

X-eGroups-Return: sentto-1413460-699-961453776-mupj=igc.apc.org@returns.onelist.com
X-Sender: abolition2000@abolition2000.org
To: abolition-caucus@egroups.com
From: Abolition 2000 <admin@abolition2000.org>
Mailing-List: list abolition-caucus@egroups.com; contact abolition-caucus-owner@egroups.com
Delivered-To: mailing list abolition-caucus@egroups.com
List-Unsubscribe: <mailto:abolition-caucus-unsubscribe@egroups.com>
Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2000 14:40:06 -0800
Subject: [abolition-caucus] State Department Drops 'Rogue State' Tag

http://dailynews.yahoo.com/h/nm/20000619/pl/usa_rogues_dc_1.html

19 June 2000

State Department Drops 'Rogue State' Tag

By Jonathan Wright

WASHINGTON (Reuters) - Iran, Libya and North Korea are rogues no longer, the State Department has decided.

Now they're just "states of concern", Secretary of State Madeleine Albright said in a radio interview.

"Some of those countries aren't as bad as they used to be. They say: 'We've done some stuff so why are you still calling us a rogue state?'" one State Department official said.

Or, as State Department spokesman Richard Boucher put it more carefully on Monday: "It's just a recognition that we have seen some evolution in different ways in different places, and that we will deal appropriately with each one based on the kind of evolution we're seeing."

Iran, for example, has become more democratic, with presidential and parliamentary elections. Libya has handed over the suspects in the Lockerbie case for trial and North Korea has declared a moratorium on tests of its long-range missiles.

Even Iraq, a hardcore "rogue state" under the old description, is now "a state previously known as rogue", to quote Boucher's jocular formulation.

Albright, speaking on National Public Radio's Diane Rehm show, said: "We are now calling these states 'states of concern' because we are concerned about their support for terrorist activities, their development of missiles, their desire to disrupt the international system."

Four Groups Of Nations

The Clinton administration, and especially Albright as ambassador to the United Nations, was once an enthusiastic proponent of the "rogue state" theory.

In an April 1994 lecture, she divided the countries of the world into four categories -- international good citizens, emerging democracies, rogue states and countries where a state hardly exists, such as Somalia and Sierra Leone.

She defined a rogue state as one that had no part in the international system and that tried to sabotage it. U.S. policy should be to isolate them, she added.

For the past year or so, the United States had used the term mainly for countries it thought might be working on long-range missiles. This was the justification for planning a controversial national defense against their missiles.

But experience, especially with the isolated Stalinist state of North Korea, has shown that it might be more productive in the long run to engage in dialogue.

In the case of Iran, moreover, the United States has been actively seeking a dialogue with the government, despite repeated rebuffs from Tehran.

Calling Names Does Not Help

Talks between the United States and North Korea, which have no diplomatic relations, have persuaded Pyongyang to freeze its nuclear program, allow the United States to inspect suspect sites and suspend the missile tests. The talks may have been a factor in persuading North Korean leader Kim Jong-il to take part in last week's summit with South Korea.

One U.S. official tied the change in terminology specifically to the case of North Korea, one of the countries which the United States calls a state sponsor of terrorism.

"It doesn't help to be calling them rogues one minute and trying to get them to be reasonable the next," he said.

Boucher said the State Department wanted to move away from putting countries in groups and would not be drawn on whether there were "states of concerns" which were never rogues.

The term "rogue" never had any formal status but Albright initially included Iraq, Iran, Serbia, Sudan, and North Korea.

Cuba and Syria have been on the U.S. list of "terrorism sponsors" but were rarely if ever called rogues.

"The category has outlived its usefulness...but we're not trying to create new categories. We're trying to deal with each situation in U.S. interests. If we see a development that we think is in U.S. interests, we will respond," Boucher said.

"If we're able to encourage them (states of concern) or pressure them or otherwise produce changes in their behavior, and therefore change in our relationship, we're willing to do that," the spokesman added.

Call Your eGroup and Save With beMANY!

http://click.egroups.com/1/5072/2/_/91925/_/961453776/

To subscribe to the Abolition Global Caucus, send an email from the account you wish to be subscribed to: "abolition-caucus-subscribe@egroups.com"

Do not include a subject line or any text in the body of the message.

To: jdi@clw.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Key senators
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear John,

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament is meeting next Thursday to continue planning for fall activities and beyond. We are interested in identifying key senators in the next Congress so that we can start organizing interfaith grassroots lobbying. For those up for re-election we can get grassroots folks to ask questions at voter forums, etc. For all of them we can encourage interfaith delegations to start meeting with their senators after the election before the next Congress convenes.

I am interested in two categories: swing vote Republicans and influential Democrats who should be speaking out more forcefully on a range of nuclear disarmament issues. For the latter I note how few were willing to sign Senator Dorgan's letter to President Clinton. I think I have a pretty good idea who the swing Republicans are, but I would like your ideas with some sense of priority. I also would like your suggestions on Democrats who can be encouraged to be stronger advocates of our cause.

I would appreciate receiving your suggestions at least by Wednesday, June 21.

Thanks,
Howard

From: "Surratt, Doris" <DSurratt@NAPAWASH.ORG>
To: Charles Washington <chaswash@mediaone.net>,
David Mora
<davidm@ci.salinas.ca.us>,
George Carvalho
<gcarvalho@santa-carita.com>,
George Frederickson
<gfred@falcon.cc.ukans.edu>,
Grantland Johnson
<gjohnson@chhs.cahwnet.gov>,
Harvey White <HLW@pitt.edu>, Howard Hallman
<mupj@igc.apc.org>,
Jim Svara <svara@ncsu.edu>, Norm Johnson
<njohnson@famu.edu>,
Norman King <king_no@sanbag.ca.gov>,
Royce Hanson
<rhanson@umbc7.umbc.edu>, Tim Clark <tclark@njdc.com>,
Valerie Lemmie
<citymgr@ci.dayton.oh.us>,
"zWholey, Joseph" <wholey@usc.edu>
Cc: "zRutledge, Philip" <rutledge@indiana.edu>
Subject: First Meeting of Working Group
Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2000 14:14:08 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

Thank you for agreeing to serve on the Working Group on Social Equity Issue Definition. Valerie Lemmie, Chair, has asked me to schedule the first meeting of the Working Group for early August at the Academy offices. We anticipate that the meeting will last 3 to 4 hours. Please let me know your availability on August 3rd, 4th and 8th. A conference call will be arranged for those who wish to participate by phone.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at 1-800-883-3190 or 202-347-3190 or by e-mail at dsurratt@napawash.org.

Doris Surratt
dsurratt@napawash.org

From: "Surratt, Doris" <DSurratt@NAPAWASH.ORG>
To: Charles Washington <chaswash@mediaone.net>,
David Mora
<davidm@ci.salinas.ca.us>,
George Carvalho
<gcarvalho@santa-carita.com>,
George Frederickson
<gfred@falcon.cc.ukans.edu>,
Grantland Johnson
<gjohnson@chhs.cahwnet.gov>,
Harvey White <HLW@pitt.edu>, Howard Hallman
<mupj@igc.apc.org>,
Jim Carroll <carrollj@fiu.edu>, Jim Svara
<svara@ncsu.edu>,
Norm Johnson <njohnson@famu.edu>,
Norman King
<king_no@sanbag.ca.gov>,
Royce Hanson <rhanson@umbc7.umbc.edu>, Tim Clark <tclark@njdc.com>,
Valerie Lemmie <citymgr@ci.dayton.oh.us>,
Yvonne Braithwaite Burke <seconddistrict@bos.co.la.ca.us>,
"zWholey, Joseph" <wholey@usc.edu>
Cc: "zRutledge, Philip" <rutledge@indiana.edu>
Subject: First Meeting of Working Group (Part 2)
Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2000 16:05:36 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

In an attempt to stay one step ahead of our illustrious Chair (Phil Rutledge), I failed to realize that many of you have not received pertinent background information on the Panel on Social Equity and your specific Working Group. A memo from Phil with background materials will be mailed to you early next week.

Doris Surratt
dsurratt@napawash.org

To: "Surratt, Doris" <DSurratt@NAPAWASH.ORG>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: First Meeting of Working Group
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <043191BD8403D411A2760090279CBFA90F5C88@NAPA-NT1>
References:

At 02:14 PM 6/16/00 -0400, you wrote:

>Thank you for agreeing to serve on the Working Group on Social Equity Issue
>Definition. Valerie Lemmie, Chair, has asked me to schedule the first
>meeting of the Working Group for early August at the Academy offices. We
>anticipate that the meeting will last 3 to 4 hours. Please let me know your
>availability on August 3rd, 4th and 8th.....

Of these dates, the morning of August 4 would be difficult for me, but the other times are okay.

Howard Hallman

X-Sender: epf@pop.igc.org
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.6 (32)
Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2000 10:02:48 -0400
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: Episcopal Peace Fellowship <epf@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Agenda for June 22 meeting

I expect to be at the meeting this Thursday, Howard.

mary miller, epf

At 09:17 AM 6/15/00 -0400, you wrote:

>Dear Colleagues:

>

>The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament will meet from 1:00 to
>2:30 p.m., Thursday, June 22 in Conference Room 4 at the Methodist
>Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, D.C. Please reply whether
>you will be attending.

>

>The agenda is attached. Previously I sent a draft statement of objectives.
> If you don't have it, let me know, and I'll send it again. Prior to the
>meeting I will post other background information. If you aren't coming to
>the meeting but want to send in your comments, please get them to me by
>June 21.

>

>Probably all of you know about the Interfaith Service at the Washington
>National Cathedral at 12 noon, Wednesday, June 21, sponsored by the Nuclear
>Reduction/Disarmament Initiative. This will follow the release of the
>joint statement by religious and military leaders. You are all invited.
>I'm hoping that Wendy Starman and/or Roy Enquist can attend our meeting on
>June 22 so that our respective grassroots outreach activities can be
>mutually supportive.

>

>Shalom,
>Howard

>

>###

>

>Meeting of Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament
>1:00 to 2:30 p.m.. Thursday, June 22, 2000
>Conference Room 4, Methodist Building
>100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, D.C.

>

>Agenda

>

- >1. Introductions
- >2. Statement of objectives (draft previously sent)
 - > a. Immediate
 - > b. Longer range
- >3. Hiroshima Day
- >4. 2000 Election
 - > a. Questions for congressional candidates
 - > b. Letter to presidential candidates

- > c. Grassroots involvement
- >5. Developing a grassroots action network (memo forthcoming)
- > a. Interfaith coordination
- > b. Geographic priorities
- > c. Activities
- >6. Next meeting
- >
- >Howard W. Hallman, Chair
- >Methodists United for Peace with Justice
- >1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036
- >Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail: mupj@igc.org
- >
- >Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a membership association of
- >laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any Methodist denomination.
- >

X-eGroups-Return: sentto-1413460-695-961427951-mupj=igc.apc.org@returns.onelist.com
To: "'Abolition-Caucus@igc.org'" <abolition-caucus@egroups.com>
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator: <03B89A554A86D311A1E8080009FE5B8A05DDC5@CAMBRIDGE1>
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
From: Joseph Gerson <JGerson@afsc.org>
Mailing-List: list abolition-caucus@egroups.com; contact abolition-caucus-owner@egroups.com
Delivered-To: mailing list abolition-caucus@egroups.com
List-Unsubscribe: <mailto:abolition-caucus-unsubscribe@egroups.com>
Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2000 11:11:29 -0400
Subject: [abolition-caucus] Hibakusha Resource Available from AFSC

June 19, 2000

Friends,

As we approach Hiroshima and Nagasaki Days, many local activists look for ways to bring forward the experiences and voices of the world's nuclear weapons victims. The American Friends Service Committee has published a 16 page booklet of testimonies of Hibakusha activists from Japan and five other countries (Kazakhstan, Korea, Marshall Islands, Tahiti and the United States.) These testimonies were made as the central event of the Global Hibakusha Delegation to the Hague Appeal for Peace Conference in 1999. The delegation was organized by the AFSC, Nihon Hidankyo, Message from Hiroshima & Nagasaki, and Gensuikyo.

The booklet's text can be found on the WEB at www.afsc.org/pes.htm on the "Current Activities and Events" page. It can be ordered for \$1 plus postage. Bulk orders are also possible: 10-99 at 50 cents each plus postage and 100 or more at 40 cents each plus postage.

Copies of "With Hiroshima Eyes: Atomic War, Nuclear Extortion and Moral Imagination", a 203 page book by Joseph Gerson which describes U.S. use of nuclear weapons from Hiroshima to Baghdad, with the experiences and perspective of Japanese Hibakusha and calls for the abolition of nuclear weapons at the center, remain available from the AFSC for \$15 plus postage.

Videos and films on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, nuclear weapons, and U.S. nuclear policy can also be rented from the AFSC film library. A complete listing can be found on the Film Library's WEB page: www.afsc.org/nero/nevlib.htm.

For additional information or to order write: JGerson@afsc.org or Peace & Economic Security Program, AFSC, 2161 Massachusetts Ave., Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A. 02140. Phone: 617-661-6130.

Lonely? Get Firetalk!
Free, unlimited calls anywhere in the world.
Free voice chat on hundreds of topics.
http://click.egroups.com/1/5477/2/_/91925/_/961427952/

To subscribe to the Abolition Global Caucus, send an email from the account you wish to be subscribed to: "abolition-caucus-subscribe@egroups.com"

Do not include a subject line or any text in the body of the message.

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\[abolition-caucus] Hibakusha Re"

From: Joseph Gerson <JGerson@afsc.org>
Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2000 11:11:29 -0400
Subject: [abolition-caucus] Hibakusha Resource Available from AFSC

June 19, 2000

Friends,

As we approach Hiroshima and Nagasaki Days, many local activists look for ways to bring forward the experiences and voices of the world's nuclear weapons victims. The American Friends Service Committee has published a 16 page booklet of testimonies of Hibakusha activists from Japan and five other countries (Kazakhstan, Korea, Marshall Islands, Tahiti and the United States.) These testimonies were made as the central event of the Global Hibakusha Delegation to the Hague Appeal for Peace Conference in 1999. The delegation was organized by the AFSC, Nihon Hidankyo, Message from Hiroshima & Nagasaki, and Gensuikyo.

The booklet's text can be found on the WEB at www.afsc.org/pes.htm on the "Current Activities and Events" page. It can be ordered for \$1 plus postage. Bulk orders are also possible: 10-99 at 50 cents each plus postage and 100 or more at 40 cents each plus postage.

Copies of "With Hiroshima Eyes: Atomic War, Nuclear Extortion and Moral Imagination", a 203 page book by Joseph Gerson which describes U.S. use of nuclear weapons from Hiroshima to Baghdad, with the experiences and perspective of Japanese Hibakusha and calls for the abolition of nuclear weapons at the center, remain available from the AFSC for \$15 plus postage.

Videos and films on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, nuclear weapons, and U.S. nuclear policy can also be rented from the AFSC film library. A complete listing can be found on the Film Library's WEB page: www.afsc.org/nero/nevlib.htm.

For additional information or to order write: JGerson@afsc.org or Peace & Economic Security Program, AFSC, 2161 Massachusetts Ave., Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A. 02140. Phone: 617-661-6130.

To: mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Developing a grassroots action network
Cc:
Bcc: ipnd
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Colleagues:

At the upcoming June 22 meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, we will discuss the development of a grassroots action network. I offer some background ideas to stimulate discussion.

(A) The building blocks are the existing outreach networks of denominational offices and religious associations (my generic term for peace fellowships and other non-official organizations). For dissemination of information these networks rely upon periodicals, regular mail, e-mail, phone banks, and web sites. These mechanisms can be used to provide timely information on the issues we are dealing with. For sources of information we can draw upon the expertise of civic-sector organizations.

Questions to consider are who does what to maximize the use of these existing arrangements. This involves a commitment of various offices to participate and arrangements with civic-sector organizations to feed in timely information.

(B) We know from the CTBT ratification campaign and campaigns on other issues that we can increase our effectiveness by demonstrating interfaith support. It is sometimes easier for interfaith delegations to get appointments with senators, and to some extent with representatives, than each denomination going alone. We can increase the impact of letter writing and phone calls if they come from persons representing diverse groups located in all parts of the state or congressional district.

Some states have interfaith organizations we can relate to. In others we will have to stimulate interfaith cooperation on nuclear disarmament issues. Perhaps we can have a division of responsibility so that particular denominational offices and religious associations take the lead in different states to organize interfaith network on our issues. Who will agree to take the lead in particular states? Which ones?

(C) We can't expect to be active in all states immediately. Therefore, we need to prioritize. We might start with the Senate and identify (1) swing vote members and (2) proponents of aspects of nuclear disarmament who could do more. The first category has some senators up for re-election and some who are holdovers. We can rank states according to these categories and undertake our initial interfaith activities in those states. Later we can engage in a similar process for the House of Representatives.

I have asked some civic-sector contacts for suggestions on which senators to focus on initially. We can use their suggestions to develop our own list of priorities.

(D) As we work with our contacts in various states, we can suggest activities they might undertake. One listing in descending order of effectiveness (borrowed from Marie Rietmann) is as follows:

- (1) Organize citizen and high-level delegation visits to senators, or staff, in their field offices.
- (2) Attend senators' public meetings and ask questions.
- (3) Develop a telephone relationship with staff in D.C. who handles nuclear disarmament issues; get to know field staff who follows this issue.

- (4) Organize letters signed by non-traditional allies; hand deliver the letter and take along a couple of the signers.
- (5) Write letters to editors of newspapers; try to place op-ed articles.
- (6) Generate letters to senators from all regions of the state.
- (7) Promote calls to senators' D.C. office on designated call-in days.

Does this list make sense? Are there other activities to encourage? What are our priorities? How will we convey these suggestions to grassroots contacts? Should we produce a common body of how-to material?

Please offer your own ideas on how we can best develop grassroots activities for nuclear disarmament.

Shalom,
Howard

To: granoff
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Getting together
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Jonathan,

Are you going to be in Washington on Wednesday when the religious and civic leaders release their statement? If so, perhaps we could get together to discuss our mutual interest in interfaith mobilization.

Shalom,
Howard

To: stevenson@gsinstitute.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: June 22 meeting
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Tyler,

I hope you will be able to join us Thursday afternoon for the meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. You will be able to get a feel for our approach to mobilizing the faith community on nuclear disarmament issues. Particularly in the part of the agenda when we discuss developing a grassroots action network, you may want to describe activities of the Global Security Institute.

Shalom,
Howard

####

Meeting of Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament
1:00 to 2:30 p.m.. Thursday, June 22, 2000
Conference Room 4, Methodist Building
100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, D.C.

Agenda

1. Introductions
2. Statement of objectives (draft previously sent)
 - a. Immediate
 - b. Longer range
3. Hiroshima Day
4. 2000 Election
 - a. Questions for congressional candidates
 - b. Letter to presidential candidates
 - c. Grassroots involvement
5. Developing a grassroots action network (memo forthcoming)
 - a. Interfaith coordination
 - b. Geographic priorities
 - c. Activities
6. Next meeting

From: "James O. Watkins, Jr." <jow@mindspring.com>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Developing a grassroots action network
Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2000 16:02:23 -0400
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2615.200
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2615.200

Would add general concepts - 1. That which is most effective in communiatingi is that which takes the most time to do. 2. Don't go away - most public officials expect advocates for this or that to go away. 3. Assume an educating stance - remember all public officials and their staff are educated beyond their intelligence. 4. Take time to build a constituency that is not easily pigeon holed as "liberal activists". Specifics - I would set a goal of so many personal letters form opinion leaders in each state.

----- Original Message -----

From: Howard W. Hallman <mupj@igc.org>
To: <mupj@igc.org>
Sent: Monday, June 19, 2000 3:24 PM
Subject: Developing a grassroots action network

> Dear Colleagues:

>
> At the upcoming June 22 meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear
> Disarmament, we will discuss the development of a grassroots action
> network. I offer some background ideas to stimulate discussion.
>
> (A) The building blocks are the existing outreach networks of
> denominational offices and religious associations (my generic term for
> peace fellowships and other non-official organizations). For
> dissemination of information these networks rely upon periodicals, regular
> mail, e-mail, phone banks, and web sites. These mechanisms can be used to
> provide timely information on the issues we are dealing with. For
sources
> of information we can draw upon the expertise of civic-sector
organizations.
>
> Questions to consider are who does what to maximize the use of these
> existing arrangements. This involves a commitment of various offices to
> participate and arrangements with civic-sector organizations to feed in
> timely information.
>
> (B) We know from the CTBT ratification campaign and campaigns on other
> issues that we can increase our effectiveness by demonstrating interfaith
> support. It is sometimes easier for interfaith delegations to get
> appointments with senators, and to some extent with representatives, than
> each denomination going alone. We can increase the impact of letter
> writing and phone calls if they come from persons representing diverse
> groups located in all parts of the state or congressional district.
>

> Some states have interfaith organizations we can relate to. In others we
> will have to stimulate interfaith cooperation on nuclear disarmament
> issues. Perhaps we can have a division of responsibility so that
> particular denominational offices and religious associations take the lead
> in different states to organize interfaith network on our issues. Who
will
> agree to take the lead in particular states? Which ones?
>
> (C) We can't expect to be active in all states immediately. Therefore, we
> need to prioritize. We might start with the Senate and identify (1) swing
> vote members and (2) proponents of aspects of nuclear disarmament who
could
> do more. The first category has some senators up for re-election and some
> who are holdovers. We can rank states according to these categories and
> undertake our initial interfaith activities in those states. Later we can
> engage in a similar process for the House of Representatives.
>
> I have asked some civic-sector contacts for suggestions on which senators
> to focus on initially. We can use their suggestions to develop our own
> list of priorities.
>
> (D) As we work with our contacts in various states, we can suggest
> activities they might undertake. One listing in descending order of
> effectiveness (borrowed from Marie Rietmann) is as follows:
>
> (1) Organize citizen and high-level delegation visits to senators, or
> staff, in their field offices.
>
> (2) Attend senators' public meetings and ask questions.
>
> (3) Develop a telephone relationship with staff in D.C. who handles
nuclear
> disarmament issues; get to know field staff who follows this issue.
>
> (4) Organize letters signed by non-traditional allies; hand deliver the
> letter and take along a couple of the signers.
>
> (5) Write letters to editors of newspapers; try to place op-ed articles.
>
> (6) Generate letters to senators from all regions of the state.
>
> (7) Promote calls to senators' D.C. office on designated call-in days.
>
> Does this list make sense? Are there other activities to encourage? What
> are our priorities? How will we convey these suggestions to grassroots
> contacts? Should we produce a common body of how-to material?
>
> Please offer your own ideas on how we can best develop grassroots
> activities for nuclear disarmament.
>
> Shalom,
> Howard
>
> Howard W. Hallman, Chair

- > Methodists United for Peace with Justice
- > 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036
- > Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail: mupj@igc.org
- >
- > Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a membership association of
- > laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any Methodist denomination.

From: JGG786@aol.com
Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2000 17:17:15 EDT
Subject: Re: Getting together
To: mupj@igc.org
X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 103

Yes, I will be there with Alan Cranston and I look forward to meeting you. I think we met in Geneva during an NPT Prepcom. Jonathan

From: "James O. Watkins, Jr." <jow@mindspring.com>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Developing a grassroots action network
Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2000 16:02:23 -0400
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2615.200
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2615.200

Would add general concepts - 1. That which is most effective in
ng is that which takes the most time to do. 2. Don't go away -
most public officials expect advocates for this or that to go away. 3.
Assume an educating stance - remember all public officials and their staff
are educated beyond their intelligence. 4. Take time to build a
constituency that is not easily pigeon holed as "liberal activists".
from opinion
leaders in each state.

From: UUAWO@aol.com
Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2000 09:36:18 EDT
Subject: Re: Developing a grassroots action network
To: mupj@igc.org
X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 14

Howard --

I don't know if Larry has been in touch with you.
June 22 is the first day of the annual UU General Assembly.
Most of us, including Larry, will be in Nashville.
I'll be taking some literature for our exhibit table.
Theresa Kashin
Unitarian Universalist Wash.Ofc.

X-Sender: jdi@[209.8.25.194]
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)
Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2000 15:20:40 -0400
To: jdi@clw.org
From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>
Subject: Prominent individuals, groups and newspapers that have called
on President Clinton not to deploy national missile defense

Prominent individuals, groups and newspapers that have called on President Clinton not to deploy national missile defense:

=====
Former government officials and other prominent individuals:
=====

Harold Brown, Defense Secretary under President Carter
Zbigniew Brzezinski, national security adviser to President Carter
President Jimmy Carter
John Deutch, C.I.A. Director
Gloria C. Duffy, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense
Susan Eisenhower
Richard L. Garwin, member of Rumsfeld panel on missile threats
General Andrew J. Goodpaster (ret.), chief of staff to President Eisenhower
Henry Kissinger, Secretary of State under President Nixon
Lawrence J. Korb, Assistant Secretary of Defense under President Reagan
Ambassador Jack F. Matlock, Jr., Ambassador to Russia
Jessica T. Mathews, National Security Council staff under Pres. Carter
Robert C. McFarlane, national security adviser to President Reagan
Robert McNamara, Defense Secretary under President Kennedy
Senator Sam Nunn, Chairman Senate Armed Services Committee
Joseph S. Nye, Jr., Pentagon official under Pres. Clinton
Admiral William A. Owens (ret.), Vice Chairman Joint Chiefs of Staff
Richard N. Perle, Assistant Secretary of Defense under President Reagan
William J. Perry, Defense Secretary under President Clinton
John Rhinelander, Legal adviser to the SALT I delegation
Roald Z. Sagdeev
General John M. Shalikashvili (ret.), Chairman, Joint Chiefs of staff
John P. White, Deputy Secretary of Defense under President Clinton
R. James Woolsey, C.I.A. Director

=====
Republican politicians:
=====

Governor George W. Bush
Senator Chuck Hagel (R-NE)
Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Jesse Helms (R-NC)
Senator John McCain (R-AZ)
Senator Pat Roberts (R-KS)
Senator Gordon Smith (R-OR)

=====
Democratic politicians:
=====

Senator Joseph Biden (D-DE)

Senator Jeff Bingaman (D-NM)
Senator Barbara Boxer (D-CA)
Senator Byron Dorgan (D-ND)
Senator Richard Durbin (D-IL)
Senator Russ Feingold (D-WI)
Senator Tom Harkin (D-IA)
Senator John Kerry (D-MA)
Senator Patrick Leahy (D-VT)

=====
Foreign leaders:

=====
Canadian Foreign Minister Lloyd Axworthy
French President Jacques Chirac
Swedish Foreign Minister Ana Lindh
Russian President Vladimir Putin
German Chancellor Gerhard Schröder
Javier Solana, former secretary general of NATO

=====
Russian experts:

=====
Gary Bertsch, University of Georgia
Douglas W. Blum, Providence College
George Breslauer, University of California, Berkeley
Eva Busza, College of William and Mary
Dan Caldwell, Pepperdine University
Joseph Cirincione, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace
Timothy J. Colton, Harvard University
Herbert J. Ellison, University of Washington
Matthew Evangelista, Cornell University
Marshall I. Goldman, Harvard University
Stephen E. Hanson, University of Washington
Arthur Hartman, Former Ambassador to the Soviet Union
David Holloway, Stanford University
Ted Hopf, Ohio State University
Stuart Kaufman, University of Kentucky and former security staff (Clinton admin)
Spurgeon M. Keeny, Jr., Arms Control Association
William H. Kincade, American University
Robert Legvold, Columbia University
James R. Millar, George Washington University
James Clay Moltz, Monterey Institute of International Studies
Bruce Parrott, The Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies
William C. Potter, Institute Professor
Scott Parrish, Monterey Institute of International Studies
John B. Rhinelander, Lawyers Alliance for World Security (LAWS)
James Richter, Bates College
Dina R. Spechler, Indiana University
John Steinbruner, Center for International and Security Studies, University of Maryland
Ronald Grigor Suny, University of Chicago
Brian Taylor, University of Oklahoma
Astrid S. Tuminez, Council on Foreign Relations

Paul F. Walker, Global Green USA
Celeste A. Wallander, Harvard University

=====
Religious groups:
=====

Africa Faith and Justice Network
American Friends Service Committee, Washington Office
Baptist Peace Fellowship of North America
Church of the Brethren, Washington Office
Church Women United
Columban Fathers Justice and Peace Office
Commission on Social Action of Reform Judaism
Disciples Peace Fellowship
Episcopal Peace Fellowship
Friends Committee on National Legislation
Graymoor Ecumenical and Interreligious Institute, Washington
Maryknoll Office for Global Concern
Methodist United for Peace with Justice
Mennonite Central Committee, USA, Washington Office
National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA, Washington Office
NETWORK, A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby
Unitarian Universalist
Association of Congregations
United Church of Christ/ Office for Church in Society
World Peacemakers

=====
Public interest groups:
=====

Arms Control Association
British American Security Information Council
Center for Defense Information
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
Council for a Livable World
Federation of American Scientists
Institute for Science and International Security
International Center
Lawyers Alliance for World Security
League of Women Voters
Natural Resources Defense Council
Peace Links
Peace Action Education Fund
Physicians for Social Responsibility
Taxpayers for Common Sense
Union of Concerned Scientists
Women's Action for New Directions
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom
20/20 Vision Education Fund

=====
Newspapers:
=====

Atlanta Journal-Constitution
Bangor (Maine) Daily News
Birmingham News
Business Week
Boston Globe
Chicago Tribune
Christian Science Monitor
The Cincinnati Post
The Courier-Journal Louisville, KY
Daily News (New York)
Dallas Morning News
The Hartford Courant
The Houston Chronicle
Los Angeles Times
Nando Times (internet publication)
Newark Star-Ledger
New York Times
Omaha World Herald
Philadelphia Inquirer
Roanoke Times & World News
Seattle Post-Intelligencer
St. Petersburg Times
San Francisco Chronicle
Tulsa World
USA Today
Washington Post

John Isaacs
Council for a Livable World
110 Maryland Avenue, NE - Room 409
Washington, D.C. 20002
(202) 543-4100 x.131
www.clw.org

To: DKNUTSONR@aol.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Thanks and an invitation
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Marj and Don,

Somewhat belatedly I want to thank you for the hospitality you showed me when I was in Phoenix. I enjoyed our conversation, watching Megan, and the Mexican food.

Marj, I hope you and Jeanette will stay with us when you make your trip East in the fall. The African woman who has been living with us will be moving out by the end of July. Her daughter is coming to study at the local community college, and they will find an apartment together. So we have a guest room available with a double bed and a twin bed we put up for double occupancy. Just let us know when it will be.

On Saturday Carlee, Beth, Joy, Matthew, and I will fly to California for an eight day vacation. We'll visit San Francisco, Yosemite, and the Big Sur. My first visit to Yosemite was when I was 12, which is Matthew's age. I know he'll like it.

Cordially,
Howard

From: "Bob and Elaine Tiller" <tiller64@starpower.net>

To: <ograbc@aol.com>,

<ken@bpfna.org>,

"Jim Matlack" <denhartz@erols.com>,

<droose@afsc.org>,

<dradcliff_gb@brethren.org>,

<washofc@aol.com>,

<ann_d.parti@ecunet.org>,

<redgar@nccusa.org>,

<lisaw@nccusa.org>,

<heathern@nccusa.org>,

<bgrieves@dfms.org>,

<jmskipper@aol.com>,

<thart@dfms.org>,

<epf@peacenet.org>,

<disarm@forusa.org>,

<joe@fcnl.org>,

<kathy@fcnl.org>,

<sara@fcnl.org>,

<marsusab@aol.com>,

<J._Daryl_Byler@mcc.org>,

<CHouleMM@aol.com>,

<mknolldc@igc.org>,

<dave@paxchristiusa.org>,

<slisherness@unidial.com>,

<jow@mindspring.com>,

<wowensby@ctr.pcusa.org>,

"Bill Yolton" <dengster@aol.com>,

<uuawo@aol.com>,

<jnoble@uahc.org>,

<lintnerj@ucc.org>,

<stiefr@ucc.org>,

<dringler@umc-gbcs.org>,

<gpowers@nccbuscc.org>,

<WorldPeacemakers@compuserve.com>,

<mupj@igc.org>,

<dkelli@iiit.org>,

<ccosby@dhm.disciples.org>,

<blythe-goodman@erols.com>,

<sdeboe@csm.org>

Subject: Re: Agenda for June 22 meeting

Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2000 23:01:47 -0400

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2314.1300

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300

I expect to attend.

Bob Tiller

----- Original Message -----

From: Howard W. Hallman <mupj@igc.org>

To: <ograbc@aol.com>; <ken@bpfna.org>; <tiller64@starpower.net>; Jim Matlack
<denhartz@erols.com>; <droose@afsc.org>; <dradcliff_gb@brethren.org>;
<washofc@aol.com>; <ann_d.parti@ecunet.org>; <redgar@nccusa.org>;
<lisaw@nccusa.org>; <heathern@nccusa.org>; <bgrieves@dfms.org>;
<jmskipper@aol.com>; <thart@dfms.org>; <epf@peacenet.org>;
<disarm@forusa.org>; <joe@fcnl.org>; <kathy@fcnl.org>; <sara@fcnl.org>;
<marsusab@aol.com>; <J._Daryl_Byler@mcc.org>; <CHouleMM@aol.com>;
<mknolldc@igc.org>; <dave@paxchristiusa.org>; <slisherness@unidial.com>;
<jow@mindspring.com>; <wowensby@ctr.pcusa.org>; Bill Yolton
<dengster@aol.com>; <uuawo@aol.com>; <jnoble@uahc.org>; <lintnerj@ucc.org>;
<stiefr@ucc.org>; <dringler@umc-gbcs.org>; <gpowers@nccbuscc.org>;
<WorldPeacemakers@compuserve.com>; <mupj@igc.org&g
Sent: Thursday, June 15, 2000 9:17 AM
Subject: Agenda for June 22 meeting

> Dear Colleagues:

>
> The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament will meet from 1:00 to
> 2:30 p.m., Thursday, June 22 in Conference Room 4 at the Methodist
> Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, D.C. Please reply whether
> you will be attending.

>
> The agenda is attached. Previously I sent a draft statement of
objectives.

> If you don't have it, let me know, and I'll send it again. Prior to the
> meeting I will post other background information. If you aren't coming to
> the meeting but want to send in your comments, please get them to me by
> June 21.

>
> Probably all of you know about the Interfaith Service at the Washington
> National Cathedral at 12 noon, Wednesday, June 21, sponsored by the
Nuclear
> Reduction/Disarmament Initiative. This will follow the release of the
> joint statement by religious and military leaders. You are all invited.
> I'm hoping that Wendy Starman and/or Roy Enquist can attend our meeting on
> June 22 so that our respective grassroots outreach activities can be
> mutually supportive.

>
> Shalom,
> Howard

>
> ###

>
> Meeting of Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament
> 1:00 to 2:30 p.m.. Thursday, June 22, 2000
> Conference Room 4, Methodist Building
> 100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, D.C.

>
> Agenda

>
> 1. Introductions
> 2. Statement of objectives (draft previously sent)
> a. Immediate

- > b. Longer range
- > 3. Hiroshima Day
- > 4. 2000 Election
- > a. Questions for congressional candidates
- > b. Letter to presidential candidates
- > c. Grassroots involvement
- > 5. Developing a grassroots action network (memo forthcoming)
- > a. Interfaith coordination
- > b. Geographic priorities
- > c. Activities
- > 6. Next meeting
- >
- > Howard W. Hallman, Chair
- > Methodists United for Peace with Justice
- > 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036
- > Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail: mupj@igc.org
- >
- > Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a membership association of
- > laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any Methodist denomination.
- >

Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2000 19:59:12 -0700 (PDT)
From: <orders@amazon.com>
X-Authentication-Warning: online-3-tu0.amazon.com: nobody set sender to orders@amazon.com using -f
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: Your Order with Amazon.com (#002-4597182-8759212)
Cc:
Sender: orders@amazon.com

Thank you for ordering from Amazon.com. Your purchase information appears below.

To see the latest information about your order, or to cancel or modify a pending order, just click the "Your Account" link in the top right corner of any page on our Web site or visit:

<http://www.amazon.com/your-account>

If you ordered several items to be delivered to the same address, we may send them to you in separate boxes to give you the speediest service. Rest assured: This will not affect your shipping charges.

Thanks for shopping at Amazon.com!

-- Amazon.com Customer Service

Your purchase reads as follows:

E-mail Address: mupj@igc.org
Billing Address: Howard W. Hallman
6508 Wilmet Road
Bethesda, MD 20817
USA

Telephone: 301 897-3668

Subtotal:	\$	0.00
Shipping & Handling:	\$	0.00
Purchase Total:	\$	0.00

=====
Order #1: (Order #002-4597182-8759212)

Howard W. Hallman
6508 Wilmet Road
Bethesda, MD 20817

USA

Shipping method: Standard Shipping
Shipping Preference: Ship this when complete

1 "Grasses and Grains (The Green World)" Theresa Greenaway; Library
Binding; @ \$24.26 each
Out of print

Researching price information for 1 item(s).

NOTE REGARDING ORDERS CONTAINING OUT-OF-PRINT ITEMS: You will receive an e-mail message requesting approval of the price and condition of these titles. We will not charge your credit card until your approval has been received and the items have been obtained. Please note that each item listed as out-of-print is shipped as soon as we receive it, and will incur a separate per shipment and per item charge.

Would your friends enjoy shopping at Amazon.com? We'd love to send them a \$5 gift certificate to give us a try--and we'll send you a \$5 gift certificate for every friend who becomes a customer! Enter their e-mail addresses using the URL below, and we'll take it from there:

<http://www.amazon.com/cs-refer-a-friend>

Manage all your orders online. Access "Your Account" (<http://www.amazon.com/your-account>), and you can:

- * Track the status of this order
- * Combine open orders to save on shipping
- * Change the payment option for this order
- * Change the shipping option or address
- * Cancel unshipped items from this order

If you still need to get in touch with us about your order, send an

e-mail message to orders@amazon.com (or just reply to this message).

Thanks again for shopping at Amazon.com!

Amazon.com
Earth's Biggest Selection
<http://www.amazon.com> orders@amazon.com

"Neither fire nor wind, birth nor death can erase our good deeds."

-- Buddha

Biographies and Memoirs:

<http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/tg/browse-books/-/2429/ref=oe-oc-1>

Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2000 21:31:13 -0400
From: "Amy N. Jones" <anjones@erols.com>
Reply-To: anjones@erols.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.51 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Regrets

Sorry you can't come. We'll miss you. We hope he'll be surprised! Amy is in Mexico so I'm picking up her e-mail.

Keep Jim Maddox in your prayers. He's having Open Heart surgery either tomorrow or Thursday. From the sound of Vangy's e-mail, he is not doing well. I know they have been trying to define exactly what is wrong. She also has her Aunt with her temporarily. Auntie is 102. Her son (where she lived) died and she is with Vangy & Jim until her daughter returns from vacation. I believe another cousin has come from Florida to stay with Auntie during this time.

We also have Miles' father in hospital. Triple bypass and valve replacement. He still hasn't awakened, but CAT scan shows brain activity and that he had a small stroke. It may be days, or weeks before he comes out of it, but the neurosurgeon feels he will recover fully. They have begun physical therapy. We're still hoping to leave in August, but suspect this will be postponed, depending on Papa's condition, etc.

Much going on. Hope all is well there.

Nancy

P.S. Don't reply to me at home, as I'm here at Ken's most of the time helping with Th. Matthew (it's too much for one grandmother, alone). Besides, Mama needs company while Papa is in the hospital. It is too upsetting for her to visit him there.

You can reply here at Amy's e-mail address.

Do let us know when you can come visit. Looks like we'll now be home most of the summer.

"Howard W. Hallman" wrote:

> Dear Amy,
>
> We regret we won't be able to attend the Surprise Retirement Part for Ed
> Jones. Please give our best regards to Ed and extend our congratulations
> for 52 years of working! Wow! That's a lot. Now a well deserved retirement.
>
> Our best wishes to Nancy and all the rest of you, too.
>
> Howard & Carlee Hallman
> Howard W. Hallman, Chair
> Methodists United for Peace with Justice
> 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036

> Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail: mupj@igc.org

>

> Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a membership association of
> laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any Methodist denomination.

Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2000 10:54:10 -0400
From: Carol Blythe and Rick Goodman <blythe-goodman@erols.com>
Reply-To: blythe-goodman@erols.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.01C-DH397 (Win95; I)
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Developing a grassroots action network

Howard -- I was counting on coming to the meeting tomorrow, however, we are needed to sign loan papers related to our house-addition. Since it has been delayed several times, I'm going to do that tomorrow.

If it goes quickly, I may try to come late.

But in the meanwhile, I am still very new, so I mainly will listen and learn at these meetings.

(can you suggest a quick read to get me up to speed on the issues involved?)

I have checked with the chair of the peace and justice committee for the Alliance of Baptists -- they are probably strongest in North Carolina as far as any particular state. If that is any help, I will try to develop that possible connection.

Stan Hasty, the executive director, did sign on the letter from Sara (Friends?) and also the one from a death penalty group. I think the Alliance has a sizeable group active on death penalty issues in different states.

Please do your summary email again, that was really helpful after the last meeting --

Many thanks
Carol Blythe
for the Alliance of Baptists

Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2000 16:36:11 -0500

From: William & Brenda Hardt <wchardt@teacher.esc4.com>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.72 [en]C-DIAL (Win95; I)

X-Accept-Language: en

To: Recipient List Suppressed <bbhardt@mail.esc4.com>,

Laura Ewing <ewinglaura@aol.com>, Marci Pampe <2mpampe@pdq.net>,
MJ Van Dussen <mjvand@swbell.net>, Sharon Watt <smwatt@prodigy.net>,
Terry Dougherty <ministerterry@hotmail.com>,
Janie Cook <Janiecook@aol.com>,
Robin Martin <Robin.Martin@apachecorp.com>,
Scott Endress <scottendress@mdumc.org>,
Tom Fowler <tfowler@brazosport.cc.tx.us>,
Omowale Luthuli <luthuli@aol.com>, Glynden Bode <bod15@hotmail.com>,
Jerry Carpenter <mjc52D@aol.com>, Donna Brown <donnagb@txucom.net>,
Ann Arnett <avlib@methodists.net>, Mary Dipboye <mdipboye@yahoo.com>,
David Meeker-Williams <meeckerwill@aol.com>,
"Linda O'Neal" <malakumc@stoutinternet.com>,
Charles Gaby <cgaby@stlukes-hou.org>,
Sheena Trotter-Dennis <strotter@imgh.org>,
Jeremy burnworth <jburnworth@yahoo.com>,
Milton Jordan <cbc@shreve.net>, Eugene Easterly <aumc@eazylink.com>,
Bob Tomlinson <bobalink22@hotmail.com>,
Constance Gray <cgray@swrad.com>,
Janet Blackburn <janblackburn@yahoo.com>,
Sandy Londa <slonda@earthlink.net>, Sandra Downs <kdowns@wt.net>,
Alfred Zustovich <pag_zustovich@msn.com>,
Cheryl Ferguson <cferg7498@aol.com>

Subject: article submitted to UM Reporter

Friends- I have just submitted this article suggestion to the UM Reporter. Please pray that they will run it or something similar. Do you have additions to it? Let me know. Brenda

Cover letter: June 19, 2000

Dear Dan Gangler & United Methodist Reporter Staff:

It has come to my attention that so many United Methodist go on mission trips each year but rarely make a component of their mission a deliberate attempt to understand the full scope of their mission opportunity. Their trip could serve not only to offer mercy but could be a large stepping stone to help them bridge the understanding gap about justice issues. Based on Micah 6:8 "O mortal, what does the Lord require of you but to do justice, love mercy, and walk humbly with your God", and Luke 4:16-17, we strive as Christian educators to help increase the understanding of systemic social change. The following article was written by Sheena Trotter-Dennis, Associate Director-Interfaith Relations for Interfaith Ministries of Greater Houston who also serves on the Texas Annual Conference Board of Church & Society. Her phone is 281-286-4054 and her e-mail is strotter@imgh.org.

The questions that need asking were given to me by Rev. Carol Windrum (contact information at end) who has been the Peace With Justice Ministries director for the Nebraska

Conference
of the UMC for over 17 years. She received the questions from Jim
Winkler at the
GBCS.

I serve as the PwJ Ministries Coordinator for the Texas Conference.
Just tonight I gave a presentation on the global debt crisis and the
Jubilee 2000 campaign. It was very helpful for me to do it as I learned

so much about the WHY countries are mired in poverty and how our (first
world) future is tied to their future in so many ways.

Submitted by: Brenda Hardt

10375 New Wehdem Rd.

Brenham, TX 77833

979-830-0136-- Let me know what you think about making these two
submissions into an article for the UM Reporter.

-----^-----^-----^-----^-----

Summer Mission Trips ~ Why We Must Link Justice with Mission
by Sheena Trotter-Dennis

It's almost that time again. Youth groups around the country are
packing up their belongings, loading the youth vans and trekking across
towns, state lines and borders for their summer mission trips. Ten
years ago, I too, was among those thousands of youth who piled into vans

and rode many miles to a pre-selected mission site. Our goal for the
week - to make repairs on houses and build wheelchair ramps for people
living on Native American reservations. For one solid week, my youth
group, along with five or six other UMYF groups, worked in the hot
August sun to complete our tasks. The week was a turning point for my
youth group. The experience bonded us together and strengthened our
commitment to the group, as well as our commitment to serve others.

Summer mission trips are fun, and the lessons learned (working together
on a common project, giving up personal time to help someone less
fortunate, cross-cultural/socio-economical exchange) are unquestionably
pertinent for youth to learn. However, we are missing a key element to
Christian service - the discussion of justice. Until there is an
understanding of what can be done to correct the injustice in the world
- the service projects are not complete. We must educate our groups of
young people, and ourselves, as to why situations are unjust. As part
of our service projects, we must address the difficult questions: What
are contributing factors to poverty? Why is there a disproportionate
economic system? Why do inequities occur? The church's commitment to
serving others is clear. We must take our commitment further, by
working towards creating a just society.

Summer mission trips offer an entrée for youth to give of themselves,
and to open their eyes to the world's inequities. By offering youth a
chance to understand these situations, we not only will send youth
groups home with a commitment to serve, but also with a new mission - to

work for justice in the world. Their summer mission trip will have only

just begun.

General Questions for “doing” social analysis

1. What do you notice about our situation here today? What are the people experiencing?
2. What changes have occurred in the past twenty years? Ten years? What have been the most important changes? The most important events?
3. What influence does money have in our situation? Why?
4. Who makes the most important decisions around here? Why?
5. What are the most important relationships people have here? Why?
6. What are the most important traditions of the people? Why?
7. What do the people want most out of life? Why?
8. What will things be like in ten years if they keep going in the same direction? Why?
9. What are the most important causes of the way things are today? Why?
10. What did you learn from this information?

What follows could be called "How can VIM teams work themselves out of a job?!"

These questions were reviewed by a VIM group from Nebraska on their way to Honduras this past February...

Uncovering the many dimensions of poverty in Honduras
Questions to explore...

Deforestation

What is the extent of deforestation in Honduras? Did deforestation impact the consequences of Hurricane Mitch? What are the causes of deforestation? Is there anything we Christians of North America can do to change the patterns of deforestation (personal lifestyle or public policy)?

International Debt

Is there any link between the devastation of Hurricane Mitch and the international debt of Honduras? If there is, is there anything we Christians of North American can do to address the debt of Honduras?

Transnational Business

What is the role of transnational corporations in the economy of Honduras? What impact do they have on the poor? Is there anything we Christians in North America can do as consumers of products grown/made/assembled in Honduras to enhance the lives of the poor in Honduras?

Status of Loans and Grants

What is the status of loans and grants the Honduran government was promised by international institutions after Hurricane Mitch? If these loans and grants have not been processed, there anything we in North

American can do to help get them processed?

Foreign Policy

How have U. S. foreign policy decisions of the past and present impacted

the lives of the poor in Honduras? What have been some successful policies? What have been some detrimental policies? What can we as U.S. Citizens do to promote positive foreign policy relating to Honduras?

Military Presence

Has there been a U.S. Military presence in Honduras in the past? What role did it play? Has our government provided military assistance to Honduras? Has the U.S. government permitted arms sales to Honduras? What have the impacts been on the poor of Honduras? Is there anything we as U.S. citizens can do to influence a positive peace in Honduras?

Human Rights

What is the status of human rights in Honduras? If there is need for improvement, what can we as Christians and U.S. citizens do to promote better human rights for Honduras?

For more assistance in “doing” social analysis, contact Rev. Carol Windrum, Peace with Justice Ministries, 3735 No. 39th St., Omaha, NE 68111-2621 402/455-4281, cawindrum@yahoo.com-- or contact Robin Ringler, the Peace With Justice Director at the Board of Church & Society 202-488-5600 or dringler@gbcs-umc.org.

User-Agent: Microsoft-Outlook-Express-Macintosh-Edition/5.02.2022

Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2000 18:20:18 +0000

Subject: Schedule for NW-WG in July

From: Tim Barner <timb@2020vision.org>

To: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>,
Stephen Young <syoun@clw.org>,
Kathy Guthrie <kathy@fcl.org>,
Lisa IEER <ieer@ieer.org>,
Kathy Crandall <kathycrandall@earthlink.net>,
Kimberly Robson <wand@wand.org>,
Joan Wade <disarmament@igc.org>,
Ann Gallivan <agallivan@psr.org>,
Jenny Smith <jsmith@clw.org>,
Tom Collina <tcollina@ucsusa.org>,
Esther Pank <estherpank@hotmail.com>,
Sara Bradbury <sara@fcl.org>,
Gillian Gilhool <ggilhool@ix.netcom.com>,
Kimberly Roberts <kroberts@psr.org>,
Alistair Millar <amillar@fourthfreedom.org>,
Paul Sullivan <Paul@Taxpayer.net>,
WILPF <wilpfdc@wilpf.org>,
Ira Shorr <irashorr@hotmail.com>,
Martin Butcher <mbutcher@psr.org>,
Jim Bridgman <jbridgman@peace-action.org>,
Stephanie Broughton <fen_broughton@hotmail.com>,
John Spykerman <jspykerman@ucsusa.org>,
Peace Links office <peacelinks1@erols.com>,
David Adelman <dadelman@nrdc.org>,
Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.org>,
Chuck Ferguson <cferg@fas.org>,
Loulena Miles <Loulena@earthlink.net>,
Dan Koslofsky <dan@clw.org>,
Lynn Erskine <lerskine@clw.org>

Dear all:

At this morning's meeting we decided that the one and only July meeting of the Nuclear Weapons Working Group would be at 9:30 AM on Thursday, July 20. Esther Pank will be chairing but not be able to get agenda messages until a day ahead of time.

For items for the July 20 agenda, please copy both estherpank@hotmail.com and timb@2020vision.org. Esther would still like to have a co-chair for that meeting and August.

To the NW-WG e-mail list sent out yesterday by me, please add Lynn Erskine, Council for a Livable World <lerskine@clw.org>.

X-Lotus-FromDomain: MCC
From: J._Daryl_Byler@mail.mcc.org
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2000 09:38:07 -0400
Subject: June 22 meeting

To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj @ igc.org>
From: J. Daryl Byler
Date: 6/22/2000 9:36:57 AM
Subj: June 22 meeting

Hi Howard:

I'm afraid I will not be able to make the meeting this afternoon -- unless I'm able to finish up some key commitments this morning. Thanks for the information you passed along in preparation for today's meeting. Hope it goes well.

Warm regards,
Daryl

From: DKNUTSONR@aol.com
Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2000 13:52:28 EDT
Subject: Re: Thanks and an invitation
To: mupj@igc.org
X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 107

Dear Howard,

Jeanette and I would be delighted to stay with you while we're in the DC area.. Our target date for arriving is September 22. We plan to spend the weekend there to visit with Ben before driving to Pennsylvania for 2 or 3 days. Back to DC for a night before flying home. I'll confirm later.
Thanks for the invitation!

Since you were here Megan has had a bad burn on the palm of her hand from touching the car after it had been outside. It's way too hot in Phoenix in the summer!. She healed just fine - young skin, you know. In her birthday (June 11) pictures she has a little white sock on her hand as a reminder. She did a good job of keeping the sock on to keep the wound clean.

We're just hanging in there and trying to keep cool.

Love, Marj

To: wstarman@cathedral.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Listings in your kit
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Wendy,

Thanks for coming to the meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. It was helpful to have your participation.

As you suggested, I checked your web site to see what is in your educational packet. I was surprised that you have no Methodist contact, especially since the United Methodist Church is one of the leading advocates of nuclear abolition. You may want to add:

Peace with Justice Program
United Methodist General Board of Church and Society
Robin Ringler, Coordinator
100 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20003
Phone: 202 488-5647
Fax: 202 488-5639
(though check with her first)

Methodists United for Peace with Justice
Howard W. Hallman, Chair
1500 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036
Phone/fax: 301 896-0013

Under your interfaith listings you could add:

Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament
Howard W. Hallman, Chair
Address and phone/fax as above

Shalom,
Howard

To: ipnd
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Notes of June 22 meeting; next meeting date
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Colleagues,

Here are my notes from the June 22 meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. I call your attention to two things in particular:

(1) We will work with 20/20 Vision to get out an interfaith postcard alert on National Missile Defense. Kathy Guthrie and Greg Laszakovits will provide you a draft text and will ask whether you want to participate.

(2) The next meeting will take place on Tuesday, September 19 from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. at the Methodist Building. Please put this on your calendar.

Shalom,
Howard

###

Notes on meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament
Thursday, June 22, 2000 at Methodist Building, Washington, D.C.

In attendance were Tim Barner, Kathy Guthrie, Howard Hallman, Carroll Houle, Greg Laszakovits, Mary Miller, Bill Price, Wendy Starman, Hop Phom The, Bob Tiller.

Washington National Cathedral Project

Wendy Starman of the Washington National Cathedral project reviewed the Joint Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Statement by military professions and religious leaders, released the day before at the Cathedral. As follow up, the project will sent information kits to local religious leaders around the country. Information on the project and the materials contained in the kit are available online at www.cathedral.org/cathedral.

National Missile Defense (NMD)

Kathy Guthrie (Friends Committee on National Legislation) reviewed the sign-on letter (developed by FCNL) from the faith community to President Clinton, opposing deployment of NMD. Tim Barner and Hop Phom The from 20/20 Vision were in attendance to offer assistance to the faith community in grassroots outreach on this issue. Among the possibilities are postcard alerts, conference calls with experts, and distribution of skill sheets on such topics as how to write letters-to-the-editor, how to place op-ed pieces.

Having had a positive experience during the CTBT ratification campaign with postcard alerts, the group decided to work with 20/20 to produce one on NMD. Kathy Guthrie and Greg Laszakovits (Church of the Brethren) will work with Tim and Hop to develop a text. It will be circulated to participants in our Interfaith Committee for comments and for an opportunity to be a co-sponsor of the postcard and send it to grassroots contacts. It is hoped that the postcard can be out by early to mid-July. Kathy and Greg will be in touch with members of the Interfaith Committee on this matter.

Hiroshima Day

At our previous meeting the question was raised whether this Interfaith Committee should sponsor some kind of activity on Hiroshima Day (August 6). Discussion revealed that a number of organizations have plans underway. Also on that day the Fellowship of Reconciliation will launch a campaign to end sanctions on Iran. Bill Price (World Peacemakers) reminded us of other activities going on during July and early August through the People's Campaign for Nonviolence. We decided to share what we know about activities for Hiroshima Day but not attempt to organize anything as a committee.

Questions for Candidates

We reviewed questions to congressional candidates drafted by Jim Watkins of the Presbyterian Peacemaking Program plus some supplemental questions on the CTBT drafted by Howard Hallman and some questions to presidential candidates prepared by Hallman. The group made revisions in some of the questions. Bob Tiller (Baptist Peace Fellowship) will provide questions on the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. The group agreed that these questions should be circulated to members of the Interfaith Committee for use as they determine. This will be handled in a separate communication.

Grassroots Action Network

We reviewed a proposal for developing a grassroots action network. Carroll Houle of the Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns, new to this issue, asked if there is a grassroots network out there. Mary Miller (Episcopal Peace Fellowship) and others responded that our experience in the CTBT campaign revealed that there is if we go out and mobilize it. Partly it depends on the issue. It works best if grassroots participants feel a sense of local ownership.

Discussion focused particularly on activities this fall to encourage state and local interfaith coalitions to start meeting with senators, representatives, and their staffs following the November election. This matter will be the subject of e-mail exchange and telephone conversation during the summer and will be on the agenda for the September meeting of the committee.

Statement of Objectives

We briefly reviewed the statement of objects circulated prior to the meeting. Mary Miller suggested that the statement should be viewed as a work in progress to help us with our focus. Others agreed.

Next Meeting

We decided to meet next on Tuesday, September 19 from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. at the Methodist Building.

Notes written by Howard W. Hallman, Chair

X-Sender: jdi@[209.8.25.194]
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)
Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2000 09:04:50 -0400
To: jdi@clw.org
From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>
Subject: Quote of the Day: Lott "not going to be outraged" if Clinton defers missile defense decision (see item #2 of 6)

1. "Politics Mixes With Strategy In Plan For Antimissile System" - N.Y. Times
2. "53 House Democrats Urge FBI Probe Of Missile Testing" - Balt. Sun
3. "Russian Threatens Action Over U.S. Missile Plan" - Wash. Post
4. "BMDO Reviews Proposals To Work With Russia On NMD" - Defense Daily
5. "NMD Critics Lack Information, BMDO Director Says" - Aerospace Daily
6. "Russia Won't Buy Bill's Missile-Defense Wiggle" - Time

=====

1. Politics Mixes With Strategy In Plan For Antimissile System
New York Times - June 23, 2000 - By Michael R. Gordon with Steven Lee Myers

President Clinton's aides initially thought that they had the perfect plan for building a missile shield over the United States, a system that would guard against nuclear, biological and chemical threats without plunging the United States into a bitter tug of war with the Russians.

To ease Moscow's concerns, the system would be built at Grand Forks, N.D., the only place where a limited defense could be deployed under an exception carved out in the Antiballistic Missile Treaty that the United States signed with the Soviet Union in 1972.

But then computer simulations demonstrated that the system could not cover the westernmost islands in the Aleutians. And while only several thousand people lived on these remote reaches of Alaska, no one in the Clinton administration was about to tell Senator Ted Stevens, the powerful Alaska Republican who is chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, that the world's most elaborate missile defense system would not protect some of his constituents.

"Every computer run we ran showed that we could not get to the four westernmost islands of the Aleutians or two westernmost uninhabited in Hawaii," a former administration official said. "The Pentagon charts had red on Alaska and Hawaii, meaning we could not cover all parts of those states."

Those red spots, and a complex debate among government lawyers over how to interpret the treaty, killed the Grand Forks option. Soon plans were approved to put 100 missile interceptors and a new battle-management radar in Alaska, raising the projected cost by \$2 billion. The administration began pushing to amend the ABM treaty, and Washington found itself enmeshed in a debate that has soured relations with Russia, unnerved America's allies in Europe and provoked fears of a new arms race in Asia.

The administration has long argued that its plan to build a limited missile

defense was a response to emerging missile threats from countries like North Korea, Iran and Iraq. But a reconstruction of the decision-making involved in the plan shows that as with the decision to protect the Aleutian Islands, both the administration and its Republican rivals have long been motivated by domestic political calculations as well as by strategic concerns.

A major aim of the administration plan has been to protect Mr. Clinton -- and more important, Vice President Al Gore, the presumed Democratic presidential candidate -- against Republican charges that the Democrats have been soft on defense, according to administration officials and lawmakers.

The administration's initial antimissile plan was forged in negotiations with Congressional leaders as the White House sought to defuse the missile defense issue before the 1996 presidential election.

This year, Mr. Gore and Governor George W. Bush of Texas have both called for some version of a missile shield even before crucial tests of the technology, and before American intelligence experts had completed an assessment of how Russia, China, North Korea and other nations would be likely to respond to such a system.

As American diplomats have been sent around the world to discuss the worries of the Russians, Chinese and Western Europeans, they are trying to make the best case for an American decision that appears to be all but made.

Mr. Clinton may defer the deployment decision to a successor, but there seems to be too much political momentum behind the idea of an antimissile system for the United States to abandon it now. While there is still intense debate among scientists about the feasibility of the administration's plan, the guiding assumption in the Pentagon is that sooner or later the technology can work.

Mr. Clinton's national security adviser, Samuel R. Berger, insists that political considerations have played no role in the decision and that the administration is tackling a complex and thankless issue.

"Our proposal is based on our analysis of the emerging threat and our commitment to maintain the core of the ABM treaty, which contributes to stability and to the efforts of the U.S. and Russia to control the process of reducing nuclear weapons," Mr. Berger said.

But veterans of Washington's bare-knuckled battles over arms control say politics has played an enormous role in the debate over whether to deploy such a system. In their view, it is politics that is stampeding the United States into a decision.

"Russian, China and the NATO allies have become virtual bystanders in this debate," said Thomas Graham Jr., an arms control specialist who served as Mr. Clinton's special ambassador on proliferation issues. "The real fight is being waged in Washington, and it is much more about politics than the threat."

The Politics: Stealing Thunder of Republicans

How support for a missile defense system became a political litmus test of is a tale of raw partisan politics, bitter fights over secret intelligence reports and an evolving missile threat.

Missile defense seemed to be little more than a footnote to history when Mr. Clinton took office in 1992. The Soviet Union had collapsed and seemingly with it President Ronald Reagan's bold dream of a "Star Wars" defense against ballistic missiles.

With the encouragement of the military, the Clinton administration reorganized the Pentagon's research on antimissile systems, giving priority to systems for protecting American troops from attack by short-range and medium-range rockets and playing down defenses to protect the United States.

But as Mr. Clinton prepared for the 1996 re-election campaign, the politics of missile defense intensified. Republicans, after winning control of the House in the 1994 election, pressed to revive a version of Mr. Reagan's proposal.

Faced with that challenge, Mr. Clinton used one of his time-tested tactics: He stole the Republicans' thunder by co-opting their position.

In 1995, seeking to hammer out a bipartisan compromise, the White House opened negotiations with four Senate leaders: Sam Nunn, a Georgia Democrat; Carl Levin, a Democrat from Michigan; John W. Warner, a Virginia Republican; and William S. Cohen, the Maine Republican whom Mr. Clinton later appointed secretary of defense.

The administration promised to develop the technology for an antimissile system within three years. That would put the United States in position actually to deploy an antimissile system within a second three-year period if new missile threats emerged, or so the White House argued. Hence, the plan became known as "three plus three."

"We sort of created the Pentagon program," Senator Levin said in an interview. "We tried to encapsulate where we were going on development."

There was another important assumption behind the strategy: The first phase of any missile defense would be based at Grand Forks, consistent with the ABM treaty. That would enable Washington to avoid a diplomatic rupture with the Kremlin.

In the end, Senate Republicans signed off on the deal, but their more hard-line colleagues in the House balked, and the effort to forge a bipartisan consensus on missile defense fell apart.

Still, Mr. Clinton had signaled that he was prepared to consider a limited missile defense to blunt his Republican critics, and conservative Republicans had indicated that they were prepared to one-up the Democrats by pushing for a more ambitious system.

"It was both a classic example of how the Congress could drive the defense

debate and an example of Clinton's 'New Democrat' approach to defense," said Joseph Cirincione, a senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. "Clinton was able to say that he was all for missile defense and put the tough decisions off to the future."

The Intelligence: A Second Review Sounds the Alarm

As it turned out, missile defense was not a big issue during Mr. Clinton's re-election fight; Bob Dole, his Republican challenger, barely mentioned it.

But it did not take long before the debate re-emerged. This time intelligence was the battleground.

The administration had drawn comfort from a 1995 National Intelligence Estimate, coordinated by the Central Intelligence Agency, that concluded that nations like North Korea would need at least 15 years to develop a missile that could strike the continental United States.

Republican lawmakers, however, objected to the implication that there was no need to speed development of a missile shield, and they set out to challenge it.

Their first attempt failed. To review the intelligence report, they established a panel whose chairman was Robert M. Gates, the director of central intelligence during the Bush administration. But its 1996 report basically supported the view of American intelligence experts.

Two years later, however, the Republicans tried again. This time Congress set up a panel headed by Donald Rumsfeld, who was defense secretary under President Gerald R. Ford and was at Governor Bush's side recently when he unveiled his plan to build a more expansive missile defense system if elected this fall.

Three of the nine members of the commission were picked by Democrats, including Richard Garwin, a renowned physicist who is a Republican but is known for his fierce independence. Mr. Garwin recalled in an interview that while Mr. Rumsfeld conducted the review in a fair-minded manner, the panel's mandate was carefully drafted to boost the case for antimissile defenses.

"The charge was cooked," Mr. Garwin said. "We were not asked what were the most likely ways in which the U.S. might be attacked and how they compared to an ICBM. We were only asked to study the long-range missile threat. Nor did they ask us what to do about it. If they asked us about that, we would never have reached agreement in six months."

The scope of the commission's mandate was particularly important because American intelligence has concluded that there is a greater risk that a foe would try to sneak a nuclear bomb or biological weapons into the United States than attack it with a long-range missile.

The Rumsfeld panel report was published in July 1998, and soon became one of the most influential documents in modern American military planning. India and Pakistan had recently exploded nuclear bombs, catching the United

States by surprise. It was a period when military experts were particularly anxious about both the quality of United States intelligence and third world threats.

In a sharp critique, the Rumsfeld panel concluded that American intelligence officials had been far too relaxed about missile threats and noted that there were shortcuts that could be used to develop such a weapon.

For instance, time-consuming Russian or American-style test programs could be eliminated and a crude, inaccurate missile could be developed to lob a nuclear weapon or a biological warhead at the United States.

"This is not a distant threat," the panel said.

Stung by the criticism, American intelligence later revised its intelligence estimate, reflecting many of the Rumsfeld panel's arguments.

The North Koreans: A Missile Test Surprises the U.S.

If the Republicans had based their crusade for missile defense on the Rumsfeld report alone, however, they might still be fighting an uphill battle. But just a month after the report came out, on Aug. 31, 1998, they gained additional ammunition when the North Koreans sent a satellite hurtling toward space on a Taepo Dong-1 missile.

For days, the North Koreans insisted that the satellite was broadcasting "immortal revolutionary hymns" in honor of their late leader, Kim Il Sung, and his son, Kim Jong Il. Only later would it become clear that the satellite had never gone into orbit and had fallen into the Pacific Ocean.

"They said it was up there broadcasting music, but we never found the music," a Defense Department official said.

The Taepo Dong-1 was not the most sophisticated system. Its first two stages consisted of relatively primitive systems: a liquid-fueled Scud and a liquid-fueled No Dong missile.

But it was the third stage that surprised the United States. It consisted of a small solid-fueled motor designed to thrust the satellite into space. The use of the third stage reflected an important milestone in North Korea's attempt to develop an intercontinental-range missile.

"That they were doing this at all suggests they were farther along than the intelligence community had anticipated they would be," Walter B. Slocombe, the under secretary of defense for policy, said in an interview. "It would be as if you were watching a diver who you think can only do a simple one somersault, and she tries a three-and-half reverse, but screws up the half part. The fact she tried it at all indicates she is better than you thought she was, and the fact she got most of the way through indicates she is a lot farther along than you thought she was."

Even so, American intelligence says the North Korean missile has considerable limitations: It is not powerful enough to carry a nuclear warhead to the United States, though it could carry a lighter biological

warhead. Nor is it particularly accurate.

"It would be very inaccurate, so inaccurate that if aimed at Honolulu it would probably land in the water," said a senior American official who is familiar with intelligence on the missile. "If it was aimed at Alaska, it would probably hit land mass but might not land anywhere near a city."

More recently, American intelligence has concluded that the North Koreans have abandoned work on that missile in favor of the Taepo Dong-2, a two-stage missile that uses a cluster of No Dong engines as a first stage and a No Dong missile as a second stage. The Taepo Dong-2 has never been flight-tested, a vital step in developing a missile, and cannot be test-launched under an accord that the United States has negotiated with North Korea. The North Koreans, however, have continued work on the program.

If North Korea did conduct a flight test and built another Taepo Dong-2, it might have a rudimentary long-range missile in a matter of months, according to American intelligence officials. While such a missile could deliver a nuclear-size payload to Alaska and Hawaii, it could not reach the continental United States unless the North Koreans added a third stage. But a third stage would make it less accurate, American officials say.

Even if North Korea did violate the test ban and developed an effective intercontinental-range missile, it would have enough nuclear material only for two warheads at most, according to United States intelligence, compared with more than 6,000 missile warheads for the United States.

The missile threat from other nations is more distant, and American specialists are divided over whether Iran can field an intercontinental-range ballistic missile by 2010. As for Iraq, American intelligence experts cannot agree on whether it can develop a long-range ballistic missile by 2015.

Because the United States' overwhelming military might has deterred North Korea in the past, some senior American officials say there is no reason to think that Pyongyang would act irrationally in the future and threaten the world's sole remaining superpower with a missile strike.

"North Korea has not used its artillery against Seoul for decades, and it could do a real number on it," a senior American official said. "It has not used its Scud missiles against the rest of South Korea. It has not used its No Dong missiles against Japan. So you have to argue they have been deterred."

Still, in making their case for a missile defense, advocates say even a rudimentary ability to deliver a biological or nuclear warhead might give North Korea a weapon it might brandish to try to prevent Washington from coming to the aid of South Korea or Japan in a future conflict. Although deterrence has worked in the past, the proponents argue, there is no guarantee that it will in the future. And if the United States has the money and technology to develop a missile defense, it should do so, they insist.

"The threat is that nations with aggressive ambitions could come to believe

that because of their missile capability, we could be deterred from intervening in their region," said Barry M. Blechman, a member of the Rumsfeld panel and chairman of the Henry L. Stimson Center, a Washington-based research organization. "That is the whole reason for defense."

With the White House seeking to protect its right flank during the election year, however, the complex debate over deterrence has received relatively short shrift.

"Eighty percent of my colleagues in the Congress are not really paying attention," said Senator Joseph R. Biden Jr., a Delaware Democrat. "They think they need to be for some kind of defense, but they don't really know anything about it. We have not really had a debate."

The Site: From the Dakotas North to Alaska

Eager to demonstrate a new seriousness on missile defense, the administration moved into high gear last year. It developed a new goal: The United States should be able to build a limited antimissile defense by late 2005.

Officially, Mr. Clinton insisted that he had not yet decided whether to build a limited defense. He says his decision will depend on the antimissile technology that is to be tested on July 7 and on evaluations of the threat and the implications for arms control. He may defer a decision about deploying the system, but there is virtually no chance that he will decide a missile defense is unnecessary.

Even as it moved forward on the issue, however, the White House wanted to avoid a diplomatic confrontation with Moscow. The hope was that the initial phase of a missile defense might be deployed at Grand Forks, which was the only American site permitted for such a defense under the ABM treaty.

But that hope was dashed when Republicans insisted that even a limited system had to protect all 50 states, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff made this a military requirement.

No matter how hard they tried, American military experts could not cover all of the United States from Grand Forks.

The Western Aleutians and some uninhabited islands in Hawaii were outside the sphere of coverage. The White House pressed the Pentagon to re-examine the problem, but it only seemed to get worse. That was a huge political obstacle since Senator Stevens headed the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense and Senator Daniel K. Inouye of Hawaii was the ranking Democrat on the panel.

Another problem was how to interpret the ABM treaty with the Russians.

While Reagan administration lawyers had ruled that a "thin defense" at Grand Forks would not violate the treaty, now lawyers in the State Department were insisting that a nationwide defense would run afoul of the accord.

Faced with these obstacles, the Clinton administration scrapped its Grand Forks plan in early 1999, and resigned itself to deploying 100 interceptors in central Alaska and erecting a powerful battle-management radar on Shemya, a remote island in the Aleutians. That would entail difficult negotiations with Moscow.

And unlike the situation in 1996, it became difficult for Mr. Clinton to endorse the idea of missile defense while putting off tough decisions until after the next election. In the winter of 1998, an earnest Air Force lieutenant colonel who worked for the Joint Chiefs of Staff gave several national security aides at White House a dose of bad news: The administration was running out of time.

To meet the administration's goal of deploying the first phase of its system by 2005, the colonel explained, Mr. Clinton would have to give the final go-ahead for some of work by November 2000, on the eve of the presidential election.

The briefing struck the White House like a thunderclap. The administration had thought that it could balance politics, diplomacy and security by simply exploring the idea of a limited defense. Now, after years of maneuvering, it was boxed into a corner.

The administration had not yet carried out crucial tests of the system. It did not have the latest intelligence on how China, Russia and North Korea might respond. Nor had it prepared its European allies or the Russians for such a dramatic change in defense policy.

But it could wait no longer. It would have to open negotiations with the Russians and conduct them during an American election campaign.

Recently, to provide Mr. Clinton with more flexibility, administration lawyers came up with a ruling that some initial work could be done without violating the treaty. But arms control supporters have criticized this move, and the Russians are opposed.

Despite all the headaches, it is not clear that the administration's plan will even provide the political benefits the White House had hoped for. While its defense plan is too much for the Russians, Republicans are assailing it as too limited.

Looking back on the debate, Senator Biden said the administration had erred by trying to steal the missile defense issue from Republicans. That, he said, has simply prompted the Republicans to propose an even grander defense and committed the Democrats to a premature decision on the issue.

"I told Berger he had made a big mistake," he recalls telling the national security adviser. "If you think 'thin defense' plays well politically, well guess what, thick plays better."

=====

2. "53 House Democrats Urge FBI Probe Of Missile Testing"

Delay won't 'outrage' Senate GOP leader

WASHINGTON -- More than 50 House Democrats urged the FBI yesterday to investigate "serious allegations of fraud and cover-up" in development of a national missile defense system.

The Air Force general in charge of developing the system, Lt. Gen. Ronald Kadish, denied any deception and told Congress such allegations already have been disproved.

Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott, meanwhile, said he is "not going to be outraged" if President Clinton leaves a decision on the system to the next president.

Congressional Republicans have been pushing for Clinton to give the go-ahead this year for a system to protect all 50 states from limited nuclear missile attack. Lott is the first high-ranking Republican to suggest that a delay might be acceptable.

Support for the system has been mixed among Democrats, with opponents citing recent reports questioning whether the planned system of interceptor missiles would work and whether the Pentagon is objectively weighing test results.

"If we're relying on this technology to protect the United States and the technology is being advanced with false information, the people have a right to know," said Rep. Dennis Kucinich.

The Ohio Democrat appeared at a news conference on the Capitol lawn with several other Democrats and physicist Robert L. Park, who said the limited testing conducted by the Pentagon is inadequate to ensure a viable system.

Park said scientists with the American Physical Society strongly support an FBI inquiry into whether any tests have been rigged to succeed or had data withheld.

At a House hearing yesterday, Kadish strongly defended test procedures and the development of a system he said is essential to defending against intentional or accidental nuclear missile attack. Allegations of fraudulent testing have been made since 1996 and have been taken seriously with no evidence of deception, he said.

Kadish acknowledged that a significant setback in any element of the system could delay the entire program, designed for deployment by 2005 at a cost expected to exceed \$36 billion.

Earlier this week, Defense Secretary William S. Cohen indicated that he might recommend going ahead with the system even if a July 7 test fails. The test involves a missile collision over the Pacific. Incoming missiles would be destroyed by impact rather than by an explosive device, requiring a precise hit.

Fifty-three Democrats signed the letter to FBI Director Louis J. Freeh. It cited concerns of Massachusetts Institute of Technology scientists and alleged a cover-up of a failed experiment of the system.

=====
3. "Russian Threatens Action Over U.S. Missile Plan"

Washington Post - June 23, 2000 - By Sharon LaFraniere, Washington Post Foreign Service

MOSCOW, June 22 — A top Russian military official warned today that Moscow may pull out of a 12-year-old treaty calling for the destruction of medium-range nuclear missiles if Washington starts building a limited national missile defense system.

Withdrawal from the December 1987 Intermediate Nuclear Forces Treaty was one of a "list of measures" that Russia might take if Washington does not back off its missile defense proposal, Vladimir Yakovlev, commander in chief of the Russian Strategic Rocket Forces, warned in a television interview.

Yakovlev's warning appeared to contrast with the tone of Russian President Vladimir Putin's slightly more conciliatory stance at his summit with President Clinton here two weeks ago. Yakovlev's statement appeared to renew Russian threats to react strongly if the United States goes forward with a proposal to deploy 100 missile interceptors in Alaska.

Russia opposes the U.S. proposal, arguing that it violates the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, considered a cornerstone of disarmament policy.

At the summit, Putin agreed with Clinton that hostile third states may pose a threat to major powers, and said changes to the ABM Treaty might be possible. He suggested building a joint U.S.-Russian defense system, although in a much less ambitious form than the one envisioned by Washington.

Yakovlev, returning to harsher rhetoric, said Russia may begin building medium-range missiles again if the United States violates the ABM Treaty.

Russian Foreign Minister Igor Ivanov suggested that Russia might work with Norway at a controversial U.S.-built radar station in Arctic Norway. Norway and the United States say the station can track only space debris, but Russian officials suggest it may also be capable of tracking missiles and could be the start of a U.S. defense system. Norwegian officials said they would not allow Russians to inspect the site.

=====
4. "BMDO Reviews Proposals To Work With Russia On NMD"

Defense Daily - June 23, 2000 - By Kerry Gildea

Air Force Lt. Gen. Ronald Kadish, director of the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO), yesterday confirmed that the organization is in the midst of reviewing a variety of options to cooperate with Russia on national missile defense (NMD)--including one option of joint work on a new

Russian S-500 system.

Senior Russian defense officials shared with U.S. government officials for the first time their new development plans for the S-500, "a brand new missile defense system," Rep. Curt Weldon (R-Pa.), chair of the House Armed Services Committee's research and development subcommittee, said at a hearing yesterday.

Weldon said that he learned of the Russian system during a visit to Moscow earlier this month with Defense Secretary William Cohen. And, Weldon said he has discussed with Cohen a proposal to work on a joint missile defense program with the Russians. Kadish, responding to questions from Weldon at the hearing, confirmed proposals are under review.

"We are putting together a way to understand the proposals the Russians are making," Kadish said. "It's a very serious effort with a lot of potential should it work out."

Weldon warned the Russians--with or without U.S. cooperation--are proceeding with development of the new S-500 system. The Russian defense leaders said they have completed all the mathematical equations for the S-500, he noted. And, it would "violate the protocols" for missile defense systems allowed under the current interpretation of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, he added.

It has been known that Russia currently has a limited missile defense capability surrounding Moscow with at least 100 nuclear-tipped warheads. However, there are varying opinions on the capability of that system and some intelligence officials who believe it could be much more effective than Russia would like the United States to know (Defense Daily, June 6).

The new S-500 would be an upgraded capability from the developed S-400. The S-400 is estimated to be capable of engaging enemy ballistic missiles with ranges of 3,500 kilometers.

Kadish also at the hearing fought back at critics of the Pentagon's NMD program who have been warning for weeks the system is too expensive, incapable of defending against ballistic missiles and will be useless when challenged by enemy decoys and countermeasures. The attacks continued yesterday with a new group of House critics, led by Rep. Dennis Kucinich (D-Ohio), calling on the FBI to investigate allegations that DoD has covered up failures in the NMD program and the system's vulnerability to countermeasures.

"Those who say that it is technologically impossible for the NMD system to do adequate discrimination do so on the basis of very limited knowledge and without the benefit of testing results that we have generated to date and will generate in years ahead," Kadish said. "In the future, we will add even more tools to the discrimination toolbox, to include the infrared sensors or Space Based Infrared Low satellites, which will be used to track the warhead. As our computing power grows and discrimination sensors improve and multiply, it will get harder and harder to defeat our maturing NMD system."

Kadish, on Wednesday, gave a two-hour classified briefing on the countermeasures for interested members of Congress. Weldon called for the briefing and invited HASC members and non-members, but said only two non-members accepted the invitation to learn the facts about the program.

Kadish provided a very detailed description of a range of technologies, techniques and phenomenologies "that I believe will provide a high degree of confidence that we can defeat the expected threat both in the near term and in the future," Weldon said.

But, Kadish agreed the program is under intense scrutiny and it is difficult to defend when dealing with classified data regarding countermeasures.

"This program has been turned inside out and placed under a microscope," Kadish said. "A problem for one is a problem for all--there are many parties who have a lot invested in the development of an effective NMD system and who will flag any problems in the program or inaccuracies in our reporting."

=====

5. "NMD Critics Lack Information, BMDO Director Says" Aerospace Daily - June 23, 2000

Critics of the National Missile Defense program who say the system can't distinguish between incoming missiles and decoys are doing so with inadequate information, the director of the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization said yesterday.

That's because many of the discrimination technologies and techniques that the BMDO can use can't be discussed publicly, Lt. Gen. Ronald Kadish testified before the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Research and Development.

"There is a lot of redundancy and synergy built into this system," Kadish said. "Those who say that it is technologically impossible for the NMD system to do adequate discrimination do so on the basis of very limited knowledge and without the benefit of the testing results that we have generated to date and will generate in the years ahead."

Subcommittee Chairman Curt Weldon (R-Pa.) said the need to keep certain information secret puts the BMDO in a tough spot, since countermeasures have become a major target of NMD critics.

"If BMDO reveals these capabilities, it may compromise them and allow rogue nations to develop the means to make their countermeasures more effective," Weldon said. "Yet if BMDO can't address these issues to members of Congress, the critics get a free ride and support for the program may erode."

Separately, 53 House members asked the FBI yesterday to look into allegations that the Dept. of Defense and defense contractors changed test data to hide the failure of the NMD to distinguish between incoming missiles and decoys.

"We want to find out if we have an umbrella that can't protect anything except maybe defense contractors who are praying this system gets advanced no matter what," said Rep. Dennis Kucinich (D-Ohio), who initiated the letter-writing effort to launch an FBI probe.

FBI spokesman Bill Carter declined to comment, except to say the agency will review the letter and respond to the lawmakers.

The BMDO has denied all fraud allegations. Kadish said that hundreds of program and data analysts in government, industry and independent review panels "routinely and aggressively analyze and catalogue our testing results and investigate the validity, utility and authenticity" of the test data.

"Simply put ... this program has been turned inside out and placed under a microscope," Kadish said.

=====

6. "Russia Won't Buy Bill's Missile-Defense Wiggle"
Time, 06/16/00

White House lawyers say U.S. can start work on the system but deny that it's violating the ABM treaty. Tell it to the Russians...

It, er, depends on what you mean by "is," Mr. Putin.... Clinton administration lawyers appear to have come up with a classically Clintonesque solution to their missile-defense dilemma. The New York Times reports Thursday that the administration's best legal brains have eschewed conventional wisdom, which holds any effort to start work on deploying a new missile defense system as a violation of the 1972 Antiballistic Missile Treaty. Instead, they reportedly argue that the U.S. can begin clearing the system's proposed site on the Alaskan island of Shemya, and even pour its concrete foundations, without technically violating the agreement. But there is no court that umpires adherence to arms-control treaties, and Clinton's legal team is extremely unlikely to convince Russia's President Vladimir Putin that Washington isn't fouling out.

Still, the significance of shifting the legal interpretation goes to the roots of President Clinton's missile-defense predicament: In order to meet his own 2005 deadline for deploying a system designed to defend against missiles fired by "rogue states" - and to defend himself and Vice President Gore from Republican charges that they've left America wide open to all manner of future imagined nuclear missile threats - the President has to give the go-ahead this fall to start work on the site next spring. That timetable, though, is based on a legal interpretation that the proposed work is in violation of the ABM treaty. By that reading, if the Russians won't green-light the system, Washington would have to alert Moscow in the fall in order to comply with the requirement that either side give six months' notice of a decision to pull out of the treaty. The Russians have refused to give such a green light because even the limited system President Clinton wants deployed is the crucial first step toward the comprehensive missile umbrella favored by Republicans, which would

neutralize Russia's nuclear arsenal.

Now, instead of being forced to make a tough choice ahead of the presidential election, Clinton is being offered new wiggle room by his lawyers. After all, if clearing the site and pouring the concrete can be deemed to be within the bounds of the ABM treaty, then the White House can at once quiet Republican criticism by showing that it is building a missile defense system and insist to Moscow that it isn't violating the treaty. But though slick lawyering may give Clinton the opportunity to punt the issue of whether to scrap the ABM treaty into the next presidency, the Russians watch CNN, too - and they know that the concrete President Clinton would order poured on a frostbitten Alaskan island isn't for a barbecue pit. He may be better off whispering to Putin what some of his experts are quietly telling him - that the system can't work.

John Isaacs
Council for a Livable World
110 Maryland Avenue, NE - Room 409
Washington, D.C. 20002
(202) 543-4100 x.131
www.clw.org

To: wstarman@cathedral.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Outreach to United Methodists
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Wendy,

From your web site I am pleased to learn that in your outreach you want to connect people with denominational resources, including agencies and organizations working for nuclear disarmament. Therefore, when you mail your kit to United Methodists I suggested that you include (1) the resolution on "Nuclear Abolition" adopted by the United Methodist General Conference, setting denominational policy on this issue, (2) information about Methodists United for Peace with Justice, and (2) assuming Robin Ringler wants it, information on the Peace with Justice Program of the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society. At the Cathedral Bishop Oden indicated that the Council of Bishops may set up a new task force on nuclear abolition. If that occurs, information on it could be included in the Methodist package.

Please let me know if I can help get this information together for you.

Shalom,
Howard

To: dave@paxchristiusa.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Letter to presidential candidates
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Dave,

I realize that you are so busy with other Pax Christi activities that you haven't been able to deal with my proposal for an interfaith letter to presidential candidates on nuclear disarmament. The time has slipped so that getting something out by mid-July isn't possible. I'm now thinking that as soon as the nominating convention are over -- the Democrats are last, from August 14 to 17 -- we write to the nominees of four parties: Democratic, Republican, Reform, and Green. We can ask them our questions, request a reply by Tuesday, September 5, and indicate that we will have a news conference on September 7 to release the candidates' answers to our questions. What would you think of that?

Attached is a redraft of the letter to candidates, reflecting this approach.

I'll be away from June 24 to July 2. Hopefully the week of July 3 I can discuss this with you.

Shalom,
Howard

###

Draft Letter to Presidential Candidates
from Religious Leaders

To be sent to nominees of Democratic, Republican, Reform, and Green parties
after the nomination process has been completed (mid-August)

Sample for Vice President Al Gore. To be adapted for other candidates.

Dear Mr. Vice President:

Congratulations on your nomination by the Democratic Party for the office of President of the United States. We look forward to a wholesome debate among the candidates on significant issues that are of great importance to the American people.

Among these issues there is none more important than the future of the world's nuclear arsenal. Our own perspective is that the time has come for the United States to provide creative leadership to achieve the global elimination of nuclear weapons. We hope you share this view. In this letter we pose a series of questions on this matter. We would greatly appreciate receiving a reply from you by Tuesday, September 5, which is two months before the election. We will hold a news conference on September 7 to release your answers to our questions along with the replies of candidates of the Republican, Reform, and Green parties. For decades numerous religious denominations, interfaith organizations, and religious leaders have questioned the morality of nuclear weapons and have called for their elimination.

Thus, the Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1983 stated: "We believe that that the time has come when the churches must unequivocally declare that the production and deployment as well as the use of nuclear weapons are a crime against humanity and that such activities must be condemned on ethical and theological grounds. Furthermore, we appeal for the institution of a universal covenant to this effect so that nuclear weapons and warfare are

delegitimized and condemned as violations of international law."

Speaking for the Holy See, Archbishop Renato Martino in October 1997 told the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly: "Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21st century. They cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation.... The world must move to the abolition of nuclear weapons through a universal, non-discriminatory ban with intensive inspection by a universal authority."

In a message on January 1, 2000 His Holiness the Dalai Lama called for a step-by-step approach to external disarmament. He stated, "We must first work on the total abolishment of nuclear weapons and gradually work up to total demilitarization throughout the world."

In the United States numerous denominations have called for the elimination of nuclear weapons. Excerpts from these statements are attached. Recently 21 heads of communion and other religious leaders joined with 18 retired general and admirals to point out that "the long-term reliance of nuclear weapons in the arsenals of the nuclear powers, and the ever-present danger of their acquisition by others, is morally untenable and militarily unjustifiable. They constitute a threat to the security of our nation, a peril to world peace, a danger to the whole human family." Therefore, they called for "action leading to the international prohibition of these weapons."

What are your views on the morality of possession, threatened use, and actual use of nuclear weapons? To what extent do you agree or disagree with the broad consensus that has emerged within the faith community on the inherent immorality of nuclear weapons?

We are encouraged that the United States has joined with Russia, United Kingdom, France, and China in making a commitment to "an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals." This occurred in the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). This commitment carries forward the obligation for good faith negotiations on nuclear disarmament as expressed in Article VI of the NPT, an agreement signed by the United States in July 1968 and ratified by the U.S. Senate in March 1969.

Because the nuclear-weapon states have made an unequivocal commitment to eliminate their nuclear arsenals, we believe that a useful first step would be for all possessors of nuclear weapons to mutually pledge never to use nuclear weapons against any adversary at any time under any circumstance. As president would you be willing to work to achieve such a no-use pledge by the nuclear weapon states and other possessors?

If you do not favor a no-use policy, please tell us the categories of targets you as commander-in-chief would consider legitimate to strike with nuclear weapons. We believe that the American people are entitled to have this information.

We note that Presidents Truman and Eisenhower chose not to use nuclear weapons in the stalemated Korean War and that Presidents Johnson and Nixon choose not to use nuclear weapons in the Vietnam War even though the United States was losing. We also note that numerous retired generals, admirals, and national security civilian officials have indicated that nuclear weapons have no war-fighting utility. We hope that you will take these factors into consideration in your response.

The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) provides a means of controlling the spread of nuclear weapons. If elected president, will you seek ratification of the CTBT by the United States Senate?

Many experts have pointed out the inherent danger of keeping U.S. and Russian strategic nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert. If elected president, will you embark upon a de-alerting initiative to take strategic weapons off hair-trigger alert? If so, please provide specifics.

During the past fifteen years progress has been made in reduction of nuclear weapons through treaties between the United States and the Soviet Union, then Russia. They include two treaties negotiated under President Ronald Reagan, the Intermediate Nuclear Force Treaty to eliminate an entire class of nuclear weapons and the first Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START I), and START II negotiated under President Bush. If elected president, will you pursue additional agreements with Russia to achieve further cuts in the strategic arsenal? If so, what are your specific

objectives?

An alternative approach to nuclear arms reduction through treaties is to undertake a series of reciprocal initiatives through executive action. This was the approach used by President George Bush in 1991 when he took unilateral action to deactivate a large number of U.S. strategic weapons and to withdraw most U.S. tactical nuclear weapons stationed outside the United States. A few weeks later Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev reciprocated with similar actions. Would you as president seek deep cuts in the nuclear arsenal through similar reciprocal initiatives? Please provide specifics.

For two other weapons of mass destruction, biological and chemical, the nations of the world have entered into international conventions providing for their elimination with adequate safeguards. Many experts believe that there should now be a nuclear weapons convention that provides for total elimination of nuclear weapons within a timebound framework with effective verification and enforcement. Do you favor multilateral negotiations to achieve a global nuclear weapons convention?

What other initiatives do you plan to take for the elimination of nuclear weapons?

We will greatly appreciate your response to these questions, which we will circulate to interested parties within the faith community. If your busy schedule permits, a delegation of the signers would welcome an opportunity to meet with you to discuss these issues in greater detail.

Respectfully yours,

Signers

Attachments:

Excerpts from statements by U.S. religious bodies.

Joint Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Statement by military professionals and religious leaders.

Drafted by Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice

June 21, 2000

To: hipkins
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Where are you?
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Hi,

Where are you these days? I need to send a change-of-agent form to Char for signature as secretary of MUPJ. Also I'm working on membership records and may have an updated list for the Peace Leaf mailing.

We're going to California from June 24 to July 2. So it may be after that before I bring these tasks to completion.

Shalom,
Howard

From: "JamesHipkins" <JamesHipkins@emailmsn.com>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Where are you?
Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2000 13:01:45 -0400
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2615.200
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2615.200

----- Original Message -----

From: Howard W. Hallman <mupj@igc.org>
To: <JamesHipkins@msn.com>
Sent: Friday, June 23, 2000 12:41 PM
Subject: Where are you?

> Hi,
>
> Where are you these days? I need to send a change-of-agent form to Char
> for signature as secretary of MUPJ. Also I'm working on membership
records
> and may have an updated list for the Peace Leaf mailing.

>
> We're going to California from June 24 to July 2. So it may be after that
> before I bring these tasks to completion.

>
> Shalom,
> Howard
> Howard W. Hallman, Chair
> Methodists United for Peace with Justice
> 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036
> Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail: mupj@igc.org

>
> Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a membership association of
> laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any Methodist denomination.

>
We are here. We are in the midst of packing. We will be off line until
Sept. when we move in to new home in Massillon. After July 7 send mail to us
at 3894 Dartmouth Ave., N.W., Massillon, OH 44646. This will be our address
after Sept. Until then they will hold the mail at the post office and we
will pick it up. Our first pick up will be around July 20. Whew! I hope
this is the last move. I am getting to old for this. May take me a month to
find a printer, and get setup for mailing Peace Leaf. You can keep in touch
until July 3. I will shut the computer down then. I still have not gotten
refund for last mailing. Some where around \$75.

Jim Hipkins

From: WStarman@cathedral.org To: mupj@igc.org Cc: Karin_Davidson@cathedral.org Subject: RE: Outreach to United Methodists Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2000 15:52:23 -0400 X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

Dear Howard,

I always appreciate your insight and suggestions.

However, we have designed our entire outreach program to provide each religious group with the option of adding to the kits as they see fit for their faith community, or leaving them exactly as they stand now (no changes). The Cathedral will not be involved with tailoring any of the kits to the specific faith communities. We're specifically leaving that up to each group.

So, if the Methodist body decides to add other documents, that will be up to them. If they choose to go that route, we can send them the kits, and provide them with the funding to do the mailing. In that case, additional materials will not generate from or be organized by the Cathedral. We simply don't have the manpower, or the ability to monitor requests that could come in from Conservative and Reform Jews, Muslims, Methodists, Episcopals, Catholics, Presbyterians, etc.

Some religious groups might choose not to add materials. Others might want to add, in which case we can supply their educational/peace office with the kits so they can adjust them as they wish. In some cases we might distribute directly through a local DC mail house. In other cases we might need to go through the faith community mail houses. We are flexible.

Karin Davidson, Education Outreach Coordinator, will be in touch with Bishop Oden and the Methodist office that handles educational/peace projects to determine how they would like to handle all of the above.

Thanks again for the great meeting yesterday. It was very inspiring and filled with good information.

Best Regards,

Wendy

Dear Wendy,

From your web site I am pleased to learn that in your outreach you want to connect people with denominational resources, including agencies and organizations working for nuclear disarmament. Therefore, when you mail your kit to United Methodists I suggested that you include (1) the resolution on "Nuclear Abolition" adopted by the United Methodist General Conference, setting denominational policy on this issue, (2) information about Methodists United for Peace with Justice, and (2) assuming Robin

Ringler wants it, information on the Peace with Justice Program of the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society. At the Cathedral Bishop Oden indicated that the Council of Bishops may set up a new task for force on nuclear abolition. If that occurs, information on it could be included in the Methodist package.

Please let me know if I can help get this information together for you.

Shalom,
Howard

Howard W. Hallman, Chair
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036
Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail: mupj@igc.org

Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a membership association of laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any Methodist denomination.

To: Hdsunited@aol.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Methodist United for Peace with Justice
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <14.4ea6dab.2678f5e1@aol.com>
References:

At 10:51 AM 6/14/00 EDT, you wrote:

>I would like to receive information concerning your "renewed campaign" to
>eliminate nuclear weapons. My address:
>Rev. Don Smith.....

Thanks for your inquiry. Attached is a fuller description of our renewed campaign. As it gets going, we'll keep in touch with you. Also attached is information about Methodists United for Peace with Justice.

Shalom,
Howard Hallman

###

Renewed Campaign to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons

Methodists United for Peace with Justice is renewing its campaign to build public support for the global elimination of nuclear weapons. The campaign will build upon "unequivocal" statements made by two important bodies in May.

On May 10 the United Methodist General Conference, meeting in Cleveland, updated its resolution on "Nuclear Abolition" by a vote of 679 to 11. The resolution unequivocally rejects the use or threatened use of nuclear weapons and calls upon all possessors of nuclear weapons to carry out a set of actions leading to their elimination.

Ten days later on May 20 the Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), meeting in New York, adopted its Final Document to the set the course for nuclear disarmament for the next five years. In this document the five nuclear-weapon states -- United States, Russia, United Kingdom, France, and China -- made a commitment for "an unequivocal undertaking to accomplishment the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals."

How the possessors of nuclear weapons can fulfill their commitment is outlined in a series of steps recommended by the General Conference resolution. They include:

- Renounce unconditionally the use of nuclear weapons for deterrence and war-fighting purposes.
- Pledge never to use nuclear weapons against any adversary under any circumstance.
- Immediately de-alert their nuclear arsenals by separating warheads from delivery vehicles.
- Dismantle all nuclear warheads and delivery vehicles.
- Ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT)
- Halt all efforts to develop and deploy a national missile defense (NMD) because such a system is illusory, unnecessary, and wasteful.

According to its chair, Howard W. Hallman, Methodists United for Peace with Justice intends to build grassroots support for these measures. This will occur through information bulletins and action alerts to peace with justice networks and through public advocacy in Washington, D.C. Sample questions for political candidates will be offered on a non-partisan basis. The organization will establish a web site to

facilitate the flow of information.

###

About Methodists United for Peace with Justice

Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a national membership organization working to achieve the global elimination of nuclear weapons. We work through education by providing information to local churches and conference committees. We engaged in public policy advocacy in Washington, D.C. and through grassroots mobilization. We publish a quarterly newsletter, Peace Leaf and periodically send out Peace/Justice Alerts. We have been most active within the United Methodist Church, including successfully petitioning the General Conference for a resolution on "Nuclear Abolition". However, we seek participation of all Methodist denominations in the United States, which is why we are called "Methodists United".

Currently we are building support for another attempt to achieve Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). We believe the time has come for all possessors of nuclear weapons to mutually pledge never to use nuclear weapons against any adversary at any time under any circumstance. We advocate de-alerting the global strategic arsenal by taking weapons off hair-trigger alert and separating warheads from delivery vehicles. We favor deep cuts in the U.S. and Russian strategic arsenals accompanied by multilateral negotiations to achieve a global nuclear weapons convention to outlaw all nuclear weapons and provide for their total elimination. We oppose development of a national missile defense because it is likely to provoke a renewed nuclear arms race, is extremely costly, and is of doubtful technological feasibility,

Membership is available in Methodists United for Peace with Justice for individuals and organizations. We have no fixed membership dues but suggest a contribution of \$15 or more for individuals and \$25 or more for organizations. To join send your contribution and your name, address, telephone and fax numbers, and e-mail address to Methodists United for Peace with Justice, 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington

To: "David A. Highfield" <davidh@carr.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Nuclear weapons
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <000801bfd616\$c0277860\$02da403f@PreferredCustomer>
References:

At 11:39 AM 6/14/00 -0400, you wrote:

> I would like to be a part of the renewed campaign to abolish nuclear
> weapons. Pastor Dave Highfield Westminster UM Church 162 E. Main St.
> 21157

Thanks for your inquiry. Attached is a fuller description of our renewed campaign. As it gets going, we'll keep in touch with you. Also attached is information about Methodists United for Peace with Justice.

Shalom,
Howard Hallman

###

Renewed Campaign to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons

Methodists United for Peace with Justice is renewing its campaign to build public support for the global elimination of nuclear weapons. The campaign will build upon "unequivocal" statements made by two important bodies in May.

On May 10 the United Methodist General Conference, meeting in Cleveland, updated its resolution on "Nuclear Abolition" by a vote of 679 to 11. The resolution unequivocally rejects the use or threatened use of nuclear weapons and calls upon all possessors of nuclear weapons to carry out a set of actions leading to their elimination.

Ten days later on May 20 the Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), meeting in New York, adopted its Final Document to set the course for nuclear disarmament for the next five years. In this document the five nuclear-weapon states -- United States, Russia, United Kingdom, France, and China -- made a commitment for "an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals."

How the possessors of nuclear weapons can fulfill their commitment is outlined in a series of steps recommended by the General Conference resolution. They include:

- Renounce unconditionally the use of nuclear weapons for deterrence and war-fighting purposes.
- Pledge never to use nuclear weapons against any adversary under any circumstance.
- Immediately de-alert their nuclear arsenals by separating warheads from delivery vehicles.
- Dismantle all nuclear warheads and delivery vehicles.
- Ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT)
- Halt all efforts to develop and deploy a national missile defense (NMD) because such a system is illusory, unnecessary, and wasteful.

According to its chair, Howard W. Hallman, Methodists United for Peace with Justice intends to build grassroots support for these measures. This will occur through information bulletins and action alerts to peace with justice networks and through public advocacy in Washington, D.C. Sample questions for political candidates will be offered on a non-partisan basis. The organization will establish a web site to facilitate the flow of information.

###

About Methodists United for Peace with Justice

Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a national membership organization working to achieve the global elimination of nuclear weapons. We work through education by providing information to local churches and conference committees. We engaged in public policy advocacy in Washington, D.C. and through grassroots mobilization. We publish a quarterly newsletter, Peace Leaf and periodically send out Peace/Justice Alerts. We have been most active within the United Methodist Church, including successfully petitioning the General Conference for a resolution on "Nuclear Abolition". However, we seek participation of all Methodist denominations in the United States, which is why we are called "Methodists United".

Currently we are building support for another attempt to achieve Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). We believe the time has come for all possessors of nuclear weapons to mutually pledge never to use nuclear weapons against any adversary at any time under any circumstance. We advocate de-alerting the global strategic arsenal by taking weapons off hair-trigger alert and separating warheads from delivery vehicles. We favor deep cuts in the U.S. and Russian strategic arsenals accompanied by multilateral negotiations to achieve a global nuclear weapons convention to outlaw all nuclear weapons and provide for their total elimination. We oppose development of a national missile defense because it is likely to provoke a renewed nuclear arms race, is extremely costly, and is of doubtful technological feasibility,

Membership is available in Methodists United for Peace with Justice for individuals and organizations. We have no fixed membership dues but suggest a contribution of \$15 or more for individuals and \$25 or more for organizations. To join send your contribution and your name, address, telephone and fax numbers, and e-mail address to Methodists United for Peace with Justice, 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington

From: invoice.inquiry@mindspring.com
 Date: Sun, 25 Jun 2000 09:46:28 -0400 (EDT)
 To: mupj@igc.org
 Subject: "EarthLink/MindSpring Invoice #30038452, Please Read"
 X-Hercules-ID: mupj@igc.org

Remit To: Account Number: 2028691
 Page: 1
 EarthLink Inc. Invoice Date: 06/13/00
 P.O. Box 7645 Invoice Number: 30038452
 Atlanta, Ga. 30357-0645 USA

Bill To: Due upon receipt.
 Current charges are late if
 Howard W. Hallman not received by 07/13/00
 Methodists United for Peace wi
 1500 16th St., NW
 Washington, DC 20036

Date	Description	Qty	Price	Amount
	Previous Balance			15.95
06/10/00	Check # 1239			15.95CR
	Adjusted Beginning Balance			.00
06/13/00	non-automated payment	1.00	1.00	1.00
	mupj (Howard W. Hallman)			
06/13/00	Jun 13-Jul 12:Standard monthly	1.00	14.95	14.95
06/12/00	May 13-Jun 12:Hours used		11.95	
	Current Chgs:		15.95	
	Balance Due:		15.95	

Please pay upon receipt and be sure to include your account number 2028691 with your payment. Any previous balance may be considered past due at this time.

*** \$40 for you and a friend! ***
 For every friend you refer to EarthLink between June 5 and June 30, 2000, we'll credit your account \$40 -

plus, we'll give a \$40 credit to the person you refer!
For details, visit <http://www.earthlink.com/referrals/promotion>.

We provide several tools designed to help you manage your EarthLink account more effectively. These tools may be found at:
<http://www.mindspring.com/acct-mgmt/index.html>

If you think there is an error on your invoice, please write to us via email at invoice.inquiry@mindspring.com or US mail at the address above within 30 days of the invoice date to dispute the erroneous charge.

Remit To:	Invoice Number: 30038452
EarthLink Inc.	Page: 2
P.O. Box 7645	Invoice Date: 06/13/00
	Account Number: 2028691

We'll be happy to clarify your invoice or correct any erroneous charges.

From: WStarman@cathedral.org To: mupj@igc.org Subject: RE: Listings in your kit Date: Mon, 26 Jun 2000 15:17:44 -0400 X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

Thanks Howard!

I'll look into exploring this for the Web site. It's too late for us to add this to our printed materials.

As I mentioned, the Methodists could also add an attachment to the printed kits before distribution, per their request.

Wendy

-----Original Message-----

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]

Sent: Thursday, June 22, 2000 4:28 PM

To: wstarman@cathedral.org

Subject: Listings in your kit

Dear Wendy,

Thanks for coming to the meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. It was helpful to have your participation.

As you suggested, I checked your web site to see what is in your educational packet. I was surprised that you have no Methodist contact, especially since the United Methodist Church is one of the leading advocates of nuclear abolition. You may want to add:

Peace with Justice Program
United Methodist General Board of Church and Society
Robin Ringler, Coordinator
100 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20003
Phone: 202 488-5647
Fax: 202 488-5639
(though check with her first)

Methodists United for Peace with Justice
Howard W. Hallman, Chair
1500 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036
Phone/fax: 301 896-0013

Under your interfaith listings you could add:

Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament
Howard W. Hallman, Chair
Address and phone/fax as above

Shalom,
Howard

Howard W. Hallman, Chair
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036
Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail: mupj@igc.org

Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a membership association of laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any Methodist denomination.

X-Envelope-To: <mupj@igc.org>
From: David Robinson <dave@paxchristiusa.org>
To: "'Howard W. Hallman'" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: Letter to presidential candidates
Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2000 14:51:48 -0400

Dear Howard,

Thanks for your patience on this. I read through the new draft and I think that your initiative is great and could be very important in setting the context of the debate on elimination. I have a few questions and comments. First, it's a great idea to have them provide responses, to let them know that we will release these responses at a press event, and that you are including the Reform and Green parties as well--Excellent!

As for the substance of the text, it is generally very good, on point. However, I do not understand the "no-use" section. Do you mean "no first-use" or do you really mean "no-use?" It seems that if such a declaration were possible, (and I do not believe it is) it would render the Nuclear Weapons Convention idea a mere formality. Oh, if we were to live in such a world...

Unless this is a strategic question intended to illicit a response that could be used against him. But trying to get a likely President to publicly pronounce his intent to use nuclear weapons (the only other answer to the question if one does not embrace "no-use") could actually be damaging to the extreme. I can't imagine them falling into such a trap. And even if they do, I doubt that such a pronouncement could have a positive effect on the international political climate. (but again, if its to get them to admit what we already know is the case, thereby bringing international scorn down on them and US policy generally, well, then it might make sense and could serve to coalesce international opposition. It could also seriously backfire, undermining any attempt to get anything through the CD and providing China with cover for their ballistic missile efforts and Russia with cover for their more offensive nuclear posture).

I would not say, as you do in the paragraph on past Presidential decisions not use nukes, that Nixon and Johnson refrained "even though the US was losing." First, I don't think that there ever was a point when the US was losing in Vietnam. Militarily, the US won every major m our questions, request a reply by Tuesday, September 5, and indicate that we will have a news conference on September 7 to release the candidates' answers to our questions. What would you think of that?

Attached is a redraft of the letter to candidates, reflecting this approach.

I'll be away from June 24 to July 2. Hopefully the week of July 3 I can discuss this with you.

Shalom,
Howard

###

Draft Letter to Presidential Candidates
from Religious Leaders

To be sent to nominees of Democratic, Republican, Reform, and Green parties
after the nomination process has been completed (mid-August)

Sample for Vice President Al Gore. To be adapted for other candidates.

Dear Mr. Vice President:

Congratulations on your nomination by the Democratic Party for the office of President of the United States. We look forward to a wholesome debate among the candidates on significant issues that are of great importance to the American people.

Among these issues there is none more important than the future of the world's nuclear arsenal. Our own perspective is that the time has come for the United States to provide creative leadership to achieve the global elimination of nuclear weapons. We hope you share this view. In this letter we pose a series of questions on this matter. We would greatly appreciate receiving a reply from you by Tuesday, September 5, which is two months before the election. We will hold a news conference on September 7 to release your answers to our questions along with the replies of candidates of the Republican, Reform, and Green parties. For decades numerous religious denominations, interfaith organizations, and religious leaders have questioned the morality of nuclear weapons and have called for their elimination.

Thus, the Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1983 stated: "We believe that that the time has come when the churches must unequivocally declare that the production and deployment as well as the use of nuclear weapons are a crime against humanity and that such activities must be condemned on ethical and theological grounds. Furthermore, we appeal for the institution of a universal covenant to this effect so that nuclear weapons and warfare are delegitimized and condemned as violations of international law."

Speaking for the Holy See, Archbishop Renato Martino in October 1997 told the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly: "Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21st century. They cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation.... The world must move to the abolition of nuclear weapons through a universal, non-discriminatory ban with intensive inspection by a universal authority."

In a message on January 1, 2000 His Holiness the Dalai Lama called for a step-by-step approach to external disarmament. He stated, "We must first work on the total abolishment of nuclear weapons and gradually work up to total demilitarization throughout the world."

In the United States numerous denominations have called for the elimination of nuclear weapons. Excerpts from these statements are attached. Recently 21 heads of communion and other religious leaders joined with 18 retired general and admirals to point out that "the long-term reliance of nuclear weapons in the arsenals of the nuclear powers, and the ever-present danger of their acquisition by others, is morally untenable and militarily unjustifiable. They constitute a threat to the security of our nation, a peril to world peace, a danger to the whole human family." Therefore, they called for "action leading to the international prohibition of these weapons."

What are your views on the morality of possession, threatened use, and actual use of nuclear weapons? To what extent do you agree or disagree with the broad consensus that has emerged within the faith community on the

inherent immorality of nuclear weapons?

We are encouraged that the United States has joined with Russia, United Kingdom, France, and China in making a commitment to "an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals."

This occurred in the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). This commitment carries forward the obligation for good faith negotiations on nuclear disarmament as expressed in Article VI of the NPT, an agreement signed by the United States in July 1968 and ratified by the U.S. Senate in March 1969.

Because the nuclear-weapon states have made an unequivocal commitment to eliminate their nuclear arsenals, we believe that a useful first step would be for all possessors of nuclear weapons to mutually pledge never to use nuclear weapons against any adversary at any time under any circumstance. As president would you be willing to work to achieve such a no-use pledge by the nuclear weapon states and other possessors?

If you do not favor a no-use policy, please tell us the categories of targets you as commander-in-chief would consider legitimate to strike with nuclear weapons. We believe that the American people are entitled to have this information.

We note that Presidents Truman and Eisenhower chose not to use nuclear weapons in the stalemated Korean War and that Presidents Johnson and Nixon choose not to use nuclear weapons in the Vietnam War even though the United States was losing. We also note that numerous retired generals, admirals, and national security civilian officials have indicated that nuclear weapons have no war-fighting utility. We hope that you will take these factors into consideration in your response.

The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) provides a means of controlling the spread of nuclear weapons. If elected president, will you seek ratification of the CTBT by the United States Senate?

Many experts have pointed out the inherent danger of keeping U.S. and Russian strategic nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert. If elected president, will you embark upon a de-alerting initiative to take strategic weapons off hair-trigger alert? If so, please provide specifics.

During the past fifteen years progress has been made in reduction of nuclear weapons through treaties between the United States and the Soviet Union, then Russia. They include two treaties negotiated under President Ronald Reagan, the Intermediate Nuclear Force Treaty to eliminate an entire class of nuclear weapons and the first Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START I), and START II negotiated under President Bush. If elected president, will you pursue additional agreements with Russia to achieve further cuts in the strategic arsenal? If so, what are your specific objectives?

An alternative approach to nuclear arms reduction through treaties is to undertake a series of reciprocal initiatives through executive action. This was the approach used by President George Bush in 1991 when he took unilateral action to deactivate a large number of U.S. strategic weapons

and to withdraw most U.S. tactical nuclear weapons stationed outside the United States. A few weeks later Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev reciprocated with similar actions. Would you as president seek deep cuts in the nuclear arsenal through similar reciprocal initiatives? Please provide specifics.

For two other weapons of mass destruction, biological and chemical, the nations of the world have entered into international conventions providing for their elimination with adequate safeguards. Many experts believe that there should now be a nuclear weapons convention that provides for total elimination of nuclear weapons within a timebound framework with effective verification and enforcement. Do you favor multilateral negotiations to achieve a global nuclear weapons convention?

What other initiatives do you plan to take for the elimination of nuclear weapons?

We will greatly appreciate your response to these questions, which we will circulate to interested parties within the faith community. If your busy schedule permits, a delegation of the signers would welcome an opportunity to meet with you to discuss these issues in greater detail.

Respectfully yours,

Signers

Attachments:

Excerpts from statements by U.S. religious bodies.
Joint Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Statement by military professionals and religious leaders.

Drafted by Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice
June 21, 2000

Howard W. Hallman, Chair
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036
Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail: mupj@igc.org

Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a membership association of laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any Methodist denomination.

To: phil
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: "EarthLink/MindSpring Invoice #30038452, Please Read"
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Phil,

Please pay this bill at your convenience.

Howard

From: invoice.inquiry@mindspring.com
>Date: Sun, 25 Jun 2000 09:46:28 -0400 (EDT)
>To: mupj@igc.org
>Subject: "EarthLink/MindSpring Invoice #30038452, Please Read"
>X-Hercules-ID: mupj@igc.org

>
> Remit To: Account Number: 2028691
> Page: 1
> EarthLink Inc. Invoice Date: 06/13/00
> P.O. Box 7645 Invoice Number: 30038452
> Atlanta, Ga. 30357-0645 USA

>
>
> Bill To: Due upon receipt.
> Current charges are late if
> Howard W. Hallman not received by 07/13/00
> Methodists United for Peace wi
> 1500 16th St., NW
> Washington, DC 20036

>Date	Description	Qty	Price	Amount
>	Previous Balance			15.95
>06/10/00	Check # 1239			15.95CR
>	Adjusted Beginning Balance			.00
>06/13/00	non-automated payment	1.00	1.00	1.00
>	mupj (Howard W. Hallman)			

>06/13/00 Jun 13-Jul 12:Standard monthly 1.00 14.95 14.95
>06/12/00 May 13-Jun 12:Hours used 11.95

> -----
> Current Chgs: 15.95

> -----
> Balance Due: 15.95
> =====

> Please pay upon receipt and be sure to include your account number
> 2028691 with your payment. Any previous balance may be considered
> past due at this time.

> *** \$40 for you and a friend! ***

> For every friend you refer to EarthLink between June 5
> and June 30, 2000, we'll credit your account \$40 -
> plus, we'll give a \$40 credit to the person you refer!
> For details, visit <http://www.earthlink.com/referrals/promotion>.

> We provide several tools designed to help you manage your EarthLink
> account more effectively. These tools may be found at:
> <http://www.mindspring.com/acct-mgmt/index.html>

> If you think there is an error on your invoice, please write to us via
> email at invoice.inquiry@mindspring.com or US mail at the address above
> within 30 days of the invoice date to dispute the erroneous charge.

> Remit To:	Invoice Number: 30038452
> EarthLink Inc.	Page: 2
> P.O. Box 7645	Invoice Date: 06/13/00
	Account Number: 2028691

> We'll be happy to clarify your invoice or correct any erroneous charges.

From: "Surratt, Doris" <DSurratt@NAPAWASH.ORG>
To: Charles Washington <chaswash@mediaone.net>,
David Mora
<davidm@ci.salinas.ca.us>,
George Carvalho
<gcarvalho@santa-clarita.com>,
George Frederickson
<gfred@falcon.cc.ukans.edu>,
Grantland Johnson
<gjohnson@chhs.cahwnet.gov>,
Harvey White <hlw@pitt.edu>, Howard Hallman
<mupj@igc.apc.org>,
Jim Carroll <carrollj@fiu.edu>, Jim Svara
<svara@ncsu.edu>,
Norm Johnson <njohnson@famu.edu>,
Norman King
<king_no@sanbag.ca.gov>,
Royce Hanson <rhanson@umbc7.umbc.edu>, Tim Clark <tclark@njdc.com>,
Valerie Lemmie <citymgr@ci.dayton.oh.us>,
Yvonne Braithwaite Burke <seconddistrict@bos.co.la.ca.us>,
"zWholey, Joseph" <wholey@usc.edu>
Cc: "zRutledge, Philip" <rutledge@indiana.edu>
Subject: August Meeting of Working Group
Date: Thu, 29 Jun 2000 14:27:40 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

The first meeting of the Working Group on Social Equity Issue Definition has been scheduled for Friday, August 4, 2000 - 10:00 A.M. to 2:00 P.M. (Eastern time), at the Academy Offices in Washington, DC. More details and related materials will be forwarded in early July.

Again, thank you for agreeing to participate.

Doris Surratt
dsurratt@napawash.org

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express for Macintosh - 4.01 (295) Date: Mon, 03 Jul 2000 16:18:39 -0400 Subject: interfaith card From: "NMD" To: mupj@igc.org Dear Howard,

In reference to your conversation with Jim Wyerman, please find enclosed / attached the interfaith card draft, where we included your suggestion about the letter to the President.

Jim suggested that I attach and enclose (below the generic email) the text of the interfaith draft so the recipients can choose what works best for them.

Dear Friend of the Interfaith Community,

As you may know, the President is about to make a decision on National Missile Defense (NMD) deployment by late summer or early fall. It is very important to educate and mobilize all members and supporters against the NMD program which could trigger a new arms race and threaten common security among all nations; NMD cost is also unjust and wasteful and represents a major drain on the federal budget at the expense of life affirming programs such as social services or education.

The interfaith community is joining their efforts in a common card that would mobilize their members on the NMD issue.

We hope that you will be willing to join our public outreach efforts on this issue, and sign on as a sponsor to the interfaith card that has already been endorsed by a number of faith groups. You will find enclosed / attached copy of the interfaith card.

In case you are interested, please let me know how many cards you will need; 2020 Vision will take the printing cost of the cards. We will be glad to send them over to you so you can deliver them to your members.

Sincerely

NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE

TRADING PEACE FOR A NEW NUCLEAR ARMS RACE

<> There seem to be only two stages in military weapons development: "We're still testing" and "We're already committed." The wildly expensive and unproven technology called national missile defense (NMD) is about to reach the second stage if President Clinton makes a "GO" decision this fall.

As people of faith, we are concerned about creating a safer and more peaceful world. There is still a chance we can stop NMD, but we need every supporter to speak their conscience now.

Only public opinion can turn this decision around.

The IDEA of NMD is appealing: create a shield to protect us from nuclear missiles before they hit American soil. The REALITY of NMD is different and far more ominous. Here's why:

o NMD risks a new arms race.

NMD violates the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty with Russia. If we begin building NMD, then both Russia and China will build more nuclear weapons to ensure that their offensive weapons can overwhelm our defenses. Recent decisions by Russian President Putin and the Duma show a willingness to negotiate deep cuts in nuclear weapon stockpiles. NMD would thwart this reduction.

o NMD cost is unjust and wasteful.

A Congressional Budget Office NMD estimate in April skyrocketed to \$60 billion over fifteen years, for even a limited system. Imagine the drain on the federal budget at a time when life affirming programs such as social services and environmental protection are already facing cuts. NMD will profit only a few high tech weapons makers with our tax dollars, while ignoring those in need. Real national and personal security are brought about not with further militarization but human development.

o NMD threatens common security among all nations.

Members of faith communities measure human security in quality of right relations among nations and people, of shelter, of education, of health, of nutrition, of freedom, and of our spiritual lives. The true path to peace is to strengthen common security among all nations and people. This can be best achieved through arms control and multilateral diplomacy. A decision to deploy NMD will elicit responses from other nations who will see NMD not as a legitimate effort for American defense, but as a new American threat.

ACTION: With so much riding on this decision, we ask you to take three steps:

1) Write to President Clinton and tell him why he should NOT begin NMD deployment -- unjust and wasteful cost, risks of a new arms race, threat to human and common security; 2) Write a "letter to the editor" to your local paper about your opposition to NMD; 3) SEND A COPY of your letter to a newspaper to 2020 Vision, so we can track our combined efforts! Thank you.

CONTACT:

President Clinton president@whitehouse.gov
The White House (202) 456-1414
1600 Pennsylvania Ave, NW
Washington, DC 20500

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\interfaith card"

NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE

TRADING PEACE FOR A NEW NUCLEAR ARMS RACE

<> There seem to be only two stages in military weapons development: "We're still testing" and "We're already committed." The wildly expensive and unproven technology called national missile defense (NMD) is about to reach the second stage if President Clinton makes a "GO" decision this fall.

As people of faith, we are concerned about creating a safer and more peaceful world. There is still a chance we can stop NMD, but we need every supporter to speak their conscience now.

Only public opinion can turn this decision around.

The IDEA of NMD is appealing: create a shield to protect us from nuclear missiles before they hit American soil. The REALITY of NMD is different and far more ominous. Here's why:

- o NMD risks a new arms race.

NMD violates the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty with Russia. If we begin building NMD, then both Russia and China will build more nuclear weapons to ensure that their offensive weapons can overwhelm our defenses. Recent decisions by Russian President Putin and the Duma show a willingness to negotiate deep cuts in nuclear weapon stockpiles. NMD would thwart this reduction.

- o NMD cost is unjust and wasteful.

A Congressional Budget Office NMD estimate in April skyrocketed to \$60 billion over fifteen years, for even a limited system. Imagine the drain on the federal budget at a time when life affirming programs such as social services and environmental protection are already facing cuts. NMD will profit only a few high tech weapons makers with our tax dollars, while ignoring those in need. Real national and personal security are brought about not with further militarization but human development.

- o NMD threatens common security among all nations.

Members of faith communities measure human security in quality of right relations among nations and people, of shelter, of education, of health, of nutrition, of freedom, and of our spiritual lives. The true path to peace is to strengthen common security among all nations and people. This can be best achieved through arms control and multilateral diplomacy. A decision to deploy NMD will elicit responses from other nations who will see NMD not as a legitimate effort for American defense, but as a new American threat.

ACTION: With so much riding on this decision, we ask you to take three steps:

1) Write to President Clinton and tell him why he should NOT begin NMD deployment -- unjust and wasteful cost, risks of a new arms race, threat to human and common security; 2) Write a "letter to the editor" to your local paper about your opposition to NMD; 3) SEND A COPY of your letter to a newspaper to 2020 Vision, so we can track our combined efforts! Thank you.

CONTACT:

President Clinton president@whitehouse.gov
The White House (202) 456-1414
1600 Pennsylvania Ave, NW
Washington, DC 20500

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express for Macintosh - 4.01 (295)

Date: Wed, 05 Jul 2000 11:34:30 -0400

Subject: Re: NMD card

From: "NMD" <NMD@2020vision.org>

To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>

Dear Howard,

Thank you so much for your email and for sending our card to the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. (my name is spelled Hop Pham-Thi)

Could you please email me the list of recipients. As Jim discussed with you, we would like to help make a few phone calls to follow up with them, since time is running short... Would you let me know whom you wish to contact, i will be glad to contact the other members.

thanks again. Peace to you,

Hop P.T.

>From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>

>To: NMD@2020vision.org

>Subject: NMD card

>Date: Wed, Jul 5, 2000, 8:28 AM

>

>Dear Hop,

>

>I forwarded the interfaith postcard and your message to members of the
>Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. Attached is my message.

>

>Thanks for doing this,

>Howard

>

>###

>

>Dear Colleagues:

>

>At the June 22 meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament,
>we agreed to work with 20/20 Vision on a postcard alert on National Missile
>Defense (NMD). Kathy Guthrie and Greg Laszakovits met with Tim Barner and
>Hop Phom The at 20/20 and developed the attached draft.

>

>Would you be willing to be listed as a sponsor of this postcard? If so,
>the name of your organization will be printed on the card.

>

>20/20 will provide a free supply of cards to sponsoring organizations.

>Each organization will be responsible for distribution. The size of the

>card requires 20¢ postage. The message can also be transmitted

>electronically or included in a newsletter. How many copies of the NMD

>alert do you want?

>

>Please send your answers to these to questions directly to Hop Phom The at

>20/20 at NMD@2020vision.org or 202 833-2020. We need your answer by
>Monday, July 10. Postcards will be available a week to ten days later. If
>you send your reply via e-mail, please send me a copy at mupj@igc.org so
>that I can keep track of the response.

>
>If you have any questions, please call Hop or me.

>
>Shalom,
>Howard

>
>Howard W. Hallman, Chair
>Methodists United for Peace with Justice
>1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036
>Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail: mupj@igc.org

>
>Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a membership association of
>laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any Methodist denomination.

>

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express for Macintosh - 4.01 (295)

Date: Wed, 05 Jul 2000 11:34:30 -0400

Subject: Re: NMD card

From: "NMD" <NMD@2020vision.org>

To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>

Dear Howard,

Thank you so much for your email and for sending our card to the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmement. (my name is spelled Hop Pham-Thi)

Could you please email me the list of recipients. As Jim discussed with you, we would like to help make a few phone calls to follow up with them, since time is running short... Would you let me know whom you wish to contact, i will be glad to contact the other members.

thanks again. Peace to you,

Hop P.T.

To: David Robinson <dave@paxchristiusa.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: Letter to presidential candidates
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <01BFE047.3BC30680@dave.paxchristiusa.org>
References:

Dave,

Your message didn't come through in its entirety. It stopped as indicated below and then skipped to part of my message and my draft of the letter.

Please send your full message again and your redraft.

I'll be out this morning, Wednesday, July 5 but will return in the afternoon. If your message is here by then, I'll read it and call you.

Howard

At 02:51 PM 6/27/00 -0400, you wrote:

>Dear Howard,

>

>Thanks for your patience on this. I read through the new draft and I think that your initiative is great and could be very important in setting the context of the debate on elimination. I have a few questions and comments. First, it's a great idea to have them provide responses, to let them know that we will release these responses at a press event, and that you are including the Reform and Green parties as well--Excellent!

>

>As for the substance of the text, it is generally very good, on point. However, I do not understand the "no-use" section. Do you mean "no first-use" or do you really mean "no-use?" It seems that if such a declaration were possible, (and I do not believe it is) it would render the Nuclear Weapons Convention idea a mere formality. Oh, if we were to live in such a world...

>

>Unless this is a strategic question intended to illicit a response that could be used against him. But trying to get a likely President to publicly pronounce his intent to use nuclear weapons (the only other answer to the question if one does not embrace "no-use") could actually be damaging to the extreme. I can't imagine them falling into such a trap. And even if they do, I doubt that such a pronouncement could have a positive effect on the international political climate. (but again, if its to get them to admit what we already know is the case, thereby bringing international scorn down on them and US policy generally, well, then it might make sense and could serve to coalesce international opposition. It could also seriously backfire, undermining any attempt to get anything through the CD and providing China with cover for their ballistic missile efforts and Russia with cover for their more offensive nuclear posture).

>

>I would not say, as you do in the paragraph on past Presidential decisions not use nukes, that Nixon and Johnson refrained "even though the US was losing." First, I don't think that there ever was a point when the US was losing in Vietnam. Militarily, the US won every major m our questions,

To: ipnd
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: interfaith card on NMD
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\00703.07.txt;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Colleagues:

At the June 22 meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, we agreed to work with 20/20 Vision on a postcard alert on National Missile Defense (NMD). Kathy Guthrie and Greg Laszakovits met with Tim Barner and Hop Phom The at 20/20 and developed the attached draft.

Would you be willing to be listed as a sponsor of this postcard? If so, the name of your organization will be printed on the card.

20/20 will provide a free supply of cards to sponsoring organizations. Each organization will be responsible for distribution. The size of the card requires 20¢ postage. The message can also be transmitted electronically or included in a newsletter. How many copies of the NMD alert do you want?

Please send your answers to these to questions directly to Hop Phom The at 20/20 at NMD@2020vision.org or 202 833-2020. We need your answer by Monday, July 10. Postcards will be available a week to ten days later. If you send your reply via e-mail, please send me a copy at mupj@igc.org so that I can keep track of the response.

If you have any questions, please call Hop or me.

Shalom,
Howard

###

> Dear Friend of the Interfaith Community,
>
> NMD cost is also unjust and wasteful and represents a major drain on the
> federal budget at the expense of life affirming programs such as social
> services or education.
>
> The interfaith community is joining their efforts in a common card that
> would mobilize their members on the NMD issue.
>
> You will find enclosed / attached copy of the interfaith card.
>
> We will be glad to send them over to you so you can deliver them to your
> members.
>
> Sincerely
>
> Hop Phom The
> NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE
>
> TRADING PEACE FOR A NEW NUCLEAR ARMS RACE

>
><> """""""" decision this fall.
>
>
>
>
> Only public opinion can turn this decision around.
>
> The REALITY of NMD is different and far more ominous. Here's why:
>
>
> NMD would thwart this reduction.
>
> NMD cost is unjust and wasteful.
> Real national and personal security are brought about not with further
> militarization but human development.
>
>
>
>
> "" SEND A COPY of your letter to a newspaper to 2020 Vision, so we can
> track our combined efforts! Thank you.
>
> CONTACT:
> president@whitehouse.gov
> (202) 456-1414
>
>
>
>
> Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\interfaith
> card"

To: NMD@2020vision.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: NMD card
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Hop,

I forwarded the interfaith postcard and your message to members of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. Attached is my message.

Thanks for doing this,
Howard

###

Dear Colleagues:

At the June 22 meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, we agreed to work with 20/20 Vision on a postcard alert on National Missile Defense (NMD). Kathy Guthrie and Greg Laszakovits met with Tim Barner and Hop Phom The at 20/20 and developed the attached draft.

Would you be willing to be listed as a sponsor of this postcard? If so, the name of your organization will be printed on the card.

20/20 will provide a free supply of cards to sponsoring organizations. Each organization will be responsible for distribution. The size of the card requires 20¢ postage. The message can also be transmitted electronically or included in a newsletter. How many copies of the NMD alert do you want?

Please send your answers to these to questions directly to Hop Phom The at 20/20 at NMD@2020vision.org or 202 833-2020. We need your answer by Monday, July 10. Postcards will be available a week to ten days later. If you send your reply via e-mail, please send me a copy at mupj@igc.org so that I can keep track of the response.

If you have any questions, please call Hop or me.

Shalom,
Howard

To: kathy@fcnl.org, washofc@alo.com, NMD@2020vision.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Possible change in postcard
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Hop, Kathy, and Greg,

In reviewing the text of the interfaith postcard on NMD, Jaydee Hanson and Robin Ringler of the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society believe that it should have a stronger opening to stress the urgency of the issue. I know it's hard to change a text in circulation, but I would like to suggest consideration of the following substitute for the first two paragraphs to reflect their views.

"President Clinton is nearing a decision on whether to deploy a national missile defense (NMD). If he says "go ahead" to this wildly expensive and unproven technology, it will be a serious setback to our quest for a safer and more peaceful world. We in the faith community need to speak out vigorously to stop further development of NMD."

What would you think of this modification? If you agree by Thursday, July 6, we can send it back to our list. This will be within our deadline of getting an answer by Monday, July 10.

Shalom,
Howard

Date: Wed, 5 Jul 2000 16:41:56 -0400
From: William J Price <WorldPeaceMakers@compuserve.com>
Subject: interfaith card on NMD
Sender: William J Price <WorldPeaceMakers@compuserve.com>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>

Dear Howard,

Yes World peacemakers will be delighted to be listed.

I can use 500 copies to use in a mailing going out in 3weeks. Bill

To: nmd@2020vision.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: interfaith card on NMD
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

>Date: Wed, 5 Jul 2000 16:41:56 -0400
>From: William J Price <WorldPeaceMakers@compuserve.com>
>Subject: interfaith card on NMD
>Sender: William J Price <WorldPeaceMakers@compuserve.com>
>To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
>
>Dear Howard,
>
>Yes World peacemakers will be delighted to be listed.
>
>I can use 500 copies to use in a mailing going out in 3weeks. Bill
>

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express for Macintosh - 4.01 (295)

Date: Wed, 05 Jul 2000 17:01:39 -0400

Subject: Re: Possible change in postcard

From: "NMD" <NMD@2020vision.org>

To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>

CC: kathy@fcnl.org

, glaszakovits_gb@brethren.org

Dear Howard,

Thanks for your message. I already got two positive replies from your contact.

Robin's suggestions look good to me, although I would like to keep the "people of faith" and switch "assertive" to "vigorous", which may seem too strong to some faith groups:

"President Clinton is nearing a decision on whether to deploy a national missile defense (NMD). If he says "go ahead" to this wildly expensive and unproven technology, it will be a serious setback to our quest for a safer and more peaceful world.

As people of faith, we need to speak out assertively to stop further development of NMD, and invite every supporter to speak their conscience now."

Tim gave me from Maine some useful (style) changes from Kathy, which I have included in the final draft. I'll be waiting for everyone's final comments before I send the final draft to all of you.

It may be helpful to let people know after Thursday, that the draft is in its final form, unless we get feedback (on the text) from major church groups we cannot ignore ?

Peace to you,

Hop

>From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
>To: kathy@fcnl.org, washofc@alo.com, NMD@2020vision.org
>Subject: Possible change in postcard
>Date: Wed, Jul 5, 2000, 3:52 PM
>

>Dear Hop, Kathy, and Greg,

>
>In reviewing the text of the interfaith postcard on NMD, Jaydee Hanson and
>Robin Ringler of the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society
>believe that it should have a stronger opening to stress the urgency of the
>issue. I know it's hard to change a text in circulation, but I would like
>to suggest consideration of the following substitute for the first two
>paragraphs to reflect their views.
>

>"President Clinton is nearing a decision on whether to deploy a national
>missile defense (NMD). If he says "go ahead" to this wildly expensive and
>unproven technology, it will be a serious setback to our quest for a safer
>and more peaceful world. We in the faith community need to speak out
>vigorously to stop further development of NMD."

>

>What would you think of this modification? If you agree by Thursday, July
>6, we can send it back to our list. This will be within our deadline of
>getting an answer by Monday, July 10.

>

>Shalom,
>Howard

>

>Howard W. Hallman, Chair
>Methodists United for Peace with Justice
>1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036
>Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail: mupj@igc.org

>

>Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a membership association of
>laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any Methodist denomination.

>

To: gpowers@nccbuscc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: National Missile Defense
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Jerry,

Yesterday I sent out a request for cosponsors for a postcard alert on national missile defense. I realize that you are unlikely to sign on. However, I'm wondering if you would be willing to send out your own alert to your diocesan network, asking them to get letters to President Clinton opposing deployment of NMD. The text of the postcard provides information. I can provide you more if you want it.

Shalom,
Howard

To: nmd@2020vision.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Postcard text
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Hop,

Your change to my suggested opening is okay with me with one exception.

In the second paragraph the word "supporter" should be changed to "opponent" because the natural antecedent is "NMD". We are mobilizing the opponents, not the supporters. It would read as follows (with a superfluous comma removed):

"As people of faith, we need to speak out assertively to stop further development of NMD and invite every supporter to speak their conscience now."

I've sent this revised language to Robin Ringler for her review. I'll check with Kathy and Greg today.

I should have the list of contacts before noon today.

Shalom,
Howard

To: dringler@umc-gbcs.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Postcard text
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Robin,

I sent Hop Pham-Thi some new wording for the opening of the NMD postcard. She made some adjustments so that it reads as follows:

"President Clinton is nearing a decision on whether to deploy a national missile defense (NMD). If he says "go ahead" to this wildly expensive and unproven technology, it will be a serious setback to our quest for a safer and more peaceful world.

As people of faith, we need to speak out assertively to stop further development of NMD and invite every opponent to speak their conscience now."

Would this language meet your and Jaydee's concern? Would you then send it out as well as be a cosponsor?

Shalom,
Howard

X-eGroups-Return: sentto-1413460-838-962908302-mupj=igc.apc.org@returns.onelist.com
X-Sender: abolition2000@abolition2000.org
To: abolition-caucus@egroups.com, abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
From: Abolition 2000 <admin@abolition2000.org>
Mailing-List: list abolition-caucus@egroups.com; contact abolition-caucus-owner@egroups.com
Delivered-To: mailing list abolition-caucus@egroups.com
List-Unsubscribe: <mailto:abolition-caucus-unsubscribe@egroups.com>
Date: Thu, 6 Jul 2000 10:42:25 -0800
Subject: [abolition-caucus] Abolition 2000 Annual General Meeting 30 April 2000

Abolition 2000 Annual General Meeting
30 April 2000

I. ABOLITION 2000 COORDINATING COMMITTEE REPORT

Activities -- The 1999-2000 Coordinating Committee was established at the Hague Appeal for Peace in May 1999. Members included: Janet Bloomfield, (UK) John Burroughs (alternate for Alyn Ware), Jacqueline Cabasso (US), Pol D'Huyvetter (Belgium), David Krieger (US), Richard Salvador (Belau), Alice Slater (US), Hiro Umebayashi (Japan), Alyn Ware (Aotearoa) and Ross Wilcock (Canada). In June, 1999, the ACC hired Carah Ong as Coordinator for the Network and appointed her to the ACC. The ACC met monthly and then weekly, prior to the AGM by telephone conference calls and by email in between calls. The ACC defined the role of the Coordinator and served as her support team. The ACC tried to engage the Global Council in discussion and participation in Network activities. Last December the ACC submitted a statement to the Millenium Forum, and this Spring the ACC issued a Statement of Demands to the NPT (enclosed). In January, the ACC issued a 4 point Call to Action to Network members calling for signatures on the Abolition Petition, coordinated actions during Abolition Days (March 1 - 8), and efforts to invite Heads of States to the NPT. The ACC also initiated the "2000 by 2000" campaign to enroll 2000 Abolition 2000 endorsers by the end of the NPT. The ACC coordinated the International Petition presentation to Ambassador Baali during the NPT Review Conference at the UN in New York.

Recommendations -- Unfortunately, over the last year, the ACC experienced a lack of adequate feedback from the Global Council and the Network members. The ACC recommends that efforts be made to increase communication over the next year. While the ACC was geographically diverse on paper, in practicality, lack of resources made it difficult to ensure participation from all of its members. The ACC proposed that Abolition 2000 accept the City of Nagasaki's invitation to be part of the Global Citizens' Assembly for the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons in Nagasaki in November 2000. Also, the current structure of the ACC should be maintained for the coming year and that membership should consist of 8 members, including a representative of the host organization and the Coordinator.

II. ABOLITION 2000 STAFF REPORT

Activities -- Carah Ong became the Coordinator of the Network in June 1999. Over the last year she has been responsible for outreach to new organizations and communication among Network members. Carah manages the Abolition Global Caucus list-serv as well as the US Caucus list-serv.

Each month, Carah edits an on-line electronic newsletter entitled "Abolition 2000 Grassroots News." Additionally, Carah has developed the Abolition 2000 website, which received an award from Infoseek/GO.com as the #4 Watchdog organization on the internet. Carah has also updated Abolition 2000 materials and created a new brochure. In January, Carah began fundraising for the Network by writing grants and financial appeal letters.

Recommendations -- For the upcoming year, Carah recommended that the Global Council, the Coordinating Committee and the Network Coordinator work to increase regional ties and communication among Network Members by establishing active regional contacts and developing stronger relationships with regional contacts and Network Members. Also, Carah recommended that a quarterly newsletter be mailed to all members groups to increase contact with organizations that do not have access to email. Additionally, Carah will work to increase the number of languages in which Abolition 2000 materials are available. Carah will continue to work on the website as a tool for outreach.

III. REPORT FROM THE GLOBAL COUNCIL

Activities -- The Global Council was established at the Hague Appeal for Peace in an effort to create a more geographically representative body. A list-serve was established for the Global Council as the means of communication. During the year, some discussion took place on the list-serve regarding whether or not the A2000 Statement should be amended and updated, as well as some discussion on the possibility of getting governments to convene a conference to amend the NPT. Although several attempts were made to engage the Global Council there was very little response.

Recommendations -The role of the Global Council should be reformulated to include active Regional Contacts and others who are most active in the Network. The Global Council should work with the ACC and the Coordinator to increase the availability of information and materials in other languages. Also, continued outreach to regional A2000 networks and organizations should be increased.

IV. REPORT FROM WORKING GROUPS

*Note: this does not represent a complete list of A2000 Working Groups. There is no standard definition of a Working Group (WG). WGs tend to represent issue areas of concern within A2000, and WG conveners tend to serve as issue area resource people to the Network. To get involved, see enclosed list of WG conveners..

*The Military-Industrial Complex WG, convened by Stephen Staples and Alice Slater met with the leadership group for the Seattle teach-in to urge that nuclear issues be placed on the agenda and participated in the globalization teach-in in Washington DC during the WTO/IMF protests.

*The Sustainable Energy WG, convened by Alice Slater should focus on point 10 in the A2000 Statement and work to establish a Sustainable Energy Agency.

*The WG on Space, convened by Bruce Gagnon and the Global Network Against

Nuclear Weapons and Power in Space, held a meeting in New York in 1999. The WG on Space also held an international conference in Washington DC from 14-17 April 2000. Future activities include international call-in days to President Clinton and the US Congress to oppose Ballistic Missile Defense and a demonstration on 7 October to protest the militarization of Outer Space.

*Pamela Meidell would like to turn over the convenor position of the WG on Radiation and Health Effects. This WG should form a network of affected individuals and bring them together to share their stories.

*The Nuclear Weapons Convention WG, convened by Alyn Ware and Jurgen Scheffran, established a list-serv to promote discussion of an NWC. In 1999, IPPNW, IALANA, INESAP and LCNP published "Security and Survival: The Case for a Nuclear Weapons Convention." Merav Datan, of IPPNW, also publishes a "Nuclear Weapons Convention Monitor" each month to answer frequently asked questions and monitor progress on the implementation of a NWC. The New Zealand Government has recently incorporated the NWC into its policy.

*The Religious WG is working to establish interfaith partnerships and hopes to involve 30-40 mainstream religions/denominations in the WG. Dave Robinson, a co-convenor of the Religious WG, hopes to focus on bishops in the South and the World Council of Churches, and to get the Vatican to issue a statement on Nuclear Disarmament.

*The Communications WG, convened by Richard Salvador, has faced many challenges, primarily because of the gap in available technology. Richard has distributed information from the A2000 Network to Indigenous Peoples and vice versa.

*The Grassroots WG, convened by David Krieger, has been institutionalized in the monthly Abolition 2000 Grassroots Newsletter. Organizations should communicate activities to Carah and share information with other Network members.

*The CTBT and Beyond WG, convened by Jackie Cabasso and Western States Legal Foundation (WSLF), works to further points 3 (pro CTBT) and 7 (end lab testing) of the A2000 Statement.. WSLF collects and disseminates information about ongoing nuclear weapons research, development and testing to NGOs, decision makers and legislative bodies in the US and internationally. In the US, WSLF assisted with the Markey Congressional Resolution calling for an end to lab testing, and created a packet with the Alliance for Nuclear Accountability (a US network) that was distributed to all NPT delegations. WSLF is sponsoring several panel presentations on "Stockpile Stewardship" and the role of nuclear scientists at the NPT Review Conference.

V. GENERAL DISCUSSION "WHAT WE WANT TO HAPPEN"

*Quarterly Abolition 2000 Grassroots Newsletter in "hardcopy", translated into several languages, to be mailed.

*Days of Internationally coordinated actions with educational brochures

about participating sites and groups.

*Develop International Working Groups

*Increase communication and deepen relationships

*Greater transparency, accessibility and accountability

*Broader ownership and participation

*Enough resources to do the job

*Use Working Groups to call for specific actions, to strategize and make lateral outreach to the globalization activists, women, environmentalists, religious leaders, etc.

*Nurture the Network

*Develop educational and outreach materials

*Translate information and materials into several languages

*Make the weaponization of space a focus issue

*Increase communication with more regions and learn their priorities

*Use developed materials with specific actions

*Have regional links on the A2000 website

* Build up and develop International Abolition Days (1-8 March established at the Hague)

*Open and deepen the spectrum/dimension of the intellectual and action/activist ends

VI. AGREEMENTS MADE BY NETWORK MEMBERS PRESENT AT THE AGM

1. The nature of the Network and the substance of the Abolition 2000 Statement and the Moorea Declaration were reaffirmed. No one person or organization can represent Abolition 2000 or speak for the Network. However, Network organizations are encouraged to publicly identify themselves as members of "Abolition 2000: A Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons."
2. A list of Coordinating Committee Members for the year 2000-2001 was adopted (see enclosed).
3. A list of Global Council Members for the year 2000-2001 was adopted (see enclosed), however, membership may be broadened by the ACC or the Global Council itself.
4. Abolition 2000 will endorse and take part in the Global Citizens'

Assembly for the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons in Nagasaki in November 2000. Hiro Umebayashi will form a Working Group.

5. The ACC and the Global Council will begin discussion on the advisability and feasibility of updating the Abolition 2000 Statement or preparing an amendment to the Statement reflecting the reality that we're now in the year 2000

6. There was a proposal for the next Annual General Meeting to be held in the Global South. Bahig Nassar offered the possibility of hosting such a meeting in Cairo, Egypt. Jackie Cabasso offered to work with Bahig. Other suggestions included Bangladesh, South Asia, Costa Rica and Mexico City.

Abolition 2000 Annual General Meeting
30 April 2000

Coordinating Committee Members 2000-2001

Janet Bloomfield, UK	Atomic Mirror
John Burroughs (alternate), US	Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy
Jackie Cabasso, US	Western States Legal Foundation
David Krieger, US	Nuclear Age Peace Foundation
Carah Ong, US	Staff
Lars Pohlmeier, Germany	IPPNW
Alice Slater, US	Global Resource Action Center for the Environment (GRACE)
Hiro Umebayashi, Japan	Peace Depot
Alyn Ware, Aotearoa	Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy
Ross Wilcock, Canada	Physicians for Global Survival

Abolition 2000 Annual General Meeting
30 April 2000

Proposed List of Global Council Members 2000-2001

Aotearoa
Marion Hancock Peace Foundation
Chris King Abolition 2000 Wellington (Aotearoa Regional Contact)

Australia
Ron and Iren Gale Australian Peace Committee (Australia Regional Contact)
John Hallam Friends of the Earth Sydney
Jo Vallentine

Canada
Bev Delong Canadian Network (Canada Regional Contact)

France
Lysianne Alezard (France Regional Contact)
Daniel Durand Le Mouvement de la Paix

Japan
Akira Kawasaki Peace Depot

Latin America
Ruben Arvisu
JackieMitzi Stark WILPF Costa Rica (Latin America Regional Contact)

Middle East
Bahig Nassar Arab Coordinating Center (Middle East Regional Contact)
Israeli contact

Indigenous Representation
Corbin Harney
Tom Goldtooth/Naila Butler Indigenous Environmental Network
North American Great Lakes Basin (Indigenous Representative)
suggested by Annabel Dwyer

Pacific
Richard Salvador

Russia
Alexey Yablokov
Alla Yaroshinskaya

Scientific Community
Andreas Toupadakis

South Africa
Paul Saoke (South Africa Regional Contact)

South Asia

Sweden
Klas Lundias IPPNW Sweden

UK
Dave Knight Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament
Claire Poyner A2000 UK (UK Regional Contact)

US
Andrew Lichterman Western States Legal Foundation
Pamela Meidell Atomic Mirror
Zia Mian Princeton University
M.V. Ramana Princeton University

Youth
Michelle Xenos Shundahai Network
Carah Ong

Abolition 2000 Annual General Meeting
30 April 2000

Important Dates

July

1 and 7 Protest against the National Missile Defense system at Vandenberg Air Force Base

3-12 Third test of the National Missile Defense system

16 Anniversary of the Trinity Test

US Campaign Demonstration in Washington D.C.
Demonstration at Bechtel Headquarters in San Francisco

August

6 Hiroshima Day

Demonstration at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory

9 Nagasaki Day

Demonstration at Los Alamos National Laboratory

12-17 Nuclear Free Great Lakes Action Camp/Michigan, USA

October

7 International day of protest to stop the militarization and nuclearization of Space

November

11-12 First National Convention of the anti-nuclear/peace groups in New Delhi, India

17-20 Global citizens Assembly for the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons in Nagasaki

Carah Lynn Ong

Coordinator, Abolition 2000

PMB 121, 1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 1
Santa Barbara CA 93108

Phone (805) 965 3443 FAX(805) 568 0466

Email: admin@abolition2000.org

Website <http://www.abolition2000.org>

Join the Abolition-Global Caucus listserv to receive regular updates about the Abolition movement. The caucus provides an international forum for conversation on nuclear-related issues. Important articles and information relating to nuclear issues are also circulated to keep interested individuals and activists informed about nuclear issues.

To subscribe to the Abolition Global Caucus, please do one of the following:

1. Send a message to the list moderator at admin@abolition2000.org
2. Visit the Abolition-caucus website at:
[Http://www.egroups.com/list/abolition-caucus/](http://www.egroups.com/list/abolition-caucus/) and submit a membership form.
3. Visit the Abolition 2000 website and submit a membership form.
4. Send an e-mail to: abolition-caucus-subscribe@egroups.com (leave the subject line and body of the message blank).

To post a message to the Abolition Global Caucus, send your message to:

abolition-caucus@egroups.com

To subscribe to the Abolition-USA listerve, send a message (with no subject) to:

abolition-usa-request@lists.xmission.com

In the body of the message, write:

"subscribe abolition-usa" (do not include quotation marks)

To post a message to the Abolition-USA list, mail your message to:

abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

Special Offer-Earn 300 Points from MyPoints.com for trying @Backup

Get automatic protection and access to your important computer files.

Install today:

http://click.egroups.com/1/6347/3/_/91925/_/962908302/

To subscribe to the Abolition Global Caucus, send an email from the account you wish to be subscribed to: "abolition-caucus-subscribe@egroups.com"

Do not include a subject line or any text in the body of the message.

From: Washofc@aol.com
Date: Thu, 6 Jul 2000 09:23:01 EDT
Subject: Re: Possible change in postcard
To: mupj@igc.org
X-Mailer: AOL 5.0 for Windows sub 109

The changes are more than ok with me Howard. I appreciate the stronger language.

Greg

From: Robin Ringler <DRingler@UMC-GBCS.ORG>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: Postcard text
Date: Thu, 6 Jul 2000 10:02:32 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

Thanks very much Howard! It sounds great. I'll run it by Jaydee ASAP and let you know.

Robin

-----Original Message-----

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Thursday, July 06, 2000 9:15 AM
To: Robin Ringler
Subject: Postcard text

Robin,

I sent Hop Pham-Thi some new wording for the opening of the NMD postcard. She made some adjustments so that it reads as follows:

"President Clinton is nearing a decision on whether to deploy a national missile defense (NMD). If he says "go ahead" to this wildly expensive and unproven technology, it will be a serious setback to our quest for a safer and more peaceful world.

As people of faith, we need to speak out assertively to stop further development of NMD and invite every opponent to speak their conscience now."

Would this language meet your and Jaydee's concern? Would you then send it out as well as be a cosponsor?

Shalom,
Howard

Howard W. Hallman, Chair
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036
Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail: mupj@igc.org

Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a membership association of laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any Methodist denomination.

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express for Macintosh - 4.01 (295)
Date: Thu, 06 Jul 2000 15:17:31 -0400
Subject: interfaith card follow-up
From: "NMD" <NMD@2020vision.org>
To: mupj@igc.org

Dear Howard,

Thank you for faxing me the list of interfaith group contacts. I have called the ones you don't call, but many are out of town, and I'll have to call back next Monday.

I left a message for Father Stan Deboe (Conference of Major). He is gone since Wednesday and will be back on Monday. He may not have had the time to get your email. Since time is running short, would you mind emailing him again in L.A. your message on the faith card, his assistant told me he would check his laptop while in Los Angeles. His email is: cmsmjp@aol.com. I will call again him on Monday.

Carol Blythe's phone number does not seem to be right. would you have another one?

Also, Kathy gave me a list of contact names she knows of, and mentioned that you would be the best person to advise me on contacts at:

- African Faith and Justice Network
- African Methodist Episcopal Church
- African " " " " Zion Church
- Congress of National Black Churches

Thank you again. Peace to you,

Hop

To: dave@paxchristiusa.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: NMD postcard
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Dave,

Here is a re-transmittal of my message about an interfaith postcard on NMD that we are doing with 20/20. I hope Pax Christi USA will be a sponsor and send out cards to your members.

Howard

###

Dear Colleagues:

At the June 22 meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, we agreed to work with 20/20 Vision on a postcard alert on National Missile Defense (NMD). Kathy Guthrie and Greg Laszakovits met with Tim Barner and Hop Phom The at 20/20 and developed the attached draft.

Would you be willing to be listed as a sponsor of this postcard? If so, the name of your organization will be printed on the card.

20/20 will provide a free supply of cards to sponsoring organizations. Each organization will be responsible for distribution. The size of the card requires 20¢ postage. The message can also be transmitted electronically or included in a newsletter. How many copies of the NMD alert do you want?

Please send your answers to these to questions directly to Hop Phom The at 20/20 at NMD@2020vision.org or 202 833-2020. We need your answer by Monday, July 10. Postcards will be available a week to ten days later. If you send your reply via e-mail, please send me a copy at mupj@igc.org so that I can keep track of the response.

If you have any questions, please call Hop or me.

Shalom,
Howard

###

> Dear Friend of the Interfaith Community,
>
> NMD cost is also unjust and wasteful and represents a major drain on the
> federal budget at the expense of life affirming programs such as social
> services or education.
>
> The interfaith community is joining their efforts in a common card that
> would mobilize their members on the NMD issue.
>
> You will find enclosed / attached copy of the interfaith card.
>

> We will be glad to send them over to you so you can deliver them to your
>members.

>
> Sincerely

>
> Hop Pham-Thi

TRADING PEACE FOR A NEW NUCLEAR ARMS RACE

"President Clinton is nearing a decision on whether to deploy a national missile defense (NMD). If he says "go ahead" to this wildly expensive and unproven technology, it will be a serious setback to our quest for a safer and more peaceful world.

As people of faith, we need to speak out assertively to stop further development of NMD, and invite every opponent to speak their conscience now."

Only public opinion can turn this decision around.

The IDEA of NMD is appealing: create a shield to protect us from nuclear missiles before they hit American soil. The REALITY of NMD is different and far more ominous. Here's why:

o NMD risks a new arms race.

NMD violates the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty with Russia. If we begin building NMD, then both Russia and China will build more nuclear weapons to ensure that their offensive weapons can overwhelm our defenses. Recent decisions by Russian President Putin and the Duma show a willingness to negotiate deep cuts in nuclear weapon stockpiles. NMD would thwart this reduction.

o NMD cost is unjust and wasteful.

A Congressional Budget Office NMD estimate in April skyrocketed to \$60 billion over fifteen years, for even a limited system. Imagine the drain on the federal budget at a time when life affirming programs such as social services and environmental protection are already facing cuts. NMD will profit only a few high tech weapons makers with our tax dollars, while ignoring those in need. Real national and personal security are brought about not with further militarization but human development.

o NMD threatens common security among all nations.

Members of faith communities measure human security in quality of right relations among nations and people, of shelter, of education, of health, of nutrition, of freedom, and of our spiritual lives. The true path to peace is to strengthen common security among all nations and people. This can be best achieved through arms control and multilateral diplomacy. A decision to deploy NMD will elicit responses from other nations who will see NMD not as a legitimate effort for American defense, but as a new American threat.

ACTION: With so much riding on this decision, we ask you to take three steps:

1) Write to President Clinton and tell him why he should NOT begin NMD deployment -- unjust and wasteful cost, risks of a new arms race, threat to human and common security; 2) Write a "letter to the editor" to your local paper about your opposition to NMD; 3) SEND A COPY of your letter to a newspaper to 2020 Vision, so we can track our combined efforts! Thank you.

CONTACT:

President Clinton president@whitehouse.gov
The White House (202) 456-1414
1600 Pennsylvania Ave, NW
Washington, DC 20500

To: dave@paxchristiusa.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Letter to candidates
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dave,

As of 5:30 p.m., Wednesday, July 6 I haven't received your message about the draft letter to presidential candidates. Perhaps you sent it and it went astray. Please try again.

Thanks,
Howard

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express for Macintosh - 4.01 (295) Date: Fri, 07 Jul 2000 11:56:31 -0400 Subject: interfaith card From: "NMD" To: mupj@igc.org Dear Howard,

Sorry it took me a while to email you the last draft. I just spoke with Kathy and Greg about the final changes, and they are happy with it, except for minor grammar changes from Kathy.

I have attached the final draft and enclosed it as well.

Thank you again. Peace,

Hop

NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE

TRADING PEACE FOR A NEW NUCLEAR ARMS RACE

◇ President Clinton is nearing a decision on whether to deploy a national missile defense (NMD). If he says "go ahead" to this wildly expensive and unproven technology, it will be a serious setback to our quest for a safer and more peaceful world.

As people of faith, we need to speak out assertively to stop further development of NMD and invite all supporters to speak their consciences now.

Only public opinion can turn this decision around.

The IDEA of NMD is appealing: create a shield to protect us from nuclear missiles before they hit American soil. The REALITY of NMD is different and far more ominous. Here's why:

- o NMD risks a new arms race.

NMD violates the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty with Russia. If we begin building NMD, then both Russia and China may build more nuclear weapons to ensure that their offensive weapons can overwhelm our defenses. Recent decisions by Russian President Putin and the Duma show a willingness to negotiate deep cuts in nuclear weapon stockpiles. NMD would thwart this reduction.

- o NMD cost is unjust and wasteful.

A Congressional Budget Office NMD estimate in April skyrocketed to \$60 billion over fifteen years, for even a limited system. Imagine the drain on the federal budget at a time when life affirming programs such as social services and environmental protection are already facing cuts. NMD will profit only a few high tech weapons makers with our tax dollars, while ignoring those in need. Real national and personal security are brought about not with further militarization but human development.

- o NMD threatens common security among all nations.

Members of faith communities measure human security in quality of right relations among nations and people, of shelter, education, health, nutrition, freedom, and of our spiritual lives. The true path to peace is to strengthen common security among all nations and people. This can be best achieved through arms control and multilateral diplomacy. A decision to deploy NMD will elicit responses from other nations who will see NMD not as a legitimate effort for American defense, but as a new American threat.

ACTION: With so much riding on this decision, we ask you to take three steps:

1) Write to President Clinton and tell him why he should NOT begin NMD deployment -- unjust and wasteful cost, risks of a new arms race, threat to human and common security; 2) Write a Letter to the Editor to your local paper voicing your opposition to NMD; 3) SEND A COPY of your letter to a newspaper to 2020 Vision, so we can track our combined efforts! Thank you.

CONTACT:

President Clinton president@whitehouse.gov
The White House (202) 456-1414
1600 Pennsylvania Ave, NW
Washington, DC 20500

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\interfaith card1"

Date: Fri, 7 Jul 2000 11:39:52 -0400
From: "Ken Sehested" <ken@mail.bpfna.org>
Reply-To: <ken@mail.bpfna.org>
To: <NMD@2020vision.org>
CC: <mupj@igc.org>, <tiller64@starpower.net>
Subject: Re: interfaith card on NMD
X-Mailer: <IMail v6.00>

Please add our organization's name on the NMD postcard and send us 2,000 copies of the card when it is ready.

Ken Sehested
Executive Director
Baptist Peace Fellowship of North America
4800 Wedgewood Dr.
Charlotte, NC 28210

-----@ @\$\$DraftStart@ @\$\$-----
DraftTo:NMD@2020vision.org
DraftCC:"Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
DraftBCC:

-----@ @\$\$DraftEnd@ @\$\$-----
----- Original Message -----
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Date: Wed, 05 Jul 2000 08:27:05 -0400

>Dear Colleagues:

>
>At the June 22 meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament,
>we agreed to work with 20/20 Vision on a postcard alert on National Missile
>Defense (NMD). Kathy Guthrie and Greg Laszakovits met with Tim Barner and
>Hop Phom The at 20/20 and developed the attached draft.

>
>Would you be willing to be listed as a sponsor of this postcard? If so,
>the name of your organization will be printed on the card.

>
>20/20 will provide a free supply of cards to sponsoring organizations.
>Each organization will be responsible for distribution. The size of the
>card requires 20¢ postage. The message can also be transmitted
>electronically or included in a newsletter. How many copies of the NMD
>alert do you want?

>
>Please send your answers to these to questions directly to Hop Phom The at
>20/20 at NMD@2020vision.org or 202 833-2020. We need your answer by
>Monday, July 10. Postcards will be available a week to ten days later. If
>you send your reply via e-mail, please send me a copy at mupj@igc.org so
>that I can keep track of the response.

>
>If you have any questions, please call Hop or me.

>
>Shalom,
>Howard

>

>###

>
>> Dear Friend of the Interfaith Community,

>>
>> NMD cost is also unjust and wasteful and represents a major drain on the
>>federal budget at the expense of life affirming programs such as social
>>services or education.

>>
>> The interfaith community is joining their efforts in a common card that
>>would mobilize their members on the NMD issue.

>>
>> You will find enclosed / attached copy of the interfaith card.

>>
>> We will be glad to send them over to you so you can deliver them to your
>>members.

>>
>> Sincerely

>>
> Hop Phom The

NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE

TRADING PEACE FOR A NEW NUCLEAR ARMS RACE

>><> """""""" decision this fall.

>>
>>
>> Only public opinion can turn this decision around.

>>
>> The REALITY of NMD is different and far more ominous. Here is why:

>>
>>
>> NMD would thwart this reduction.

>>
>> NMD cost is unjust and wasteful.
>> Real national and personal security are brought about not with further
>>militarization but human development.

>>
>>
>>
>> "" SEND A COPY of your letter to a newspaper to 2020 Vision, so we can
>>track our combined efforts! Thank you.

>>
>> CONTACT:
>> president@whitehouse.gov
>> (202) 456-1414

>>
>>
>>
>> Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\interfaith
>>card"

>

Dear Howard,

Enclosed/attached please find the final draft of the card.

Peace,
Hop

NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE

TRADING PEACE FOR A NEW NUCLEAR ARMS RACE

<> President Clinton is nearing a decision on whether to deploy a national missile defense (NMD). If he says "go ahead" to this wildly expensive and unproven technology, it will be a serious setback to our quest for a safer and more peaceful world.

As people of faith, we need to speak out assertively to stop further development of NMD and invite all our supporters to speak their consciences now.

Only public opinion can turn this decision around.

The IDEA of NMD is appealing: create a shield to protect us from nuclear missiles before they hit American soil. The REALITY of NMD is different and far more ominous. Here's why:

o NMD risks a new arms race.

NMD violates the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty with Russia. If we begin building NMD, then both Russia and China may build more nuclear weapons to ensure that their offensive weapons can overwhelm our defenses. Recent decisions by Russian President Putin and the Duma show a willingness to negotiate deep cuts in nuclear weapon stockpiles. NMD would thwart this reduction.

o NMD cost is unjust and wasteful.

A Congressional Budget Office NMD estimate in April skyrocketed to \$60 billion over fifteen years, for even a limited system. Imagine the drain on the federal budget at a time when life affirming programs such as social services and environmental protection are already facing cuts. NMD will profit only a few high tech weapons makers with our tax dollars, while ignoring those in need. Real national and personal security are brought about not with further militarization but human development.

o NMD threatens common security among all nations.

Members of faith communities measure human security in quality of right relations among nations and people, of shelter, education, health, nutrition, freedom, and of our spiritual lives. The true path to peace is to strengthen common security among all nations and people. This can be best achieved through arms control and multilateral diplomacy. A decision to deploy NMD

will elicit responses from other nations who will see NMD not as a legitimate effort for American defense, but as a new American threat.

ACTION: With so much riding on this decision, we ask you to take three steps:

1) Write to President Clinton and tell him why he should NOT begin NMD deployment -- unjust and wasteful cost, risk of a new arms race, threat to human and common security; 2) Write a Letter to the Editor to your local paper voicing your opposition to NMD; 3) SEND A COPY of your letter to a newspaper to 20/20 Vision, so we can track our combined efforts! Thank you.

CONTACT:

President Clinton president@whitehouse.gov

The White House (202) 456-1414

1600 Pennsylvania Ave, NW

Washington, DC 20500

To: ipnd
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: interfaith card on NMD
Cc: nmd@2020vision.org
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\NMD interfaith card.txt;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Colleagues:

Here is a revised draft of the interfaith card on national missile defense (NMD) to reflect changes suggested by several people. Mainly the first two paragraphs have been rewritten to focus sharply on President Clinton. Other changes are minor adjustments in wording.

We now have ten endorsers (and assume that they will accept the re-wording). We are looking for more sponsors. Please contact Ms. Hop Tham-Thi at 20/20 vision with your endorsement and order for cards. Please send me a copy for my information.

Thanks for your support.

Howard

>

>-----

>

NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE

>

>

TRADING PEACE FOR A NEW NUCLEAR ARMS RACE

>

><> President Clinton is nearing a decision on whether to deploy a national missile defense (NMD). If he says "go ahead" to this wildly expensive and unproven technology, it will be a serious setback to our quest for a safer and more peaceful world.

>

> As people of faith, we need to speak out assertively to stop further
>development of NMD and invite all our supporters to speak their consciences now.

>

> Only public opinion can turn this decision around.

>

> The REALITY of NMD is different and far more ominous. Here's why:

>

>

> NMD would thwart this reduction.

>

> NMD cost is unjust and wasteful.

> Real national and personal security are brought about not with further
>militarization but human development.

>

>

>

>

>

> SEND A COPY of your letter to a newspaper to 2020 Vision, so we can
>track our combined efforts! Thank you.

>

> CONTACT:

> president@whitehouse.gov

> (202) 456-1414

>

>

>

>

>

> Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\interfaith

>card1"

To: dave@paxchristiusa.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Redraft
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\abolish.276.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Dave,

Here is a redraft of the letter to presidential candidates that incorporates your suggestions. Please let me know what you think about it.

It is attached below and sent as a separate attachment in case you want it that way.

Shalom,
Howard

###

Draft Letter to Presidential Candidates from Religious Leaders (7-7-00)

To be sent to nominees of Democratic, Republican, Reform, and Green parties
after the nomination process has been completed (mid-August)

Sample for Vice President Al Gore. To be adapted for other candidates.

Dear Mr. Vice President:

Congratulations on your nomination by the Democratic Party for the office of President of the United States. We look forward to a wholesome debate among the candidates on significant issues that are of great importance to the American people.

Among these issues there is none more important than the future of the world's nuclear arsenal. Our own perspective is that the time has come for the United States to provide creative leadership to achieve the global elimination of nuclear weapons. We hope you share this view.

In this letter we pose a series of questions on this matter. We would greatly appreciate receiving a reply from you by Tuesday, September 5, which is two months before the election. We will hold a news conference on September 7 to release your answers to our questions along with the replies of candidates of the Republican, Reform, and Green parties.

For decades numerous religious denominations, interfaith organizations, and religious leaders have questioned the morality of nuclear weapons and have called for their elimination.

Thus, the Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1983 stated: "We believe that that the time has come when the churches must unequivocally declare that the production and deployment as well as the use of nuclear weapons are a crime against humanity and that such activities must be condemned on ethical and theological grounds. Furthermore, we appeal for the institution of a universal covenant to this effect so that nuclear weapons and warfare are delegitimized and condemned as violations of international law."

Speaking for the Holy See, Archbishop Renato Martino in October 1997 told the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly: "Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21st century. They cannot be

justified. They deserve condemnation.... The world must move to the abolition of nuclear weapons through a universal, non-discriminatory ban with intensive inspection by a universal authority."

In a message on January 1, 2000 His Holiness the Dalai Lama called for a step-by-step approach to external disarmament. He stated, "We must first work on the total abolishment of nuclear weapons and gradually work up to total demilitarization throughout the world."

In the United States numerous denominations have called for the elimination of nuclear weapons. Excerpts from these statements are attached. Recently 21 heads of communion and other religious leaders joined with 18 retired general and admirals to point out that "the long-term reliance of nuclear weapons in the arsenals of the nuclear powers, and the ever-present danger of their acquisition by others, is morally untenable and militarily unjustifiable. They constitute a threat to the security of our nation, a peril to world peace, a danger to the whole human family." Therefore, they called for "action leading to the international prohibition of these weapons."

(1) What are your views on the morality of possession, threatened use, and actual use of nuclear weapons? To what extent do you agree or disagree with the broad consensus that has emerged within the faith community on the inherent immorality of nuclear weapons?

(2) We are encouraged that the United States has joined with Russia, United Kingdom, France, and China in making a commitment to "an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals." This occurred in the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). This commitment carries forward the obligation for good faith negotiations on nuclear disarmament as expressed in Article VI of the NPT, an agreement signed by the United States in July 1968 and ratified by the U.S. Senate in March 1969. If elected president, what specifically will you do during your four-year term to fulfill this commitment?

(3) For instance, do you favor multilateral negotiations to achieve a global nuclear weapons convention that provides for total elimination of nuclear weapons within a timebound framework with effective verification and enforcement?

(4) There are interim steps to take in the quest for the elimination of nuclear weapons. For example, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) provides a means of controlling the spread of nuclear weapons. If elected president, will you seek ratification of the CTBT by the United States Senate?

(5) Many experts have pointed out the inherent danger of keeping U.S. and Russian strategic nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert. If elected president, will you embark upon a de-alerting initiative to take strategic weapons off hair-trigger alert? If so, please provide specifics.

(5) During the past fifteen years progress has been made in reduction of nuclear weapons through treaties between the United States and the Soviet Union, then Russia. Two treaties were negotiated under President Ronald Reagan: the Intermediate Nuclear Force (INF) Treaty to eliminate an entire class of nuclear weapons and the first Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START I). Another treaty, START II, was negotiated under President Bush. Russian President Vladimir Putin has indicated a willingness to negotiate a START III agreement to reduce the number of deployed strategic warheads to 1,000 on each side. However, we understand that the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff insist upon keeping 2,500 warheads in active service because of the targeting requirements of current U.S. policy. If elected president, will you change U.S. policy so that deeper bilateral cuts in strategic weapons can occur? Will you negotiate a START III agreement with Russia? What level of strategic warheads will you seek?

(6) Complementary to nuclear arms reduction through treaties is to undertake a series of reciprocal initiatives through executive action. This was the approach used by President George Bush in 1991 when he took unilateral action to deactivate a large number of U.S. strategic weapons and to withdraw most U.S. tactical nuclear weapons stationed outside the United States. A few weeks later Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev reciprocated with similar actions. Would you as president use similar reciprocal initiatives to achieve such objectives as de-alerting and significant reductions in the nuclear arsenal? If so, please provide specifics.

(7) We note that numerous retired generals, admirals, and national security civilian officials have indicated that nuclear weapons have no war-fighting utility. (See attached statements.) We also know that Presidents Truman and Eisenhower chose not to use nuclear weapons in the Korean War and that Presidents Johnson and Nixon chose not to use nuclear weapons in the Vietnam War. Do you see any utility for nuclear weapons in war? If so, please tell us the categories of targets you as commander-in-chief would consider legitimate to strike with nuclear weapons.

(8) If your reply indicates that nuclear weapons are useful only to deter other nuclear weapons, would not the wisest and safest course of action be to achieve the universal elimination of nuclear weapons through such measures as previously identified?

(9) Are there other initiatives you plan to undertake for the elimination of nuclear weapons?

We will greatly appreciate your response to these questions by September 5 prior to our news conference on September 7. If your busy schedule permits, a delegation of the signers would welcome an opportunity to meet with you to discuss these issues in greater detail.

Respectfully yours,

Signers

Attachments:

Excerpts from statements by U.S. religious bodies.

Joint Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Statement by military professionals and religious leaders.

Statements of retired military leaders on the lack of utility of nuclear weapons for war-fighting.

Drafted by Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice
July 7, 2000

X-Sender: jdi@[63.106.26.66]
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)
Date: Fri, 07 Jul 2000 15:40:59 -0400
To: jdi@clw.org
From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>
Subject: Whatever the test results -- overwhelming opposition to
missile defense deployment decision

PROMINENT INDIVIDUALS, GROUPS AND NEWSPAPERS
WHO HAVE CALLED ON PRESIDENT CLINTON NOT TO DEPLOY
NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE

Many politicians of both parties, former government officials, Nobel laureates, scientists, foreign policy experts and newspapers have called on President Clinton not to deploy national missile defense.

There are a variety of motivations: some are opposed to national missile defense, some prefer a different deployment plan that includes sea- and/or space-based interceptors, and some would like to see a decision made by President Bush, if he is elected, rather than President Clinton.

All on this list have publicly called upon President Clinton to defer the deployment decision or not to deploy the current national missile defense plan.

=====
Former government officials:
=====

Harold Brown, Defense Secretary under President Carter
Zbigniew Brzezinski, national security adviser to President Carter
Jimmy Carter, President
Jonathan Dean, Ambassador
John Deutch, C.I.A. Director
Gloria C. Duffy, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense
Richard L. Garwin, member of Rumsfeld panel on missile threats
General Andrew J. Goodpaster (ret.), chief of staff to President Eisenhower
Donald Gregg, Bush Administration Ambassador to South Korea
Arthur Hartman, Ambassador to the Soviet Union
Henry Kissinger, Secretary of State under President Nixon
Lawrence J. Korb, Assistant Secretary of Defense under President Reagan
Ambassador Jack F. Matlock, Jr., Ambassador to Russia
Jessica T. Mathews, National Security Council staff under Pres. Carter
Robert C. McFarlane, national security adviser to President Reagan
Robert McNamara, Defense Secretary under President Kennedy
Senator Sam Nunn, Chairman Senate Armed Services Committee
Joseph S. Nye, Jr., Pentagon official under Pres. Clinton
Admiral William A. Owens (ret.), Vice Chairman Joint Chiefs of Staff
Richard N. Perle, Assistant Secretary of Defense under President Reagan
William J. Perry, Defense Secretary under President Clinton
John Rhinelander, Legal adviser to the SALT I delegation
General John M. Shalikashvili (ret.), Chairman, Joint Chiefs of staff
Paul Warnke, A.C.D.A Director

John P. White, Deputy Secretary of Defense under President Clinton
R. James Woolsey, C.I.A. Director
Herbert York, former Eisenhower and Clinton official

=====
Republican politicians:
=====

Governor George W. Bush
Senator Chuck Hagel (R-NE)
Chairman Jesse Helms (R-NC)
Majority Leader Trent Lott (R-MS)
Senator John McCain (R-AZ)
Senator Pat Roberts (R-KS)
Senator Gordon Smith (R-OR)

=====
Democratic politicians:
=====

Rep. Tom Allen (D-ME)
Senator Joseph Biden (D-DE)
Senator Jeff Bingaman (D-NM)
Senator Barbara Boxer (D-CA)
Senator Byron Dorgan (D-ND)
Senator Richard Durbin (D-IL)
Senator Russ Feingold (D-WI)
Senator Tom Harkin (D-IA)
Rep. Rush Holt (D-NJ)
Senator John Kerry (D-MA)
Senator Patrick Leahy (D-VT)

=====
Nobel laureates:
=====

Sidney Altman, 1989 in chemistry
Philip W. Anderson, 1977 in physics
Kenneth J. Arrow, 1972 in economics
Julius Axelrod, 1970 in medicine
Baruj Benacerraf, 1980 in medicine
Hans A. Bethe, 1967 in physics
J. Michael Bishop, 1989 in medicine
Nicolaas Bloembergen, 1981 in physics
Paul D. Boyer, 1997 in chemistry
Steven Chu, 1997 in physics
Stanley Cohen, 1986 in medicine
Leon N. Cooper, 1972 in physics
E. J. Corey, 1990 in chemistry
James W. Cronin, 1980 in physics
Renato Dulbecco, 1975 in medicine
Edmond H. Fischer, 1992 in medicine
Val L. Fitch, 1980 in physics
Robert F. Furchgott, 1998 in medicine
Murray Gell-Mann, 1969 in physics
Ivar Giaever, 1973 in physics
Walter Gilbert, 1980 in chemistry

Sheldon L. Glashow, 1979 in physics
Roger C. L. Guillemin, 1977 in medicine
Herbert A. Hauptman, 1985 in chemistry
Dudley R. Herschbach, 1986 in chemistry
Roald Hoffmann, 1981 in chemistry
David H. Hubel, 1981 in medicine
Jerome Karle, 1985 in chemistry
Arthur Kornberg, 1959 in medicine
Edwin G. Krebs, 1992 in medicine
Leon M. Lederman, 1988 in physics
Edward B. Lewis, 1995 in medicine
Rudolph A. Marcus, 1992 in chemistry
Franco Modigliani, 1985 in economics
Mario Molina, 1995 in chemistry
Marshall Nirenberg, 1968 in medicine
Douglas D. Osheroff, 1996 in physics
Arno A. Penzias, 1978 in physics
Martin L. Perl, 1995 in physics
Norman F. Ramsey, 1989 in physics
Burton Richter, 1976 in physics
Richard J. Roberts, 1993 in medicine
Herbert A. Simon, 1978 in economics
Richard E. Smalley, 1996 in chemistry
Jack Steinberger, 1988 in physics
James Tobin, 1981 in economics
Daniel C. Tsui, 1998 in physics
Steven Weinberg, 1979 in physics
Robert W. Wilson, 1978 in physics
Chen Ning Yang, 1957 in physics

=====
Foreign leaders:
=====

Canadian Foreign Minister Lloyd Axworthy
French President Jacques Chirac
Swedish Foreign Minister Ana Lindh
Russian President Vladimir Putin
German Chancellor Gerhard Schröder
Javier Solana, former secretary general of NATO

=====
Russian experts:
=====

Gary Bertsch, University of Georgia
Douglas W. Blum, Providence College
George Breslauer, University of California, Berkeley
Eva Busza, College of William and Mary
Dan Caldwell, Pepperdine University
Joseph Cirincione, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace
Timothy J. Colton, Harvard University
Herbert J. Ellison, University of Washington
Matthew Evangelista, Cornell U.
Marshall I. Goldman, Harvard U.
Stephen E. Hanson, U. of Washington

David Holloway, Stanford U.
Ted Hopf, Ohio State University
Stuart Kaufman, University of Kentucky and former security staff (Clinton
admin)
William H. Kincade, American U.
Robert Legvold, Columbia U.
James R. Millar, George Washington U.
James Clay Moltz, Monterey Institute of International Studies
Bruce Parrott, The Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies
William C. Potter, Institute Professor
Scott Parrish, Monterey Institute of International Studies
James Richter, Bates College
Dina R. Spechler, Indiana University
John Steinbruner, University of Maryland
Ronald Grigor Suny, University of Chicago
Brian Taylor, University of Oklahoma
Astrid S. Tuminez , Council on Foreign Relations
Paul F. Walker, Global Green USA
Celeste A. Wallander, Harvard University

=====
China experts:
=====

David Arase, Pomona College
R. David Arkush, U. of Iowa
Richard Baum, UCLA
Jan Berris, National Committee on United States-China Relations
Thomas P. Bernstein, Columbia University
Thomas Bickford, U. of Wisconsin, Oshkosh
Marc Blecher, Oberlin College
Walter C. Clemens, Jr., Boston University
Jerome A. Cohen, NYU Law School
Ralph A. Cossa, Pacific Forum CSIS
Bruce Dickson, George Washington U.
Elizabeth Economy, Council on Foreign Relations
Joseph W. Esherick, U.of Cal., San Diego
Corinna-Barbara Francis, U. of Missouri
John Gershman, Foreign Policy in Focus
Paul H.B. Godwin, National War College
Thomas B. Gold, U. of Cal., Berkeley
Avery Goldstein, U. of Pennsylvania
Benjamin Gregg, University of Texas
John L. Holden, National Committee on United States- China Relations
Arthur W. Hummel Jr., Former Amb. to the PRC
Harlan Jencks, U. of California, Berkeley
Samuel Kim, Columbia University
William C. Kirby, Harvard University
Michael Klare, Hampshire College
Uldis Kruze, University of San Francisco
David M. Lampton, Johns Hopkins-SAIS
and The Nixon Center
John W. Lewis, Stanford University
Stanley Lubman, Stanford Law School
Charles A. Meconis, Institute for Global Security Studies

Rajan Menon, Lehigh University
Maria Chan Morgan, Earlham College
James H. Nolt, World Policy Institute
Suzanne Ogden, Northeastern University
Minxin Pei, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace
Jonathan D. Pollack, RAND
Lucian Pye, MIT
Lawrence C. Reardon, U.N.H.
David Shambaugh, G.W. University
Leon V. Sigal, Social Science Research Council
Dorothy J. Solinger, U. of California, Irvine
Richard P. Suttmeier, U. of Oregon
Nancy Bernkopf Tucker, Georgetown U.
Jonathan Unger (US citizen), Australian National University, Canberra
Allen S. Whiting, U. of Arizona

=====
National Security and Foreign Policy Analysts:
=====

George Bunn
Admiral Eugene Carroll, U.S. Navy (Ret.)
John Cornwall, physicist
Bob Dietz, former systems engineer at Lockheed
Susan Eisenhower
Daniel Ellsberg
Steve Fetter, scientist
Sherman Frankel, physicist
Marvin Goldberger, former president of Cal Tech
Kurt Gottfried, physicist
Lisbeth Gronlund, physicist
Spurgeon M. Keeny, Jr., Arms Control Association
George Lewis, physicist
Jack Mendelsohn
Matthew Meselson, bio-chemist
Ted Postol, physicist
Roald Z. Sagdeev
Andrew Sessler, physicist
Kosta Tsipis, physicist
Frank von Hippel, Former Assistant Director for National Security
David Wright, physicist

=====
Religious groups:
=====

Africa Faith and Justice Network
American Friends Service Committee, Washington Office
Baptist Peace Fellowship of North America
Church of the Brethren, Washington Office
Church Women United
Columban Fathers Justice and Peace Office
Commission on Social Action of Reform Judaism
Disciples Peace Fellowship
Episcopal Peace Fellowship
Friends Committee on National Legislation

Graymoor Ecumenical and Interreligious Institute, Washington
Maryknoll Office for Global Concern
Methodist United for Peace with Justice
Mennonite Central Committee, USA, Washington Office
National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA, Washington Office
NETWORK, A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby
Unitarian Universalist
Association of Congregations
United Church of Christ/ Office for Church in Society
World Peacemakers

=====
Public interest groups:
=====

Americans for Democratic Action
American Physical Society
Arms Control Association
British American Security Information Council
Center for Defense Information
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
Council for a Livable World
Federation of American Scientists
Greenpeace
Institute for Science and International Security
Institute on Religion and Public Policy
International Center
Lawyers Alliance for World Security
League of Women Voters
Natural Resources Defense Council
Peace Links
Peace Action Education Fund
Physicians for Social Responsibility
Taxpayers for Common Sense
Union of Concerned Scientists
Women's Action for New Directions
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom
20/20 Vision Education Fund

=====
Newspapers:
=====

Atlanta Journal-Constitution
Baltimore Sun
Bangor (Maine) Daily News
Birmingham News
Business Week
Boston Globe
Chicago Tribune
Christian Science Monitor
The Cincinnati Post
The Courier-Journal Louisville, KY
Daily News (New York)
Dallas Morning News
The Hartford Courant

The Houston Chronicle
Los Angeles Times
Minneapolis Star Tribune
Nando Times (internet publication)
Newark Star-Ledger
New York Times
Omaha World Herald
Philadelphia Inquirer
Roanoke Times & World News
Seattle Post-Intelligencer
St. Petersburg Times
San Francisco Chronicle
Tulsa World
USA Today
Washington Post

John Isaacs
Council for a Livable World
110 Maryland Avenue, NE - Room 409
Washington, D.C. 20002
(202) 543-4100 x.131
www.clw.org

From: UUAWO@aol.com
Date: Fri, 7 Jul 2000 15:52:44 EDT
Subject: Re: interfaith card on NMD
To: mupj@igc.org
X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 14

I can't manage to open the postcard text because it's in an attached file.
Can you copy and paste it directly into the text of an email and send it?
Thanks!

Will Tanzman
Legislative Assistant Intern
Unitarian Universalist Association Washington Office

From: Kathy Guthrie <kathy@fcnl.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: interfaith card on NMD
Date: Fri, 7 Jul 2000 15:55:03 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

Howard,
FCNL has signed on!
Kathy

-----Original Message-----

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Friday, July 07, 2000 2:36 PM
To: ograbc@aol.com; ken@bpfna.org; tiller64@starpower.net; Jim Matlack;
droose@afsc.org; dradcliff_gb@brethren.org; washofc@aol.com;
ann_d.parti@ecunet.org; redgar@nccusa.org; lisaw@nccusa.org;
heathern@nccusa.org; bgrieves@dfms.org; jmskipper@aol.com;
thart@dfms.org; epf@peacenet.org; disarm@forusa.org; joe@fcnl.org;
kathy@fcnl.org; sara@fcnl.org; marsusab@aol.com; J._Daryl_Byler@mcc.org;
CHouleMM@aol.com; ogc@maryknoll.org; dave@paxchristiusa.org;
slisherness@unidial.com; jow@mindspring.com; wowensby@ctr.pcusa.org;
Bill Yolton; uuawo@aol.com; jnoble@uahc.org; stiefr@ucc.org;
dringler@umc-gbcs.org; gpowers@nccbuscc.org;
WorldPeacemakers@compuserve.com; mupj@igc.org; dkelli@iiit.org;
ccosby@dhm.disciples.org; blythe-goodman@erols.com; sdeboe@csm.org
Cc: nmd@2020vision.org
Subject: interfaith card on NMD

Dear Colleagues:

Here is a revised draft of the interfaith card on national missile defense (NMD) to reflect changes suggested by several people. Mainly the first two paragraphs have been rewritten to focus sharply on President Clinton. Other changes are minor adjustments in wording.

We now have ten endorsers (and assume that they will accept the re-wording). We are looking for more sponsors. Please contact Ms. Hop Tham-Thi at 20/20 vision with your endorsement and order for cards. Please send me a copy for my information.

Thanks for your support.

Howard

>
>-----

> NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE
>
> TRADING PEACE FOR A NEW NUCLEAR ARMS RACE
>

><> President Clinton is nearing a decision on whether to deploy a national missile defense (NMD). If he says "go ahead" to this wildly expensive and

unproven technology, it will be a serious setback to our quest for a safer and more peaceful world.

>

> As people of faith, we need to speak out assertively to stop further
>development of NMD and invite all our supporters to speak their
consciences now.

>

> Only public opinion can turn this decision around.

>

> The REALITY of NMD is different and far more ominous. Here's why:

>

>

> NMD would thwart this reduction.

>

> NMD cost is unjust and wasteful.

> Real national and personal security are brought about not with further
>militarization but human development.

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

> SEND A COPY of your letter to a newspaper to 2020 Vision, so we can
>track our combined efforts! Thank you.

>

> CONTACT:

> president@whitehouse.gov

> (202) 456-1414

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

> Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\interfaith
>card1"

To: UUAWO@aol.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: interfaith card on NMD
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <b6.77e2f8c.26978f0c@aol.com>
References:

At 03:52 PM 7/7/00 EDT, you wrote:

>I can't manage to open the postcard text because it's in an attached file.
>Can you copy and paste it directly into the text of an email and send it?
>Thanks!
>Will Tanzman
>Legislative Assistant Intern
>Unitarian Universalist Association Washington Office

In my recent communication I sent the text in the e-mail message as well as in an attachment. But here it is again.

My understanding is the Larry Egbert has already signed on for the UUA. Is that correct? If so, how many copies of the card do you want?

Howard Hallman

###

NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE

TRADING PEACE FOR A NEW NUCLEAR ARMS RACE

<> President Clinton is nearing a decision on whether to deploy a national missile defense (NMD). If he says "go ahead" to this wildly expensive and unproven technology, it will be a serious setback to our quest for a safer and more peaceful world.

As people of faith, we need to speak out assertively to stop further development of NMD and invite all our supporters to speak their consciences now.

Only public opinion can turn this decision around.

The IDEA of NMD is appealing: create a shield to protect us from nuclear missiles before they hit American soil. The REALITY of NMD is different and far more ominous. Here's why:

- o NMD risks a new arms race.

NMD violates the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty with Russia. If we begin building NMD, then both Russia and China may build more nuclear weapons to ensure that their offensive weapons can overwhelm our defenses. Recent decisions by Russian President Putin and the Duma show a willingness to negotiate deep cuts in nuclear weapon stockpiles. NMD would thwart this reduction.

- o NMD cost is unjust and wasteful.

A Congressional Budget Office NMD estimate in April skyrocketed to \$60 billion over fifteen years, for even a limited system. Imagine the drain on the federal budget at a time when life affirming programs such as social services and environmental protection are already facing cuts. NMD will profit only a few high tech weapons makers with our tax

dollars, while ignoring those in need. Real national and personal security are brought about not with further militarization but human development.

o NMD threatens common security among all nations.

Members of faith communities measure human security in quality of right relations among nations and people, of shelter, education, health, nutrition, freedom, and of our spiritual lives. The true path to peace is to strengthen common security among all nations and people. This can be best achieved through arms control and multilateral diplomacy. A decision to deploy NMD will elicit responses from other nations who will see NMD not as a legitimate effort for American defense, but as a new American threat.

ACTION: With so much riding on this decision, we ask you to take three steps:

1) Write to President Clinton and tell him why he should NOT begin NMD deployment -- unjust and wasteful cost, risks of a new arms race, threat to human and common security; 2) Write a Letter to the Editor to your local paper voicing your opposition to NMD; 3) SEND A COPY of your letter to a newspaper to 2020 Vision, so we can track our combined efforts! Thank you.

CONTACT:

President Clinton president@whitehouse.gov
The White House (202) 456-1414
1600 Pennsylvania Ave, NW
Washington, DC 20500

To: David Robinson <dave@paxchristiusa.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: interfaith card on NMD
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <01BFE8C9.860665E0@dave.paxchristiusa.org>
References:

At 10:44 AM 7/8/00 -0400, you wrote:

>This looks good Howard. Have you got an email that I can send our endorsement to? Thanks.
>Dave

Dave,

Send your endorsement and number of copies that you want to Ms. Hop Pham-Thi at 20/20 Vision:
nmd@2020vision.org. Send a copy to me so that I can keep track.

Thanks,
Howard

X-Envelope-To: <mupj@igc.org>
From: David Robinson <dave@paxchristiusa.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: interfaith card on NMD
Date: Sat, 8 Jul 2000 10:44:35 -0400

This looks good Howard. Have you got an email that I can send our endorsement to? Thanks.
Dave

From: Howard W. Hallman [SMTP:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Friday, July 07, 2000 2:36 PM
To: ograbc@aol.com; ken@bpfna.org; tiller64@starpower.net; Jim Matlack; droose@afsc.org;
dradcliff_gb@brethren.org; washofc@aol.com; ann_d.parti@ecunet.org; redgar@nccusa.org; lisaw@nccusa.org;
heathern@nccusa.org; bgrieves@dfms.org; jmskipper@aol.com; thart@dfms.org; epf@peacenet.org;
disarm@forusa.org; joe@fcnl.org; kathy@fcnl.org; sara@fcnl.org; marsusab@aol.com; J._Daryl_Byler@mcc.org;
CHouleMM@aol.com; ogc@maryknoll.org; dave@paxchristiusa.org; slisherness@unidial.com; jow@mindspring.com;
wowensby@ctr.pcusa.org; Bill Yolton; uuawo@aol.com; jnoble@uahc.org; stiefr@ucc.org; dringler@umc-gbcs.org;
gpowers@nccbuscc.org; WorldPeacemakers@compuserve.com; mupj@igc.org; dkelli@iiit.org;
ccosby@dhm.disciples.org; blythe-goodman@erols.com; sdeboe@csm.org
Cc: nmd@2020vision.org
Subject: interfaith card on NMD

<<File: ATT00015.txt>><<File: ATT00016.txt>>Dear Colleagues:

Here is a revised draft of the interfaith card on national missile defense (NMD) to reflect changes suggested by several people. Mainly the first two paragraphs have been rewritten to focus sharply on President Clinton. Other changes are minor adjustments in wording.

We now have ten endorsers (and assume that they will accept the re-wording). We are looking for more sponsors. Please contact Ms. Hop Tham-Thi at 20/20 vision with your endorsement and order for cards. Please send me a copy for my information.

Thanks for your support.

Howard

>
>-----
>

> NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE
>
> TRADING PEACE FOR A NEW NUCLEAR ARMS RACE
>

><> President Clinton is nearing a decision on whether to deploy a national missile defense (NMD). If he says "go ahead" to this wildly expensive and unproven technology, it will be a serious setback to our quest for a safer and more peaceful world.

>
> As people of faith, we need to speak out assertively to stop further
>development of NMD and invite all our supporters to speak their
consciences now.

>
> Only public opinion can turn this decision around.
>
> The REALITY of NMD is different and far more ominous. Here's why:
>
>
> NMD would thwart this reduction.
>
> NMD cost is unjust and wasteful.
> Real national and personal security are brought about not with further
> militarization but human development.
>
>
>
>
> SEND A COPY of your letter to a newspaper to 2020 Vision, so we can
> track our combined efforts! Thank you.
>
> CONTACT:
> president@whitehouse.gov
> (202) 456-1414
>
>
>
>
>
> Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\interfaith
> card1"

To: lhenderson@dfms.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Postcard alert on national missile defense
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Ms. Henderson,

Here is the message I previously sent to Tom Hart regarding a postcard alert on national missile defense. If you can forward this to him at the Convention, I will appreciate it. If you have any questions, please call me at 301 896-0013.

Howard Hallman

###

Dear Colleagues:

At the June 22 meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, we agreed to work with 20/20 Vision on a postcard alert on National Missile Defense (NMD). Kathy Guthrie and Greg Laszakovits met with Tim Barner and Ms. Hop Pham-Thi at 20/20 and developed the attached draft.

Would you be willing to be listed as a sponsor of this postcard? If so, the name of your organization will be printed on the card.

20/20 will provide a free supply of cards to sponsoring organizations. Each organization will be responsible for distribution. The size of the card requires 20¢ postage. The message can also be transmitted electronically or included in a newsletter. How many copies of the NMD alert do you want?

Please send your answers to these to questions directly to Hop Pham-Thi at 20/20 at NMD@2020vision.org or 202 833-2020. We need your answer by Monday, July 10 {Now extended to Friday, July 14}. Postcards will be available a week to ten days later. If you send your reply via e-mail, please send me a copy at mupj@igc.org so that I can keep track of the response.

If you have any questions, please call Hop or me.

Shalom,
Howard

###

> Dear Friend of the Interfaith Community,
>
> NMD cost is also unjust and wasteful and represents a major drain on the
> federal budget at the expense of life affirming programs such as social
> services or education.
>
> The interfaith community is joining their efforts in a common card that
> would mobilize their members on the NMD issue.
>

> You will find enclosed / attached copy of the interfaith card.
>
> We will be glad to send them over to you so you can deliver them to your
>members.
>
> Sincerely
>
> Hop Pham-Thi

NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE

TRADING PEACE FOR A NEW NUCLEAR ARMS RACE

<> President Clinton is nearing a decision on whether to deploy a national missile defense (NMD). If he says "go ahead" to this wildly expensive and unproven technology, it will be a serious setback to our quest for a safer and more peaceful world.

As people of faith, we need to speak out assertively to stop further development of NMD and invite all our supporters to speak their consciences now.

Only public opinion can turn this decision around.

The IDEA of NMD is appealing: create a shield to protect us from nuclear missiles before they hit American soil. The REALITY of NMD is different and far more ominous. Here's why:

o NMD risks a new arms race.

NMD violates the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty with Russia. If we begin building NMD, then both Russia and China may build more nuclear weapons to ensure that their offensive weapons can overwhelm our defenses. Recent decisions by Russian President Putin and the Duma show a willingness to negotiate deep cuts in nuclear weapon stockpiles. NMD would thwart this reduction.

o NMD cost is unjust and wasteful.

A Congressional Budget Office NMD estimate in April skyrocketed to \$60 billion over fifteen years, for even a limited system. Imagine the drain on the federal budget at a time when life affirming programs such as social services and environmental protection are already facing cuts. NMD will profit only a few high tech weapons makers with our tax dollars, while ignoring those in need. Real national and personal security are brought about not with further militarization but human development.

o NMD threatens common security among all nations.

Members of faith communities measure human security in quality of right relations among nations and people, of shelter, education, health, nutrition, freedom, and of our spiritual lives. The true path to peace is to strengthen common security among all nations and people. This can be best achieved through arms control and multilateral diplomacy. A decision to deploy NMD will elicit responses from other nations who will see NMD not as a legitimate effort for American defense, but as a new American threat.

ACTION: With so much riding on this decision, we ask you to take three steps:

1) Write to President Clinton and tell him why he should NOT begin NMD deployment -- unjust and wasteful cost, risks of a new arms race, threat to human and common security; 2) Write a Letter to the Editor to your local paper voicing your opposition to NMD; 3) SEND A COPY of your letter to a newspaper to 2020 Vision, so we can track our combined efforts! Thank you.

CONTACT:

President Clinton president@whitehouse.gov
The White House (202) 456-1414

1600 Pennsylvania Ave, NW
Washington, DC 20500

To: jmcdaniel@afsc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Postcard alert on national missile defense
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Judith,

Here is the message I previously sent to Diana Roose about the interfaith postcard alert on national missile defense. We hope that AFSC will become a sponsor and request a supply of cards for distribution.

If you have any questions, please call me at 301 896-0013.

Shalom,
Howard

###

Dear Colleagues:

At the June 22 meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, we agreed to work with 20/20 Vision on a postcard alert on National Missile Defense (NMD). Kathy Guthrie and Greg Laszakovits met with Tim Barner and Ms. Hop Pham-Thi at 20/20 and developed the attached draft.

Would you be willing to be listed as a sponsor of this postcard? If so, the name of your organization will be printed on the card.

20/20 will provide a free supply of cards to sponsoring organizations. Each organization will be responsible for distribution. The size of the card requires 20¢ postage. The message can also be transmitted electronically or included in a newsletter. How many copies of the NMD alert do you want?

Please send your answers to these to questions directly to Hop Pham-Thi at 20/20 at NMD@2020vision.org or 202 833-2020. We need your answer by Monday, July 10 {Now extended to Friday, July 14}. Postcards will be available a week to ten days later. If you send your reply via e-mail, please send me a copy at mupj@igc.org so that I can keep track of the response.

If you have any questions, please call Hop or me.

Shalom,
Howard

###

> Dear Friend of the Interfaith Community,
>
> NMD cost is also unjust and wasteful and represents a major drain on the
> federal budget at the expense of life affirming programs such as social
> services or education.
>

> The interfaith community is joining their efforts in a common card that
> would mobilize their members on the NMD issue.
>
> You will find enclosed / attached copy of the interfaith card.
>
> We will be glad to send them over to you so you can deliver them to your
> members.
>
> Sincerely
>
Hop Pham-Thi

NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE

TRADING PEACE FOR A NEW NUCLEAR ARMS RACE

<> President Clinton is nearing a decision on whether to deploy a national missile defense (NMD). If he says "go ahead" to this wildly expensive and unproven technology, it will be a serious setback to our quest for a safer and more peaceful world.

As people of faith, we need to speak out assertively to stop further development of NMD and invite all our supporters to speak their consciences now.

Only public opinion can turn this decision around.

The IDEA of NMD is appealing: create a shield to protect us from nuclear missiles before they hit American soil. The REALITY of NMD is different and far more ominous. Here's why:

o NMD risks a new arms race.

NMD violates the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty with Russia. If we begin building NMD, then both Russia and China may build more nuclear weapons to ensure that their offensive weapons can overwhelm our defenses. Recent decisions by Russian President Putin and the Duma show a willingness to negotiate deep cuts in nuclear weapon stockpiles. NMD would thwart this reduction.

o NMD cost is unjust and wasteful.

A Congressional Budget Office NMD estimate in April skyrocketed to \$60 billion over fifteen years, for even a limited system. Imagine the drain on the federal budget at a time when life affirming programs such as social services and environmental protection are already facing cuts. NMD will profit only a few high tech weapons makers with our tax dollars, while ignoring those in need. Real national and personal security are brought about not with further militarization but human development.

o NMD threatens common security among all nations.

Members of faith communities measure human security in quality of right relations among nations and people, of shelter, education, health, nutrition, freedom, and of our spiritual lives. The true path to peace is to strengthen common security among all nations and people. This can be best achieved through arms control and multilateral diplomacy. A decision to deploy NMD will elicit responses from other nations who will see NMD not as a legitimate effort for American defense, but as a new American threat.

ACTION: With so much riding on this decision, we ask you to take three steps:

1) Write to President Clinton and tell him why he should NOT begin NMD deployment -- unjust and wasteful cost, risks of a new arms race, threat to human and common security; 2) Write a Letter to the Editor to your local paper voicing your opposition to NMD; 3) SEND A COPY of your letter to a newspaper to 2020 Vision, so we can track our combined efforts! Thank you.

CONTACT:

President Clinton president@whitehouse.gov

The White House (202) 456-1414

1600 Pennsylvania Ave, NW

Washington, DC 20500

To: tiller64@starpower.net
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Questions for candidates
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Bob,

At the June 22 meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament you promised to draft a question to candidates on the NPT. Now that the postcard on NMD is moving along, I want to get out the total list of questions. Thus, I will appreciate receiving yours.

I called your work number from the May 22 sign-up sheet and got into a fax machine. Please supply me with the correct number. Also, call you when you get a chance, and I'll explain about the "spy" at the June 22 meeting.

Shalom,
Howard

From: OGrabc@aol.com
Date: Mon, 10 Jul 2000 12:34:05 EDT
Subject: Interfaith NMD post card
To: NMD@2020vision.org
CC: mupj@igc.org
X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows sub 102

to the attention of Hop Pham-Thi

Thank you for sending me the revised text of the NMD post card. Please sign our organization on as follows:

National Ministries, American Baptist Churches USA

I would appreciate receiving 500 copies of the post card once they become available. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you.

Curtis Ramsey-Lucas
(202) 544-3400
ograbc@aol.com

To: slisherness@unidial.com, jow@mindspring.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Postcard on NMD
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Sara and Jim,

We're wondering whether the Presbyterian Peacemaking Program will be a sponsor of the interfaith postcard on national missile defense. If so, how many copies would you want? 20/20 vision will provide them free.

We are trying to finalize the list of sponsors by this Wednesday, July 12.

Call me at 301 896-0013 if you have any questions.

Shalom,
Howard

Dear Ron,

Here is the message on the postcard alert on national missile defense. We hope that your office will be a sponsor and will order cards to send to your constituents. If so, please reply to Ms. Hop Tham-Thi at 20/20 Vision, who is handling this matter: nmd@2020vision.org. Please send me a copy so that I can keep up with who is signing. If you have any questions, call me at 301 896-0013.

I look forward to a continuing relationship with you.

At the June 22 meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, we agreed to work with 20/20 Vision on a postcard alert on National Missile Defense (NMD). Kathy Guthrie and Greg Laszakovits met with Tim Barner and Ms. Hop Pham-Thi at 20/20 and developed the attached draft.

Would you be willing to be listed as a sponsor of this postcard? If so, the name of your organization will be printed on the card.

20/20 will provide a free supply of cards to sponsoring organizations. Each organization will be responsible for distribution. The size of the card requires 20¢ postage. The message can also be transmitted electronically or included in a newsletter. How many copies of the NMD alert do you want?

Please send your answers to these to questions directly to Hop Pham-Thi at 20/20 at NMD@2020vision.org or 202 833-2020. We need your answer by Monday, July 10 {Now extended to Wednesday, July 12}. Postcards will be available a week to ten days later. If you send your reply via e-mail, please send me a copy at mupj@igc.org so that I can keep track of the response.

If you have any questions, please call Hop or me.

Shalom,
Howard

###

> Dear Friend of the Interfaith Community,
>
> NMD cost is also unjust and wasteful and represents a major drain on the
>federal budget at the expense of life affirming programs such as social
>services or education.
>
> The interfaith community is joining their efforts in a common card that
>would mobilize their members on the NMD issue.
>
> You will find enclosed / attached copy of the interfaith card.
>
> We will be glad to send them over to you so you can deliver them to your
>members.
>
> Sincerely
>
> Hop Pham-Thi

NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE

TRADING PEACE FOR A NEW NUCLEAR ARMS RACE

<> President Clinton is nearing a decision on whether to deploy a national missile defense (NMD). If he says "go ahead" to this wildly expensive and unproven technology, it will be a serious setback to our quest for a safer and more peaceful world.

As people of faith, we need to speak out assertively to stop further development of NMD and invite all our supporters to speak their consciences now.

Only public opinion can turn this decision around.

The IDEA of NMD is appealing: create a shield to protect us from nuclear missiles before they hit American soil. The REALITY of NMD is different and far more ominous. Here's why:

- o NMD risks a new arms race.

NMD violates the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty with Russia. If we begin building NMD, then both Russia and China may build more nuclear weapons to ensure that their offensive weapons can overwhelm our defenses. Recent decisions by Russian President Putin and the Duma show a willingness to negotiate deep cuts in nuclear weapon stockpiles. NMD would thwart this reduction.

- o NMD cost is unjust and wasteful.

A Congressional Budget Office NMD estimate in April skyrocketed to \$60 billion over fifteen years, for even a limited system. Imagine the drain on the federal budget at a time when life affirming programs such as social services and environmental protection are already facing cuts. NMD will profit only a few high tech weapons makers with our tax dollars, while ignoring those in need. Real national and personal security are brought about not with further militarization but human development.

- o NMD threatens common security among all nations.

Members of faith communities measure human security in quality of right relations among nations and people, of shelter, education, health, nutrition, freedom, and of our spiritual lives. The true path to peace is to strengthen common security among all nations and people. This can be best achieved through arms control and multilateral diplomacy. A decision to deploy NMD will elicit responses from other nations who will see NMD not as a legitimate effort for American defense, but as a new American threat.

ACTION: With so much riding on this decision, we ask you to take three steps:

- 1) Write to President Clinton and tell him why he should NOT begin NMD deployment -- unjust and wasteful cost, risks of a new arms race, threat to human and common security;
- 2) Write a Letter to the Editor to your local paper voicing your opposition to NMD;
- 3) SEND A COPY of your letter to a newspaper to 2020 Vision, so we can track our combined efforts! Thank you.

CONTACT:

President Clinton president@whitehouse.gov
The White House (202) 456-1414
1600 Pennsylvania Ave, NW
Washington, DC 20500

From: UUAWO@aol.com
Date: Mon, 10 Jul 2000 16:11:18 EDT
Subject: Re: interfaith card on NMD
To: mupj@igc.org
X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 14

Thanks for the text of the postcard. I had previously sent an email signing on for the UUA, but then I recieved notice that the text had changed slightly, so I wanted to make sure the language was still consistent with our principles. I still do not know how many copies we can distribute; I'll e-mail you when I find out.

Thanks again!

Will

From: Vmsmagic@cs.com
Date: Tue, 11 Jul 2000 13:28:52 EDT
Subject: MUPJ
To: mupj@igc.apc.org
X-Mailer: CompuServe 2000 32-bit sub 103

I've deposited the Rockefeller check and shall shortly send you a payment!

Along with checks to pay the other bills.

P.

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express for Macintosh - 4.01 (295)

Date: Tue, 11 Jul 2000 14:05:58 -0400

Subject: interfaith card

From: "NMD" <NMD@2020vision.org>

To: mupj@igc.org

, kathy@fcnl.org

, glaszakovitz_gb@brethren.org

Dear Kathy, Howard, and Greg,

You will find attached the final draft for the interfaith card. I modified, after consulting with Tim, the first bullet:Russia and China are likely ...(instead of may). This suggestion was made by Dennis Frado from ELCA which may join our efforts.

Please confirm to me the number of cards you need:

- FCNL: 100 (given by Tim)

- MUPJ: 100

- Church of the Brethren: 3000

Also Greg, please let me know the exact title of your organization that should be printed on the card.

Thank you again. Peace to you,

Hop

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\interfaith card"

NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE

TRADING PEACE FOR A NEW NUCLEAR ARMS RACE

<> President Clinton is nearing a decision on whether to deploy a national missile defense (NMD). If he says "go ahead" to this wildly expensive and unproven technology, it will be a serious setback to our quest for a safer and more peaceful world.

As people of faith, we need to speak out assertively to stop further development of NMD and invite all our supporters to speak their consciences now.

Only public opinion can turn this decision around.

The IDEA of NMD is appealing: create a shield to protect us from nuclear missiles before they hit American soil. The REALITY of NMD is different and far more ominous. Here's why:

- o NMD risks a new arms race.

NMD violates the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty with Russia. If we begin building NMD, then both Russia and China are likely to build more nuclear weapons to ensure that their offensive weapons can overwhelm our defenses. Recent decisions by Russian President Putin and the Duma show a willingness to negotiate deep cuts in nuclear weapon stockpiles. NMD would thwart this reduction.

- o NMD cost is unjust and wasteful.

A Congressional Budget Office NMD estimate in April skyrocketed to \$60 billion over fifteen years, for even a limited system. Imagine the drain on the federal budget at a time when life affirming programs such as social services and environmental protection are already facing cuts. NMD will profit only a few high tech weapons makers with our tax dollars, while ignoring those in need. Real national and personal security are brought about not with further militarization but human development.

- o NMD threatens common security among all nations.

Members of faith communities measure human security in quality of right relations among nations and people, of shelter, education, health, nutrition, freedom, and of our spiritual lives. The true path to peace is to strengthen common security among all nations and people. This can be best achieved through arms control and multilateral diplomacy. A decision to deploy NMD will elicit responses from other nations who will see NMD not as a legitimate effort for American defense, but as a new American threat.

ACTION: With so much riding on this decision, we ask you to take three steps:

1) Write to President Clinton and tell him why he should NOT begin NMD deployment -- unjust and wasteful cost, risk of a new arms race, threat to human and common security; 2) Write a Letter to the Editor to your local paper voicing your opposition to NMD; 3) SEND A COPY of your letter to a newspaper to 20/20 Vision, so we can track our combined efforts! Thank you.

CONTACT:

President Clinton president@whitehouse.gov
The White House (202) 456-1414
1600 Pennsylvania Ave, NW
Washington, DC 20500

To: "NMD" <NMD@2020vision.org>, kathy@fcl.org, glazakovitz_gb@brethren.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: interfaith card
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <E13C4R7-0003ep-00@dfw-corpmp1.email.verio.net>
References:

At 02:05 PM 7/11/00 -0400, NMD wrote:

>Dear Kathy, Howard, and Greg,

>

>You will find attached the final draft for the interfaith card....

Hop,

I hate to get picky at this late stage, but when I converted the previous version to Word it highlighted two errors that remain in the latest draft.

(1) In the paragraph under "NMD threatens common security....", "strengthen" is misspelled.

(2) In the last sentence of the previous paragraph -- "Real national and personal security are brought about not with further militarization but human development" -- even though "security" has two modifiers it is a singular subject and therefore requires a singular verb: "is". Also, "with" should be added before human development to make the "not/but" phrase balanced.

Howard

To: nmd@2020vision.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Pax Christi USA endorsement
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Hop,

Here is a copy of my correspondence with Dave Robinson about endorsement of the NMD postcard by Pax Christi USA. I left a telephone message for him this morning. If you want to try himself yourself to get his order, his number is 814 453-4955, x. 235.

Howard

###

To: David Robinson <dave@paxchristiusa.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: interfaith card on NMD
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <01BFE8C9.860665E0@dave.paxchristiusa.org>
References:

At 10:44 AM 7/8/00 -0400, you wrote:

>This looks good Howard. Have you got an email that I can send our endorsement to? Thanks.
>Dave

Dave,

Send your endorsement and number of copies that you want to Ms. Hop Pham-Thi at 20/20 Vision: nmd@2020vision.org. Send a copy to me so that I can keep track.

Thanks,
Howard

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express for Macintosh - 4.01 (295)

Date: Tue, 11 Jul 2000 16:24:55 -0400

Subject: Re: interfaith card

From: "NMD" <NMD@2020vision.org>

To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>

Dear Howard,

I will be glad to correct the typo on strengthen. For the other sentence, I do see your point, but the changes and the sentence itself come from Greg (I still have his handwritten changes). Should I just modify it again? I will have to send the final draft to Kathy and Greg...

Ann Delorey just signed on. I emailed to Pax Christi to get their number.

Thank you Peace to you.

Hop

>From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>

>To: "NMD" <NMD@2020vision.org>, kathy@fcl.org, glaszakovitz_gb@brethren.org

>Subject: Re: interfaith card

>Date: Tue, Jul 11, 2000, 3:11 PM

>

>At 02:05 PM 7/11/00 -0400, NMD wrote:

>>Dear Kathy, Howard, and Greg,

>>

>>You will find attached the final draft for the interfaith card.....

>

>Hop,

>

>I hate to get picky at this late stage, but when I converted the previous version to Word it highlighted two errors that remain in the latest draft.

>

>(1) In the paragraph under "NMD threatens common security....",

>"strengthen" is misspelled.

>

>(2) In the last sentence of the previous paragraph -- "Real national and personal security are brought about not with further militarization but human development" -- even though "security" has two modifiers it is a singular subject and therefore requires a singular verb: "is". Also, "with" should be added before human development to make the "not/but" phrase balanced.

>

>Howard

>Howard W. Hallman, Chair

>Methodists United for Peace with Justice

>1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036

>Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail: mupj@igc.org

>

>Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a membership association of laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any Methodist denomination.

>

From: "James O. Watkins, Jr." <jow@mindspring.com>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Postcard on NMD
Date: Wed, 12 Jul 2000 09:41:28 -0400
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2615.200
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2615.200

Howard - at this late date, do not think that we will be listed as sponsor, thank you.

----- Original Message -----

From: Howard W. Hallman <mupj@igc.org>
To: <slisherness@unidial.com>; <jow@mindspring.com>
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2000 12:47 PM
Subject: Postcard on NMD

> Dear Sara and Jim,
>
> We're wondering whether the Presbyterian Peacemaking Program will be a
> sponsor of the interfaith postcard on national missile defense. If so,
how
> many copies would you want? 20/20 vision will provide them free.
>
> We are trying to finalize the list of sponsors by this Wednesday, July 12.
>
> Call me at 301 896-0013 if you have any questions.
>
> Shalom,
> Howard
> Howard W. Hallman, Chair
> Methodists United for Peace with Justice
> 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036
> Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail: mupj@igc.org
>
> Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a membership association of
> laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any Methodist denomination.

To: nmd@2020vision.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Postcard on NMD
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

>From: "James O. Watkins, Jr." <jow@mindspring.com>
>To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
>Subject: Re: Postcard on NMD
>Date: Wed, 12 Jul 2000 09:41:28 -0400
>X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
>X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2615.200
>X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2615.200

>
>Howard - at this late date, do not think that we will be listed as sponsor,
>thank you.

>
>----- Original Message -----
>From: Howard W. Hallman <mupj@igc.org>
>To: <slisherness@unidial.com>; <jow@mindspring.com>
>Sent: Monday, July 10, 2000 12:47 PM
>Subject: Postcard on NMD

>
>
>> Dear Sara and Jim,
>>
>> We're wondering whether the Presbyterian Peacemaking Program will be a
>> sponsor of the interfaith postcard on national missile defense. If so,
>how
>> many copies would you want? 20/20 vision will provide them free.
>>
>> We are trying to finalize the list of sponsors by this Wednesday, July 12.
>>
>> Call me at 301 896-0013 if you have any questions.
>>
>> Shalom,
>> Howard
>> Howard W. Hallman, Chair
>> Methodists United for Peace with Justice
>> 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036
>> Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail: mupj@igc.org
>>
>> Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a membership association of
>> laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any Methodist denomination.
>
>

From: "Heather Nolen" <heathern@nccusa.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: interfaith card on NMD
Date: Wed, 12 Jul 2000 10:37:42 -0400
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)
Importance: Normal
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300

Hi Howard,

FYI--the NCC is on the postcard.

Heather Nolen

-----Original Message-----

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Friday, July 07, 2000 2:36 PM
To: ograbc@aol.com; ken@bpfna.org; tiller64@starpower.net; Jim Matlack;
droose@afsc.org; dradcliff_gb@brethren.org; washofc@aol.com;
ann_d.parti@ecunet.org; redgar@nccusa.org; lisaw@nccusa.org;
heathern@nccusa.org; bgrieves@dfms.org; jmskipper@aol.com;
thart@dfms.org; epf@peacenet.org; disarm@forusa.org; joe@fcnl.org;
kathy@fcnl.org; sara@fcnl.org; marsusab@aol.com; J._Daryl_Byler@mcc.org;
CHouleMM@aol.com; ogc@maryknoll.org; dave@paxchristiusa.org;
slisherness@unidial.com; jow@mindspring.com; wowensby@ctr.pcusa.org;
Bill Yolton; uuawo@aol.com; jnoble@uahc.org; stiefr@ucc.org;
dringler@umc-gbcs.org; gpowers@nccbuscc.org;
WorldPeacemakers@compuserve.com; mupj@igc.org; dkelli@iit.org;
ccosby@dhm.disciples.org; blythe-goodman@erols.com; sdeboe@csm.org
Cc: nmd@2020vision.org
Subject: interfaith card on NMD

Dear Colleagues:

Here is a revised draft of the interfaith card on national missile defense (NMD) to reflect changes suggested by several people. Mainly the first two paragraphs have been rewritten to focus sharply on President Clinton. Other changes are minor adjustments in wording.

We now have ten endorsers (and assume that they will accept the re-wording). We are looking for more sponsors. Please contact Ms. Hop Tham-Thi at 20/20 vision with your endorsement and order for cards. Please send me a copy for my information.

Thanks for your support.

Howard

>
>-----
>
>
> NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE

>
>
>
>
><> **TRADING PEACE FOR A NEW NUCLEAR ARMS RACE**

><> President Clinton is nearing a decision on whether to deploy a national missile defense (NMD). If he says "go ahead" to this wildly expensive and unproven technology, it will be a serious setback to our quest for a safer and more peaceful world.

>
> As people of faith, we need to speak out assertively to stop further >development of NMD and invite all our supporters to speak their consciences now.

>
> Only public opinion can turn this decision around.

>
> The REALITY of NMD is different and far more ominous. Here's why:

>
>
> NMD would thwart this reduction.

>
> NMD cost is unjust and wasteful.

> Real national and personal security are brought about not with further >militarization but human development.

>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> SEND A COPY of your letter to a newspaper to 2020 Vision, so we can >track our combined efforts! Thank you.

>
> CONTACT:

> president@whitehouse.gov

> (202) 456-1414

>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\interfaith >card1"

To: "NMD" <NMD@2020vision.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: final list of sponsors!
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <E13DALb-0004F2-00@dfw-corpmp1.email.verio.net>
References:

Hop,

Thanks much to you for a job well done in getting out the interfaith card on NMD. In the three weeks since the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament decided to work with 20/20 on the card, we've accomplished a lot: producing the text, getting numerous sponsors. It's a good partnership that we will want to continue.

Shalom,
Howard

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express for Macintosh - 4.01 (295)

Date: Fri, 14 Jul 2000 17:00:29 -0400

Subject: Re: final list of sponsors!

From: "NMD" <NMD@2020vision.org>

To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>

Dear Howard,

Thank you so much for your thoughtful reply. It was really great to work with you and your feedback was of great help. As I mentioned to Tim, it's a team work, and I am very glad it worked out well and we got so many (and important) faith groups. The people I contacted were also very wonderful and understanding of our time constraints.

I look forward to working with you again. Peace to you,

Hop

>From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>

>To: "NMD" <NMD@2020vision.org>

>Subject: Re: final list of sponsors!

>Date: Fri, Jul 14, 2000, 3:54 PM

>

>Hop,

>

>Thanks much to you for a job well done in getting out the interfaith card

>on NMD. In the three weeks since the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear

>Disarmament decided to work with 20/20 on the card, we've accomplished a

>lot: producing the text, getting numerous sponsors. It's a good

>partnership that we will want to continue.

>

>Shalom,

>Howard

>

>

>

>

INTERFAITH POSTCARD ON NMD
LIST OF SPONSORING FAITH GROUPS - JULY 14, 2000

BAPTIST PEACE FELLOWSHIP OF NORTH AMERICA
BUDDHIST PEACE FELLOWSHIP
CONFERENCE OF MAJOR SUPERIORS OF MEN
CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN RABBIS
CHURCH OF THE BRETHREN WASHINGTON OFFICE
CHURCH WOMEN UNITED
EPISCOPAL CHURCH
EPISCOPAL PEACE FELLOWSHIP
EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA
FELLOWSHIP ON RECONCILIATION
FRIENDS COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL LEGISLATION
GENERAL BOARD OF CHURCH AND SOCIETY, UNITED METHODIST
CHURCH
JEWISH PEACE FELLOWSHIP
MARYKNOLL OFFICE FOR GLOBAL CONCERN
MENNONITE CENTRAL COMMITTEE US WASHINGTON OFFICE
METHODISTS UNITED FOR PEACE WITH JUSTICE
MUSLIM PEACE FELLOWSHIP
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES
NATIONAL MINISTRIES, AMERICAN BAPTIST CHURCHES USA
PAX CHRISTI USA
PRESBYTARIAN PEACE FELLOWSHIP
SISTERS OF MERCY OF THE AMERICAS
SISTERS OF ST JOSEPH OF PEACE
SOJOURNERS
UNION OF AMERICAN HEBREW CONGREGATIONS
UNITARIAN UNIVERSALIST ASSOCIATION
UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST JUSTICE AND WITNESS MINISTRIES
WORLD PEACEMAKERS

X-eGroups-Return: sentto-1413460-939-963843473-mupj=igc.apc.org@returns.onelist.com

X-Sender: slatera@204.141.205.3

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0.2

To: regina.hagen@jugendstil.da.shuttle.de (regina.hagen@jugendstil.da.shuttle.de),
abolition-caucus@egroups.com

From: ASlater <aslater@gracelinks.org>

Mailing-List: list abolition-caucus@egroups.com; contact abolition-caucus-owner@egroups.com

Delivered-To: mailing list abolition-caucus@egroups.com

List-Unsubscribe: <mailto:abolition-caucus-unsubscribe@egroups.com>

Date: Mon, 17 Jul 2000 10:13:28 -0400

Subject: Re: [abolition-caucus] Study to evaluation usefulness of major anti-nukes foundation

Alas, Regina--the appointment of Sam Nunn to advise the Turner foundation will mean nuclear weapons forever--just "safer" ones--that don't proliferate to other countries. Nunn is a US hegemonist--he once told me that he thought we shouldn't have a moratorium on nuclear testing and that Russia should test too. (That was at the 1992 Democratic convention where I was working for Jerry

Brown). he's from the Southern, conservative democrats "good ole boy" network where Gore and Clinton hail from and there's no help there. Also, Charles Curtis, the former Secretary of Energy who is also advising Turner's Foundation, will be nuclear power, nuclear pollution and nuclear cover-ups forever. Expect to see a lot more funding for reducing nuclear danger, stopping proliferation, safeguarding Russia's nukes, but nothing for abolition, the peaceful useful of space, sustainable energy, etc. Alas, Alas!! Alice

At 02:06 PM 07/16/2000 -0400, regina.hagen@jugendstil.da.shuttle.de wrote:

>Friends,

>in one of Bill Smirnov's long e-mails about nuclear stuff, I found the

>article

>attached below. Basically it says that former U.S. Senator Sam Nunn on the

>request of billionaire Ted Turner is to conduct a study whether it seems

>useful

>to start an extremely well-funded foundation to support efforts to reduce

>"the

>threat of nuclear weapons and materials around the world."

>This would, of course, be a great thing. The article continues:

>"The announcement expected today will say the study will examine

>the effect a private organization could have on four areas:

>

>Stemming the proliferation of nuclear weapons, materials and

>know-how.

>

>Enhancing the security and safety of nuclear weapons and

>materials.

>

>Reducing the chances of intentional or accidental use of nuclear

>weapons.

>

>Building the trust, accountability and confidence essential to

>progress in arms reductions and in furthering the goals of the

>Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty.

>
>>>From my point of view one crucial topic is missing here: support of
>>NGOs' work
>to raise awareness in the public on the nuclear issue and also the NGOs'
>efforts
>to propose alternatives - the Nuclear Weapons Convention is one example.
>If such
>a huge foundation should actually be founded it would surely be desirable
>that
>they would be willing to also fund projects which do not require millions
>but a
>few or several ten thousand dollars - like studies, translations, writing
>papers, supporting travels, paying for staff, etc. etc. - all what is
>often so
>painfully missing in our daily work.
>
>If any of you has contacts to Senator Nunn or knows how to best raise this
>question should certainly do so. Or am I mistaken?
>
>In Peace
>Regina
>
>*****
>TURNER, NUNN SEEK PRIVATE MEANS TO LIMIT NUCLEAR THREATS
>
>The Atlanta Journal-Constitution
>
>Peachtree Road Race 2000 photo gallery.
>
>PAGE 1 / A SECTION JULY 13, 2000
>
>Don Melvin and Maria Saporta - Staff
>
>Two of Georgia's most prominent citizens --- Atlanta billionaire
>Ted Turner and former U.S. Sen. Sam Nunn --- are teaming up in a
>major effort to create a foundation dedicated to reducing the
>threat of nuclear weapons and materials around the world.
>
>The two men will announce today they are launching a study "to
>determine the impact that a private organization with significant
>resources could have on reducing the nuclear threat."
>
>The study, which will last through December, will be supervised
>by Nunn and will cost Turner between \$400,000 and \$1 million.
>
>But the goal is much larger than a study. If Nunn's inquiries
>show that a private organization could play a useful role, the
>most likely outcome would be the creation of a well-funded
>foundation paid for by Turner and run by Nunn.
>
>"That's certainly a possibility that Ted and I have discussed,"
>Nunn said Wednesday in a telephone interview from Monterey,
>Calif., where he was attending an international conference on
>nonproliferation.

>
>Turner has long been known for the bold philanthropic stroke. In
>1991, he created the Turner Foundation, which grants tens of
>millions of dollars a year to organizations concerned with
>protecting the environment and reducing population growth.
>
>In 1997, Turner announced he would give \$1 billion over 10 years
>to United Nations-related projects. So far, that effort has
>awarded more than \$275 million to projects around the world
>dealing with children's health, population and women's issues,
>peace and security, and the environment.
>
>Nunn would not say how much money Turner is willing to devote to
>the new effort to curb nuclear weapons, saying the amount will
>depend on the results of the study. But it will be a significant
>amount.
>
>"Ted has made clear to me that he is talking about a very
>substantial commitment and very substantial resources," Nunn
>said. "He has talked in terms of an effort of what I would call
>unprecedented magnitude."
>
>Nunn termed Turner's dedication to the project as equal to his
>commitment to the U.N. Foundation, though the financial
>contribution may not be as great.
>
>Turner was not available Wednesday for an interview, his office
>said. But a statement issued by Turner said recent discussions
>with experts have taught him two important things:
>
>"First, in the post-Cold War era, the nuclear threat has become,
>in many ways, more complex and dangerous. Second, if we are to
>reduce the nuclear threat, we need to raise public awareness and
>inspire leadership and cooperation around the world. It is my
>hope that this scoping study will determine whether --- and if
>so, how --- we can play a role in meeting that challenge."
>
>The effort brings together two men of huge accomplishments and
>vastly different styles.
>
>Turner, 61, the founder of CNN and a vice chairman of Time
>Warner, has a reputation as a brash, sometimes impulsive achiever
>who tends to want things done yesterday.
>
>Nunn, also 61 and former chairman of the Senate Armed Services
>Committee, is known as a methodical and deliberate statesman more
>inclined to caution than impulse.
>
>The ex-senator from Perry acknowledged those differences.
>
>"We have different styles not just on the surface, but probably
>when you scratch down a ways," Nunn said with a soft laugh. "But
>that's one of the questions --- can we basically complement each
>other and use the strengths each of us has to tackle what I think

>is the most important security question facing mankind? And I
>believe we can, and Ted believes we can. But we want to make sure
>we have a meeting of the minds, and where we differ we want to
>make sure that those differences are things that are not going to
>block a successful effort."

>
>Nunn said he and Turner have traits in common, as well.

>
>"Ted is known as someone who is bold and gets things done," he
>said. "I hope I'm seen as someone who gets things done. This
>combination is what's exciting to me."

>
>The announcement expected today will say the study will examine
>the effect a private organization could have on four areas:

>
>Stemming the proliferation of nuclear weapons, materials and
>know-how.

>
>Enhancing the security and safety of nuclear weapons and
>materials.

>
>Reducing the chances of intentional or accidental use of nuclear
>weapons.

>
>Building the trust, accountability and confidence essential to
>progress in arms reductions and in furthering the goals of the
>Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty.

>
>Nunn said he has been involved in nuclear issues since 1974, when
>he visited a NATO tactical nuclear weapons base and concluded
>that one of our greatest challenges was preventing the accidental
>or unauthorized use of the weapons. His involvement as a senator
>increased further after the breakup of the Soviet Union, he said.

>
>He and Turner have been discussing this initiative for several
>months, he said.

>
>Nunn said that the threat of an all-out nuclear war has
>diminished significantly in the past 10 or 12 years. But the
>danger is not over, he said.

>
>"I think the threat of the use of a nuclear weapon by some group
>at some point in time in the next few years has gone up," he
>said. "Now that's a big distinction but it's an important one,
>because proliferation is occurring, nuclear knowledge is
>spreading, the ability to make nuclear weapons that was formerly
>mainly governments' is now spread through the Internet. . . . One
>of the key things is preventing the nuclear materials from
>joining up with the know-how in terrorist groups or in
>irresponsible nations."

>
>Nunn said whether a private foundation can play a significant
>role will be determined, in important respects, by the answers to
>two questions. One is whether a distinction between what

>governments ought to do and what private organizations ought to
>do can be successfully made. The other is whether Turner's money
>can induce other organizations and governments to increase their
>own contributions.

>

>Nunn, who is a partner in the Atlanta law firm King & Spalding,
>will carry out the study with Charles Curtis, a former deputy
>secretary of energy.

>

>Nunn said the study will determine which, among what he said were
>hundreds of needs, might be best filled by a foundation. He cited
>these possibilities as examples:

>

>Helping, through high-risk investments, commercial businesses
>dispose of nuclear material.

>

>Helping scientists in Russia's "nuclear cities" --- about 10
>isolated cities that have both the experts and the materials
>necessary to make nuclear, chemical and biological weapons, but
>to which funding has been cut --- obtain "gainful, meaningful,
>constructive employment" so they are not tempted or forced to
>sell their expertise elsewhere.

>

>Helping dismantle missile-carrying submarines. "There are all
>these nuclear reactors on 100 Russian submarines, and nobody is
>addressing the problem and they are just deteriorating in the
>oceans of the world," Nunn said. The foundation might use its
>money to convince governments as those in the Scandinavian
>countries and Japan to spend some of their money to dismantle the
>submarines and protect their own environments, he said.

>

>Being available to engage in private diplomacy in areas such as
>India and Pakistan, if the U.S. government cannot. Such efforts,
>Nunn said, would be undertaken only in close coordination with
>the government.

>

>The U.S. government is spending \$600,000 to \$700,000 a year on
>nuclear arms control. The foundation wants to work with the
>government, supplementing --- but certainly not replacing --- its
>efforts, Nunn said.

>

>Without getting others to ante up, he said, the initiative will
>be doomed to fail.

>

>"If you can't leverage this money," Nunn said, "even Ted's
>fortunes are not enough to penetrate the problem."

>

>ON THE WEB: For more information about Turner's foundations:
>www.unfoundation.org or www.turnerfoundation.org

>

>*****

>Regina Hagen
>Darmstaedter Friedensforum
>Teichhausstrasse 46

>D-64287 Darmstadt
>Germany
>Tel. [49] (6151) 47 114
>Fax [49] (6151) 47 105

>
>
>

>-----
>Wish you had something rad to add to your email?
>We do at www.supersig.com.
>http://click.egroups.com/1/6807/3/_/91925/_/963773310/

>-----
>
>To subscribe to the Abolition Global Caucus, send an email from the
>account you wish to be subscribed to:
>"abolition-caucus-subscribe@egroups.com"

>
>
>Do not include a subject line or any text in the body of the message.

>

Experience MSN...
Get 1 FREE* month of unlimited Internet access!
http://click.egroups.com/1/6323/3/_/91925/_/963843473/

To subscribe to the Abolition Global Caucus, send an email from the account you wish to be subscribed to: "abolition-caucus-subscribe@egroups.com"

Do not include a subject line or any text in the body of the message.

From: SUSAN PEEK <SUSAN.PEEK@ecunet.org>
To: newscope@ecunet.org
Date: 18 Jul 2000 19:38:40 GMT
Organization: Ecunet
Lines: 276
Subject: [Newscope] Newscope, July 21, 2000
Sender: newscope-admin@ecunet.org
X-Mailman-Version: 1.1
List-Id: <newscope.ecunet.org>
X-BeenThere: newscope@ecunet.org

Note #619 from SUSAN PEEK to NEWSCOPE:

Newscope
A Newsletter for United Methodist Leaders
Vol. 28, No. 28/July 21, 2000

UMC Elects 13 New Bishops, Seven Blacks

Thirteen new bishops were elected during five simultaneous U.S. jurisdictional conferences July 12-15. Those selected to hold the highest office in the UMC include four Black men, three Black women, and six White men.

Prior to the elections, the 50 active bishops in the United States included nine White women, 27 White men, 10 Black men, two Asian-American men, and two Hispanic-American men. The retiring class of bishops consists of nine White men, one White woman, two Black men, and one Asian-American man. In three conferences, it took 19 ballots before the elections were completed. That figure is a long way from the U.S. record of 47 ballots cast in 1980 before a bishop was elected in the Western Jurisdiction.

North Central Jurisdiction-Madison, Wisc.

Bishops retiring: Charles W. Jordan (Iowa), Donald A. Ott (Michigan), and Judith Craig (West Ohio).

Gregory V. Palmer (Black), 45, senior pastor of the UMC of Berea, Ohio, was elected on the sixth ballot. A former superintendent of the Youngstown District (1990-93), Palmer has served five churches in Oxford, N.C., Durham, N.C., Cleveland, and Canton, Ohio. He is a graduate of Duke University Divinity School (M.Div.-1979), and was awarded an honorary Doctor of Divinity from Baldwin-Wallace College (1999). Palmer has served on the General Council on Ministries (1992-2000) where he chaired the committee on the election of general secretaries (1996-2000). He also chaired the East Ohio Conference Board of Ordained Ministry (1993-2000). Palmer is a four-time delegate to General Conference. He is married to Cynthia Palmer, and the couple has a daughter at Bowling Green State University and a son at Ohio State University.

Linda Lee (Black), 51, superintendent of the Detroit East District, was elected on the 14th ballot. A graduate of United Theological Seminary (M.Div.-1984 and D.Min.-1994), Lee began her ministerial career as a chaplain intern at Adrian College prior to her graduation from seminary. She was appointed to serve Residence Park UMC, Dayton, Ohio (1982-87), and then served as assistant to the dean for educational administration at Methodist Theological School. She also served as an associate pastor at

Central UMC, Detroit, and pastor of Conant Ave. UMC, Detroit, prior to being named to the Detroit Conference cabinet. Lee served as chair of Black Clergywomen of the UMC (1996-98) and has been a member of many conference committees. She has also served as a speaker for numerous schools, retreats, and conferences and is a two-time delegate to General Conference. She is married to Lamarr V. Gibson, and the couple has three children.

Bruce R. Ough (White), 49, pastor of Saint Paul's UMC, Cedar Rapids, Iowa (1997-present), was elected on the 19th ballot. A graduate of Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary (M.Div.-1978), Ough served as a youth minister, as North Dakota Conference camping director, and as an associate pastor in Chicago prior to being appointed council director for the Dakotas Area (1978-92). He was then named superintendent of the Cedar Rapids District (1992-97). He is a member of the General Commission on Christian Unity and Interreligious Concerns (1996-2000) and has published professional and inspirational articles. He is a three-time delegate to General Conference and serves on the North Central Jurisdiction Committee on Episcopacy. He is married to Charlene Ann Feldner Henning (1976); the couple has three boys.

Assignments: Chicago Area-Joseph C. Sprague (Northern Illinois Conference); Dakotas Area-Michael J. Coyner (Dakotas Conference); Illinois Area-Sharon Brown Christopher (Illinois Great River Conference); Indiana Area-Woodie W. White (North Indiana and South Indiana conferences); Iowa Area-Gregory V. Palmer (Iowa Conference); Michigan Area-Linda Lee (Detroit and West Michigan conferences); Minnesota Area-John L. Hopkins (Minnesota Conference); Ohio East Area-Jonathan D. Keaton (East Ohio Conference); Ohio West Area-Bruce R. Ough (West Ohio Conference); and Wisconsin Area-Sharon Zimmerman Rader (Wisconsin Conference).

Northeastern Jurisdiction-Somerset, N.J.

Bishop retiring: George W. Bashore (Pittsburgh).

Violet Lucinda Fisher (Black), 60, superintendent of the Mary McLeod Bethune District (1994-present), was elected on the 17th ballot. Fisher served as a teacher in Virginia and Maryland when she was ordained elder in the King's Apostle Holiness Church of God (1965). In 1975, she was appointed evangelist for the northeastern region of the denomination prior to being ordained deacon in the Eastern Pennsylvania Conference of the UMC (1988), where she was appointed associate pastor of St. Daniel's UMC, Chester, Pa. Fisher was ordained elder and appointed to Memorial UMC, Philadelphia (1990-94). She is a graduate of George Washington University (M.Ed.-1978) and Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary (M.Div.-1988) and received a D.D. from Baltimore College of Bible (1984). She served as dean of the Eastern Pennsylvania Conference Cabinet (1998-99) and was named Black UM Preacher of the Year in 1993. Fisher is a two-time delegate to General Conference. She has one son.

Assignments: Albany Area-Susan Morrison (Troy and Wyoming conferences); Boston Area-Susan Hassinger (New England Conference); Harrisburg Area-Neil Irons (Central Pennsylvania Conference); New Jersey Area-Alfred Johnson (Northern New Jersey and Southern New Jersey conferences); New York Area-Ernest Lyght (New York Conference); New York West Area-Violet Fisher (North Central New York and Western New York conferences); Philadelphia Area-Peter Weaver (Eastern Pennsylvania and Peninsula-Delaware conferences); Pittsburgh Area-Hae-Jong Kim (Western Pennsylvania Conference); Washington Area-Felton E. May (Baltimore-Washington Conference); and West Virginia

Area-S. Clifton Ives (West Virginia Conference).

Southeastern Jurisdiction-Lake Junaluska, N.C.

Bishops retiring: Marshall L. Meadors Jr. (Mississippi), Robert C. Morgan (Louisville), and Richard C. Looney (South Georgia).

Larry M. Goodpaster (White), 52, senior pastor of First UMC, Tupelo, Miss., is the first person in the United States to be elected as a bishop of the United Methodist Church in the 21st century. The former superintendent of the Tupelo District (1996-1998) was elected on the fifth ballot at 10:40 a.m. (EDT) on July 13. A member of the Mississippi Conference, Goodpaster is a graduate of Candler School of Theology (M.Div.-1973 and D.Min-1982.) and former pastor of Oxford (Miss.) University UMC (1985-92) and Central UMC in Meridian, Miss. (1992-1996). He served on the General Commission on Religion and Race (1996-2000) and the Board of Trustees of Millsaps College (1994-present), his alma mater. He is a three-time delegate to General Conference. Goodpaster is married to Deborah Cox Goodpaster (1971); the couple has two daughters.

Benjamin Michael Watson (White), 52, pastor of Dauphin Way UMC in Mobile, Ala. (1990-present), was elected on the 10th ballot. He was founding pastor of Covenant UMC in Dothan, Ala. (1979-90). Prior to that, he served Florida churches in Milton and Molino. He is a graduate of Emory University (M.Div.-1974) and Vanderbilt University (D.Min.-1975). Watson is a two-time delegate to the World Methodist Conference and received the Denman Evangelism Award from the Alabama-West Florida Conference (1990). He also served on the conference board of ordained ministry (1976-84 and 1994-present). He is a two-time delegate to General Conference. Watson is married to Margaret Lee Watson (1973), and the couple has one married son in Albany, Ga., and a daughter attending the University of Alabama.

James R. King Jr. (Black), 52, pastor of Brentwood (Tenn.) UMC, was elected on the 19th ballot. A graduate of the Interdenominational Theological Center (M.Div.-1972), King served churches in Roanoke, Ala., and Richmond, Calif. He served over a year (1977) as director of the Wesley Foundation at Tennessee State University before being named associate director and then director of the Tennessee Conference Council on Ministries. In 1984, he served as an evangelist on a mission team to Grenada, West Indies, and he served for ten years as pastor of Clark Memorial UMC in Nashville (1985-95). In 1996, he was appointed superintendent of the Murfreesboro District, and in 1999 he was named pastor of the 4,500 member Brentwood church. He is a five-time delegate to General Conference. King is married to Margaret Rosetta "Rose" Hayden, and the couple has two sons and a daughter.

Assignments: Alabama-West Florida Area-Larry M. Goodpaster (Alabama-West Florida Conference); Birmingham Area-Robert E. Fannin (North Alabama Conference); Charlotte Area-Charlene Kammerer (Western North Carolina Conference); Columbia Area-J. Lawrence McCleskey (South Carolina Conference); Florida Area-Cornelius L. Henderson (Florida Conference); Holston Area-Ray W. Chamberlain Jr. (Holston Conference); Louisville Area-James R. King Jr. (Kentucky and Red Bird Missionary conferences); Mississippi Area-Kenneth L. Carder (Mississippi Conference); Nashville Area-William W. Morris (Memphis and Tennessee conferences); North Georgia Area-Lindsey Davis (North Georgia Conference); Raleigh Area-Marion M. Edwards (North Carolina Conference); Richmond Area-Joe E. Pennel Jr. (Virginia Conference); and South Georgia Area-B. Michael Watson (South Georgia Conference).

South Central Jurisdiction-Albuquerque, N.M.

Bishops retiring: J. Woodrow Hearn (Houston), Raymond H. Owen (San Antonio), Joe Allen Wilson (Fort Worth), and Dan E. Solomon (Louisiana). Rhymes H. Moncure Jr. (Black), 55, senior pastor of Missouri UMC in Columbia, Mo. (1991-present) was elected on the first ballot. After serving churches in Kansas City and St. Louis, he he was appointed superintendent of the St. Louis South District. Moncure is a graduate of Saint Paul School of Theology (M.Div.-1977) and Carolina University School of Theology (D.Min.-1990). He has served as a director for the General Board of Global Ministries (1988-1996) and the General Commission on Christian Unity and Interreligious Concerns (1996-2000). He is a five-time delegate to General Conference. Moncure is married to Jewell Lena Wells Moncure (1968), and the couple has a son in Atlanta and a daughter in St. Louis.

William Wayne Hutchinson (White), 58, executive director of the New Mexico Conference UM Foundation (1997-present), was elected on the second ballot. After serving churches in Hobbs, N.M., Marfa, Texas, Artesia, N.M., and Las Cruces, N.M., he was named superintendent of the Odessa District (1986-89). Hutchinson is a graduate of Duke Divinity School (M.Div.-1966) and received a D.D. from McMurry University, Abilene, Texas (1987). He has served as a member of the General Board of Discipleship (1996-2000) and the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry (1988-96). He was chair of the New Mexico Conference Council on Ministries (1984-90); he also chaired the conference committee on the episcopacy (1992-2000). He is a four-time delegate to General Conference. Hutchinson is married to Kay Aitken Hutchinson (1964), and the couple has a son in St. Louis, a married son in Reno, Nevada, and one grandchild.

Max Whitfield (White), 55, superintendent of the Fayetteville (Ark.) District (1996-present), was elected on the fourth ballot. After serving as pastor of Arkansas churches in Eureka Springs, Harrison, Cherry Valley, Bella Vista, and Springdale, Whitfield was named superintendent of the Batesville District in 1994. He moved to the Fayetteville District in 1996. He is a graduate of Perkins School of Theology (M.Div.-1969) and Princeton Theological Seminary (D.Min.-1983). He served as chair of the North Arkansas Council on Ministries (1984-88) and was a member of the General Commission on Religion and Race (1996-2000) and the General Board of Global Ministries (1992-96). He is a three-time delegate to General Conference. Whitfield is married to Valerie Vaughn Whitfield (1993) and has a daughter in Little Rock, two daughters in Springdale, Ark., a son in Springdale, and a son in Lewisville, Texas.

Ben R. Chamness (White), 60, superintendent of the Houston Northwest District (1996-present), was elected on the 7th ballot. He was appointed to that post after serving Texas churches in Mt. Hope, Carthage, Diana, Avinger, Maud, Houston, Missouri City, Port Arthur, Kingwood, and Tyler. He is a graduate of Perkins School of Theology (Th.M.-1965) and Drew University (D.Min.-1986). He has served as president of the South Central Jurisdictional Council on Finance and Administration (1992-96) and the South Central Jurisdictional Executive Committee (1992-96). He was vice-chair of Texas Conference Board of Ordained Ministry (1984-88) and is a four-time delegate to General Conference. Chamness is married to Joye Fay Stokes Chamness (1960), and the couple has one married son in Houston and a son in Austin.

Assignments: Arkansas Area-Janice Riggie Huie (Little Rock and North Arkansas conferences); Dallas Area-William B. Oden (North Texas Conference);

Fort Worth Area-Ben Chamness (Central Texas Conference); Houston Area-Alfred Norris (Texas Conference); Kansas Area-A. Frederick Mutti (Kansas East and Kansas West conferences); Louisiana Area-William W. Hutchinson (Louisiana Conference); Missouri Area-Ann B. Sherer (Missouri East and Missouri West conferences); Nebraska Area-Rhymes H. Moncure Jr. (Nebraska Conference); Northwest Texas/New Mexico Area-D. Max Whitfield (New Mexico and Northwest Texas conferences); Oklahoma Area-Bruce P. Blake (Oklahoma and Oklahoma Indian Missionary conferences); and San Antonio Area-Joel N. Martinez (Rio Grande and Southwest Texas conferences).

Western Jurisdiction-Casper, Wyo.

Bishops retiring: Roy I. Sano (Los Angeles) and Melvin G. Talbert (San Francisco).

Beverly J. Shamana (Black), 60, an associate director for ethnic, justice, and outreach ministries for the California-Pacific Conference (1989-present), was elected on the second ballot. The former pastor of Faith UMC, Los Angeles (1980-84), and Inglewood UMC (1984-89) is a graduate of Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary and received the 1994 Outstanding Preacher Award from Claremont School of Theology in 1995. She has served on the General Commission on the Status and Role of Women (1976-84) and the General Board of Publication (1988-96), and she is the author of the forthcoming Abingdon book *Seeing in the Dark: A Vision of Creativity and Spirituality*. Shamana was a delegate to the 2000 General Conference.

Warner H. Brown Jr. (Black), 53, pastor of First UMC, Bakersfield, Calif. (1998-present), was elected on the 19th ballot. A graduate of Wesley Theological Seminary (M.Div.-1974), Brown served three appointments in Pittsburgh before being named associate director of the California-Nevada Conference Council in 1979. One year later, he was named council director (1980-83) and then superintendent of the Golden Gate District (1983-87). He served as pastor of Taylor Memorial UMC, Oakland (1987-98), prior to being named pastor of the 1,000-member church in Bakersfield. He was a member of the General Commission on Religion and Race (1996-2000) and now serves on the UM Committee on Relief Catastrophic Disaster Response Team (1996-present). He is a two-time delegate to General Conference. Brown is married to Minnie Jones Brown, and the couple has three children.

Assignments: Denver Area-Warner H. Brown Jr. (Rocky Mountain and Yellowstone conferences); Los Angeles Area-Mary Ann Swenson (California-Pacific Conference); Phoenix Area-William W. Dew Jr. (Desert Southwest Conference); Portland Area-Edward Paup (Alaska Missionary and Oregon-Idaho Conference); San Francisco Area-Beverly Shamana (California-Nevada Conference); and Seattle Area-Elias G. Galvan (Pacific Northwest Conference).

Personalia

Nelson Mandela, internationally known anti-apartheid leader and retired president of South Africa, will receive the 2000 World Methodist Peace Award from the World Methodist Council.

James M. Perry, a staff executive with the Minnesota Conference, has been elected chair of the Commission on General Conference.

Zane B. Scott, a UM layman and attorney from Virginia, has been named director of congregational leader development for the General Board of Discipleship.

Neal F. Fisher, president of Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary since 1980, has announced plans to retire June 30, 2001.

Sherryl Leigh Wright, a Ph.D. candidate at Iliff School of Theology and Denver University, has been awarded a \$5,000 Esther E. Edwards Graduate Scholarship by the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry.

Larry Linville, an executive with Evansville, Ind.-based Shoe Carnival, has been named vice-president of information technology and chief information officer for the Nashville-based UM Publishing House.

Vashti McKenzie, a pastor in Baltimore, was elected July 11 as the first female bishop in the 213-year history of the African Methodist Episcopal Church. She will head a district in southern Africa.

Permission is granted to electronically download this newsletter. UM publications may also quote Newscope with credit without special permission. Any other electronic or mechanical reproduction and/or distribution of the entire newsletter requires prior permission from the UM Publishing House; Rights and Permissions Office, 201 Eighth Ave. South; Nashville, TN 27202. Rich Peck, Editor (615-749-6007). To submit articles or information, write <RPeck@UMPublishing.org>.

Newscope mailing list
Newscope@ecunet.org
<http://www.ecunet.org/mailman/listinfo/newscope>

From: invoice.inquiry@mindspring.com
Date: Tue, 18 Jul 2000 06:50:28 -0400 (EDT)
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: "EarthLink/MindSpring Invoice #31333766, Please Read"
X-Hercules-ID: mupj@igc.org

Remit To: Account Number: 2028691
Page: 1
EarthLink Inc. Invoice Date: 07/13/00
P.O. Box 7645 Invoice Number: 31333766
Atlanta, Ga. 30357-0645 USA

Bill To: Due upon receipt.
Current charges are late if
Howard W. Hallman not received by 08/04/00
Methodists United for Peace wi
1500 16th St., NW
Washington, DC 20036

Date	Description	Qty	Price	Amount
	Previous Balance			15.95
07/13/00	non-automated payment	1.00	1.00	1.00
	mupj (Howard W. Hallman)			
07/13/00	Jul 13-Aug 12:Standard monthly	1.00	14.95	14.95
07/12/00	Jun 13-Jul 12:Hours used	6.04		
	Current Chgs:		15.95	
	Balance Due:		31.90	

Please pay upon receipt and be sure to include your account number 2028691 with your payment. Any previous balance may be considered past due at this time.

Refer your friends to EarthLink and we'll give you a free month of service (up to \$19.95). Tell your friends to call 1.800.EARTHLINK and have them mention your email address!

We provide several tools designed to help you manage your EarthLink

account more effectively. These tools may be found at:

<http://www.mindspring.com/acct-mgmt/index.html>

If you think there is an error on your invoice, please write to us via email at invoice.inquiry@mindspring.com or US mail at the address above within 30 days of the invoice date to dispute the erroneous charge.

We'll be happy to clarify your invoice or correct any erroneous charges.

X-Envelope-To: <mupj@igc.org>
From: David Robinson <dave@paxchristiusa.org>
To: "'Howard W. Hallman'" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: Condolence and query
Date: Tue, 18 Jul 2000 11:40:03 -0400

Dear Howard,

Thank you for the kind words about my Grandmother. We were very close, and her passing leaves a large hole in my life. She died at home, among her loved ones, after gathering us all together for one last time together. It was in many ways, quite beautiful.

I have read the new draft and I think it is a very fine job. I think you should move ahead with it. How many Catholic bishops do you want me to seek? I think I can get 4 easily enough by the end of the DNC. Is that too many? Let me know. I leave for our National Assembly in Richmond this coming Sunday and will be there all week. The next week I am on vacation.

Peace,
Dave

From: Howard W. Hallman [SMTP:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Tuesday, July 18, 2000 9:17 AM
To: dave@paxchristiusa.org
Subject: Condolence and query

Dear Dave,

I understand that your grandmother died last week. I offer my condolence to you. It's been a long time since my own grandparents died, but I still remember my feeling of loss. So I can imagine how you feel.

When you return to the office, I want to talk to you about the letter to presidential candidates. It's four weeks until the time I want to send it, just after the Democratic National Convention. We'll need that much time to get the proper signers. So if we don't wrap it up by the end of this week, I doubt that we'll be able to go ahead with it.

I assume you got my latest revision, which I e-mailed on July 7.

Shalom,
Howard

Howard W. Hallman, Chair
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036
Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail: mupj@igc.org

Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a membership association of laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any Methodist denomination.

To: dave@paxchristiusa.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Condolence and query
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Dave,

I understand that your grandmother died last week. I offer my condolence to you. It's been a long time since my own grandparents died, but I still remember my feeling of loss. So I can imagine how you feel.

When you return to the office, I want to talk to you about the letter to presidential candidates. It's four weeks until the time I want to send it, just after the Democratic National Convention. We'll need that much time to get the proper signers. So if we don't wrap it up by the end of this week, I doubt that we'll be able to go ahead with it.

I assume you got my latest revision, which I e-mailed on July 7.

Shalom,
Howard

To: dringler@umc-gbcs.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Peace and justice songs
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Robin,

At the Peace with Justice Coordinators meeting in Cleveland, Ann Price made available to us an excellent new collection of hymns, "Sing Justice! Do Justice!" To go with this collection I am looking for peace and justice songs in "praise band" style. I want to use them with the praise band in my local church, in which I play my viola.

Would you be willing to ask your GBCS colleagues if they know of such songs. If so, I would like to know the title, composer, lyricist, publisher, and recording if available. Of whatever of such information is available.

Thanks for your help.

Howard

To: ctolopp@erols.com, ldiamond@Knight-hub.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Interfaith card on NMD
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Friends,

We are pleased that the Jewish Peace Fellowship is a sponsor of the interfaith postcard on national missile defense (NMD) that was developed jointly by 20/20 Vision and the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair.

The Interfaith Committee formed this spring as vehicle for action on series of issues dealing with nuclear disarmament. It builds upon our previous experience in working together for Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), a task not yet completed. We are in the process of finalizing a set of questions for congressional candidates on nuclear disarmament issues which organizations can use in their contacts during the election campaign. In the fall we will encourage state and local interfaith coalitions to prepare for ongoing contacts with senators and representatives during the next Congress.

We invite the Jewish Peace Fellowship to participate in these activities of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. Our next meeting will be on Tuesday, September 19 from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. at the Methodist Building, Conference Room 4, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, D.C. We hope that your representative can attend.

