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BAE case in the Lords

The Government’s appeal against the High Court decision that it was unlawful to stop the Serious Fraud Office (SFO) investigation into BAE Systems’ Al Yamamah arms deals with Saudi Arabia was heard in the House of Lords on 7th and 8th July. Ann Feltham reports.

Buried
The five senior Judges are technically a committee of the Lords so the hearing took place in a Lords’ Committee room, dominated by a huge painting of the burial of King Harold. Only the tops of the heads of the Judges (without wigs) were visible from most of the public seats as the banks of case documents formed a wall across the room. Between the Judges and the rest of us sat eleven bewigged barristers – CAAT and The Corner House had four (David Pannick QC, Philippe Sands QC, Dinah Rose QC and Ben Jaffey) and the Government five, whilst ‘interested party’ BAE, and ‘intervener’ Justice, a human rights and law reform organisation, had one apiece. All these barristers were backed by teams of solicitors.

Even though the Lords’ authorities had added an extra bench, this retinue left little space in the room. We all crammed in – CAAT and Corner House people; the Guardian’s Rob Evans, who had done so much to expose the BAE corruption allegations, was there along with journalists from other papers, the BBC and specialist legal magazines; representatives from the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, concerned that its 1997 Anti-Bribery Convention will be rendered meaningless if the Government is allowed to stop corruption inquiries as in this case, took copious notes; Peter Gardiner, the former BAE travel agent who gave evidence to the SFO looked on; and many others were present.

The arguments
The Government’s lead barrister, Jonathan Sumption QC, went first. He argued that the Director of the SFO, as an independent prosecutor, had a wide discretion as to which cases he investigated or prosecuted, he just had to act ‘reasonably’ in making his decisions. He also produced a witness statement from the Foreign Office in an attempt to show that, in contrast to what Lord Justice Moses had said in the High Court, the attention of Saudi Arabian authorities had been drawn to the separation of powers between the Government and the legal authorities in the UK.

David Pannick challenged this. He said the rule of law had to prevail and that this demanded that the SFO did not give into threats by Saudi Arabia to withdraw cooperation on anti-terrorism until all other options had been exhausted and, even then, only if it was strictly necessary. The Government, he said, did not meet this test, as all bar one of the approaches to Saudi Arabia listed in the Foreign Office statement had been made before the threats were issued and all were fairly casual mentions in the course of other meetings. Additionally, the UK did not seem to have reminded Saudi Arabia of its anti-terrorism commitments.

With regards to the OECD Convention, Dinah Rose argued that this was a relevant consideration because the SFO Director said his decision was made in accordance with it – the question was whether ‘national security’ was an implied exemption or not and she said not – whilst the Government said it was up to the OECD to decide on this issue.

No decision as yet
There was very little intervention by the Judges as the barristers made their submissions. This, we were told, is unusual. Each of five Judges now considers the submissions, looks up the precedents and writes his or her own speech – the verdict is the majority view. The result will be announced, most likely in October, when the Judges’ committee reports to the full House of Lords.
US subpoenas for BAE staff

In May, Alan Garwood, former head of D ESO and now BAE Systems’ business development director, was served with a subpoena by officials from the US Department of Justice (DoJ). US authorities are investigating allegations of corruption in relation to the al-Yamamah arms deal with Saudi Arabia (the case that the UK government dropped). Should the DoJ find that bribery took place, it may ban BAE Systems from bidding for contracts from the US government. More than half of the company’s business is currently based in the US.

BAE chief executive Mike Turner was issued with a similar subpoena when changing planes in the US and may be forced to appear before a US grand jury if BAE Systems continues to limit its co-operation with the DoJ over the investigation.

FINANCIAL TIMES, 5/6/08; TIMES, 21/5/08

New BAE chief exec

Ian King has been promoted from chief operating officer at BAE Systems to succeed Mike Turner as chief executive of the company. He will start the new role in September and has pledged to implement in full recommendations made by Lord Woolf in his report on the company’s ethical standards.

King is one of several BAE executives who were recently issued with subpoenas by the US Department of Justice.

Mike Turner will be resuming his association with Babcock International, the support services group, taking over as chair in November.

INDEPENDENT, 28/6/08; DAILY TELEGRAPH, 28/6/08 AND 29/5/08

Mercenaries

A new security agreement currently under negotiation in Iraq may mean that foreign contractors no longer have immunity from Iraqi law. Iraqi foreign minister Hoshyar Zebari said that if there was another incident like the one in which Blackwater mercenaries killed civilians, then those involved would be arrested and punished.

INDEPENDENT, 18/6/08

Government-industry links

More than 30 members of the House of Lords have been found to employ staff who also work for lobbyists, companies or business trade groups. Robin Ashby, employed as a research assistant by Baroness Harris of Richmond, had his security pass removed by his employer as his pass may not have been used exclusively for parliamentary work. He also worked as an arms trade lobbyist. Some MPs claim that lax House of Lords rules lead to easier access of lobbyists to peers.

INDEPENDENT, 27/6/08

Finmeccanica in US market

Italian military group Finmeccanica has bought DRS Technologies, a leading supplier to the US military market, hailing it as a ‘strategic’ deal that allows it to market US products around the world. Finmeccanica will maintain DRS’s own management and headquarters.

FINANCIAL TIMES, 14/5/08

US acquisitions

UK companies Chemring and Ultra Electronics are pushing ahead with their strategy of growth in the US military market, with Chemring acquiring Scot Inc and Ultra acquiring Harris Acoustic Products and Magneto Inductive Systems Ltd (MISL).

The total value of European acquisitions in the US market soared from $2.6bn to $8.5bn between 2006 and 2007.

JANE’S DEFENCE WEEKLY, 4/6/08
QinetiQ

QinetiQ has also seen growth in the US, with its US subsidiary increasing its revenues to over $1bn. The company’s recent orders in the US include a $400 million contract for Talon robots and replacement parts for the US military in Iraq and Afghanistan. Chief executive Graham Love has said he expects the US business to grow sales at ‘double-digit’ rates this year.

JANE’S DEFENCE WEEKLY, 4/6/08; DEFENSE NEWS, 9/6/08, DAILY TELEGRAPH, 29/5/08

US resignation speculation

The forced resignation of the top two officials in the US Air Force has prompted speculation that key projects, such as a joint project between Rolls-Royce and General Electric to produce aircraft engines, could be scrapped. The US Secretary of Defense asked for the two resignations after a series of blunders.

TIMES, 16/6/08

Saudis in Lincolnshire

As part of Project Salam, pilots from Saudi Arabia have begun training on the Eurofighter Typhoon at RAF Coningsby in Lincolnshire. The first of the 72 aircraft ordered by the Saudis will be delivered next year.

JANE’S DEFENCE WEEKLY, 28/5/08

Israel

Israeli firms signed a record $5.6bn in new arms deals in 2007, with the US as its largest market, and India its second largest.

DEFENSE NEWS, 26/5/08

Aker concerns

In the wake of European Union approval of a South Korean takeover of Norway’s Aker shipyard, Italy and France have raised concerns over potential leaking of vital ship-building technology and know-how from the continent. Officials have discussed creating a ‘shipbuilding Airbus’ and merging Aker with a state-owned Italian company in order to keep Aker European.

DEFENSE NEWS, 14/5/08

Libya

Libya has signed a deal with the UK arm of General Dynamics to equip Libya's Elite Brigade with a communications and data system and associated support. This is the UK’s first major military deal with Libya since an arms embargo was lifted in 2004.

DEFENSE NEWS, 12/5/08

JSF

A coalition of US African American and Latino groups have written to US presidential candidates urging them to end the Joint Strike Fighter programme and spend the approximately one trillion dollars involved on domestic programmes instead.

DEFENSE NEWS, 2/6/08

Contractor charged in Iraq

A US military court has convicted a civilian contractor who was operating in Iraq. The contract interpreter had been charged for allegedly stabbing another contractor at a US base. The trial marked the first time since the Vietnam war that the military has prosecuted a civilian, and is seen as a crucial test of wartime contractor oversight.

JANE’S DEFENCE WEEKLY, 2/7/08

World arms data

In June, the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) published its 2008 Yearbook. This is a definitive guide to world military expenditure and a valuable resource for a broad range of other arms-related information and analysis.

The tables below show the military expenditure of the top 10 spenders and the rank order of the top 10 exporters and importers of major conventional weapons. The information is taken from SIPRI (www.sipri.org) and relates to 2007.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top military spenders</th>
<th>$bn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>58*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* ESTIMATED FIGURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top arms exporters</th>
<th>Top arms importers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>UAE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Venezuela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reed Elsevier disposes of DSEi

On the 1st June last year, Reed Elsevier announced that it would pull out of the international arms fair business. The decision followed a high profile campaign, coordinated by CAAT, which highlighted the incompatibility of Reed’s involvement in the arms trade with the company’s position as the number one publisher of medical and science journals. The decision was a blow to those trying to portray arms fairs as a legitimate business area. It remains affirmation that the arms trade has no place within a reputable business.

At the company Annual General Meeting in April this year, Reed announced that it hadn’t renewed its contract to organise Taiwan’s TADTE arms fair and had sold IDEX to the Abu Dhabi National Exhibitions Company. On the 29th May it was announced that the remaining three identified arms fairs, including London’s DSEi arms fair, had been sold to Clarion Events.

Clarion Events
Clarion is new to the arms trade. Its business is organising ‘80 exhibitions, conferences and seated events across Britain, Europe, North America, Africa and Asia’, employing around 200 people.

Reed AGM court case

In April 2005, Andrew Wood was CAAT’s Media Co-ordinator. That year, he and other CAAT staff attended the Annual General Meeting of Reed Elsevier. Reed had recently acquired Spearhead, a company that organises arms fairs. After the AGM, Andrew and others experienced a police surveillance operation, which Andrew described as follows:

‘They repeatedly photographed us close-up; we were followed and questioned; attempts were made to obtain my identity by subterfuge. I think you can imagine my anxiety – why was I being singled out; it was rather ‘kafka-esque’ - there seemed no rationale for the police attention. Later I learned that my photograph, like others, was stored in a computer system and that my details were held in a Criminal Intelligence database. Further, the police had deduced my name using a shareholder list, adding it to their records. I was a ‘suspect’, and like other ‘suspects’ my photo was likely to appear on a police spotter sheet used on other occasions. Yet, no unlawful activity occurred at the AGM, and no criminal investigation was being undertaken by the police’

After this experience, Andrew and others took a case to the High Court claiming that the police acted unlawfully. Andrew said: ‘clearly, there is a risk that such invasive surveillance may dissuade participation in the political process; indeed it may ‘institutionalise’ political interference, being repeatedly undertaken against certain groups without reasonable grounds or regard for human rights. Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights – respect for private and family life, now part of English law, was intended to safeguard against this.’

At a hearing in April, Justice McCombe found against Andrew, but gave permission for an appeal as there is insufficient case law in this area. A Court of Appeal hearing is now expected to take place. For further details see www.judicialreview.org.uk.

Protests against the DSEi arms fair
CAAT

Suhler Stevenson), meaning there will be no shareholder/AGM activities in this campaign.

Although there are many differences between Reed and Clarion, there are similarities in that both mainly focus on non-military business and have activities that sit very uneasily with arms fairs. Most strikingly, Clarion organises The Baby Show, which takes place four times a year in Birmingham, London (twice a year) and Manchester. Other events include Antiques for Everyone, the Caravan and Motorhome Show and the London International Horse Show.

If you would like to contact Clarion about its new business venture write to Clarion Events, Earls Court Exhibition Centre, Warwick Road, London SW5 9TA (or see www.clarionevents.com). IAN PRICHARD
South Somerset Peace Group

In June CAAT supporters South Somerset Peace Group welcomed Nicholas Hildyard and Sarah Sexton of the Corner House to give a talk on ‘Arms and Saudi Arabia – Challenging BAE Systems in the Courts’. The talk centred on the legal challenge to the dropping of the SFO corruption investigation into BAE’s arms deals with Saudi Arabia.

Nick focused on corruption, quoting Hilary Benn in April 2006: ‘Corruption, like temptation, exists everywhere, but in poor countries it can kill. Money meant for drugs for a sick child, or to build a hospital, can be siphoned off into private bank accounts or to build a luxury house.’ Sarah brought the group up to date on responses to the judicial review.

Their talk was followed by a wide-ranging discussion on the links between corruption, probity and development. Members of the group now know how far the UK government will go to obtain and protect arms deals. The talk increased understanding of arms-related issues amongst group members and strengthened our commitment to campaign against the arms trade.

WITH THANKS TO MARTIN SHIRLEY, SOUTH SOMERSET PEACE GROUP

Christian Network

A Just End?

‘A Just End? Belief, Propaganda and the Arms Trade’ was the title of a half-day symposium organised by James Ramsay of the University of East London (UEL) Chaplaincy and held at the Docklands Campus on 18th June. The packed programme included a series of short talks and presentations from members of the local community.

Why we fight

On behalf of CAAT, I was invited onto the panel of experts to lead discussions on Why We Fight and One Man’s Story, shown as part of the London Socialist Film Co-op’s 2007/08 season, and coinciding with the end of Stop Week (see pages 8–9). Despite the very warm weather making the outdoors a more attractive option, 93 people attended this daytime screening.

Why We Fight is directed by Eugene Jarecki and won the Grand Jury Prize for a documentary at the 2005 Sundance Film Festival in Utah. The film opens with President Dwight Eisenhower’s 1961 farewell speech in which he made the first reference to the ‘military-industrial complex’, which, as we moved through the years to the 1991 and 2003 US-led invasions of Iraq, became expanded to the ‘military-industrial-government-contractors complex’. At the beginning of the film, when asked to give reasons why the USA was fighting in Iraq, ordinary Americans replied confidently with phrases like: ‘for freedom and right’ and ‘to defeat the enemies of freedom’; two years later none of those interviewed was sure of the answer.

This is an excellent film, better, in my opinion than Michael Moore’s Fahrenheit 9/11, and a must-see for all CAAT supporters. One of the many memorable scenes was of an American military man at an arms fair who, after rather unconvincingly trying to explain the technical features of the latest killing machine he had been admiring, smiled at the camera and said ‘By the way these are my two lovely daughters’. The subsequent discussion with the audience gave me the opportunity to talk about CAAT’s current projects and successes. Our literature stall in the foyer also raised a lot of interest and welcome donations. ALUN MORRINAN

CAAT National Gathering 2008

8th November Conway Hall
25 Red Lion Sq
London
WC1R 4RL
10am–5pm

CAAT’s annual get-together for everyone interested in ending the arms trade and working for a more just and peaceful world!

Join us for workshops and discussions together with our keynote speaker Solomon Hughes, author of the book War on Terror, Inc. Corporate Profitiing from the Politics of Fear.

This will be a great opportunity to meet like-minded people, share perspectives, develop your skills and learn about arms trade campaigning.

Book your place online at www.caat.org.uk, return the booking form insert in this issue of CAATnews, or contact Anne Marie on annemarie@caat.org.uk or 020 7281 0297.
Across the UK on 1–8 June 2008, people stood up during Stop Week to show the Government that the arms trade does not have public support. Stalls and other activities were held in Birmingham, Brighton, Edinburgh, Hastings, Kingston, Lancaster, London, Norwich, Oldham/Saddleworth, Oxford, Sheffield and Winchester. Many people were made aware of the Government’s attempt to place BAE above the law and the campaign to control BAE! Marisa Birri compiled the following round-up.

London CAAT

“London CAAT decided on a ‘Merchants of Death’ walk as one part of our Stop the Arms Trade Week. Rather than a series of protests, this was a more sedate tour of Central London, with descriptions of certain companies thrown in. So thirteen of us met outside Victoria station and even had the sun shining on us. In terms of the types of companies we went to, there was a clear distinction.

Obviously, we took in major military producers and arms dealers such as BAe Systems, Boeing UK, Rolls Royce, Lockheed Martin (including INSYS), QinetiQ, MATRA BAe, Northrop Grumman, General Dynamics and Land Rover Leyland International Holdings. Among such ‘Merchants of Death’ there is a long history of corruption allegations, sometimes involving countries with serious records of human rights abuse, which underlines the indiscriminate nature of the trade.

In addition, the knowledgeable guides informed those present of the details of some of the numerous corporate mercenaries who have their offices in Central London. These include Spear Communications, Aegis Defence Services, Erinys International and ArmorGroup. These Private Military and Security Companies (PMSCs) are making a killing out of wars in Iraq and Afghanistan in a trade worth more than $100 billion. PMSCs outnumber British soldiers in Iraq by a ratio of more than 6:1.”

ROBIN YU, LONDON CAAT

Lancaster University

“As part of CAAT’s Stop the Arms Trade Week, a loose network of students – including members of the University’s People & Planet society and Labour Club – joined together to protest about Lancaster University’s relations with BAE. Pivotal to this link is BAE’s sponsorship of a course in the Management School and the institution’s ongoing investment in the company.

In order to persuade the University to sever its links with BAE, we asked students to sign the following statement: ‘I declare that I am opposed to the arms trade and to the University’s links with BAE Systems. I demand that the University adopts an ethical investment policy’.

Many members of a largely supportive student population, including members of the student union and university newspaper, agreed to sign the declaration. We publicly displayed these cards in order to demonstrate the level of opposition to Lancaster’s association with BAE. Following this, we sealed each statement in its own envelope and posted the large correspondence to the Vice-Chancellor. This action was part of an ongoing drive to encourage the University to end its relations with BAE. Over the coming year, we intend to continue the campaign.”

BEN EDWARDS, LANCASTER UNIVERSITY

The Saddleworth Peace Movement

The Saddleworth Peace Movement had their letters printed in local newspapers and lobbied their MP:

“Four core members of Saddleworth Peace Movement, and one new member who came as a result of publicity, visited Phil Woolas (MP for Oldham East and Saddleworth) on the proposed change to the Constitutional Renewal Bill. We know Phil well and were pleased to hear him say that he would write to Jack Straw on this issue. We await his response. Subsequently, we have collected more than 180 signatures on the CAAT petition. Few people refuse to
Edinburgh CAAT
“During the week, and for a further 10 days, Edinburgh CAAT Group had a display in the Edinburgh Peace and Justice Centre, with wall mountings giving colourful presentations on what CAAT is about and focusing on the current campaign to control BAE.

On the weekend of 7th & 8th June, the group held a joint stall with other peace organisations under the banner ‘Scotland’s For Peace’ at the Meadow’s Festival in Edinburgh. This event was attended by several thousand people and the sun shone brightly. We promoted CAAT campaign issues with a focus on arms and international development, government subsidies, clean investment and Stop BAE. We used a ‘guess the cost of weapons quiz’ to engage passers-by which shocked many people as to their cost. We collected signatures for CAAT, gave out Stop BAE postcards, and gathered more names of people who are interested in the campaign locally. We also used this as an opportunity to ask people to sign the Scottish Peace Covenant, and many did.

It was a worthwhile experience, providing an opportunity to share resources, present common themes, and make stronger links with other local peace organisations. It is hoped that we will build on this in the future.”

MARK BITEL, CAAT EDINBURGH

Winchester Quaker Peace Group
“Two supporters of CAAT’s campaign sat on the higher steps of the Buttercross in the High Street holding up two big handwritten posters on the issue of ‘Don’t put BAE above the Law’. The posters were eye-catching enough to make a fair number of passers-by stop in their tracks to take the time to read about BAE, the Government and the law. Some of them came to sign our petition, or to discuss the issue further with us, or to take more information from our table, or they wanted to write to the Prime Minister as proposed. And of course some people expressed their disagreement, others said they did not think anything one does ever changes anything. I don’t believe that, I did feel encouraged by this vigil and encounters, and also felt that somehow what we did mattered!”

