



Campaign for the Accountability of American Bases

No. 38 September/October 2008

Local, National and International News

Dear friends

Looking back over the 'Editorials' of the CAAB newsletter over the years is a rather gloomy experience! We are always hopeful but they document increasing alarm about the state of the world and systems and structures of a democratic process not being applied. "Please stop and do things in a different way ..." is the tenor of each one of the 'Editorials'.

Reflecting on what has happened at the American base at Menwith Hill (North Yorkshire) reveals that it has grown and grown since the US Army arrived in 1951. There have always been people around who protested, raised questions and worked away to try to find out and express their concerns. The base now has over 30 radomes and is enclosed by weld mesh alarmed fencing with cameras and CCTV video recording. Every step of the way round can (potentially) be monitored for miles around – even if stopping to take in the wonderful countryside or innocently walking. But who is the base accountable to? Certainly not the British Government – as with all US bases in this country and indeed worldwide. There is very little meaningful accountability. The US military and their Agencies are in firm control.

Menwith Hill is part of the worldwide web of American bases (now over 700) with their

footprint being relentlessly stamped in new areas of the world.

The conflict in Georgia hastened the signing, in obscene haste, of an agreement for components of the US Missile Defense system to be built in the Czech Republic and Poland. How hopelessly this conflict has been handled. Russia is understandably upset about the US Missile Defense system right up to her borders and is not persuaded by the US Government that they have no intention to threaten Russia. Would you trust either of them? However, what is at stake is the health of the region and maybe the world. What the world desperately needs is imaginative thinking, alternatives to violence and a lot of hope and goodwill to all nations ... 'pie in the sky' and simplistic maybe ... but this is what CAAB persistently works for and the vision we have.

Inevitably the newsletter can only give tastes of information – more can be found on the relaunched website which we are in the process of building – so patience please! We are indebted to the Andrew Wainwright Trust who gave us a grant and for the skills and help of Ray Middleton.
[Observations very welcome!]

Around the US Bases

NSA MENWITH HILL

(near Harrogate, North Yorkshire)

New US Commander: The new US Commander is Colonel M O'Brien (a woman) who is in full command and control of Menwith Hill (the RAF Commander is Squadron Leader Lumsdon – a RAF Liaison Officer).

Running repairs?: There is work being done on several of the radomes and satellite dishes.

Planning applications: There have been no new planning applications since May this year.

Covered up: We are grateful to Anne Lee who passed on a document headed - USAF RAF Menwith Hill 'Cultural Heritage Management Plan – Final Report'. It was completed two and a half years ago and has only just come to light through a Freedom of Information request by Anne.

Quote from the document: *"This report presents the results of a number of assessments of the station summary of an archaeological desk-based assessment and walkover survey of RAF Menwith Hill.*

The work has been carried out on behalf of the United States Forces in Europe 'to allow an evaluation of the cultural heritage research within the site with respect to its future management in relation to current and future activities. The goals of the plan are to protect all recorded cultural heritage sites and any significant, previously unrecorded remains at RAF Menwith Hill ..."

Chris Dean (Hon.Treasurer of CAAB and local historian) and Paul Wood (for many years Hon. Keeper of Otley museum and local historian) analysed the document. They both have years of passion, knowledge, research and experience in this field to preserve, conserve and meticulously document local history. Their conclusions? "It is woefully inadequate and represents an eleventh hour sop to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty but could not cover

up the irredeemable damage already done to these historic sites now under acres of concrete of NSA Menwith Hill". *[Menwith Hill should have been included but was excluded from the ANOB many years ago].*

Court

Hefty fine and costs imposed at Harrogate Magistrates' Court - 3 July 2008:

Lindis Percy was in Harrogate Magistrates' Court charged with an alleged offence of 'obstruction of the highway' on the day of five years of the illegal invasion and war in Iraq. She defended herself as she has done many times before. She has been successful before when charged with this particular offence – using the authority of *Hirst and Agu v Chief Constable of West Yorkshire Police* (1986).

From the start it was abundantly clear that the Magistrates had made up their minds. There was CCTV evidence, witness evidence by PC Brown (North Yorkshire Police who made the arrest) and PC Rigby (Ministry of Defence Police Agency who accompanied PC Brown). Both officers were part of the Counter Terrorist Unit (CTU) patrolling round the American base at Menwith Hill.

