

NOTTINGHAM

FOCUS



GENERAL  
NOTION  
ELECTE



CONSCRIPTION

"The National Executive of the Campaign have agreed on statement opposing conscription and the extension of British conventional arms. Part of the statement says:

"Not only is conscription advanced in some quarters as a means whereby Britain can quickly raise her armed forces strength to meet what are held to be commitments in Europe, Cyprus, Aden, Kenya and Malaysia, but, more dangerously, it is being argued as an unpleasant but nevertheless necessary alternative to reliance on tactical nuclear weapons in Europe and reliance on an independent strategic nuclear deterrent. The Labour Party is officially committed to upgrade Britain's conventional arm as an alternative defence policy to reliance on nuclear weapons, and the great difficulties that are likely to be experienced in increasing manpower voluntarily are certain to strengthen the pressures for some form of conscription.

The Executive Committee of CND emphatically denies that this is any viable alternative to the Government's present nuclear defence policy. First, it ignores the very important but little publicised fact given by US Defence Secretary McNamara that Western forces' manpower is already well ahead of that of the Soviet Union despite the fact that far fewer forces are necessary if only a defensive posture is envisaged. Secondly, such measures would materially increase tension and engender the feelings of hostility and insecurity which are so basic a cause of the cold war. Thirdly, any argument for reinforcing Britain's contribution to NATO presupposes that the policy of deterrence is the right way to avert war, and that only the means of deterrence need to be revised. We deny this assumption.

For these reasons the Executive Committee of CND will oppose any attempt to reintroduce any kind of conscription, total or selective."



As it is limited to Campaign policy, the Executive has argued against conscription solely on the grounds that an increase in manpower is unnecessary and possibly dangerous, rather than against conscription as such. Of course, the strongest objections to conscription are based on preserving the liberty of the individual and on the futility of making someone fight either against his will or for a cause he does not support. But, even if it is used only to maintain the present manpower levels, conscription will have disadvantages as part of the defence by deterrence policy. However limited the enlistment might be, the necessary legislation and organisation could be used for a rapid expansion in manpower at any time. Creating this machinery can only be provocative to the East and will introduce a fresh danger to the nuclear arms race.

As regards the nature of British commitments abroad, it is worth quoting the Government's Statement on Defence, issued in February. We first read the following:

"We have said that the keystone of Britain's defence policy is the prevention of war. In Europe this means above all, the prevention of nuclear war..... Further afield the ultimate objective is the same but the emphasis is different because the nature of the immediate threat, to ourselves and to our friends, is different. In Asia and in Africa, in all the under-developed regions, there are powerful pressures for change, and it is for us both an interest and a responsibility to help it to take place with a minimum of violence."

(page 8)

But: "The Brunei rebellion, which broke out in December, 1962, was effectively suppressed by February, 1963."

(page 29)



"The 1st Battalion the Gordon Highlanders were sent from Kenya to Swaziland in June, 1963, at the request of the High Commissioner for the South Africa High Commission Territories to meet an internal security situation which developed from labour and political unrest in the Territory." (page 30)

"In April, 1963, a general strike was declared in British Guiana. By July it was feared that disorders, which had been sporadic up to that time, might become widespread, and reinforcements consisting of Headquarters 2nd Infantry Brigade and 2nd Greenjackets were sent by air from the United Kingdom to reinforce the 2nd Battalion Grenadier Guards." (page 30)

Obviously, our concern in these operations has been to protect British interests rather than to allow political changes that might be embarrassing to Britain and the West. But are we justified in simply containing unrest and dissatisfaction by military intervention? Such tactics only delay positive measures and invite violent reactions. Surely we can develop our understanding of political and diplomatic methods to handle these situations with sympathy rather than force.

Cyprus is the nearest our forces have come to playing a police role (though the presence of British bases in Cyprus compromises us here). The British Government has at last recognized that it is better for an international rather than a national force to intervene in such local conflicts. If there is to be an international police force, it must be trained to use a minimum of violence, if any, and must be free of national loyalties. In particular, the ordinary British soldier is trained to deal with 'enemies' and in a way that is quite unsuited to such situations.



Statement on Defence 1964

We promised a review of the Government's White Paper in this issue, but really there is very little in it worth commenting on. Expenditure on defence will increase from £1,838 million to £1,999 million (this would be well over £2000 million if it included the large orders for aircraft and other equipment which were placed just after the paper was published).

Manpower levels are remaining the same but there is a slight swing in the Navy's favour from the RAF which will increase as the V-bombers are phased out and Polaris comes into operation.

Attempting to mention everything, yet glossing over reasons and issues, the writers give the impression of a Headmaster's Report on Speech Day; that the Service chiefs are justifying the retention of weapons and attitudes just because they have always been and that is the way they have done things before, is hardly hidden.

Sometimes the talking down becomes plain space-wasting;

" Like all aircraft carriers she is a self-contained mobile air base with her own runway, hangar and maintenance space, navigational aids, ground control, ( ? ) radar and so on."

Other comments will be found in the article on conscription.



In the first edition of Nottingham Focus we published some of the opinions of the prospective parliamentary candidates in three local constituencies, Nottingham West, Carlton and Nottingham South, as they were stated in answers to a questionnaire on unilateral nuclear disarmament. In this edition we complete the picture by covering Nottingham Central, Nottingham North and Rushcliffe in the same way.

We hope to comment on these opinions in the next Nottingham Focus.

---

NOTTINGHAM CENTRAL - including Sherwood and Basford

1959 result electorate 52,491

Cordeaux C. 24,004

Winterbottom Lab. 21,869

Majority 2,135

Opinions of the prospective candidates.