With best regards,
Howard Hallman

To: dshank@sojourners.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Interfaith card on NMD
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Dwayne,

We are pleased that Sojourners is a sponsor of the interfaith postcard on national missile defense (NMD) that was developed jointly by 20/20 Vision and the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair.

The Interfaith Committee formed this spring as vehicle for action on series of issues dealing with nuclear disarmament. It builds upon our previous experience in working together for Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), a task not yet completed. We are in the process of finalizing a set of questions for congressional candidates on nuclear disarmament issues which organizations can use in their contacts during the election campaign. In the fall we will encourage state and local interfaith coalitions to prepare for ongoing contacts with senators and representatives during the next Congress.

We invite Sojourners to participate in these activities of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. Our next meeting will be on Tuesday, September 19 from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. at the Methodist Building, Conference Room 4, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, D.C. We hope that your representative can attend.

With best regards,
Howard Hallman

To: sroyster@sistersofmercy.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Interfaith card on NMD
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Friends,

We are pleased that the Sisters of Mercy are a sponsor of the interfaith postcard on national missile defense (NMD) that was developed jointly by 20/20 Vision and the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair.

The Interfaith Committee formed this spring as vehicle for action on series of issues dealing with nuclear disarmament. It builds upon our previous experience in working together for Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), a task not yet completed. We are in the process of finalizing a set of questions for congressional candidates on nuclear disarmament issues which organizations can use in their contacts during the election campaign. In the fall we will encourage state and local interfaith coalitions to prepare for ongoing contacts with senators and representatives during the next Congress.

We invite the Sisters of Mercy to participate in these activities of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. Our next meeting will be on Tuesday, September 19 from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. at the Methodist Building, Conference Room 4, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, D.C. We hope that your representative can attend.

With best regards,
Howard Hallman

To: csjp@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Interfaith card on NMD
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Friends,

We are pleased that the Sisters of Saint Joseph of Peace are a sponsor of the interfaith postcard on national missile defense (NMD) that was developed jointly by 20/20 Vision and the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair.

The Interfaith Committee formed this spring as vehicle for action on series of issues dealing with nuclear disarmament. It builds upon our previous experience in working together for Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), a task not yet completed. We are in the process of finalizing a set of questions for congressional candidates on nuclear disarmament issues which organizations can use in their contacts during the election campaign. In the fall we will encourage state and local interfaith coalitions to prepare for ongoing contacts with senators and representatives during the next Congress.

We invite the Sisters of Saint Joseph of Peace to participate in these activities of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. Our next meeting will be on Tuesday, September 19 from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. at the Methodist Building, Conference Room 4, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, D.C. We hope that your representative can attend.

With best regards,
Howard Hallman

To: ipnd
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Sponsors of interfaith card on NMD
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\00717.02.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Colleagues,

20/20 Vision has sent the interfaith postcard on national missile defense to the printer. Those of you who signed on will be receiving your supply in a few days. The list of endorses is attached.

I am pleased that we renewed our partnership with 20/20, which was so useful during the CTBT ratification campaign. Hop Tham-Thi deserves praise for her hard work on this effort.

Shalom,
Howard

###

INTERFAITH POSTCARD ON NMD
LIST OF SPONSORING FAITH GROUPS - JULY 14, 2000

BAPTIST PEACE FELLOWSHIP OF NORTH AMERICA
BUDDHIST PEACE FELLOWSHIP
CONFERENCE OF MAJOR SUPERIORS OF MEN
CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN RABBIS
CHURCH OF THE BRETHREN WASHINGTON OFFICE
CHURCH WOMEN UNITED
EPISCOPAL CHURCH
EPISCOPAL PEACE FELLOWSHIP
EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA
FELLOWSHIP ON RECONCILIATION
FRIENDS COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL LEGISLATION
GENERAL BOARD OF CHURCH AND SOCIETY, UNITED METHODIST
CHURCH
JEWISH PEACE FELLOWSHIP
MARYKNOLL OFFICE FOR GLOBAL CONCERN
MENNONITE CENTRAL COMMITTEE US WASHINGTON OFFICE
METHODISTS UNITED FOR PEACE WITH JUSTICE
MUSLIM PEACE FELLOWSHIP
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES
NATIONAL MINISTRIES, AMERICAN BAPTIST CHURCHES USA
PAX CHRISTI USA
PRESBYTARIAN PEACE FELLOWSHIP
SISTERS OF MERCY OF THE AMERICAS
SISTERS OF ST JOSEPH OF PEACE
SOJOURNERS
UNION OF AMERICAN HEBREW CONGREGATIONS
UNITARIAN UNIVERSALIST ASSOCIATION
UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST JUSTICE AND WITNESS MINISTRIES

To: phil
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: "EarthLink/MindSpring Invoice #31333766, Please Read"
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Phil,

Please pay. Thanks.

Howard

From: invoice.inquiry@mindspring.com
>Date: Tue, 18 Jul 2000 06:50:28 -0400 (EDT)
>To: mupj@igc.org
>Subject: "EarthLink/MindSpring Invoice #31333766, Please Read"
>X-Hercules-ID: mupj@igc.org

>
> Remit To: Account Number: 2028691
> Page: 1
> EarthLink Inc. Invoice Date: 07/13/00
> P.O. Box 7645 Invoice Number: 31333766
> Atlanta, Ga. 30357-0645 USA

>
>
> Bill To: Due upon receipt.
> Current charges are late if
> Howard W. Hallman not received by 08/04/00
> Methodists United for Peace wi
> 1500 16th St., NW
> Washington, DC 20036

>Date	Description	Qty	Price	Amount
>	Previous Balance			15.95
>	>07/13/00 non-automated payment	1.00	1.00	1.00
>	>			
>	> mupj (Howard W. Hallman)			
>	>07/13/00 Jul 13-Aug 12:Standard monthly	1.00	14.95	14.95
>	>07/12/00 Jun 13-Jul 12:Hours used	6.04		
>	>			

> Current Chgs: 15.95

> -----
> Balance Due: 31.90

> =====

> Please pay upon receipt and be sure to include your account number
> 2028691 with your payment. Any previous balance may be considered
> past due at this time.

> Refer your friends to EarthLink and we'll give you a free month
> of service (up to \$19.95). Tell your friends to call
> 1.800.EARTHLINK and have them mention your email address!

> We provide several tools designed to help you manage your EarthLink
> account more effectively. These tools may be found at:
> <http://www.mindspring.com/acct-mgmt/index.html>

> If you think there is an error on your invoice, please write to us via
> email at invoice.inquiry@mindspring.com or US mail at the address above
> within 30 days of the invoice date to dispute the erroneous charge.
> We'll be happy to clarify your invoice or correct any erroneous charges.

To: David Robinson <dave@paxchristiusa.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: Condolence and query
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <01BFF0AC.EDDBA820@dave.paxchristiusa.org>
References:

Dave,

I suggest five Catholic bishops with a geographic spread and perhaps some racial/ethnic variety. I'm going try for United Methodist bishops in Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Nebraska, and California; one African-American, one Hispanic. You'll note that I include Gore's and Bush's home states.

Give me your names as soon as you get them.

Thanks,
Howard

To: David Robinson <dave@paxchristiusa.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: Condolence and query
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <01BFF0AC.EDDBA820@dave.paxchristiusa.org>
References:

Dave,

I suggest five Catholic bishops with a geographic spread and perhaps some racial/ethnic variety. I'm going try for United Methodist bishops in Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Nebraska, and California; one African-American, one Hispanic. You'll note that I include Gore's and Bush's home states.

Give me your names as soon as you get them.

Thanks,
Howard

X-Envelope-To: <mupj@igc.org>
From: David Robinson <dave@paxchristiusa.org>
To: "'Howard W. Hallman'" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: Condolence and query
Date: Tue, 18 Jul 2000 11:40:03 -0400

Dear Howard,

Thank you for the kind words about my Grandmother. We were very close, and her passing leaves a large hole in my life. She died at home, among her loved ones, after gathering us all together for one last time together. It was in many ways, quite beautiful.

I have read the new draft and I think it is a very fine job. I think you should move ahead with it. How many Catholic bishops do you want me to seek? I think I can get 4 easily enough by the end of the DNC. Is that too many? Let me know. I leave for our National Assembly in Richmond this coming Sunday and will be there all week. The next week I am on vacation.

Peace,
Dave

From: Howard W. Hallman [SMTP:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Tuesday, July 18, 2000 9:17 AM
To: dave@paxchristiusa.org
Subject: Condolence and query

Dear Dave,

I understand that your grandmother died last week. I offer my condolence to you. It's been a long time since my own grandparents died, but I still remember my feeling of loss. So I can imagine how you feel.

When you return to the office, I want to talk to you about the letter to presidential candidates. It's four weeks until the time I want to send it, just after the Democratic National Convention. We'll need that much time to get the proper signers. So if we don't wrap it up by the end of this week, I doubt that we'll be able to go ahead with it.

I assume you got my latest revision, which I e-mailed on July 7.

Shalom,
Howard

Howard W. Hallman, Chair
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036
Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail: mupj@igc.org

Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a membership association of laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any Methodist denomination.

X-Envelope-To: <mupj@igc.org>
From: David Robinson <dave@paxchristiusa.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: Condolence and query
Date: Tue, 18 Jul 2000 22:30:49 -0400

Howard,

If I get you the names, can you contact them? You can write a joint letter from the two of us. Point out that as signers of The Morality of Nuclear Deterrence statement, they are taking the next step to call our political leaders to accountability. I can look at a draft this week and we'll be in business.

Peace,
Dave

From: Howard W. Hallman [SMTP:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Tuesday, July 18, 2000 11:46 AM
To: David Robinson
Subject: RE: Condolence and query

Dave,

I suggest five Catholic bishops with a geographic spread and perhaps some racial/ethnic variety. I'm going try for United Methodist bishops in Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Nebraska, and California; one African-American, one Hispanic. You'll note that I include Gore's and Bush's home states.

Give me your names as soon as you get them.

Thanks,
Howard

Howard W. Hallman, Chair
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036
Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail: mupj@igc.org

Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a membership association of laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any Methodist denomination.

To: dave@paxchristiusa.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Letters to potential signers
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Dave,

Attached are three draft letters to be used in getting signers to the letter to presidential candidates on nuclear disarmament. As you can see, I would like to indicate that Bishop Sullivan is an initial signer. Is that acceptable? Do you have his consent?

My drafts include a letter to the Catholic bishops you will indicate. Although I am willing to write them, I would prefer that you adapt my draft and write them yourself. Please advise.

I will go ahead with plans to schedule a news conference at the National Press Club on Thursday, September 7. Can you get Bishop Sullivan to participate? Or someone else? I hope you can be there, too.

I'll be out this morning, but you can reach me after 2:00 p.m. today, Wednesday, July 19.

Shalom,
Howard

##

Sample letter to United Methodist bishops

Dear Bishop _____:

As you may know, the 2000 United Methodist General Conference renewed its support for the abolition of nuclear weapons by updating the resolution on "Nuclear Abolition" (copy enclosed). Because this issue is so significant to the future of the world, it is a matter that deserves attention by U.S. presidential candidates in this year's election campaign.

Accordingly, we have drafted the attached letter on this issue to be sent to candidates of the Democratic, Republican, Reform, and Green parties. The letter will be mailed to the candidates and their top advisors on Friday, August 18 after the last nominating convention has ended (the Democratic on August 17). We will ask the candidates to reply by Tuesday, September 5 and then hold a news conference on September 7 to release their replies.

As initial signers we have United Methodist Bishop C. Dale White and Catholic Bishop Walter Sullivan, president of Pax Christi USA. We are inviting other religious leaders from a cross section of denominations and regions of the country to sign the letter. Would you be willing to be a signer? From the United Methodist Church we are also requesting Bishops A, B, and C to sign, giving us a geographic spread.

You can reply to me by e-mail at mupj@igc.org, by phone or fax at 301 896-0013, or by letter to Methodists United for Peace with Justice, 6508 Wilmet Road, Bethesda, MD 20817. If you have any questions, please call me.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman

###

Sample letter to Catholic bishops

Dear Bishop _____:

The future of the global nuclear arsenal is an issue that deserves serious consideration in the U.S. presidential campaign. Accordingly, Dave Robinson of Pax Christi USA and I have drafted the attached letter on this issue to candidates of the Democratic, Republican, Reform, and Green parties. Our intent is to mail this letter to the candidates and their top advisors on Friday, August 18 after the last nominating convention has ended (the Democratic on August 17). We will ask the candidates to reply by Tuesday, September 5 and then hold a news conference on September 7 to release their replies.

Initial signers of the letter include Bishop Walter Sullivan, president of Pax Christi, USA and United Methodist Bishop C. Dale White, who chaired the committee of the United Methodist Council of Bishops that produced the 1986 report *In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace*. Because you endorsed the 1999 Pax Christi USA statement, *The Morality of Nuclear Deterrence*, we invite you to sign this letter to the presidential candidates. This is the next step of calling our political leaders to accountability on this important issue.

Because I am handling final preparations, you can reply to me by e-mail at mupj@igc.org, by phone or fax at 301 896-0013, or by letter to Methodists United for Peace with Justice, 6508 Wilmet Road, Bethesda, MD 20817. If you have any questions, please call me or get in touch with Dave Robinson at 814 453-4955, ext. 235.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman

###

Sample letter to Bill Yolton; to be adapted for contacts in other denominations.

Dear Bill,

The future of the global nuclear arsenal is an issue that deserves serious consideration in the U.S. presidential campaign. Accordingly, with assistance of Dave Robinson of Pax Christi USA, I have drafted the attached letter on this issue to candidates of the Democratic, Republican, Reform, and Green parties. Our intent is to mail this letter to the candidates and their top advisors on Friday, August 18 after the last nominating convention has ended (the Democratic on August 17). We will ask the candidates to reply by Tuesday, September 5 and then hold a news conference on September 7 to release their replies.

As initial signers we have United Methodist Bishop C. Dale White and Catholic Bishop Walter Sullivan. Bishop White chaired the committee of the United Methodist Council of Bishops that produced the 1986 report *In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace*. Bishop Sullivan is president of Pax Christi USA.

We are seeking three to five prominent leaders from other U.S. denominations to sign this letter. Would you be willing to help us obtain several Presbyterian leaders? They don't necessarily have to have official positions with the Presbyterian Church (USA), but some kind of name recognition at least within denominational circles would be helpful. Also geographic spread and if possible racial, ethnic, and gender variety would be desirable. I will need to know their names, organizational identity, city, and state by Monday, August 14.

You can reply to me by e-mail at mupj@igc.org or by letter to Methodists United for Peace with Justice, 6508 Wilmet Road, Bethesda, MD 20817. If you have any questions, please call me at 301 896-0013.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman

To: dwhite11@edgenet.net
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Letter to presidential candidates
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Dale,

It's taken longer than I thought it would to work out the text of a letter to presidential candidates on nuclear disarmament. I wanted to get the consent of Dave Robinson of Pax Christi USA, my major partner in this endeavor, and this is finally accomplished.

The revised (and hopefully final) text is attached. May we list you as an initial signer? We will then endeavor to get three to five leaders from various denominations plus a few other prominent religious leaders.

Our plan is to mail the letter to the candidates of the Democratic, Republican, Reform, and Green parties on Friday, August 18 after the last nominating convention is over (the Democratic on August 17). We will ask them for a reply by Tuesday, September 5 and then hold a news conference on September 7 to release the results. It will be at the National Press Club in Washington, D.C. Would you be able and willing to participate? We can pay your expenses.

You may reply by e-mail or reach me by phone at 301 896-0013. Thanks for your cooperation.

Shalom,
Howard

###

Letter to U.S. Presidential Candidates from U.S. Religious Leaders

To be sent to nominees of Democratic, Republican, Reform, and Green parties
after the nomination process has been completed (mid-August)

Sample for Vice President Al Gore. To be adapted for other candidates.

Dear Mr. Vice President:

Congratulations on your nomination by the Democratic Party for the office of President of the United States. We look forward to a wholesome debate among the candidates on significant issues that are of great importance to the American people.

Among these issues there is none more important than the future of the world's nuclear arsenal. Our own perspective is that the time has come for the United States to provide creative leadership to achieve the global elimination of nuclear weapons. We hope you share this view.

In this letter we pose a series of questions on this matter. We would greatly appreciate receiving a reply from you by Tuesday, September 5, which is two months before the election. We will hold a news conference on September 7 to release your answers to our questions along with the replies of candidates of the Republican, Reform, and Green parties.

For decades numerous religious denominations, interfaith organizations, and religious leaders have questioned the morality of nuclear weapons and have called for their elimination.

Thus, the Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1983 stated: "We believe that that the time has come when the churches must unequivocally declare that the production and deployment as well as the use of nuclear weapons are a crime against humanity and that such activities must be condemned on ethical and theological grounds. Furthermore, we appeal for the institution of a universal covenant to this effect so that nuclear weapons and warfare are delegitimized and condemned as violations of international law."

Speaking for the Holy See, Archbishop Renato Martino in October 1997 told the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly: "Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21st century. They cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation.... The world must move to the abolition of nuclear weapons through a universal, non-discriminatory ban with intensive inspection by a universal authority."

In a message on January 1, 2000 His Holiness the Dalai Lama called for a step-by-step approach to external disarmament. He stated, "We must first work on the total abolishment of nuclear weapons and gradually work up to total demilitarization throughout the world."

In the United States numerous denominations have called for the elimination of nuclear weapons. Excerpts from these statements are attached. Recently 21 heads of communion and other religious leaders joined with 18 retired general and admirals to point out that "the long-term reliance of nuclear weapons in the arsenals of the nuclear powers, and the ever-present danger of their acquisition by others, is morally untenable and militarily unjustifiable. They constitute a threat to the security of our nation, a peril to world peace, a danger to the whole human family." Therefore, they called for "action leading to the international prohibition of these weapons."

(1) What are your views on the morality of possession, threatened use, and actual use of nuclear weapons? To what extent do you agree or disagree with the broad consensus that has emerged within the faith community on the inherent immorality of nuclear weapons?

(2) We are encouraged that the United States has joined with Russia, United Kingdom, France, and China in making a commitment to "an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals." This occurred in the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). This commitment carries forward the obligation for good faith negotiations on nuclear disarmament as expressed in Article VI of the NPT, an agreement signed by the United States in July 1968 and ratified by the U.S. Senate in March 1969. If elected president, what specifically will you do during your four-year term to fulfill this commitment?

(3) For instance, do you favor multilateral negotiations to achieve a global nuclear weapons convention that provides for total elimination of nuclear weapons within a timebound framework with effective verification and enforcement?

(4) There are interim steps to take in the quest for the elimination of nuclear weapons. For example, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) provides a means of controlling the spread of nuclear weapons. If elected president, will you seek ratification of the CTBT by the United States Senate?

(5) Many experts have pointed out the inherent danger of keeping U.S. and Russian strategic nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert. If elected president, will you embark upon a de-alerting initiative to take strategic weapons off hair-trigger alert? If so, please provide specifics.

(6) During the past fifteen years progress has been made in reduction of nuclear weapons through treaties between the United States and the Soviet Union, then Russia. Two treaties were negotiated under President Ronald Reagan: the Intermediate Nuclear Force (INF) Treaty to eliminate an entire class of nuclear weapons and the first Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START I). Another treaty, START II, was negotiated under President Bush. Russian President Vladimir Putin has indicated a willingness to negotiate a START III agreement to reduce the number of deployed strategic warheads to 1,000 on each side. However, we understand that the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff insist upon keeping 2,500 warheads in active service because of the targeting requirements of current U.S. policy. If elected president, will you change U.S. policy so that deeper bilateral cuts in strategic weapons can occur? Will you negotiate a START III agreement with Russia? What level of strategic warheads will you seek?

(7) Complementary to nuclear arms reduction through treaties is the undertaking of reciprocal initiatives through executive action. This was the approach used by President George Bush in 1991 when he took unilateral action to deactivate a large number of U.S. strategic weapons and to withdraw most U.S. tactical nuclear weapons stationed outside the United States. A few weeks later Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev reciprocated with similar actions. Would you as president use similar reciprocal initiatives to achieve such objectives as de-alerting and significant reductions in the nuclear arsenal? If so, please provide specifics.

(8) We note that numerous retired generals, admirals, and national security civilian officials have indicated that nuclear weapons have no war-fighting utility. (See attached statements.) We also know that Presidents Truman and Eisenhower chose not to use nuclear weapons in the Korean War and that Presidents Johnson and Nixon chose not to use nuclear weapons in the Vietnam War. Do you see any utility for nuclear weapons in war? If so, please tell us the categories of targets you as commander-in-chief would consider legitimate to strike with nuclear weapons.

(9) If your reply indicates that nuclear weapons are useful only to deter other nuclear weapons, would not the wisest and safest course of action be to achieve the universal elimination of nuclear weapons through such measures as previously identified?

(10) Are there other initiatives you plan to undertake for the elimination of nuclear weapons?

We will greatly appreciate your response to these questions by September 5 prior to our news conference on September 7. If your busy schedule permits, a delegation of the signers would welcome an opportunity to meet with you to discuss these issues in greater detail.

Respectfully yours,

Signers

Attachments:

Excerpts from statements by U.S. religious bodies.
Joint Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Statement by military professionals and religious leaders.
Statements of retired military leaders on the lack of utility of nuclear weapons for war-fighting.

Drafted by Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice, with assistance of Dave Robinson, title, Pax Christi USA.

From: "Duane Shank" <dshank@sojourners.com>
TO: "'Howard W. Hallman'" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: Interfaith card on NMD
Date: Wed, 19 Jul 2000 10:09:24 -0400
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook 8.5, Build 4.71.2173.0
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.2106.4
Importance: Normal
X-MDAemon-Deliver-To: mupj@igc.org
X-Return-Path: DShank@sojourners.com