Lindis had been peacefully demonstrating at the main entrance to Menwith Hill for nearly an hour before the officers arrived. A Ministry of Defence Police Agency officer had been with her during the hour. This officer was not called to give evidence or a statement taken from her despite the officer being clearly seen on video. PC Brown said in his evidence that he had spoken to her. The case therefore rested on approximately 13 minutes when the officers arrived and Lindis was arrested. There was no evidence on CCTV of any obstruction of the highway. The MDPA officer was 'policing' the demonstration but these two officers (from the CTU) decided to intervene.

Lindis managed to persuade the Magistrates to agree that only a part of the CCTV evidence should be played - from when the two officers arrived. There were a lot of things that

happened in court - all friends present were distressed by the bias and lack of independence and advice for a litigant in person by Richard Irwin (Legal Advisor). He also made a serious mistake in his note taking which raised a question about Lindis's integrity. All friends in court found this deeply shocking and distressing. Glyn Sutcliffe (CPS) appeared to be in charge of the court.

Several applications were made by Lindis for the CCTV/DVD evidence to be played again after PC Brown and Rigby gave evidence, so that she could challenge what they had said. On each occasion the application was denied by the Magistrates who said that they had seen the CCTV/DVD recording once and would not allow it to be shown again.

Lindis was found guilty, fined and costs awarded against her - total £855 to be paid within 14 days. We have now appealed the verdict to York Crown Court where a retrial will be heard before a Judge and two Magistrates.

Guilty verdict at Harrogate Magistrates' Court - 19 August 2008: This case arose out of three incidents at Menwith Hill last year. Lindis Percy was charged with breaching a s.69 notice which had been issued by David Harding (Ministry of Defence Police Agency officer) at the regular Tuesday evening demonstration last July (having been held every week for nearly nine years). The CPS dropped a charge of alleged obstruction of the highway. There were two offences to be heard by Mr Sanders (District Judge – DJ - from Cheshire in the Wirrell). The case was originally set for three days but on the first day it became clear that it would not be necessary to call all 9 prosecution witnesses as there were three CCTV videos which were shown and many of the points had been agreed. This cut down the case considerably.

We had argued that the notice issued by David Harding was not valid and that the area at the main gate was part of the highway. The essence of section 69 says that if an officer reasonably believes that a person trespasses on land in the open air with the intention of disrupting, obstructing or intimidating lawful activity then an offence is committed and a notice can be

issued. Once issued the person must not come back to the land within 3 months.

Lindis was found guilty of breaching the notice twice. The DJ decided that the notice was valid and that the area in question was not part of the highway. She was given a conditional discharge (12 months) and ordered to pay £300 costs. Mr Sanders said that the offences were at the 'lower end of the scale' and implied some criticism of the MDPA. The demonstration had been peaceful. There had been only 'minor' insignificant obstruction of the traffic. He said that the kicking of a bollard was intended by Lindis to be obstructive (this was not Lindis's intention).

The 'guilty' verdict therefore rested on the fact that Lindis had kicked a bollard, ostensibly put in the middle of the main gate area for safety reasons by the MDPA so obstructing the police officers (s.69 'obstruction' clause). Because the notice was validly given the second offence was therefore proved.

An appeal has now been lodged in the Crown Court on a specific legal point.

A dark day: CAAB was at Menwith Hill for an hour, on 11 September 2008, standing opposite the main entrance to the base to mark the 7th anniversary of the attacks in America in 2001. There was a banner which said "Remembering all victims of terrorism" with a single peace flag fluttering by its side.

We went to Menwith Hill seven years ago, on the day that this terrible event happened. It occurred on a Tuesday - the regular day of the weekly demonstration. On that day we handed in a card and flowers to the US Commander. We had no upside down US flags in evidence and wore black arm bands. We have been there with the banner and the peace flag on 11 September each year since.

**IMPORTANT DEMONSTRATION:
KEEP SPACE FOR PEACE**

SATURDAY 4 OCTOBER 2008 12.00–5.00pm-ish
Kettlesing Layby on A59 Harrogate to Skipton Road
(opposite Black Bull pub) close to Menwith Hill.

Excellent Speakers, Musicians & Food
MAKE IT A BIG DEMONSTRATION
Details on: www.caab.org.uk

An invitation to participate in the demonstration on 4 October (above) was sent to Colonel

O'Brien (US Commander of Menwith Hill) from Martin Schweiger (CAAB) who will be introducing the speakers and musicians. She has been invited to give a presentation. In his letter Martin said, "It is important that however strongly we may feel on issues that we take time to listen to and consider all points of view". We have not had a reply. We intend to send another letter in case Colonel O'Brien did not receive the previous one.

'RAF' FYLINGDALES

(near Pickering, North Yorkshire)

Out to lunch: Lindis Percy received an invitation to meet and have lunch with the new RAF Commander – Greg Hammond at Fylingdales a while ago. She will be taking others with her in mid-October.

Demonstration organised by Yorkshire

CND: As part of the international week of protest called for by the Global Network Against Weapons and Nuclear Power in Space www.space4peace.org there will be a demonstration on 11 October 2008 at 1 pm – details from Yorkshire CND.

Military Land Byelaws: In 2005 the Defence Estates Review Byelaws Team launched a website giving a long list of Military Land byelaws that were to be reviewed. On the list is RAF Fylingdales byelaws (as well as Menwith Hill, Lakenheath, Mildenhall, Molesworth, etc, etc). These byelaws are invalid and many people have been arrested, detained and charged under unsafe law. We have been raising this issue through the courts for many years. Recently a small byelaws notice went up at the entrance to the approach road to the base. We will be pursuing this.

USAF CROUGHTON

(near Brackley, Northants)

Covered up: Work has been going on to cover up the largest satellite dish with a radome. It has cost \$3.2 million. The rationale behind the work is apparently to protect the antenna from the weather and to prevent costly maintenance. It will be completed in January 2009. New frequency converters are also being installed to

handle greater amounts of data, while freeing up space in the Satellite Communications facility.

USAF Croughton operates one of Europe's largest military switchboards and processes approximately a third of all U.S. military communications in Europe. The base is home to the 422nd Air Base Group. The base also provides critical links for all types of missions in Iraq according to Technical Sergeant Joseph Finney [*Extracts from Stars and Stripes 13 August 2008*].

Home for furry friends: The furriest and quite possibly tiniest of tenants on this Air Force base are getting a home of their own. Work was completed this summer on a new two-pond habitat for the water vole. Survey work started in 2006, with about \$45,000 in Air Force funds for the project following after that, according to Alex Wilkieson, the environmental flight chief at Croughton. The new ponds are all but completed, but Wilkieson said the voles won't gravitate to their new home until more vegetation grows in around the banks.

Under U.K. law, the water vole and its habitat are protected, with Wilkieson saying the Air Force effort has gone "above and beyond" guidelines for protecting such endangered species. [*Extracts from Stars and Stripes 10 September 2008*].

USAF FAIRFORD

(near Letchlade, Gloucestershire)

Cancelled: The Royal International Air Tattoo in July was cancelled for the first time because of the dreadful wet weather. Next year the airshow will be held on 18/19 July 2009 [*plenty of time to organize a presence!*].

Arrival of deadly bombers: Two B-2 Spirit Stealth Bombers (USAF) arrived at Fairford in August, having flown non-stop for 16 hours from their home at Whiteman Air Force Base in Missouri. About 70 members of the 13th Bomb Squadron from Whiteman Air Force Base arrived at USAF Fairford in two B-2s and two KC-135 Stratotankers for a "global power mission." They were monitored by Oxford CND.

Major Craig Mockler, of the 509th Operational Support Squadron, who planned the mission to Fairford said: "We love coming to Fairford, it's a great base to visit. "This mission has given us a chance to test the aircraft with the facilities here at Fairford, the last time we got to do that was two years ago.

"We've also been able to use Fairford's new operations building, which is fitted with very high-tech, secure equipment to plan our missions, and we hope to make more use of the base in the future."

The base is just one of a handful which have been designated as a stealth bomber base. Fairford and bases in Diego Garcia and Guam are the only other forward operating bases outside the U.S. capable of supporting the bombers and their unique security requirements.

The unit became the first to use the new \$4 million NATO-funded squadron operations building, which opened at Fairford last month. [Extracts from Stars and Stripes article 14 August 2008]

USAF LAKENHEATH

(near Brandon, Suffolk)

[This excellent news came in too late to be included in the last CAAB newsletter]

Federation of American Scientists (FAS) reported removal of US nuclear weapons from the UK, 26 June 2008:

Hans Kristensen (director of the nuclear information project – FAS www.fas.org) reported that the United States had withdrawn nuclear weapons from Lakenheath marking the end to more than 50 years of U.S. nuclear weapons deployed to the United Kingdom since the first nuclear bombs first arrived in September 1954.

The withdrawal, which has not been officially announced but confirmed by several sources, followed the withdrawal of nuclear weapons from Ramstein Air Base in Germany in 2005 and Greece in 2001.

The withdrawal from Lakenheath means that the U.S. nuclear weapons deployment overseas

is down to only two U.S. Air Force bases (Aviano AB in Italy and Incirlik in Turkey) plus four other national European bases in Belgium, Germany, Holland and Italy, for a total of six bases in Europe.

Arrival of F-22 Raptor aircraft?:

According to an article (7 August 2008 in the *Newbury Times*) speculation is mounting that USAF Lakenheath could become home to the US military's most advanced fighter aircraft. The £70million F-22 Raptor, which uses stealth technology. The Lockheed Martin-built Raptors have been part of the US military's airforce since December 2005 and are currently assigned to six US bases.

USAF MILDENHALL

(near Mildenhall Cambridgeshire)

Carbon footprint of military planes:

There was a protest on 11 August 2008 at Mildenhall by people who had come from the recent Climate camp at Kingsnorth. The demonstration was to highlight the pollution caused by military aircraft. Mel Harrison of East Anglia CND said, "We are here to show that military aircraft are not only committing war crimes, but climate crimes also." *[it's an issue that has received little attention but is very important – so well done!]*

FACTS: A single KC135 plane uses 44 gallons of fuel per minute, emitting approximately the same amount of CO2 as 2000 cars. The planes are used for air-to-air refuelling and can carry 30,000 gallons of fuel – enough to drive a car over 30 times around the earth.

RESPONSE TO GEORGE MONBIOT ARTICLE

Published on Anti-war.com website by Randal Mark – 23 August 2008:

George Monbiot has a piece in *The Guardian* this week ("[The US missile defense system is the magic pudding that will never run out](#)") explaining the financial motivations behind the US policy of promoting missile defense systems. His observations are fine, so far as they go, although they are limited by his own prejudices.

But enhancing strategic missile defense is more than just an endless barrel of pork. It is also a profoundly destabilizing policy that is essentially strategically aggressive. To understand how enhancing a “defense” capability can be an aggressive strategy, it is necessary to comprehend the Cold War issue of mutually assured destruction that most people under the age of 30 have probably had little cause to consider.

The hard reality of mutually assured destruction was probably the reason the USSR and USA did not initiate a nuclear third world war that would have destroyed the world. After a certain point, it became clear that both sides had such substantial arsenals of nuclear weapons that both would certainly be destroyed utterly (probably along with human civilization *in toto*) by any full exchange. What is crucial here is that this was feared to be the case even if one side succeeded in getting a jump on the other, and launched its missiles before the other side was ready. In other words, each side was thought to have the capability to substantially destroy the other, even with whatever was left to it after a successful nuclear strike upon it by the other (this latter, reduced capability was termed “[second strike](#)”).

Immense thought was given to ways to maintain stability in this situation, for obvious reasons – these were not neocon dilettantes, but men and women who really believed their lives and those of their families depended upon devising successful strategies to control the risk of nuclear destruction. Among the outcomes was an agreement known as the [ABM Treaty](#), which was intended to tightly limit the development of missile defenses in order to promote stability. This counterintuitive approach was based upon two key publicly recognised insights, and one unmentioned reality.

First, missile defenses promote inflation of nuclear arsenals by causing the enemy to increase the size and sophistication of its nuclear weapons in order to overcome the defenses. One of the best ways to beat a missile defense system is to flood it with targets and thereby swamp its targeting

mechanisms. Apart from the inherent undesirability of a nuclear arms race, such activity also destabilizes attempts to counter nuclear proliferation. Some might be surprised to learn (in the light of subsequent inaction on this count) that the key basis for the global agreement constraining nuclear proliferation ([NPT](#)) was a promise (dishonestly made and not surprisingly ignored subsequently) by the nuclear weapons states to work towards reduction of their own nuclear arsenals.

