

Personal Statement

I am standing before you to answer the charge of breach of the peace. The charge reads as follows that:

'On 12 February 2001 at the A814 North entrance, HMNB Clyde, Faslane, District of Argyll and Bute, [I] Caroline Lucas, did conduct [myself] in a disorderly manner, sit on the roadway, disrupt the free flow of traffic, refuse to desist when required to do so and commit a breach of the peace.'

I plead not guilty to this charge and will be arguing that

- a) My conduct did not amount to a breach of the peace, in particular, I did not conduct myself in a disorderly manner;
- b) My arrest, detention and subsequent charge constitutes a violation of my right to freedom of expression under Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights; and
- c) Insofar as I am found to have committed a breach of the peace, my actions were justified in that come within the doctrine of necessity recognised by Scots and international law.

a) Firstly I wish to describe for you my actions on the day of the demonstration, which I believe, contrary to the charge, did not breach anyone's peace. I arrived at the demonstration at around 7 am.

number of people were gathered around the entrance to the base. I sat down alongside other peaceful demonstrators. We held hands, sang songs and chatted. The atmosphere was peaceful and jovial. There was no violence. There was no alarm being caused to anyone. The police were standing around us but there were no attempts to stop what we were doing until later [insert what police were generally doing] [Expand what you were doing]

When I was arrested I was sitting in the middle of the roundabout approximately 10 metres from the entrance to the base. At approx. ?? the police told us that if we did not move, we would be arrested. I did not move and was then approached by two policemen who arrested me. I did not struggle but was conveyed to a waiting police vehicle, cautioned and charged. In response to being charged I stated my beliefs that 'I was defending international law and my act was an act of illegality in upholding the law.'

My actions at no stage could be described as being alarming, distressing or disturbing to anyone as they would need to have been to have constituted a breach of the peace. I did not behave in a manner that could be described as disorderly at any stage.

b) In peacefully demonstrating at the Faslane nuclear base, I was exercising my rights under Article 10 of the European Convention of Human Rights {add in relevant bit} I have a long held and genuine belief that nuclear weapons pose an unacceptable threat to society. They are weapons of mass destruction which, if used, would result in the indiscriminate killing of millions of people. They are illegal in international law and their very existence constitutes a breach of world peace.

I genuinely believe that the British Trident system is illegal and criminal. As a Member of the European Parliament, I believe it is not only my right under Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights, but my duty to stand up, for the political views I was democratically elected to represent. Green policies, demand the immediate decommissioning of Britain's nuclear weapons and the promotion of nuclear disarmament. We aim to secure a peaceful and just world future through common security, not mutual threat. As a green politician I believe in working towards a fairer global future, free of debt, poverty and weapons of mass destruction.

It is my belief that the use of Trident would quite clearly constitute not only a war crime but a crime against humanity and it is on this basis that I took the peaceful, non-violent action I did.

I have had a longstanding involvement in the peace movement for the last years. I was an active member of the US snowball campaigns in . Where I . In the last year alone I have worked with CND, Trident Ploughshares, the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation, Conscience [add more].

I am a regular contributor to the debate on European Security Defence. I have spoken out against the US national missile defence proposals at . I have become one of the leading spokespeople for the anti-war campaign since the US led war on terrorism began in October of this year, speaking at numerous national and regional demonstrations, and on local and national media. The court cannot doubt my commitment to these issues and I ask you to uphold my right to peacefully stand up for my beliefs.

c) My beliefs not only have resonance amongst the peace movement and peace activists. They are in fact upheld in International Law. The International Court of Justice Advisory Opinion on the

Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons, July 1996, envisioned no circumstance under which the use of nuclear weapons would not violate international law: *'none of the states advocating the 'clean' use of smaller, low yield, tactical nuclear weapons, has indicated, what, supposing such limited use were feasible, would be the precise circumstances justifying such use; nor whether such limited use would not tend to escalate into the all-out use of high yield weapons'* [Advisory Opinion on the Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons, General List No. 95, 8 July 1996, International Court of Justice, para 94].

Nuclear weapons cannot distinguish between civilian and military targets. The security the 'threat' of their use is supposed to offer is the very threat of mass destruction. An outcome so horrific that the theory says no-one would contemplate their use. The 1991 NATO Strategic Concept Document, Article 38, describes the purpose of Trident to create 'incalculable and unacceptable' risks. In a world where war and terror prevails can we really rely on these risks being 'unacceptable' to everyone? Weapons of mass destruction serve to create the unstable world which breeds resentment, violence and terrorism.