Lt.Col.J.K.Cordeaux MP , (Conservative)

"I could have given an unqualified affirmative to this question ( on support of Article 103 of the UN Charter) until fairly recently, but am now becoming increasingly worried by the fact that rising dictatotorships in various parts of the world are becoming able to outvote the free and democratic peoples." Britain should have and "must " afford an independent nuclear force. She should use nuclear weapons independently " in retaliation; after an attack on this country. In other words, she must deter potential aggressors with the knowledge that she will do so."

He supports British membership of NATO and other nuclear alliances, thinks the idea of nuclear-free zones is "Well worth discussion", but does not consider that Britain could take an effective initiative in world affairs without nuclear weapons.

Jack Dunnett, (Labour) supports Labour Party policy.



RUSHCLIFFE

1959 result

electorate 58,971

Redmayne C. 27,392

Sandelson Lab. 22,952

Majority 4,440

Opinions of the prospective candidates.

Rt. Hon. Martin Redmayne, MP, (Conservative)

"The British deterrent is the only sure defence against nuclear blackmail.....strengthens Britain's voice in world councils on peace and disarmament.....important contribution to the Western Alliance.....The purpose of the nuclear deterrent is to deter...it is necessary for a potential aggressor to believe that it (the strategy of deterrence) is backed by the determination to use nuclear weapons if necessary in the last resort. ....The Government must retain the right to use the British nuclear forces independently for whatever purpose they may decide.....there was a parallel in President Kennedy's independent and publicly announced decision to use the American nuclear deterrent if Russian missiles were launched from Cuba against the United States.....no nation can find salvation for itself or others in neutrality".

Colin Beech, (Liberal)

supports Article 103 of the UN Charter in principle, "but in its present state U.N.O. is not able to police the world adequately, it is therefore on occasions necessary to take independent action, however regrettably, in order to maintain peace." Britain should not have an independent nuclear force. She should never use nuclear weapons independently. "Within the NATO alliance, in present conditions" she should allow foreign nuclear bases on her territory. He supports the idea of a multi-lateral force "if this force is viable.....(it) is a sop to member countries. Far better to leave nuclear power under the control of a Supra National Committee". He says that a nuclear-free Britain could take an effective initiative in world affairs. "Our position depends on our past contributions to the cause of peace and freedom and not to being an intimidator."

A.C. Latham, (Labour)

has not yet replied to the questionnaire.



## NOTTINGHAM NORTH

1959 result

electorate 59,638

Whitlock Lab.	24,005
Blake C.	18,952
Thomas Lib.	6,581
Peck Comm.	1,331
Majority	5,053

Opinions of the prospective candidates.

William Whitlock MP, (Labour)

sent documents outlining Labour Party policy on defence, but did not answer the questionnaire.

Peter Fry (Conservative)

supports the Charter of the UN as a whole, but still feels "that the world is not yet ready to accept the sovereignty of an international body of this kind." He says that Britain should have an independent nuclear force, consisting of Polaris submarines. "She can afford it at least as well as increased conventional forces - which pre-supposes the return of conscription.....If we are ever forced to the position when we might be nuclear blackmailed without US or NATO support this dreadful possibility (of Britain using nuclear weapons independently) is conceivable". He can see no "practical option" for not supporting British membership of NATO and other nuclear alliances as he is "not a pacifist". Britain should help create a multilateral nuclear force, unless a nuclear-free zone in Europe is "a reality in acceptable terms", and this would depend on "what exact 'zone' is proposed".

John Peck (Communist)

"The fullest use of the United Nations is the way to settle disputes. A good example is the Cyprus problem at the moment.....Britain should have no nuclear force.....it is a fiction to call it 'independent' ..... it is a continuing drain on Britain's hard-pressed economy.....it encourages other nations to try to acquire nuclear weapons." He opposes British membership of NATO, saying it is "against the interests of the British people.....a military



alliance outside the framework of the United Nations Charter." The multilateral force is a "thin disguise to enable West Germany to begin to acquire control of nuclear weapons..... the creation of nuclear-free zones is one of the first steps that can be taken towards the goal of multilateral nuclear disarmament.....it is possible, nuclear free, to exercise tremendous influence. If Britain were to join this bloc (neutral nations) it would add enormously to its strength and would enable Britain to take initiatives for peace."

---

STOP PRESS.

---

RUSHCLIFFE LABOUR CANDIDATE'S REPLY RECEIVED TODAY, 16.3.64.

Arthur Latham (Labour)

"I am a CND supporter and could be called "unilateralist". Britain giving up the Bomb...the first step towards getting rid of all nuclear weapons..... All we have is a status symbol on lease, with an American General's finger on the button..... I have no enthusiasm for NATO, SEATO and the like, and I am against any foreign troops in any country. If, however, I am asked to choose between bases remaining in Britain and being removed to West Germany, I am in no doubt as to my answer. American nuclear missiles in Germany would be an even greater provocation than the Russian ones in Cuba.....I am quite convinced that the longer that nuclear weapons remain in the armouries of the world the greater the risk they will be used, and I am convinced too of the certainty of nuclear annihilation unless some new initiative is offered."

\*\*\*\*\*

Remember, for a successful Election Campaign we need cash and help from supporters. Contributions should be sent to: Leslie Hale, 1 Dunster Road, West Bridgford, Nottingham. If you can give any other help, please contact: Peter Davies, 2 Hope Drive, The Park, Nottingham.

\*\*\*\*\*

Published by:  
Peter Davies, 2 Park Drive, The Park, Nottingham,  
for Nottingham Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, and the  
Nottingham University Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament.