britain and France are calling for sanctions to be operated in this way and controlled by the United Nations.

Our government have had a hand in creating an extremely dangerous and unstable situation. If a war does start the most conservative estimate of American dead alone would be 20,000. If the price of crude oil is increased because of such a war then that figure would be nothing compared to the number of people who would starve in the Third World because of the economic damage their countries would suffer.

If you would like further information on CND's campaigning activity against this potential war, contact the national office.



A Phnom Penh primary school

Photo by Pete Brabban / Oxfam

CAMBODIA - CAUGHT BETWEEN HOPE AND DESPAIR

The turbulent and tragic history of Cambodia lends itself to the extremes of emotion. From the hope and optimism of post colonial independence to the deep, dark despair and horror of Pol Pot's rule to the bitter joy of liberation by the Vietnamese and the imposed isolation of the last ten years. With such a history it is hardly surprising that when hope is offered to the Cambodians it usually comes already flawed, sometimes fatally flawed.

When I visited Cambodia in 1988 I entered a country in a vacuum. Since 1979, when the Vietnamese armies had rescued Cambodia from the appalling and inhuman rule of Pol Pot the country had been held in isolation by the world community. Its crime was not to have chosen their rescuers carefully enough. This imposed isolation denied Cambodia access to international circles, indeed its seat in the UN was left in the hands of the Khmer Rouge. It also denied the country and

its people the type of help and aid that any country would receive after such an appalling human disaster. What little help that arrived from Eastern Bloc and the Non Governmental Organisations (NGO's) such as Oxfam was received with gratitude and used with an impressive energy. As I travelled through the country my admiration for the Cambodians grew by leaps and bounds as I witnessed the supreme efforts they were making to create some sort of future and normality to their lives. But behind all his was the ever present fear of a return of to the "Killing fields" of Pol Pot's monstrous rule. Time and again I listened with horror to the stories told by ordinary people of their experiences at the hands of the Khmer Rouge. Such was the scale of suffering that statements like "we were lucky only two or three members of my family died" came as something of a relief to me. But I was never able to answer fully one of the most common questions put to me; "why has Pol Pot never been punished for what he was responsible for, and why does the world allow the Khmer Rouge to continue to attack us and to threaten our future". To a degree I share this incomprehension at the favourable treatment received by the Khmer Rouge since they were ousted. The words "strategic interests" sound hollow and obscene when faced with the mass graves of the victims of the Khmer Rouge or in the torture rooms of Toul Sleng Prison. And even now when the

international community through the UN have deemed to break the deadlock on Cambodia the scheme they have come up with is severely flawed carrying within it the seeds of its own failure.

The "framework proposals" put forward by the "permanent five" of the UN Security Council are intended to offer an avenue by which the Government of Cambodia and the three opposition factions can work out a "comprehensive settlement". Therein lies the first flaw a "comprehensive settlement" means that nothing is settled until everything is settled. This is supposed to emerge from a consensus of all the parties thereby including the power of veto, a device the Khmer Rouge have found very useful in stalling the peace talks. The scheme also proposes an interim government, a supreme National Council composed of representatives of all four groupings, including Pol Pot and the Khmer Rouge. This is like inviting the Nazis to play a role in governing post war Germany. The track record of genocide and organised terror by the Khmer Rouge counts for little in this pursuit of peace and are referred to in official circles as "the policies and practices of a recent government".

But the most serious flaw in these recent proposals is the absence of any call for a cease-fire in the fighting or an attempt to stop the flow of arms to the combatants. Recent reports tell of how the Khmer Rouge have received tanks in preparation for the dry season campaign. This would mark a dramatic change to the tactics being used by the Khmer Rouge, who up until now have relied on a campaign of mine laying and hit and run attacks. The war they are waging is by no means a clean one. The majority of

mines laid are of the anti personnel variety intended to maim the victim. So successful have they been, perhaps with the help of the SAS, that every month for the past year at least one thousand Cambodians, mostly civilians have needed amputations. The success of their campaign can be judged not only by these casualties but also in the 150,000 people displaced by the fighting. The warning signals have also gone out that next years harvest will be a poor one because the peasants are afraid to work their fields because of the fear of mines.

It is not in the Khmer Rouge's interest that peace comes quickly they are gaining confidence every day that they can win this war. Their strategy appears to be one of drawing out the negotiations as long as possible while stepping up the military offensive. A settlement offers them temporary partial power while success in the war offers them total power.

Events within the country also give them hope for success as Cambodia plunges ever deeper into economic crisis. Having had a trade and aid embargo imposed on them by the UN in 1979 they have been reliant for government income on aid from the Soviet Union and Eastern Bloc countries. With the recent events in Eastern Europe these have either disappeared or have been reduced considerably. This crisis in turn has brought to the surface all the worst aspects of an un-



One of the 1,000 people a month who lose a limb from anti-personnel mines.

Photo by Pete Brabban / Oxfam

derdeveloped economy, widespread corruption, huge disparities in wealth and a growing divide between the cities and the countryside. The very same conditions the Khmer Rouge were able to use when snatching power in 1975.

Once again the Cambodian people find that their future is being decided elsewhere by schemes hatched on the other side of the globe and which take little account of their dignity, their fears and their aspirations. Schemes which take account of everyone else's interests and little of their own. Schemes which are badly flawed and offer the potential for disaster.

To prevent such a disaster it is up to all of us to call on our leaders to demand a cease-fire, to stem the flow of arms and to create the type of agreement that will never allow the Khmer Rouge to take power in that tragic country ever again.

If you want to play a part in creating a real peace in Cambodia I suggest that you contact Oxfam who have been working in and campaigning for Cambodia for the past eleven years. Do it now before you forget all about Cambodia until the disaster appears on your television screens.

By Peter Braban, who works in the North of England for Oxfam.

Other useful contacts are The Friends of Cambodia and the British Vietnam Association both of which are campaigning for government pressure for a cease fire, for developmental aid to be made available to Cambodia immediately and against the diplomatic and military assistance this government has been giving the Khmer Rouge.



Photo by Pete Brabban / Oxfam

The building on the right was known as a reeducation centre. People were killed there.

MORTIMER'S COLUMN

BRITAIN NEEDS ARMS CUTS

By a large majority the 1990 Labour Party conference called for a substantial cut in Britain's military spending. If a card vote had been taken the resolution would probably have received at least a two-thirds majority. Without doubt this decision repre-



John Edmunds speaking against an emergency motion on the Gulf

sents the overwhelming view of the Labour movement.

Nevertheless, Labour's leadership quickly made it clear that it did not intend to accept for inclusion in Labour's programme the call for a substantial cut in Britain's military spending. This was an unwise, indeed foolish, decision by Labour's leadership.

It was unwise, first, because it does not reflect the reality of current world situation. Britain is spending some £21 billion a year for military purposes. Where and who is the enemy to justify such an enormous sum?

Certainly, it cannot be the Soviet Union and the countries of the Warsaw Pact. In 1990 Gorbachev was given the Nobel Peace Prize for his consistent and imaginative initiatives for peace and arms reductions.

The Soviet Union, like Britain, need

peace and disarmament to help solve its economic problems. The Warsaw Pact no longer exists as a military force and the whole world knows it.

The rejection by the Labour leadership of the conference decision on military cuts is also unwise because it is likely to leave the Party politically isolated, trailing behind even the Conservative Party. The recent conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, in which the USA, Britain and the Soviet Union participated, agreed on significant measures for disarmament. Is Labour to cling to guns, bombs, tanks and nuclear weapons when the trend, including Britain's Conservative government, is to reduce the military potential?

Thirdly, the huge resources at present devoted to arms by Britain - well above the European NATO average - are needed for peaceful purposes. To promise to improve health care, education, housing, pensions and industrial investment without a commitment to reduce military spending is an act of public deception unworthy of the labour movement. It is not the movement which can be faulted; it is its leadership's rejection of wishes of the movement.

WHAT GOES UP.....

Labour Party conference in 1990 took the important step of reaffirming the party's commitment to reducing military spending to the Western European average. Given the changes that had taken place in the previous twelve months, most notably the virtual collapse of the Warsaw Pact, few were surprised that this resolution was successful. The question which the Labour Movement now needs to discuss seriously is how to develop related policies which will inspire confidence, protect jobs, and help to build on the already considerable public support for such an objective.


A new pamphlet from Labour Action for Peace puts forward, in an accessible way, the sort of options which face an incoming Labour Government in 1991 or 1992. It takes the formulation in the predecessor of the resolution passed at the last conference (Composite 47, passed in 1989 by a majority of 69%) and considers how this might translate into military budget levels.

While the present European average for military spending is around 3% this figure is itself likely to decline substantially in the coming years. In the light of this fact, three options for British military spending to the end of the century are illustrated in the pamphlet.

The first takes British military spending down to the 3% level of the existing European average, which corresponds to a budget level of £18 billion and a total saving over 9 years of £14 billion (assuming a 'straight-line' decrease). This would take us back to a similar level of spending as the 1979 Budget. The second option, 2% of GDP by 2,000, is what has been described as 'the historic British peacetime level' and could produce a cumulative saving of three times as much. The most drastic cut illustrated, down to 1% of GDP, could produce cumulative savings of £68 billion.

As well as giving specific cost comparisons between current weapons-programmes and notional civilian alternatives, the pamphlet also argues that to leave the economic consequences of disarmament to market forces would bring disaster both for military-supported jobs and for the wider economy. This is echoed in the foreword by Bill Morris. Following from this, Bruce Kent argues in a

The UK Military Budget in Constant 1990/1 Figures



postscript for the creation of a Labour Party inspired arms conversion agency even while the Party is in opposition, in order to ensure that the jobs and communities can be protected as soon as possible.

'Labour and Military Spending - Achieving the Peace Dividend' by Frank Allaun and Paul Quigley, with contributions from Bill Morris and Bruce Kent, available from Labour Action for Peace, 37 Hollingworth Rd, Orpington, Kent BR5 1AQ.

The secretary of Labour Action for Peace, Ron Huzzard, was the winner of the 1990 Frank Cousins/T&GWU Peace Award.

This should not end the struggle. It will continue and so it should. Trade Unionists and the Labour Party members must not permit their disillusionment with the leadership's attitude to the conference decision on arms cuts to be converted into withdrawal and inactivity.

The whole world needs peace and disarmament. There is no justification for Britain's huge military spending. It should be cut and the resources devoted to constructive peaceful purposes. A planned arms conversion programme is an essential priority.

For many years after the Second World War Japan and Germany spent very little on arms. The economic result is now there for all to see. Britain, under both Labour and Conservative governments, sought military strength and produced economic weakness. It is time to change course.

Jim Mortimer, Nov 1990.

THE TUC, THE LABOUR PARTY AND DEFENCE SPENDING

Both the TUC and the Labour Party passed motions this year condemning the current levels of arms spending and calling for resources to be channelled into the regeneration of our civilian manufacturing economy. That is essentially the same position which Trade Union CND have been advocating for a number of years. However the Labour Party leadership have made it clear that they do not feel bound by the conference decision and may well campaign on a policy which is not in line with that policy.

This creates two problems. One is the distancing of the Labour Party from the trade union movement and the other is that there is a pressing need for the party to recognise the realities of the problems facing our manufacturing industry.

Britain is in a very serious fix. A major part of our industry is concentrated on producing weapons to the extent that in some areas we have become dependent on the export of these weapons. But the export market for these weapons is evaporating. Arms sales abroad by France, for in-



Bruce Kent and Martin O'Neil MP at the Tribune fringe meeting at the Labour Party conference

stance, have dropped by 50% in the last six months.

Britain and France are being hit by the growing sale of arms from third world countries. Brazil, Pakistan, China, South Africa, Korea, Japan and possibly some Eastern European countries now produce Main Battle Tanks and sell them on the open market in competition with the traditional producers such as Britain and France. There is a flood of second hand equipment now available from the USA. That same French government report said of the Middle Eastern market that Britain and France would be 'reduced to picking up the crumbs our American allies had not bothered to collect'.

The other factor is the decline in scope for the production of weapons. Britain's defence budget will rise this year but it will be reduced to something like 3.4% of our GDP in the next few years. The Independent on the 11th of November, carried an article saying Conservative treasury ministers want to reduce defence to the level of our European NATO partners in the space of five years. That is surprisingly

close to the figures TUCND and the left of the Labour Party have been campaigning for a number of years.

So there is a logic, independent of the public statements made on defence spending, which lead to considerable reductions in our defence spending. The dangerous thing about allowing the conservatives to reduce spending in this way is that they are unlikely to plough this money into the economy in a way which would be constructive. If savings are simply channelled into poll tax cuts we will see rising unemployment and falling GDP.

The policy passed at the Labour Party conference has a rationale which is unavoidable. The motions passed this year argue for channelling money in the initial stages into our manufacturing base. If that happens we will see an increase in the GDP, reduce unemployment and decrease the balance of trade deficit which in turn could reduce the inflationary spiral our economy has been locked into for a number of years. There is no way round this for the Labour Party. It is the policy it will have to adopt if it gets into power.



Neil Kinnock addressing the TUC

CFE TREATY AGREED - A MAJOR STEP FOR DISARMAMENT

The Conventional Forces in Europe treaty was signed by 34 nations in Paris on the 19th of November. It means substantial military cutbacks for all of the military powers in Europe and for the US.

The treaty limits the amount of military equipment and the number of military personnel each of the alliances can keep in the four zones specified by the treaty. Limits are placed on the overall numbers of different types of equipment that each of

the alliances can keep and also limits placed on the concentrations of this equipment in the particular zones. The intention is to make it almost impossible, without months of careful and obvious preparation, for any of the partners in the alliances to engage in military action against another.

The limits have been set at 20,000 tanks, 30,000 armoured vehicles, 20,000 artillery pieces, 6,800 fighter aircraft and 2,000 what is termed attack helicopters for each of the two military alliances. In addition each alliance has agreed to station no more than 195,000 troops in the central zone which covers Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Germany, and the Benelux countries.


The 34 nations signing the treaty were the participants at the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE). This conference will now be established as a permanent body with a centre in Vienna to monitor the military situation in Europe and to work out mechanisms to prevent conflict from developing. There will also be an office in Warsaw

to monitor elections in Europe and a permanent staff to run the CSCE sited in Prague.

Included in the CFE treaty is a recognition that the two alliances no longer regard themselves as enemies.

Not only does the treaty mean we shall be scrapping large amounts of equipment but it also has massive, fundamental implications for Britain's military and foreign policy and for our industry. For instance in NATO alone there are five models for the new generation of Main Battle Tank (MBT's) of which Britain's Challenger 2 is one. With a limit of 20,000 which means a probable market of about 7,000 for the new ones the market wont stand 5 new models. The same is true of all the major weapons systems.

So the treaty means a confrontation is no longer possible between the two alliances and the two sides will no longer regard themselves as enemies. It has established negotiating procedures to deal with security in Europe and set up offices to service them. The implications of this treaty can not be understated.



Pete Haggar (T&GWU) speaking against a constitutional amendment at this years CND Conference

the campaign this year. The new General Secretary, who was appointed before the national conference, is Garry Lefly. Garry will be leaving a career as a teacher to take up the position in January. The new Chair of CND, elected at the conference, is Margery Thompson, who was CND's parliamentary worker for a number of years and who now

works for the RCN as a parliamentary lobbyist.