Second, missile defenses make nuclear war more likely, not less. They do so by undermining the iron reality of mutually assured destruction. Despite the practical ineffectiveness of missile defense systems so far (as highlighted by Monbiot in the above article), the existence of such systems gives politicians and military leaders the possibility of thinking they might survive a nuclear war. In particular, since missile defenses would be much more effective against a reduced second strike than against the full first strike capability of a superpower, the possession of a missile defense system encourages decision-makers to think that they could “win” by launching a surprise first strike. Nobody who has observed recent events or followed the paranoid and aggressive pronouncements of the US regime and elite should be in any doubt that the US is more than capable of launching such a first strike in the guise of “preemptive” defense.

The third, unmentioned reality that explains why mutually assured destruction kept the peace throughout the latter years of the Cold War is the unprecedented situation it created whereby the decision-makers on war and peace actually themselves, personally (and their families), had to face the consequences of the wrong decision. In this situation, suddenly the usual testosterone surges and jingoist urges that in previous eras had sufficed to cause national leaders to sacrifice other people in their millions doubtless seemed less overwhelming. Anything, therefore, that undermines mutually assured destruction strikes at one of the core reasons for the successful avoidance of global war.

All these realities remain as true as they ever

were, but in the climate of the post-Soviet period, the worst consequences of US [abrogation of the ABM treaty](#) were not immediately felt. Russia was in no condition to compete with the US, and indeed was probably quite ready to concede broad US global leadership, if the US had chosen to treat Russia with respect in turn. In these circumstances, a nuclear arms race was not forthcoming, and there was no real threat of a war between the US and Russia. Although the Russians pointed out the well known problems of missile defenses (see for instance [Foreign Affairs, September/October 2000: "The Missile-Defense Mistake: Undermining Strategic Stability and the ABM Treaty"](#) by Russian Foreign Minister Igor Ivanov), their objections were brushed aside. Glyn Sutcliffe, Crown Prosecutor, sometimes appeared to be in charge of the court.

Things have now changed, however. The US proved unable to simply be the most powerful state in the world without rubbing the rest of the world's collective noses in the situation at every opportunity. A universalist ideology of globalist democratization, combined with American exceptionalism and Israeli nationalist domination of US politics, produced endless interference in other countries' affairs and an open pursuit of "[full spectrum dominance](#)." In the case of Russia, the US seemed to go out of its way to humiliate and antagonize its former rival. On missile defense, Kosovo, NATO expansion and the flouting of the UN Security Council over Iraq, the Russians were insulted time and again, and US and allied military encroachment on Russia became ever more menacing. ("Menacing" is, of course, a matter of perspective. The fact that Americans and their apologists and allies don't see that their own actions could be construed as such merely reflects their own limited capacity to see from other perspectives).

With the Georgia fighting and the US response, we now see, for the first time since Gorbachev, the real possibility of a direct strategic confrontation between the US and Russia, over issues that are "red lines" for Russia. While the Georgia issue will rumble on and provide pretexts for US and allied

action against Russia, it is over the Ukraine that a real dispute is likely to arise.

With this return to the Cold War situation of a direct confrontation between two states with substantial nuclear arsenals, the old unassailable logic of mutually assured destruction and missile defense reasserts itself. In this context, the introduction of US missile defenses to Poland and possibly even Ukraine can be seen for the foolishly provocative acts of aggression they really are. As outlined above, these developments create the potential for a US first strike that Russia simply cannot afford to ignore, in the hands of a state that has launched wars of aggression in Yugoslavia and Iraq, threatens one against Iran, has interfered in the politics of numerous countries through "color revolutions," and propagandizes against the Russian "threat." In order to deter a US preemptive strike, Russia will feel the need to reinvigorate its military generally, but in response to the installation of US missile defenses, technological enhancement and numerical increases to Russia's nuclear weapons manifest will be vital.

Given the nature of the US regime (and of the hierarchies of both US political parties of power), there is little prospect now of avoiding a drawn out (if we are lucky!) confrontation. Anyone who wishes to understand the underlying truths of the situation, though, must begin with a proper understanding of the strategic missile defense issue, and not [the kind of superficial or even outright mendacious propaganda nonsense that passes for "analysis" in our complicit media](#).