IRENE ASHBY, WINCHESTER QUAKER PEACE GROUP

Norfolk CAAT
“Following up our letters printed in both the main local papers, the Eastern Daily Press and the Norwich Evening News, those available decided to join up with our Norwich Stop the War colleagues to have a joint stall in the centre of Norwich on Saturday June 7th. This was our main effort for Stop the Arms Trade week … However the continual rain on the Saturday meant having an outside stall was impossible. The dedicated supporters searched out suitable dry places to give out our information … I got in the front of the Forum where I expected that security at any time would move me on. I managed to leaflet for nearly two hours uninterrupted. As a group we managed to hand out approximately 200 Stop BAE freepost cards plus other CAAT information.”

ANDY STREET, CAAT NORFOLK
Cluster bomb treaty

On 30 May 2008, after ten days of intense negotiation and five years of tireless campaigning, over 100 governments delivered a treaty that bans cluster bombs forever. Laura Cheeseman of the Cluster Munition Coalition outlines the significance of this decision.

The UK has been the third biggest user of cluster bombs in the last decade, but was among the 111 governments that adopted the treaty in Dublin and played a significant role in ensuring that the negotiations were successful. Two days before the end of the negotiations, Gordon Brown announced the withdrawal from service of the UK’s remaining cluster bombs, influencing the decision of many other governments participating in the conference. Now the UK must sign the treaty in December and implement national legislation.

Expectations
Considered the most significant disarmament and humanitarian treaty of the decade, the final text exceeded all expectations, banning the use, production, transfer and stockpiling of cluster bombs and containing the strongest provisions for victim assistance ever agreed in international humanitarian law. Campaigners from around the world, survivors of cluster bombs, former military personnel, Nobel Peace Laureates and clearance operators cheered alongside government delegates as, one by one, 111 nations formally endorsed the treaty.

Just the beginning
Delivering the Cluster Munition Convention was a momentous and historic step, but the work of governments and individuals around the world is really just beginning. To become binding in international law, 30 governments must ratify the treaty after it is signed in Oslo in December 2008. The UK government has confirmed that it will be among the countries that sign the treaty in December. Now the UK must implement national legislation to prohibit cluster bombs enabling early ratification, encourage other countries to sign the treaty and take national steps to start abiding by the terms of the treaty. Taking a leadership role in this way will help to internationally stigmatise the weapons and prevent other countries that have not signed from using cluster bombs, notably the US.

Cluster bombs
Cluster bombs have consistently caused excessive deaths and injuries to civilians both during and after conflict. Designed to break open in mid-air and scatter up to hundreds of smaller bombs over wide areas, cluster bombs cannot distinguish between military targets and civilians. Many do not explode on impact, thus continuing to kill and injure innocent people long after conflict has ended. Furthermore, widespread contamination of residential, agricultural and industrial land makes it virtually impossible for people to rebuild their lives after conflict. Often it is the poorest communities that are the most victimised by the weapon.

In signing the treaty governments are committing not only to prevent future harm to civilians from cluster bombs, but, in accordance with international human rights and humanitarian law, also to ensure clearance of contaminated land and medical, financial and socio-economic support to those people who should never have been harmed. By signing the treaty our government will directly improve the lives of thousands of people worldwide. All governments must now turn the treaty’s text into reality.

Support needed
Every signature is needed in Oslo later this year if the world is truly going to set a new international standard. Only with wide adherence to legally binding international law will the world stigmatise cluster bombs so that it is no longer politically or morally acceptable for any country to use them. Stigmatisation is key to ensuring that states, like the US, China and Russia, abide by the standard set by the treaty even though they refuse to sign it.

The Cluster Munition Coalition, the global network of organisations campaigning to ban cluster bombs, launched the People’s Treaty as soon as the treaty had been negotiated in May. It is a worldwide petition urging governments to honour their promises and legally commit themselves to banning cluster bombs but also to clearing contaminated land and providing victim assistance. People across the world must sign the petition to show their intention to make sure governments live up to their obligations. You can sign the People’s Treaty at http://www.minesactioncanada.org/peoples_treaty.

For more on the Cluster Munition Coalition see www.stopclustermunitions.org
Arms exports

Symon Hill questions whether the UK really is the world’s Number 1?

‘UK becomes biggest weapons exporter’, declared the Financial Times in June, triggering a flurry of media interest and a fresh flood of calls to the CAAT office. The Guardian ran the story in depth several days later. But any news involving both arms and statistics must be doubly suspect, so what’s the reality behind the headlines?

In the complex world of arms orders, deliveries and licences, there are many and varied ways to calculate arms exports. However you do the sums, they nearly all show the USA to be the world’s top arms exporter, with the UK in the top five.

One of the more simplistic calculations methods is simply to add up the value of orders within a given year – regardless of how long those orders take to deliver. In most years, the USA still comes out on top. But in 2007 the UK was pushed into the lead by one huge order – 72 Eurofighter aircraft to be supplied by BAE Systems to Saudi Arabia.

This is the infamous Al Salam deal (it means ‘peace’ in Arabic – feel free to laugh). It was this deal that the Saudi regime threatened to cancel until the British authorities dropped a corruption investigation into BAE in 2006. When lobbying for an end to the investigation, apologists for the arms trade argued that the deal would create thousands of British jobs. Once the deal was signed in September 2007, BAE admitted that most of the jobs would not even be based in the UK.

So Britain’s role as ‘world’s top arms exporter’ is a temporary phenomenon, dependent on a questionable means of calculation. Nonetheless, the UK sadly retains a leading role in the arms trade, despite the growth in public opposition and the backlash triggered by the BAE scandal.

Outstanding?

When the figures were released, parts of the media asked whether British people should be proud of what trade minister Digby Jones called ‘this outstanding export performance’. I debated this question on BBC Radio Five Live with Ian Godden of the Society of British Aerospace Companies. With Saudi Arabia accounting for nearly half of the 2007 orders, many callers to the programme clearly felt uneasy about a trade that relies on the whims of a violent dictatorship. There can be no doubt that most UK arms exports still go to oppressive regimes or to countries involved in armed conflict or regions of tension.

I was challenged several times on the grounds that the arms trade supposedly brings benefit to Britain’s economy. The obvious answer is that arms companies in the UK are sustained by hundreds of millions of pounds in taxpayer-funded subsidies every year. Money is poured into research and development for the arms industry at a time when we desperately need to develop skills and technology to tackle climate change. And companies such as BAE have been cutting their UK workforces for years, shifting their focus to the USA but being quick to call themselves British when they want public support here.

Real security that really is sustainable

As Steven Schofield argues in CAAT’s recent report Making Arms, Wasting Skills (see the advert on page 15 or the order form on the back page), demilitarisation and an end to arms trade subsidies would provide the resources for major investment in renewable energy and the jobs and skills that would go along with it. This would place the UK at the forefront of real security and sustainable economics. Now that’s something of which we could all be proud.
The insurance policy

The Government has an “insurance policy” should it fail in its appeal against the High Court ruling that stopping the Serious Fraud Office inquiry into BAE’s Al Yamamah arms deals with Saudi Arabia was unlawful. This “insurance policy” is the Constitutional Renewal Bill.

As drafted, the Bill would grant the Attorney General, a politician and member of the Government, an entirely new power to direct the Serious Fraud Office to halt investigations on the grounds of ‘national security’. The Bill would effectively place such a decision beyond judicial review, and would allow the Attorney General to provide little or no information to Parliament. The Bill’s definition of national security is so broad and vague as to serve easily as a fig leaf for a range of commercial and partisan interests.

The House of Commons’ Justice Committee has already criticised the Bill, arguing that it does not provide for a clear split in the role of Attorney General. It advocates the creation of a non-political legal adviser whilst the policy decisions are undertaken by a Justice Minister.

If you have not already done so, please write to your MP at the House of Commons, Westminster, London SW1A 0AA asking him or her to do all possible to persuade the Prime Minister Gordon Brown to withdraw the provisions in the Constitutional Renewal Bill that would permit the Attorney General to halt criminal investigations and prosecutions simply by citing ‘national security’ without any meaningful scrutiny by the courts or accountability to parliament. For further assistance, a draft letter is on www.caat.org.uk or can be obtained from the CAAT office.

Regulation of corporate mercenaries too difficult?

In 2002, the Government produced a Green, or consultative, Paper with options for the regulation of the burgeoning private military and security industry. After a flurry of activity, and a report by the Foreign Affairs Committee, the issue disappeared from the political agenda until 2005 when then Foreign Secretary, Jack Straw MP, asked officials to review the options. This review considered ways forward including self-regulation, national regulation along the lines of arms export controls and/or licensing systems for companies and personnel.

The need for regulation has not gone away. Corporate mercenary companies play an ever greater role, especially in conflict zones such as Iraq and Afghanistan. Even the trade organisation, the British Association of Private Security Companies, wants regulation. The Government, however, seems to have given up having failed to find a common approach acceptable to all the Departments involved.

On 15th May, Foreign Office Minister Meg Munn MP told the Commons that there were difficulties with respect to implementation or enforcement with every option considered; additionally the legal matter of extra-territorial jurisdiction was complex. CAAT, along with War on Want and other interested organisations, is considering its next step.

Ann Feltham
The decision to occupy Raytheon and destroy its computer systems had been taken in the immediate aftermath of the Israeli bombing of Qana in southern Lebanon on July 30th. Twenty-eight civilians, half under 16, had been choked or crushed to death when a precision-guided ‘bunker-buster’ ploughed down through three storeys of an apartment building to explode in the basement where members of two extended families had huddled for safety.