The incoming vice chairs are Bob Cole who is a joiner and is also the general secretary of CND in Wales, Mary Brennan who is a Doctor from Birmingham and is involved in Christian CND, Dr Adrienne Morgan who is a research scientist living in Slough and who is involved with Trade Union CND and Dave Durham who, as the name suggests, lives in Durham and has been involved in grass roots type campaigning for a number of years. The treasurer is Frank Parker, a polytechnic lecturer, who was re-elected unopposed.

The conference voted on a range of motions and had a ballot at the end of

the conference giving priority to a number of these. The issue which was given the highest priority in the coming year was campaigning over the gulf. The second priority was given to activity around Trident this year.

The trade union presence at this years national conference was smaller than on previous years as was the conference overall. Trade Unions, however, had a higher profile than in previous years and had a significant effect on a number of issues that were debated. TUCND were responsible for moving two motions, one on arms conversion and the other, an emergency motion, on the situation in Cambodia. Although they were allocated a low priority by the conference they will still be pursued by TUCND with vigour. Most people believe that arms conversion is an important issue but that it is best pursued by Trade Union CND.

One of the constitutional amendments was opposed by a number of delegates from unions. The proposal to have voting for CND's national council and officers through a postal ballot was heavily defeated.

A full report of the motions, the election results and the results of the priority ballot is available from TUCND at the national office.

TRADE UNIONS AT CND NATIONAL CONFERENCE

Both Bruce Kent and CND's General Secretary, Meg Berresford, retired from their positions with

UNIONS UNITE TO PRODUCE CONVERSION DOCUMENT

Three unions the IPMS, T&GWU and MSF have produced 20,000 copies of a joint report on arms conversion in the form of a pamphlet. In what is a scrupulously researched, well presented and easy to read document the three outline what part they feel arms conversion can play in an industrial strategy designed to regenerate Britain's manufacturing economy. Conversion of the arms industry could make it, the document argues, one of the basic components of such a regeneration for our manufacturing economy.

The document costs £5 and is available from any of the three unions who produced it via their national or regional offices. To get it from the T&GWU write to the unions national office which is Transport House, Smith Square, London SW1P 1JB.



Mr Brett (IMPS), Mr Morris (T&GWU) and Mr Gill (MSF) at the launch of the pamphlet at the Labour Party

PRIVATISATION OF THE MANAGEMENT OF ALDERMASTEN

In the Queens speech this year the government announced that they would be employing contractors to run the Atomic Weapons Establishments including that at Aldermasten. The unions involved at Aldermasten have produced a pamphlet which convincingly demonstrates their reasons for not wanting to see this happen. TUCND have other reasons for not wanting this to happen.

The proposal is to mirror the US establishment in such places which is known as the Government Owned / Contractor Operated system. As the name suggests contractors would run the management of the AWE's.

One reason put forward for doing this is that Aldermasten is behind in the schedule for the production of warheads for Trident. The unions argue that one of the reasons this has come about is that there were simply not enough civil servants in there to police the private contractors building the new plant for Trident. The new regime has meant some 20 extra managers being employed to run Aldermasten. Also they not only appear to know what they are doing but are apparently interested in seeing other, non military, work carried out there. The unions are not therefore opposed in principle to the arrangements but are worried about the way that this will affect the rights and conditions of the workforce for whom it will have far reaching implications in terms of pension rights etc.

A DANGER TO SAFETY

In the US when the person currently in charge of nuclear weapon production, Admiral Watkins, took office he described the management of their plants under the GO/CO system as being inept. He also said they had systematically ignored safety rule in the management of what are extremely dangerous processes and materials. For instance, the Savannah River plant in South Carolina has become synonymous with pollution and complacency over the damage the management were causing to the surrounding countryside. He was also concerned at their inability to meet their quota in the production of warheads. So the system has proved to be capable of producing just as great a mess as the one it is reputedly being set up to resolve in Aldermasten.

Added to this the application of commercial criteria to any aspect of the process when dealing with materials as potent and as dangerous as nuclear