BRIEF SELECTION OF PARLIAMENTARY QUESTIONS

[summer recess means only a few this time]

USA: Armed Forces

Q: Norman Baker: To ask the Secretary of State for Defence pursuant to the answer of 21 May 2008, *Official Report*, column 379W, on the armed forces: USA, on how many occasions since 1997 visiting US personnel have been (a) prosecuted under UK law and (b) dealt with under US law for offences committed in the UK; and what information his Department holds on the results of such cases dealt

with by the US military authorities. [208919]

A: Mr. Bob Ainsworth: The Ministry of Defence does not hold records of legal cases involving US visiting force personnel. **9 Jun 2008: Column 67W** [This PQ is to be directed to the Home Secretary]

Ballistic Missile Defence

Q: Mr. Dai Davies: To ask the Secretary of State for Defence whether (a) he, (b) Ministers and (c) officials have had recent discussions with counterparts in the United States administration on the possibility of deploying anti-missile interceptors at United Kingdom bases.

A: Des Browne: No discussions of this nature have taken place. [10 June 2008 column 119W]

USA: Ministry of Defence Guarding and Police Agency

Norman Baker: To ask the Secretary of State for Defence with reference to the answer of 3 September 2007, *Official Report*, column 1628W, on Ministry of Defence Guarding and Police Agency: USA, when he expects the revised Memorandum of Agreement between the Ministry of Defence Police and Guarding Agency and the US Visiting Forces to be finalised. [218407]

Mr. Bob Ainsworth: The revised Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the Ministry of Defence Police and Guarding Agency and the US authorities was signed on 20 May 2008. It will come into effect on 1 October 2008. [15 July 2008 : Column 316W]

Q: Nick Harvey: To ask the Secretary of State for Defence how many discussions he has had with (a) NATO and (b) Russia on Ballistic Missile Defence in the last 12 months. [209582]

A: Des Browne: The issue of ballistic missile defence is routinely discussed at a high level in a number of NATO and bilateral fora. [10 Jun 2008 : Column 119W]

RAF Lakenheath

Q: Mr. Dai Davies: To ask the Secretary of State for Defence when the United States withdrew from RAF Lakenheath the last of its nuclear weapons stored there. [216815]

A: Des Browne: It is both UK and NATO policy to neither confirm nor deny the presence of nuclear weapons at a given location. [8 July 2008 : Column 1463W]

FINALLY...

We obtained a copy of the new Memorandum of Arrangement (MoA) between the Ministry of Defence Police and Guarding Agency and the United States Air Force in Europe under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. According to the document it

came into operation on the day of signing - 25 May this year. There does not seem much difference between this MoA and the 1989 version. The MDPAs are still paid and under the operational control of the US authorities. The document will be put on the website soon.

GOOD NEWS: Laila (Co-ordinator of CAAB) and Rob Packer now have a daughter – Sofia May was born on 3 August 2008 – many congratulations!

Talks by CAAB since last Newsletter:

Leeds Criminal Justice Group

Press and interviews:

Red Pepper, BBC Radio 4

Meeting for Worship:

Continue outside various US bases – contact CAAB for details

Message from the Treasurer:

The road seeking justice in the courts is not only a long exhausting trail, but also very expensive when members of the legal profession are brought into support CAAB.

Fees for the last two cases (see page 2) amounted to £6,462.50 which, through the generous response to my appeal, have been paid. The legal fund remains open to help with forthcoming cases and, as ever your support is much appreciated.

We have been blessed by the fact that Lindis has shouldered her legal burdens herself on many occasions, saving CAAB a mint of money. However this is not always appropriate, as, regrettably members of the Bench will often take more notice of a lawyer rather than such a well-versed member of the public as Lindis.

It's all a balancing act trying to get a fair hearing and so dependent on the Judge or Magistrates involved and certainly not fair always expecting Lindis to take such a responsibility.

No – it didn't work out in the recent cases but we live in hope for the future. Thank you all again for helping us to continue following this rocky road.

CAAB Co-ordinators: Lindis Percy and Laila Packer

Hon Treasurer: Christine Dean

5 Garnett Street, Otley, West Yorkshire LS21 1AL

Webmaster: Ray Middleton

CONTACT: 59 Swarcliffe Road, Harrogate, HG1 4QZ.

Tel/Fax no: 01423 884076

Please note new E-mail: mail@caab.corner.org.uk

Website: <http://www.caab.org.uk>



This newsletter is printed on 100% recycled paper by: Enid Taylor Ltd, The Printing House, 8 Cold Bath Road, Harrogate, HG2 0NA.

Tel: 01423 567764 · Fax: 01423 567765

E-mail: info@enidtaylor.co.uk