This had been the latest in a series of Israeli attacks on civilian targets since the beginning of the bombardment of Lebanon on July 14th, purportedly in response to the kidnap of two Israeli soldiers by Hezbollah.

The Derry link
In Derry we knew that Raytheon was the main supplier of bunker-busters to the Israeli Defence Forces (IDF) and felt a particular responsibility to take action. Our action involved smashing the plant’s computer system, for which we were charged with affray and criminal damage. In our court case we argued that this wasn’t a crime. We argued that what we’d done was the equivalent of a citizen hearing a child being brutalised in a house and kicking in the door to put a stop to the attack. This wouldn’t constitute breaking and entering, we claimed, because the action was designed to stop a greater crime.

After a three and a half week trial, a jury decided unanimously to throw the charges out.

Irony
Raytheon’s Derry facility was announced in 1999 by SDLP leader John Hume and Unionist Party leader David Trimble on their first joint appearance after receiving the Nobel Peace Prize. The two hailed the arrival of Raytheon as part of the ‘peace dividend’ arising from the previous year’s Belfast/Good Friday Agreement. The jagged irony was self-evident and the Raytheon plant became an immediate focus of controversy.

However, all the mainstream parties – first the SDLP and the Unionists, then Sinn Fein – backed Raytheon on the basis that jobs were badly needed (150 were promised: only 40 ever materialised) and that rejection of Raytheon would leave Derry badly-placed to attract US investment in future. However, campaigners against war and for ethical investment continued to lobby, march, picket and protest against the company.

Our defence
Following the Qana bombing, we resolved that protest wasn’t enough, that we’d have to try to stop production. To sustain our defence we had to show that the IDF was committing crimes against humanity in Lebanon; that Raytheon, by continuing to supply the IDF with arms in the knowledge that this was happening, was aiding and abetting these crimes; and that the action we took was intended to have and did have the effect of thwarting or delaying the commission of further such crimes.

We submitted dozens of media reports on the conflict; Amnesty and Human Rights Watch reports; we cited internal Raytheon documents obtained under the Freedom of Information Act; and we showed through news reports, technical reports and cross-examination of Raytheon witnesses that decommissioning the Derry plant would have the effect – marginal but nonetheless real – of disrupting production of the sorts of munitions being used for criminal purposes in Lebanon.

It was on this basis that we were acquitted. This suggests to us that a court has accepted a case that Raytheon’s activities constituted aiding and abetting the commission of war crimes in Lebanon. We appeal to campaigners against the arms trade to demand a police investigation into whether this is so. Already, the Derry Anti-War Coalition is calling on the Attorney General’s office to launch a criminal investigation into Raytheon’s operations in the UK.

For more on the Raytheon 9 see www.raytheon9.org
Fundraising

Everyclick.com
You can now help raise money for CAAT whilst surfing the web by using everyclick.com as your search engine. Simply select the Trust for Research and Education on the Arms Trade (TREAT) as your chosen charity and each time you conduct a search you will add to the total amount raised. TREAT will donate all money raised to CAAT for our research and education work. You can increase the amount raised by selecting everyclick.com as the default search engine in your toolbar. The more you surf, the more we raise!

If you’re suffering from split loyalties and are already using everyclick.com to raise money for another charity, please consider alternating on a monthly or weekly basis with TREAT.

To register yourself as a fundraiser for TREAT please visit www.everyclick.com.

Legacy giving
Over the years CAAT has benefited from gifts bequeathed by supporters wishing to make a lasting difference to our work. Some supporters may choose to leave a gift to CAAT in their Will to continue the financial support they have offered during their lifetime, others because they have not been able to give such support in the past, but wish to leave a lasting legacy.

Legacy gifts come in different forms. If you are considering leaving a gift to CAAT in your Will, you may wish to leave a pecuniary legacy – a specified sum of money, or a residual legacy – a proportion of your estate once all pecuniary gifts have been distributed. Whilst residual gifts are often favoured financially for keeping pace with inflation, CAAT appreciates all legacy gifts and recognises the importance and value of such a personal decision.

Gifts donated directly to CAAT through a supporter’s Will are particularly useful, as they come unrestricted, meaning that we can use them to fund our campaigning work as well as our research. Many people, though wishing to help CAAT in their Will, are also aware of the tax implications of leaving gifts to a campaigning organisation, rather than a charity. Leaving gifts to charity in your Will can help lower the amount of inheritance tax for which you may be liable. With this in mind, if you are considering leaving a gift, you may instead wish to leave it to the Trust for Research and Education on the Arms Trade (TREAT), registered charity no. 328694. By stating clearly that you wish your gift to go towards CAAT’s work you will enable TREAT to donate the money to CAAT’s research and education programme, for which we are eligible to receive charitable funding. The more clearly you state your intentions regarding the gift, the easier it is for us to apply for and receive the funds, something to bear in mind when preparing your Will.

Regardless of whether the legacy comes to CAAT directly or through TREAT, we are always grateful for these donations. We would ask all of our supporters to consider remembering us in their Will to help us continue our work in the future. If you have already written your Will, but would like to add CAAT or TREAT as a beneficiary, you can still do so by adding a codicil to the original document. A solicitor would be able to advise you on how to go about this.

Further information about TREAT’s charitable work can be found by visiting their website www.treat-research.org.uk.

If you would like further information about leaving a legacy to CAAT or are unsure whether to leave a gift to CAAT rather than TREAT, please contact CAAT’s Fundraising Coordinator, Sally Campbell, on 020 7281 0297 or by emailing sally@caat.org.uk.

SALLY CAMPBELL
Participate in CAAT – here’s how

For more information on all of these or any enquiries not covered below contact the CAAT office on 020 7281 0297

To notify CAAT of a change of address please email enquiries@caat.org.uk with ‘change of address’ in the subject line.

Subscribe to an email list

Sign up to receive the monthly CAAT bulletin with the latest news and events, receive press releases or join the CAAT Action Network list. Contact enquiries@caat.org.uk or visit www.caat.org.uk/lists

Make a donation

Our supporters’ donations enable us to strive for a world without arms trading. Without your help there would be no campaign. Support CAAT by sending us a cheque, setting up a regular standing order donation, or by taking part in a fundraising event. Contact Sally at sally@caat.org.uk.

Campagne locally

CAAT has a network of local contacts and groups around the UK who take responsibility for promoting anti-arms trade activity and the work of CAAT in their area. Get in contact if you would like to know what is happening in your area or if you are interested in becoming a local contact or setting up a group. All that’s needed is a willingness to raise awareness of arms trade issues in any way that you feel is appropriate. Contact enquiries@caat.org.uk for info, including the Local Campaigns Pack.

Universities Network

The Universities Network provides students and staff in higher education with information on arms companies’ ties to universities. It encourages people to actively campaign and participate in breaking these ties. Contact universities@caat.org.uk.

Raise awareness

Organising a public meeting, using the local media and running a street stall have proved effective ways for CAAT groups to raise awareness of arms trade issues. CAAT can provide speakers for public meetings, materials for stalls and can also help with publicity. Contact enquiries@caat.org.uk. For media info contact Symon at press@caat.org.uk.

Protest

A protest against the arms trade can show that many people do not think it is an ordinary, acceptable business. It can also generate publicity, raising awareness about individual companies and the arms trade in general. CAAT is a nonviolent organisation and any protest organised under the name of CAAT must be nonviolent (contact the office for the CAAT guidelines). Contact enquiries@caat.org.uk.

Christian Network

The Network raises arms trade issues within national church structures and local churches. Contact Alun Morinan at christian@caat.org.uk.

Order publications

CAAT produces briefings, reports and leaflets on a range of issues. Contact Claire at claire@caat.org.uk.

GET INVOLVED

Making arms, wasting skills

Making arms, wasting skills: Alternatives to militarism and arms production by Steven Schofield

This new CAAT report pulls politics and economics together to give a wider perspective on the ‘jobs’ argument. The author sets out a broad vision, proposing a policy of arms conversion and common security that would contribute to international stability and also create skilled work offering better employment prospects than arms production.

The report is available on the CAAT website or can be ordered using the form on the back page of this issue of CAATnews.
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This is a selection of our recent materials. For a full list, see the insert in this issue of CAATnews.

**Recent publications**

- **Making Arms, Wasting Skills: Alternatives to Militarism and Arms Production**, April 2008, by Steven Schofield (£3) Quantity ___
- **The Facade of Arms Control**, Feb 2008, by Anna Stavrianakis (£3) Quantity ___
- **Study War No More: Military involvement in UK universities**, Nov 2007, by CAAT and the Fellowship of Reconciliation (£3) Quantity ___
- **Bribing for Britain: Government Collusion in Arms Sales Corruption** (Goodwin Paper #5, Oct 2007) by Tim Webb (£3) Quantity ___

**Postcards**

- **Corporate Mercenaries postcard** (free) Quantity ___
- **Stop Arming Israel postcard** (free) Quantity ___
- **Recruiting postcard** (free) Quantity ___

**Other resources**

- **T-shirts** Black with small white logo (women’s fitted: small, medium or large; unisex: medium, large or extra large) (£10) Quantity ___
- **Greeting cards** Three doves of peace or Tree of Peace (£5 for 10 cards & envelopes) Quantity ___
- **Introduction to CAAT** (free) Quantity ___

We don’t want anyone to be prevented from getting involved by the cost of materials, so many of our resources are free. However, if you are able to make a donation towards the costs of producing and sending our resources, it would be very much appreciated.

Please make cheques payable to CAAT.

Name ________________________________________________
Address ______________________________________________
__________________________________ Postcode ___________
Email _________________________________________________
Telephone _____________________________________________
Would you like to receive our monthly email bulletin?
Yes No

Please return this form to:
CAAT
11 Goodwin Street
London N4 3HQ

If you DO NOT wish to receive CAATnews please tick here □