Dear Howard.
Thanks for the note, good to hear from you again.
We're happy to sign on to these sort of things when that is useful,
but really aren't able at this time to commit to attending meetings.
Please keep me informed, and we'll do what we can.
Peace,
Duane

~~~~~  
Duane Shank                      Sojourners/Call to Renewal  
Exec Asst to the Director        2401 15th Street, NW  
202-328-8842, ext. 226            Washington, DC 20009

> -----Original Message-----  
> From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]  
> Sent: Tuesday, July 18, 2000 9:27 AM  
> To: dshank@sojourners.com  
> Subject: Interfaith card on NMD  
>  
>  
> Dear Dwayne,  
>  
> We are pleased that Sojourners is a sponsor of the interfaith  
> postcard on  
> national missile defense (NMD) that was developed jointly by  
> 20/20 Vision  
> and the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair.  
>  
> The Interfaith Committee formed this spring as vehicle for  
> action on series  
> of issues dealing with nuclear disarmament. It builds upon  
> our previous  
> experience in working together for Senate ratification of the  
> Comprehensive  
> Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), a task not yet completed. We are in  
> the process of  
> finalizing a set of questions for congressional candidates on  
> nuclear

> disarmament issues which organizations can use in their  
> contacts during the  
> election campaign. In the fall we will encourage state and local  
> interfaith coalitions to prepare for ongoing contacts with  
> senators and  
> representatives during the next Congress.  
>  
> We invite Sojourners to participate in these activities of  
> the Interfaith  
> Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. Our next meeting will be  
> on Tuesday,  
> September 19 from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. at the Methodist  
> Building, Conference  
> Room 4, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, D.C. We hope that your  
> representative can attend.  
>  
> With best regards,  
> Howard Hallman  
>  
>  
>  
>  
> Howard W. Hallman, Chair  
> Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
> 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036  
> Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail: mupj@igc.org  
>  
> Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a membership  
> association of  
> laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any Methodist  
> denomination.  
>  
>

User-Agent: Microsoft-Outlook-Express-Macintosh-Edition/5.02.2022  
Date: Wed, 19 Jul 2000 14:31:27 +0000  
Subject: Interfaith NMD card and call  
From: Tim Barner <timb@2020vision.org>  
To: Kathy Guthrie <kathy@fcnl.org>,  
Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.org>,  
Greg Laszakovits <glaszakovits\_gb@brethren.org>  
CC: Hop Pham Thi <nmd@2020vision.org>

Howard Hallman  
Greg Luszakovits  
Kathy Guthrie

July 19, 2000

Dear Howard, Greg and Kathy:

The brief letter that will accompany the Thursday, July 20 mailing of our interfaith grassroots NMD card on follows. If you know of any significant group who missed the boat but really wants to use this card ASAP, we could do a reprint with their name edited in, as long as they would pay for the printing. We will not advertise that option.

Our next step at 20/20, other than responding to requests for more cards, is to offer to sponsor a national telephone conference call for the interfaith grassroots community to encourage further NMD work during these crucial weeks.

One idea I had was to make such a call available close to August 6 Hiroshima day as an update for people with church peace events on that day, but that may be rushing not only ourselves, but other national staff or organizers, such as each of you, since you would be the logical conduit for inviting local activists to join the call.

September seems too late because the President's decision could be made by that time.

Do you like the idea? Do you have any suggestion as to the timing and a program objective around which to focus the call if not Hiroshima Day activities.

FYI: Hop Pham-Ti will be leaving on Monday for personal business in Paris, but plans to be back by mid-August at the latest.

Sincerely,

Tim Barner

\*\*\*\*\*

July 19, 2000

Dear \_\_\_\_\_ :

Thank you for your stand in opposing US deployment of a national missile defense and for joining in the collaborative grassroots interfaith card on this issue.

Enclosed are the \_\_\_\_\_ cards that you are distributing to you member or activist list.

As Hop Pham-Thi, our 20/20 Vision NMD Coordinator, has mentioned in phone conversation, we ask that you distribute these cards as quickly as possible. It's important to have a steady flow of letters opposing NMD coming into the White House because President Clinton will receive a Pentagon recommendation regarding NMD deployment by mid-August and could make his decision any time after that report.

The President needs to recognize that a good portion of citizens in faith communities are strongly opposed to the NMD program. Some of you said that you think Sunday, August 6, the day that the atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima, is an appropriate time to oppose a government initiative that risks a new arms race.

We look forward to your feedback and working with you again.

Sincerely,

Tim Barner, Program Director  
Hop Pham-Thi, NMD Campaign Coordinator

To: Tim Barner <timb@2020vision.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: Interfaith NMD card and call  
Cc: kathy@fcnl.org, glaszakovits\_gb@brethren.org  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To: <B59B6C3E.D36%timb@2020vision.org>  
References:

At 02:31 PM 7/19/00 +0000, you wrote:

>  
>Our next step at 20/20, other than responding to requests for more cards, is  
>to offer to sponsor a national telephone conference call for the interfaith  
>grassroots community to encourage further NMD work during these crucial  
>weeks.  
>  
>One idea I had was to make such a call available close to August 6 Hiroshima  
>day as an update for people with church peace events on that day, but that  
>may be rushing not only ourselves, but other national staff or organizers,  
>such as each of you, since you would be the logical conduit for inviting  
>local activists to join the call.  
>  
>September seems too late because the President's decision could be made by  
>that time.  
>  
>Do you like the idea? Do you have any suggestion as to the timing and a  
>program objective around which to focus the call if not Hiroshima Day  
>activities.

Tim,

I have other things on my docket the next six weeks and would not be able to do much to help organize a conference call. However, Kathy or Greg may want to take this on. They can respond accordingly.

As an alternative, I'm willing to send out an inquiry to the 30+ organizations on the contact list of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament to see if any organizations are interested. If they are, they could reply directly to you, and you could take it from there.

If this makes sense to Kathy and Greg, please send me a description of such an initiative, and I'll forward it to our list.

Howard

From: Kathy Guthrie <kathy@fcnl.org>  
To: "'Howard W. Hallman'" <mupj@igc.org>, Tim Barner  
<timb@2020vision.org>  
Cc: Kathy Guthrie <kathy@fcnl.org>, glaszakovits\_gb@brethren.org  
Subject: RE: Interfaith NMD card and call  
Date: Wed, 19 Jul 2000 16:45:38 -0400  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

I think that Howard's idea sounds like a good one. I will not have time to organize this either, but if there were a call, I would be able to put out a message to our constituents alerting them to this opportunity.

Kathy

-----Original Message-----

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]  
Sent: Wednesday, July 19, 2000 4:51 PM  
To: Tim Barner  
Cc: kathy@fcnl.org; glaszakovits\_gb@brethren.org  
Subject: Re: Interfaith NMD card and call

At 02:31 PM 7/19/00 +0000, you wrote:

>  
>Our next step at 20/20, other than responding to requests for more cards,  
is  
>to offer to sponsor a national telephone conference call for the interfaith  
>grassroots community to encourage further NMD work during these crucial  
>weeks.  
>  
>One idea I had was to make such a call available close to August 6  
Hiroshima  
>day as an update for people with church peace events on that day, but that  
>may be rushing not only ourselves, but other national staff or organizers,  
>such as each of you, since you would be the logical conduit for inviting  
>local activists to join the call.  
>  
>September seems too late because the President's decision could be made by  
>that time.  
>  
>Do you like the idea? Do you have any suggestion as to the timing and a  
>program objective around which to focus the call if not Hiroshima Day  
>activities.

Tim,

I have other things on my docket the next six weeks and would not be able to do much to help organize a conference call. However, Kathy or Greg may want to take this on. They can respond accordingly.

As an alternative, I'm willing to send out an inquiry to the 30+ organizations on the contact list of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear

Disarmament to see if any organizations are interested. If they are, they could reply directly to you, and you could take it from there.

If this makes sense to Kathy and Greg, please send me a description of such an initiative, and I'll forward it to our list.

Howard

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Methodists United for Peace with Justice

1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036

Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail: [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org)

Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a membership association of laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any Methodist denomination.

To: jwyerman@2020vision.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Thanks  
Cc: timb@2020vision.org, nmd@2020vision.org  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Dear Jim,

Now that the interfaith postcards on national missile defense are ready for distribution, I want to thank all of you at 20/20 Vision for your contribution to this cooperative venture. Hop Tham-Thi did a fantastic job of keeping track of the details, making contact with many of the groups on our list, and finding a few additional ones on her own. Your other staff have the knowledge and experience in getting the cards printed. And you have the funds to pay for the printing. It's a great deal for us!

At a planning meeting on May 22 the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament decided to focus on NMD. Hop and Tim Barner came to our next meeting on June 22 with an offer to get out the postcard. We readily accepted, and the project took off from there. We are glad to say that about 90 percent of the organizations participating in the Interfaith Committee signed on.

So we have picked up again on the cooperative working relationship we had in the CTBT campaign. I look forward to other joint activities in the future.

Shalom,  
Howard

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express Macintosh Edition - 4.5 (0410)

Date: Wed, 19 Jul 2000 17:58:07 -0400

Subject: Re: Thanks

From: "James K. Wyerman" <JWyerman@2020vision.org>

To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>

CC: Tim Barner <timb@2020vision.org>  
, Hop NMD <NMD@2020vision.org>

Thanks, Howard, for your kind words and also for your extensive involvement in helping us get this card out with such a good response. Although we initially had some concerns as to whether faith groups would sign on to NMD opposition as readily as they did to CTBT, it was interesting and encouraging to see that we got an even stronger response on the NMD faith card than on our CTBT faith card. 28 faith groups, committing to send out 20,000 cards is a great response. This shows progress that all of us can take some encouragement from. Now, we'd like to maintain the dialogue and assess what more we can do, beyond the card, to promote the issue within the faith community. We welcome your suggestions on that, and look forward to continued work with you. Jim

-----  
>From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
>To: jwyerman@2020vision.org  
>Subject: Thanks  
>Date: Wed, Jul 19, 2000, 5:16 PM  
>

> Dear Jim,

>  
> Now that the interfaith postcards on national missile defense are ready for  
> distribution, I want to thank all of you at 20/20 Vision for your  
> contribution to this cooperative venture. Hop Tham-Thi did a fantastic job  
> of keeping track of the details, making contact with many of the groups on  
> our list, and finding a few additional ones on her own. Your other staff  
> have the knowledge and experience in getting the cards printed. And you  
> have the funds to pay for the printing. It's a great deal for us!  
>  
> At a planning meeting on May 22 the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear  
> Disarmament decided to focus on NMD. Hop and Tim Barner came to our next  
> meeting on June 22 with an offer to get out the postcard. We readily  
> accepted, and the project took off from there. We are glad to say that  
> about 90 percent of the organizations participating in the Interfaith  
> Committee signed on.

>  
> So we have picked up again on the cooperative working relationship we had  
> in the CTBT campaign. I look forward to other joint activities in the future.

>  
> Shalom,  
> Howard

>  
> Howard W. Hallman, Chair  
> Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
> 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036

> Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail: mupj@igc.org

>

> Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a membership association of  
> laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any Methodist denomination.

>

X-eGroups-Return: sentto-1413460-962-964052007-mupj=igc.apc.org@returns.onelist.com  
X-Sender: abolition2000@abolition2000.org  
To: abolition-caucus@egroups.com  
From: Abolition 2000 <admin@abolition2000.org>  
Mailing-List: list abolition-caucus@egroups.com; contact abolition-caucus-owner@egroups.com  
Delivered-To: mailing list abolition-caucus@egroups.com  
List-Unsubscribe: <mailto:abolition-caucus-unsubscribe@egroups.com>  
Date: Wed, 19 Jul 2000 16:24:20 -0800  
Subject: [abolition-caucus] DISARMAMENT AGENDA AGREED AT 2000 NPT REVIEW CONFERENCE

Dear Abolition 2000 Network Members,

In the next few weeks, you will be receiving a mailing compiled by the Abolition 2000 Coordinating Committee. Below you will find a post-NPT report, which is included in the mailing and written by John Burroughs, a member of the ACC and executive director of the Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy.

Also, in the mailing, you will find the next steps that the network is taking to continue its work. Look for updates in upcoming editions of the Abolition 2000 Grassroots Newsletter.

Thank you for your continued support.

In peace and solidarity,  
Carah Ong

DISARMAMENT AGENDA AGREED AT  
2000 NPT REVIEW CONFERENCE  
By John Burroughs  
Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy

On 20 May 2000, the sixth Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Review Conference, meeting at the UN headquarters in New York, produced the first consensus review statement since 1985 (see <http://www.basicint.org/nuclear/revcon2000/Finaltext.htm>). Coming five years after the treaty was extended indefinitely and the Abolition 2000 Network was founded, the outcome surpassed the low expectations coming into the Conference. No serious timebound commitments were made, and many of the agreed policies and principles are sufficiently vague so that whether progress has been achieved in coming years will be open to dispute. Still, under the influence of the New Agenda Coalition and civil society, 2000 differed from 1995 in that the Conference established a comprehensive agenda for disarmament. If the NPT Review Process is to avoid becoming an irrelevant sideshow, that agenda must now be acted upon.

The most remarked upon provision was an "unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear-weapons States to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals leading to nuclear disarmament to which all states are committed under Article VI." For the first time in the 30 years since the NPT entered into force in 1970, the nuclear weapon states did not use qualifiers such as "ultimate goal" or a linkage with "general and complete" disarmament. This provision was the bottom line of the New Agenda Coalition states (Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, South Africa, and Sweden),

which took the lead in negotiating with the nuclear weapon states. Meanwhile, back in Washington, plans continue for the maintenance of large nuclear forces for the "foreseeable future". Other nuclear weapon states have similar policies at home, if not in New York.

Other "practical steps for the systematic and progressive efforts to implement Article VI" include "concrete agreed measures to further reduce the operational status of nuclear weapons systems", and "a diminishing role for nuclear weapons in security policies to minimize the risk that these weapons ever be used and to facilitate the process of their total elimination". These provisions reflect the demands of NGOs for marginalization of nuclear weapons through dealerting and the rejection of deterrence doctrines as the process of disarmament proceeds.

Ironically, during the Conference, diplomatic talking points released by The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists revealed that US negotiators advised Russia that keeping its nuclear forces on alert is a good idea. Under "any possible future arms control agreement," the talking points say, Russia (like the United States), could maintain on "constant" alert a "large, diversified, viable arsenal", sufficient to mount an "annihilating counterattack" in response to a US first strike, regardless of any "limited" US national missile defense system. And in February, the US Defense Department 2000 report described an expanded role for nuclear weapons, "to deter any potential adversary from using or threatening to use nuclear, chemical, or biological (NBC) weapons and as a hedge against defeat of US conventional forces in defense of vital interests". Britain, France, and Russia all also have doctrines of first use, the first two like the United States in defense of "vital interests".

Additional notable provisions of the NPT agenda include a moratorium on nuclear-weapons-test explosions pending entry-into-force of the CTBT; "increased transparency by the nuclear-weapon States with regard to their nuclear weapons capabilities"; "further reduction of non-strategic nuclear weapons"; "the engagement as soon as appropriate of all the nuclear-weapon States in the process leading to the total elimination of their nuclear weapons"; "the principle of irreversibility to apply to nuclear disarmament"; "the necessity of establishing in the Conference on Disarmament an appropriate subsidiary body with a mandate to deal with nuclear disarmament"; and "the further development of the verification capabilities that will be required to provide assurance of compliance with nuclear disarmament agreements for the achievement and maintenance of a nuclear-weapon-free world".

Unfortunately, the Conference did not squarely address the problems of missile proliferation and defense. For example, though a Russian proposal for a global missile monitoring and non-proliferation regime pointed in the right direction, the Conference did not call for the development of a missile control and elimination regime. Instead, the Conference referred to "preserving and strengthening" the US-Russian Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty, the position adopted by the nuclear weapon states. The United States apparently believes that amending the treaty to permit national missile defense would "strengthen" the treaty!

Also, unlike the 1995 Principles and Objectives, which specifically and

unambiguously set 1996 as the year by which a CTBT should be negotiated, the 2000 final document sets no clear timelines. 2005 is stated to be the year by which a fissile materials treaty should be completed, but this is tied to the consensus adoption of a program of work in the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. But China, which is concerned about US plans for ballistic missile defense and may wish therefore to produce more fissile material to support an arsenal build-up, has been insisting that negotiations on a fissile materials treaty be accompanied by opening of negotiations on nuclear disarmament and on prevention of an arms race in outer space. In its closing statement, China said that the ABM Treaty is coming under great challenge and the danger of weaponization in outer space is increasing. Russia similarly stated that without the ABM Treaty, it will be impossible to make progress towards nuclear disarmament.

Other gaps in the agenda include a lack of any initiatives to respond to the overt nuclearization of South Asia and Israel's continuing reliance on the nuclear threat, and a failure to support non-nuclear sources of energy. Instead there was a ritualistic invocation of the "inalienable right" to nuclear power, ignoring its role, openly proclaimed in some states, most recently Turkey, as the foundation for weapons programs. Regarding the final document's ambiguous identification of "sustainable development as a guiding principle for the peaceful use of nuclear energy", Germany, Austria, and Denmark each made clear that nuclear power does not contribute to "sustainable development".

Abolition 2000 was a strong presence at the Conference, organizing a rally, presenting petitions to the Chair, releasing a special NPT edition of the Abolition 2000 report card, and holding a press conference. And Abolition 2000 member groups released policy papers, participated in the NGO presentations to the diplomats (see <http://www.igc.org/disarm/nptngo2k.html>), and put on numerous dynamic panels, covering topics such as ballistic missile defense, the role of scientists, expanded laboratory capabilities, health and environmental effects of nuclearism, the model nuclear weapons convention, strategies for disarmament, and Russian anti-nuclear environmental activism. Several individual members of Abolition 2000 organizations served as NGO representatives on government delegations. But despite the efforts of Canada and other governments to obtain a greater role for civil society representatives in monitoring and participating in review proceedings, the Conference was able to agree only to institutionalize the practice of devoting a session of each PrepCom and Review Conference to NGO presentations.

Carah Lynn Ong  
Coordinator, Abolition 2000

"He aha te nui mea o te ao? He tangata, he tangata, he tangata" (A Maori saying)

Translation: "What is the most important thing in the world? It is the

people, the people, the people."

PMB 121, 1187 Coast Village Rd, Suite 121  
Santa Barbara, California 93108  
Tel: (805) 965-3443 Fax: (805) 568-0466  
email: [admin@abolition2000.org](mailto:admin@abolition2000.org)  
URL: <http://www.abolition2000.org>

---

Old school buds here:  
[http://click.egroups.com/1/7081/3/\\_/91925/\\_/964052007/](http://click.egroups.com/1/7081/3/_/91925/_/964052007/)

---

To subscribe to the Abolition Global Caucus, send an email from the account you wish to be subscribed to: "abolition-caucus-subscribe@egroups.com"

Do not include a subject line or any text in the body of the message.

From: pastdue@mindspring.com  
Date: Thu, 20 Jul 2000 03:25:02 -0400 (EDT)  
To: mupj@igc.org  
Subject: Important: Past Due Notice  
X-Hercules-ID: mupj@igc.org

Dear Howard W. Hallman,

This message is in regard to your EarthLink account #2028691. According to our records, your account is past due and has a balance of \$31.90. We have not received a payment to bring your outstanding balance up to date.

We send invoices monthly via email and/or the US Postal service. If you're receiving this letter via the US Postal service and have not yet received an invoice, chances are we've been sending invoices to you via email. If you do not use email, and prefer to receive invoices via the US Postal service from now on, please contact our Customer Service department. There is an additional \$1 monthly charge for paper invoices. The Customer Service department can be reached at (404) 815-9111 or (800) 719-4660 Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 a.m. ET; Saturday and Sunday from 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. ET.

This correspondence is to inform you of your past due status. Please make a payment to your account to avoid inactivation and be sure to include your account number (2028691).

If you have just recently sent payment or provided current credit card information, please disregard this message. If you'd like to provide current credit card information, you can do so by clicking on "Credit Card" at the following web page:

<http://www.mindspring.com/acct-mgmt/index.html>

Despite our best efforts, billing errors can occur. If you believe you have received this notice in error, please provide us information that will help us resolve this matter as soon as possible by sending email to pastdue@mindspring.com or calling Customer Service at one of the numbers listed above.

We value you as a customer and would like to continue serving you.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

The EarthLink Accounting Group

Remit Payments to:  
EarthLink, Inc.  
PO Box 7645  
Atlanta, GA 30357-0645



To: nmd@2020vision.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Input to news release  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Dear Hop,

Here is a draft of a statement for inclusion in your news release. You may cut and edit as you choose. However, I would like to review the final draft before it is released.

Howard

###

Statement on interfaith card on NMD by Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament.

There is widespread feeling within the faith community that deployment of national missile defense is ill-advised. It seeks a technological fix for problems best solved through multilateral diplomacy. It risks starting a new nuclear arms race. The cost of unproven national missile defense is exorbitant and wastes resources better used to meet human and community needs. For these reasons 28 faith-based organizations have joined together in sending out the postcard alert opposing national missile defense.

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament is a coalition of faith-based organizations working together for the elimination of nuclear weapons.

You can add, though it's not totally necessary:

Hallman is also chair of Methodists United for Peace with Justice, a national association of laity and clergy.

To: "Carah Ong" <admin@abolition2000.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Duplicate postings  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Dear Carah,

Do you handle the abolition-usa list serve? I receive two of ever posting. Somebody has suggested that this may because I am on the list-serve twice: as mupj@igc.org and mupj@igc.apc.org. If this is true, please remove the latter listing.

Thanks,  
Howard Hallman

To: phil  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Important: Past Due Notice  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Phil,

Apparently we didn't pay the bill for June. Maybe I neglected to send it to you. At any rate the bill I recently forwarded to you included the past due bill for a total of \$31.90.

Howard

>From: pastdue@mindspring.com  
>Date: Thu, 20 Jul 2000 03:25:02 -0400 (EDT)  
>To: mupj@igc.org  
>Subject: Important: Past Due Notice  
>X-Hercules-ID: mupj@igc.org

>  
>Dear Howard W. Hallman,

>  
>This message is in regard to your EarthLink account #2028691.  
>According to our records, your account is past due and has a balance  
>of \$31.90. We have not received a payment to bring your  
>outstanding balance up to date.

>  
>We send invoices monthly via email and/or the US Postal service. If  
>you're receiving this letter via the US Postal service and have not  
>yet received an invoice, chances are we've been sending invoices to  
>you via email. If you do not use email, and prefer to receive  
>invoices via the US Postal service from now on, please contact our  
>Customer Service department. There is an additional \$1 monthly  
>charge for paper invoices. The Customer Service department can be  
>reached at (404) 815-9111 or (800) 719-4660 Monday through Friday  
>from 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 a.m. ET; Saturday and Sunday from 8:00 a.m.  
>to 10:00 p.m. ET.

>  
>This correspondence is to inform you of your past due status.  
>Please make a payment to your account to avoid inactivation and be  
>sure to include your account number (2028691).

>  
>If you have just recently sent payment or provided current credit  
>card information, please disregard this message. If you'd like to  
>provide current credit card information, you can do so by clicking  
>on "Credit Card" at the following web page:

> <http://www.mindspring.com/acct-mgmt/index.html>

>  
>Despite our best efforts, billing errors can occur. If you believe  
>you have received this notice in error, please provide us

>information that will help us resolve this matter as soon as  
>possible by sending email to [pastdue@mindspring.com](mailto:pastdue@mindspring.com) or calling  
>Customer Service at one of the numbers listed above.

>  
>We value you as a customer and would like to continue serving you.

>  
>Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

>  
>Sincerely,

>  
>The EarthLink Accounting Group

>  
>  
>Remit Payments to:

>EarthLink, Inc.

>PO Box 7645

>Atlanta, GA 30357-0645

>  
>

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express for Macintosh - 4.01 (295)

Date: Thu, 20 Jul 2000 10:46:35 -0400

Subject: Re: Input to news release

From: "NMD" <NMD@2020vision.org>

To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>

Thank you, Howard for the quote. I will definitely have you review the last draft.

Reverend Siler is willing to prepare his own quote, and I did email him yours as a reference.

Please let me know if there are publications where you would like to see our press release published.

Rev. Siler did not receive your email sending the sponsors list. He assumes that you emailed it to Mark Brown. I emailed the list to him. For future needs, his email is: russ.siler@ecunet.org

Peace to you.

Hop.

>From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>

>To: nmd@2020vision.org

>Subject: Input to news release

>Date: Thu, Jul 20, 2000, 1:22 PM

>

>Dear Hop,

>

>Here is a draft of a statement for inclusion in your news release. You may  
>cut and edit as you choose. However, I would like to review the final  
>draft before it is released.

>

>Howard

>

>###

>

>Statement on interfaith card on NMD by Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Interfaith  
>Committee for Nuclear Disarmament.

>

>There is widespread feeling within the faith community that deployment of  
>national missile defense is ill-advised. It seeks a technological fix for  
>problems best solved through multilateral diplomacy. It risks starting a  
>new nuclear arms race. The cost of unproven national missile defense is  
>exorbitant and wastes resources better used to meet human and community  
>needs. For these reasons 28 faith-based organizations have joined together  
>in sending out the postcard alert opposing national missile defense.

>

>The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament is a coalition of  
>faith-based organizations working together for the elimination of nuclear  
>weapons.

>  
>You can add, though it's not totally necessary:  
>Hallman is also chair of Methodists United for Peace with Justice, a  
>national association of laity and clergy.  
>  
>Howard W. Hallman, Chair  
>Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
>1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036  
>Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail: mupj@igc.org  
>  
>Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a membership association of  
>laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any Methodist denomination.  
>

To: kmartin@fourthfreedom.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Statements by military leaders  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Dear Kevin,

I'm looking for statements from retired generals and admirals who say that nuclear weapons have no utility in war-fighting, especially with specific examples. Can you provide me some statements like this or reference to sources? I want to use such statements along with policy statements on morality of nuclear weapons from various faith groups.

The fullest statement I have is a 1984 article by Admiral Noel Gayler.

At the news conference at the National Cathedral in June General Charles Horner responded to a reporter's question by saying how in the Gulf War he realized that nuclear weapons had no usefulness on the battlefield. Unfortunately there is no transcript available. In *The Gift of Time* Jonathan Schell has a quote from General Horner on the Gulf War. Perhaps Horner has developed this further elsewhere.

General Lee Butler may have spoken on this matter, but the speeches of his that I have don't touch on this issue.

You may know of other generals and admirals who have spoken on the matter of utility.

I will appreciate any help you can give me.

Shalom,  
Howard

To: stevenson@gsinstitute.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Statements by military leaders  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Dear Tyler,

I'm looking for statements from retired generals and admirals who say that nuclear weapons have no utility in war-fighting, especially with specific examples. Can you provide me some statements like this or reference to sources? I want to use such statements along with policy statements on morality of nuclear weapons from various faith groups.

The fullest statement I have is a 1984 article by Admiral Noel Gayler.

At the news conference at the National Cathedral in June General Charles Horner responded to a reporter's question by saying how in the Gulf War he realized that nuclear weapons had no usefulness on the battlefield. Unfortunately there is no transcript available. In *The Gift of Time* Jonathan Schell has a quote from General Horner on the Gulf War. Perhaps Horner has developed this further elsewhere.

General Lee Butler may have spoken on this matter, but the speeches of his that I have don't touch on this issue.

You may know of other generals and admirals who have spoken on the matter of utility.

I will appreciate any help you can give me.

Shalom,  
Howard

To: bblair@cdi.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Statements by military leaders  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Dear Bruce,

I'm looking for statements from retired generals and admirals who say that nuclear weapons have no utility in war-fighting, especially with specific examples. Would someone on your staff be able to provide me some statements like this or reference to sources? I want to use such statements along with policy statements on morality of nuclear weapons from various faith groups.

The fullest statement I have is a 1984 article by Admiral Noel Gayler.

At the news conference at the National Cathedral in June General Charles Horner responded to a reporter's question by saying how in the Gulf War he realized that nuclear weapons had no usefulness on the battlefield. Unfortunately there is no transcript available. In *The Gift of Time* Jonathan Schell has a quote from General Horner on the Gulf War. Perhaps Horner has developed this further elsewhere.

General Lee Butler may have spoken on this matter, but the speeches of his that I have don't touch on this issue.

You may know of other generals and admirals who have spoken on the matter of utility.

I will appreciate any help you can give me.

Shalom,  
Howard

User-Agent: Microsoft Outlook Express Macintosh Edition - 5.0 (1513)  
Date: Thu, 20 Jul 2000 09:33:28 -0700  
Subject: Re: Statements by military leaders  
From: "[GSI] Tyler Stevenson" <stevenson@gsinstitute.org>  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>

Dear Howard,

General Charles Horner said "The nuclear weapon is obsolete. I want to get rid of them all." That's an exact quote, but I don't know where it came from. He has made several general statements regarding the military utility of nuclear weapons in the Gulf War, declaring that we had all the conventional deterrent we needed to keep Hussein from using chemical weapons. He also cited one of the criteria for the use of nuclear weapons in the Gulf, which was the lighting of the oil fields; this happened and, quite clearly, we refrained from using weapons.

You might also hunt down a statement regarding the P-5 powers' willingness to withdraw from or lose a conventional war without resorting to nuclear weapons. I can't remember who said it or when, but I'll ask around and see if I can track it down for you.

Pax,  
Tyler

User-Agent: Microsoft Outlook Express Macintosh Edition - 5.0 (1513)  
Date: Thu, 20 Jul 2000 09:42:32 -0700  
Subject: Re: Statements by military leaders  
From: "[GSI] Tyler Stevenson" <stevenson@gsinstitute.org>  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>

Dear Howard,

Two more that may be of use by Lee Butler:

The first is is excerpted from a speech he made November 22, 1998 at the Kennedy Library in Boston. The full text follows.

"...nuclear weapons are not weapons at all. They are insanely destructive agents of physical and genetic terror, whose effects transcend time and space, poisoning the earth and deforming its inhabitants for generation upon generation."

This second is from his speech to the National Press Club in February 1998. Full text follows.

"What better illustration of misplaced faith in nuclear deterrence than the persistent belief that retaliation with nuclear weapons is a legitimate and appropriate response to post-cold war threats posed by weapons of mass destruction. What could possibly justify our resort to the very means we properly abhor and condemn? Who can imagine our joining in shattering the precedent of non-use that has held for over fifty years? How could America's irreplaceable role as leader of the campaign against nuclear proliferation ever be re-justified? What target would warrant such retaliation? Would we hold an entire society accountable for the decision of a single demented leader? How would the physical effects of the nuclear explosion be contained, not to mention the political and moral consequences? In a singular act we would martyr our enemy, alienate our friends, give comfort to the non-declared nuclear states and impetus to states who seek such weapons covertly. In short, such a response on the part of the United States is inconceivable. It would irretrievably diminish our priceless stature as a nation noble in aspiration and responsible in conduct, even in the face of extreme provocation.

--Tyler

JFK LIBRARY, BOSTON  
NOVEMBER 22, 1998

Good afternoon ladies and gentlemen, and thank you, Pierce, for your comments. I must confess, however, that I find myself left with decidedly mixed emotions. I've never before been introduced by a man my wife is in love with. On that score, my dear 007, I might remind you that in my last position while on active duty I might arguably have borne the titleŠ001.

I should say in the same breath that you have extraordinary taste in female

admirers. You could not have a more loyal and devoted fan than Dorene Sue Nunley Butler, this talented, blond, Catholic dancer from California who chose me over a life of fame and fortune on the stage. Her reward for that fateful decision was to hang curtains in 28 different homes in our 33 years of life together in the Air Force. Our mutual prize was two extraordinary children and three enchanting grandchildren who collectively are the light of our lives.

Dorene and I are delighted to be back in Boston in the company of old friends and many new ones. Our first granddaughter, Madison Anne, was born here while son Brett was earning an MBA at Harvard Business School. I had the privilege of taking somewhat shorter courses at the business school and the Kennedy School, and value greatly the memories and the friendships from those endeavors.

It is equally a privilege to be your speaker this afternoon in this magnificent setting. I am indebted to the Lawyers Alliance for World Security for this recognition, and inspired by their intelligent, responsible efforts to reduce nuclear dangers. Those of us who have been in the arena, especially Ambassador Tom Graham, do not take the role of critic lightly. We are keenly aware of the constraints, the obstacles and the frustrations that confront the policymaker.

At the same time, we are equally seized by a sense of profound dismay, of opportunity lost, of danger prolonged, that the creative dimension of leadership has been displaced by the cautious underreach of the bureaucracy. In this 35th anniversary year of the signing of the Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty, who cannot yearn for the vision, the eloquence and above all the sense of personal accountability of a John F. Kennedy? He understood intuitively what legions of experts discounted, or ignored: that the prospect of nuclear war was intolerable.

That is precisely the understanding that compelled me from the blessed anonymity of retired life into the role of public critic of the nuclear weapon states and what I judge to be their irresponsible and potentially disastrous perpetuation of the most acute risks of the Cold War era.

This is not a role that I sought, relish or ever imagined. I became an instant icon of the abolition movement, about which I knew very little, in many respects admire, but with some elements of which I have sharp disagreements. I am besieged with invitations to speak, to appear, to write books and to otherwise take on a broader role I did not want and with which I am very conflicted. I frequently remind the more ardent critics of U.S. foreign and security policy who come to me for support that I was the co-author with Colin Powell of a post-Cold War military strategy premised on robust conventional forces and an unswerving U.S. commitment to global leadership.

No, this is not about notoriety, which is highly intrusive, nor personal income, which I do not need. I have no unfulfilled professional aspirations. My military career was supremely satisfying, my business career was instructive and rewarding and Dorene and I treasure our privacy.

Why then, you may very well ask, do I persist, however reluctantly, in this very public role of critic and in a more private role as advisor to policymakers who seek my views? Most simply put, because with every passing day I am increasingly convinced and concerned that the world has yet to grasp the elemental truths and the acute penalties which inform my condemnation of nuclear weapons.

I have labored as diligently as time and other responsibilities permit over the past two years to detail these truths and penalties, and more importantly, to understand the powerful forces that lead societies to tolerate, accept, embrace and even to celebrate nuclear weapons.

My efforts have been instructed and encouraged by the responses of both proponents and opponents of my public commentary. Ultimately, however, the several judgments that now follow are the product of deep and often painful reflection on nearly four decades of experience as a nuclear strategist, policymaker, planner and commander.

First, that from the earliest days of the nuclear era the risks, costs and consequences have never been properly understood nor calculated by the theorists, the planners and the poised practitioners of nuclear war.

Second, that nuclear weapons are not weapons at all. They are insanely destructive agents of physical and genetic terror, whose effects transcend time and space, poisoning the earth and deforming its inhabitants for generation upon generation.

Third, that the stakes of nuclear war engage not just the survival of the antagonists but the fate of mankind.

Fourth, that the prospect of shearing away entire societies has no military nor political justification.

Fifth, that the fateful decision of governments to acquire nuclear weapons ushers in a vast enterprise whose scope and complexity will inevitably move beyond the power of any individual or central authority to manage or to control.

Sixth, that despite the ringing rhetoric of deterrence, the mammoth organizations, with their gargantuan appetites, that make up the enterprise of nuclear weapons capability, are powerfully disposed toward greater numbers, enhanced destructiveness, more dangerous postures and first use in a crisis or conflict.

Seventh, that in the nuclear age, the increasingly convoluted prescriptions of deterrence became a formula for unmitigated disaster. Because the consequences of failure were intolerable, the quest for advantage was relentless, igniting cycle after cycle of trepidation, worst case assumptions and a reckless proliferation of nuclear devices and delivery systems.

Eighth, that nuclear weapons prey upon our deepest fears and pander to our darkest instincts. They thrive in the emotional climate born of utter

alienation and isolation. They are the natural accomplice of visceral enmity. The unbounded wantonness of their effects is a perfect companion to the urge to destroy completely.

And, finally, that after decades of accommodating to their hideous presence, we have come to accept them as commonplace, inured to their consequences and perpetuating virtually unchanged the frightful policies, practices and postures of the Cold War. I find this incomprehensible and morally intolerable.

The penalties imposed on the nuclear weapon states have been severe. They have been especially so in our own society, corroding our sense of humanity, numbing our capacity for moral outrage and undermining the essential mechanisms of the democratic process. As President Kennedy remarked to Dean Rusk after his first formal briefing on the consequences of a general nuclear war, "and we call ourselves the human race."

Over the long, dark nightmare of the Cold War, the forces of fear, ignorance, greed, power, arrogance and secrecy invaded, weakened and subverted the most basic elements of democratic dialogue, debate and decision-making. From its earliest days, the piercing light of dispassionate scrutiny was shuttered in the name of security, doubts dismissed in the name of an acute and unrelenting threat, objections overruled by the solemn innovation of vital national interests.

I have seen the price of such folly at close hand, been party to it, railed against it, and struggle still to understand its origins. But, I do understand the consequences and they are chilling. Vitaly important decisions were routinely taken without adequate understanding; assertions too often prevailed over analysis; requirements took on organizational biases; technological opportunity and corporate profits drove force levels and capability; and political opportunism intruded on calculations of military necessity. Authority and accountability were severed, policy dissociated from planning, and theory invalidated by practice. The narrow concerns of a multitude of powerful interests intruded on the rightful role of key policymakers, constraining their latitude for decision. Many were purposefully denied access to critical information essential to the proper exercise of their office.

These are harsh lessons. They go directly to the proposition, that for me lies at the heart of the matter and underwrites Article VI of the Nonproliferation Treaty: that the dictates of state sovereignty and supreme national interest cannot impose arbitrary limits on the establishment of global norms and sanctions promoting decent, civilized behavior and prohibiting reckless, destructive behavior that threatens our planetary welfare.

Given this perspective, I want to make clear that for me the goal of eliminating nuclear weapons as legitimate instruments of national power is not an endpoint, it is a waypoint. It is an essential precondition to a state of moral grace that, having rejected the wholesale slaughter of human beings as an acceptable resort, is moving instead toward global endorsement of the rule of law. I would argue that goal will remain beyond our moral

reach so long as we continue to cloak nuclear weapons as agents of stability, as if their possession somehow conveyed wisdom and forbearance, immunity from the rages of implacable hostility and clarity in the grip of crisis. We cannot at once hold sacred the gift of life and sacrosanct the capacity to destroy it utterly. Otherwise we fall victim to Stalin's horrific homely that we live in an age where the death of a single individual is a tragedy and the death of millions is a statistic.

It matters enormously that we finally regard nuclear weapons for what they are: the antithesis of hope and aspiration, destroyers of civilizations, purveyors of global ruination.

But how then, do we break free from the present dismal circumstances that we have invited by clinging so tenaciously to the fears and beliefs, the cautions and calculus, the policy and postures of a bygone era?

How is it we tolerate the spectacle of an arms control agreement held hostage to sovereign gridlock, its core numerical ceiling of 3500 operational weapons grossly excessive to the security needs of either party and indeed already well beyond the reach of a Russian strategic nuclear force in growing distress?

How is it we accept the reality of thousands of nuclear warheads still poised on high states of alert, ready for launch on a moment's notice? What can possibly justify this foolish, risky, costly and irrelevant posture? What could possibly send a more threatening, confusing and counter-productive message to a Russia sliding into chaos, fearful and suspicious of western intentions, yet desperately needing our resources and our good will?

How is it that NATO, having made what is in my strategic view the highly regrettable decision to expand toward Russia's collapsed western flank, insists upon retaining a nuclear weapons policy and posture that is wholly out of touch with its new security circumstances. Is it any wonder that Russia has abandoned its "no first use" policy, perversely earning the criticism of a NATO that refuses steadfastly to itself adopt such a policy despite it's now overwhelming conventional advantage?

But most importantly, what explains the intellectual and political paralysis in the nuclear weapon states that not only chills new thinking on these issues but actively penalizes it? The looming historical judgment of this community of political elites is that it proved unworthy of its era, incapable of seizing the moment so desperately sought, of exploiting the extraordinary opportunity for which we risked so much for so long.

This is a stunning turn of events. It suggests a major dislocation between the attitudes, habits and modalities conditioned by Cold War security concerns and the challenges, needs and opportunities of the global village that is emerging in its wake. Clearly, that is the case with respect to the incremental, numbers driven and exquisitely detailed approach to nuclear arms control enshrined in the SALT and START negotiations. What matters far more now are the policies, postures and practices that incentivize proliferation, perpetuate enmity, prolong risk and divert precious resources. Separation of warheads from delivery systems, cessation of testing and fissile material production, inventory transparency and

accounting, no first use declarations, nuclear free zones and most importantly, a genuine commitment to elimination over the longer term are far more useful than arbitrary, incremental reductions over absurdly prolonged intervals.

New thinking on these and a host of other issues of planetary significance is of utmost urgency. If such thinking will not or worse cannot come from governments, then it must instead come from the rich resources of intellectual capital present in every society, and so abundantly in our own. Whether in the great universities, among which Harvard and M.I.T. rank with such eminence; the laboratories endowed with such brilliance; the NGOs that continue to flourish and to attract remarkable talent; the foundations, councils, centers and institutes who sponsor and nourish individual genius, our nation has an infinite capacity to marshal its intellectual, economic and moral power.

Our present circumstances are not dire, but they are urgent. In the end it may matter little whether we poison our planet spontaneously, in a spasm of nuclear conflict; or incrementally, by rendering its climate incapable of supporting human life. In either case, the larger issue is that of free will, whether we shall choose to be crass and self-indulgent or noble and altruistic; savage and destructive, or civilized and decent; grasping and deceitful or generous and ethical. For myself, I choose to be optimistic despite my present dismay. I have only to contemplate the innate and profound goodness of my wife, the transporting innocence of our grandchildren and the radiant integrity of their parents to know the prospects and the promise of humanity. My challenge is simply to be worthy of their potential and deserving of their trust.

Thank you and may God help us all as we labor to create a more hopeful future and a more decent world.

"THE RISKS OF NUCLEAR DETERRENCE: FROM SUPER POWERS TO ROGUE LEADERS"  
An Address by General Lee Butler  
The National Press Club  
Washington, D.C.  
February 2, 1998

Thank you, and good afternoon ladies and gentlemen. Dorene and I are honored by your presence and gratified by your welcome. Although we are now proud residents of Nebraska -- note the obligatory display of home team colors -- Dorene and I feel very much at home in this city. I see many familiar faces in this audience, which makes the moment all the more special.

I have two roles to serve this afternoon, both very much akin to the events marking my appearance here just over a year ago. As your speaker, I intend to address two matters that go to the heart of the debate over the role of nuclear weapons: why these artifacts of the cold war continue to hold us in thrall; and the severe penalties and risks entailed by policies of deterrence as practiced in the nuclear age.

But first, it is my privilege to announce a compelling addition to the roster of distinguished international figures who have joined their voices in calling publicly for the abolition of nuclear weapons. Last year General Goodpaster and I unveiled a list of some 60 retired generals and admirals from a host of nations who declared their strong conviction that the world would be better served by the total elimination of these weapons. Today, at a press conference following my remarks, Senator Alan Cranston and I will present the names of more than one hundred present and former heads of state and other senior civilian leaders who have signed their names to a powerful statement of common concern regarding nuclear weapons and who have endorsed a reasoned path toward abolition.

The willingness of this extraordinary assembly to speak so publicly and directly to these issues is very much in keeping with what I have experienced since I became engaged in the abolition debate some two years ago. I have met legions of remarkable men and women from every corner of the earth who have labored long and patiently in this cause. Their ranks have now been swelled by tens of millions of citizens of our planet who reject the prospect of living in perpetuity under a nuclear sword of Damocles.

My purpose in entering the debate was to help legitimize abolition as an alternative worthy of serious and urgent consideration. My premise was that my unique experience in the nuclear weapons arena might help kindle greater antipathy for these horrific devices and the policies which justify their retention by the nuclear weapon states. My purpose this afternoon is to share with you the abiding concern I harbor about the course of the debate. I accepted the press club invitation because I believe this forum is well suited to speak to that concern. In so doing, I intend to render a much more explicit account than I have given to date of the lessons I have drawn from over thirty years of intimate involvement with nuclear weapons.

Permit me, however, to preface my remarks by postulating that with respect to legitimizing the prospect of abolition, there is much to applaud on the positive side of the ledger. Nuclear issues now compete more strongly for the attention of policy makers and the media that often shapes their interest. Converts are being won on many fronts to the propositions that these issues matter, that nuclear arsenals can and should be sharply reduced, that high alert postures are a dangerous anachronism, that first use policies are an affront to democratic values, and that proliferation of nuclear weapons is a clear and present danger. I am persuaded that in every corner of the planet, the tide of public sentiment is now running strongly in favor of diminishing the role of nuclear weapons. Indeed, I am convinced that most publics are well out in front of their governments in shaking off the grip of the cold war and reaching for opportunities that emerge in its wake.

Conversely, it is distressingly evident that for many people, nuclear weapons retain an aura of utility, of primacy and of legitimacy that justifies their existence well into the future, in some number, however small. The persistence of this view, which is perfectly reflected in the recently announced modification of U. S. nuclear weapons policy, lies at the core of the concern that moves me so deeply. This abiding faith in nuclear weapons was inspired and is sustained by a catechism instilled over many

decades by a priesthood who speak with great assurance and authority. I was for many years among the most avid of these keepers of the faith in nuclear weapons, and for that I make no apology. Like my contemporaries, I was moved by fears and fired by beliefs that date back to the earliest days of the atomic era. We lived through a terror-ridden epoch punctuated by crises whose resolution held hostage the saga of humankind. For us, nuclear weapons were the savior that brought an implacable foe to his knees in 1945 and held another at bay for nearly a half-century. We believed that superior technology brought strategic advantage, that greater numbers meant stronger security, and that the ends of containment justified whatever means were necessary to achieve them.

These are powerful, deeply rooted beliefs. They cannot and should not be lightly dismissed or discounted. Strong arguments can be made on their behalf. Throughout my professional military career, I shared them, I professed them and I put them into operational practice. And now it is my burden to declare with all of the conviction I can muster that in my judgment they served us extremely ill. They account for the most severe risks and most extravagant costs of the U.S.-Soviet confrontation. They intensified and prolonged an already acute ideological animosity. They spawned successive generations of new and more destructive nuclear devices and delivery systems. They gave rise to mammoth bureaucracies with gargantuan appetites and global agendas. They incited primal emotions, spurred zealotry and demagoguery, and set in motion forces of ungovernable scope and power. Most importantly, these enduring beliefs, and the fears that underlie them, perpetuate cold war policies and practices that make no strategic sense. They continue to entail enormous costs and expose all mankind to unconscionable dangers. I find that intolerable. Thus I cannot stay silent. I know too much of these matters, the frailties, the flaws, the failures of policy and practice.

At the same time, I cannot overstate the difficulty this poses for me. No one who ever entered the nuclear arena left it with a fuller understanding of its complexity nor greater respect for those with whom I served its purposes. I struggle constantly with the task of articulating the evolution of my convictions without denigrating or diminishing the motives and sacrifice of countless colleagues with whom I lived the drama of the cold war. I ask them and you to appreciate that my purpose is not to accuse, but to assess, to understand and to propound the forces that birthed the grotesque excesses and hazards of the nuclear age. For me, that assessment meant first coming to grips with my experience and then coming to terms with my conclusions.

I knew the moment I entered the nuclear arena I had been thrust into a world beset with tidal forces, towering egos, maddening contradictions, alien constructs and insane risks. Its arcane vocabulary and apocalyptic calculus defied comprehension. Its stage was global and its antagonists locked in a deadly spiral of deepening rivalry. It was in every respect a modern day holy war, a cosmic struggle between the forces of light and darkness. The stakes were national survival, and the weapons of choice were eminently suited to this scale of malevolence.

The opposing forces each created vast enterprises, each giving rise to a culture of messianic believers infused with a sense of historic mission and

schooled in unshakable articles of faith. As my own career progressed, I was immersed in the work of all of these cultures, either directly in those of the western world, or through penetrating study of communist organizations, teachings and practices. My responsibilities ranged from the highly subjective, such as assessing the values and motivation of Soviet leadership, to the critically objective, such as preparing weapons for operational launch. I became steeped in the art of intelligence estimates, the psychology of negotiations, the interplay of bureaucracies and the impulses of industry. I was engaged in the labyrinthian conjecture of the strategist, the exacting routines of the target planner and the demanding skills of the air crew and the missileer. I have been a party to their history, shared their triumphs and tragedies, witnessed heroic sacrifice and catastrophic failure of both men and machines. And in the end, I came away from it all with profound misgivings.

Ultimately, as I examined the course of this journey, as the lessons of decades of intimate involvement took greater hold on my intellect, I came to a set of deeply unsettling judgments. That from the earliest days of the nuclear era, the risks and consequences of nuclear war have never been properly weighed by those who brandished it. That the stakes of nuclear war engage not just the survival of the antagonists, but the fate of mankind. That the likely consequences of nuclear war have no politically, militarily or morally acceptable justification. And therefore, that the threat to use nuclear weapons is indefensible.

These judgments gave rise to an array of inescapable questions. If this be so, what explained the willingness, no, the zeal, of legions of cold warriors, civilian and military, to not just tolerate but to multiply and to perpetuate such risks? By what authority do succeeding generations of leaders in the nuclear weapons states usurp the power to dictate the odds of continued life on our planet? Most urgently, why does such breathtaking audacity persist at a moment when we should stand trembling in the face of our folly and united in our commitment to abolish its most deadly manifestation?

These are not questions to be left to historians. The answers matter to us now. They go to the heart of present day policies and motivations. They convey lessons with immediate implications for both contemporary and aspiring nuclear states. As I distill them from the experience of three decades in the nuclear arena, these lessons resolve into two fundamental conclusions.

First, I have no other way to understand the willingness to condone nuclear weapons except to believe they are the natural accomplice of visceral enmity. They thrive in the emotional climate born of utter alienation and isolation. The unbounded wantonness of their effects is a perfect companion to the urge to destroy completely. They play on our deepest fears and pander to our darkest instincts. They corrode our sense of humanity, numb our capacity for moral outrage, and make thinkable the unimaginable. What is anguishingly clear is that these fears and enmities are no respecter of political systems or values. They prey on democracies and totalitarian societies alike, shrinking the norms of civilized behavior and dimming the prospects for escaping the savagery so powerfully imprinted in our genetic code. That should give us great pause as we imagine the task of abolition

in a world that gives daily witness to acts of unspeakable barbarism. So should it compound our resolve.

The evidence to support this conclusion is palpable, but as I said at the outset of these remarks for much of my life I saw it differently. That was a product of both my citizenry and my profession. From the early years of my childhood and through much of my military service I saw the Soviet Union and its allies as a demonic threat, an evil empire bent on global domination. I was commissioned as an officer in the United States Air Force as the cold war was heating to a fever pitch. This was a desperate time that evoked on both sides extreme responses in policy, in technology and in force postures: bloody purges and political inquisitions; covert intelligence schemes that squandered lives and subverted governments; atmospheric testing with little understanding or regard for the long term effects; threats of massive nuclear retaliation to an ill-defined scope of potential provocation's; the forced march of inventive genius that ushered in the missile age arm in arm with the capacity for spontaneous, global destruction; reconnaissance aircraft that probed or violated sovereign airspace, producing disastrous encounters; the menacing and perilous practice of airborne alert bombers loaded with nuclear weapons.

By the early 1960's, a superpower nuclear arms race was underway that would lead to a ceaseless amassing of destructive capacity, spilling over into the arsenals of other nations. Central Europe became a powder keg, trembling under the shadow of Armageddon, hostage to a bizarre strategy that required the prospect of nuclear devastation as the price of alliance. The entire world became a stage for the U. S. - Soviet rivalry. International organizations were paralyzed by its grip. East-West confrontation dominated the nation-state system. Every quarrel and conflict was fraught with potential for global war.

This was the world that largely defined our lives as American citizens. For those of us who served in the national security arena, the threat was omnipresent, it seemed total, it dictated our professional preparation and career progression, and cost the lives of tens of thousands of men and women, in and out of uniform. Like millions of others, I was caught up in the holy war, inured to its costs and consequences, trusting in the wisdom of succeeding generations of military and civilian leaders. The first requirement of unconditional belief in the efficacy of nuclear weapons was early and perfectly met for us: our homeland was the target of a consuming evil, poised to strike without warning and without mercy.

What remained for me, as my career took its particular course, was to master the intellectual underpinning of America's response, the strategic foundation that today still stands as the central precept of the nuclear catechism. Reassessing its pervasive impact on attitudes toward nuclear weapons goes directly to my second conclusion regarding the willingness to tolerate the risks of the nuclear age.

That also brings me to the focal point of my remarks, to my purpose in coming to this forum. For all of my years as a nuclear strategist, operational commander and public spokesman, I explained, justified and sustained America's massive nuclear arsenal as a function, a necessity and a consequence of deterrence. Bound up in this singular term, this familiar

touchstone of security dating back to antiquity, was the intellectually comforting and deceptively simple justification for taking the most extreme risks and the expenditure of trillions of dollars. It was our shield and by extension our sword. The nuclear priesthood extolled its virtues, and bowed to its demands. Allies yielded grudgingly to its dictates even while decrying its risks and costs. We brandished it at our enemies and presumed they embraced its suicidal corollary of mutual assured destruction. We ignored, discounted or dismissed its flaws and cling still to the belief that it obtains in a world whose security architecture has been wholly transformed.

But now, I see it differently. Not in some blinding revelation, but at the end of a journey, in an age of deliverance from the consuming tensions of the cold war. Now, with the evidence more clear, the risks more sharply defined and the costs more fully understood, I see deterrence in a very different light. Appropriated from the lexicon of conventional warfare, this simple prescription for adequate military preparedness became in the nuclear age a formula for unmitigated catastrophe. It was premised on a litany of unwarranted assumptions, unprovable assertions and logical contradictions. It suspended rational thinking about the ultimate aim of national security: to ensure the survival of the nation.

How is it that we subscribed to a strategy that required near perfect understanding of an enemy from whom we were deeply alienated and largely isolated? How could we pretend to understand the motivations and intentions of the Soviet leadership absent any substantive personal association? Why did we imagine a nation that had survived successive invasions and mind-numbing losses would accede to a strategy premised on fear of nuclear war? Deterrence in the cold war setting was fatally flawed at the most fundamental level of human psychology in its projection of western reason through the crazed lens of a paranoid foe. Little wonder that intentions and motives were consistently misread. Little wonder that deterrence was the first victim of a deepening crisis, leaving the antagonists to grope fearfully in a fog of mutual misperception. While we clung to the notion that nuclear war could be reliably deterred, Soviet leaders derived from their historical experience the conviction that such a war might be thrust upon them and if so, must not be lost. Driven by that fear, they took Herculean measures to fight and survive no matter the odds or the costs. Deterrence was a dialogue of the blind with the deaf. In the final analysis, it was largely a bargain we in the west made with ourselves.

Deterrence was flawed equally in that the consequences of its failure were intolerable. While the price of undeterred aggression in the age of uniquely conventional weaponry could be severe, history teaches that nations can survive and even prosper in the aftermath of unconditional defeat. Not so in the nuclear era. Nuclear weapons give no quarter. Their effects transcend time and place, poisoning the earth and deforming its inhabitants for generation upon generation. They leave us wholly without defense, expunge all hope for meaningful survival. They hold in their sway not just the fate of nations, but the very meaning of civilization.

Deterrence failed completely as a guide in setting rational limits on the size and composition of military forces. To the contrary, its appetite was voracious, its capacity to justify new weapons and larger stocks

unrestrained. Deterrence carried the seed, born of an irresolvable internal contradiction, that spurred an insatiable arms race. Nuclear deterrence hinges on the credibility to mount a devastating retaliation under the most extreme conditions of war initiation. Perversely, the redundant and survivable force required to meet this exacting test is readily perceived by a darkly suspicious adversary as capable, even designed, to execute a disarming first strike. Such advantage can never be conceded between nuclear rivals. It must be answered, reduced, nullified. Fears are fanned, the rivalry intensified. New technology is inspired, new systems roll from production lines. The correlation of force begins to shift, and the bar of deterrence ratchets higher, igniting yet another cycle of trepidation, worst case assumptions and ever mounting levels of destructive capability.

Thus it was that the treacherous axioms of deterrence made seemingly reasonable nuclear weapon stockpiles numbering in the tens of thousands. Despite having witnessed the devastation wrought by two primitive atomic devices, over the ensuing decades the superpowers gorged themselves at the thermonuclear trough. A succession of leaders on both sides of the east-west divide directed a reckless proliferation of nuclear devices, tailored for delivery by a vast array of vehicles to a stupefying array of targets. They nurtured, richly rewarded, even reveled in the industrial base required to support production at such levels.

I was part of all of that. I was present at the creation of many of these systems, directly responsible for prescribing and justifying the requirements and technology that made them possible. I saw the arms race from the inside, watched as intercontinental ballistic missiles ushered in mutual assured destruction and multiple warhead missiles introduced genuine fear of a nuclear first strike. I participated in the elaboration of basing schemes that bordered on the comical and force levels that in retrospect defied reason. I was responsible for war plans with over 12,000 targets, many struck with repeated nuclear blows, some to the point of complete absurdity. I was a veteran participant in an arena where the most destructive power ever unleashed became the prize in a no holds barred competition among organizations whose principal interest was to enhance rather than constrain its application. And through every corridor, in every impassioned plea, in every fevered debate rang the rallying cry, deterrence, deterrence, deterrence.

As nuclear weapons and actors multiplied, deterrence took on too many names, too many roles, overreaching an already extreme strategic task. Surely nuclear weapons summoned great caution in superpower relationships. But as their numbers swelled, so mounted the stakes of miscalculation, of a crisis spun out of control. The exorbitant price of nuclear war quickly exceeded the rapidly depreciating value of a tenuous mutual wariness. Invoking deterrence became a cheap rhetorical parlor trick, a verbal sleight of hand. Proponents persist in dressing it up to court changing times and temperaments, hemming and re-hemming to fit shrinking or distorted threats.

Deterrence is a slippery conceptual slope. It is not stable, nor is it static, its wiles cannot be contained. It is both master and slave. It seduces the scientist yet bends to his creation. It serves the ends of evil as well as those of noble intent. It holds guilty the innocent as well

as the culpable. It gives easy semantic cover to nuclear weapons, masking the horrors of employment with siren veils of infallibility. At best it is a gamble no mortal should pretend to make. At worst it invokes death on a scale rivaling the power of the creator.

Is it any wonder that at the end of my journey I am moved so strongly to retrace its path, to examine more closely the evidence I would or could not see? I hear now the voices long ignored, the warnings muffled by the still lingering animosities of the cold war. I see with painful clarity that from the very beginnings of the nuclear era, the objective scrutiny and searching debate essential to adequate comprehension and responsible oversight of its vast enterprises were foreshortened or foregone. The cold light of dispassionate scrutiny was shuttered in the name of security, doubts dismissed in the name of an acute and unrelenting threat, objections overruled by the incantations of the nuclear priesthood.

The penalties proved to be severe. Vitally important decisions were routinely taken without adequate understanding, assertions too often prevailed over analysis, requirements took on organizational biases, technological opportunity and corporate profit drove force levels and capability, and political opportunism intruded on calculations of military necessity. Authority and accountability were severed, policy dissociated from planning, and theory invalidated by practice. The narrow concerns of a multitude of powerful interests intruded on the rightful role of key policy-makers, constraining their latitude for decision. Many were simply denied access to critical information essential to the proper exercise of their office.

Over time, planning was increasingly distanced and ultimately disconnected from any sense of scientific or military reality. In the end, the nuclear powers, great and small, created astronomically expensive infrastructures, monolithic bureaucracies and complex processes that defied control or comprehension. Only now are the dimensions, costs and risks of these nuclear nether worlds coming to light. What must now be better-understood are the root causes, the mind-sets and the belief systems that brought them into existence. They must be challenged, they must be refuted, but most importantly, they must be let go. The era that gave them credence, accepted their dominion and yielded to their excesses is fast receding.

But it is not yet over. Sad to say, the cold war lives on in the minds of those who cannot let go the fears, the beliefs, and the enmities born of the nuclear age. They cling to deterrence, clutch its tattered promise to their breast, shake it wistfully at bygone adversaries and balefully at new or imagined ones. They are gripped still by its awful willingness not simply to tempt the apocalypse but to prepare its way.

What better illustration of misplaced faith in nuclear deterrence than the persistent belief that retaliation with nuclear weapons is a legitimate and appropriate response to post-cold war threats posed by weapons of mass destruction. What could possibly justify our resort to the very means we properly abhor and condemn? Who can imagine our joining in shattering the precedent of non-use that has held for over fifty years? How could America's irreplaceable role as leader of the campaign against nuclear proliferation ever be re-justified? What target would warrant such

retaliation? Would we hold an entire society accountable for the decision of a single demented leader? How would the physical effects of the nuclear explosion be contained, not to mention the political and moral consequences? In a singular act we would martyr our enemy, alienate our friends, give comfort to the non-declared nuclear states and impetus to states who seek such weapons covertly. In short, such a response on the part of the United States is inconceivable. It would irretrievably diminish our priceless stature as a nation noble in aspiration and responsible in conduct, even in the face of extreme provocation.

And as a nation we have no greater responsibility than to bring the nuclear era to a close. Our present policies, plans and postures governing nuclear weapons make us prisoner still to an age of intolerable danger. We cannot at once keep sacred the miracle of existence and hold sacrosanct the capacity to destroy it. We cannot hold hostage to sovereign gridlock the keys to final deliverance from the nuclear nightmare. We cannot withhold the resources essential to break its grip, to reduce its dangers. We cannot sit in silent acquiescence to the faded homilies of the nuclear priesthood. It is time to reassert the primacy of individual conscience, the voice of reason and the rightful interests of humanity.

Date: Thu, 20 Jul 2000 12:28:31 -0500 From: Kevin Martin X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win98; U) X-Accept-Language: en To: "Howard W. Hallman" Subject: Re: Statements by military leaders Hi Howard,

Two possible sources. Alan Cranston has done a lot of work with former military leaders. Check his website at [gsinstitute.org](http://gsinstitute.org). I also have an article on this topic from a newsletter by a citizen group in Wisconsin I can photocopy and mail to you.

Kevin

"Howard W. Hallman" wrote:

> Dear Kevin,

>

> I'm looking for statements from retired generals and admirals who say that  
> nuclear weapons have no utility in war-fighting, especially with specific  
> examples. Can you provide me some statements like this or reference to  
> sources? I want to use such statements along with policy statements on  
> morality of nuclear weapons from various faith groups.

>

> The fullest statement I have is a 1984 article by Admiral Noel Gayler.

>

> At the news conference at the National Cathedral in June General Charles  
> Horner responded to a reporter's question by saying how in the Gulf War he  
> realized that nuclear weapons had no usefulness on the battlefield.  
> Unfortunately there is no transcript available. In *The Gift of Time*  
> Jonathan Schell has a quote from General Horner on the Gulf War. Perhaps  
> Horner has developed this further elsewhere.

>

> General Lee Butler may have spoken on this matter, but the speeches of his  
> that I have don't touch on this issue.

>

> You may know of other generals and admirals who have spoken on the matter  
> of utility.

>

> I will appreciate any help you can give me.

>

> Shalom,

> Howard

>

> Howard W. Hallman, Chair

> Methodists United for Peace with Justice

> 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036

> Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail: [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org)

>

> Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a membership association of

> laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any Methodist denomination.

User-Agent: Microsoft-Outlook-Express-Macintosh-Edition/5.02.2022

Date: Thu, 20 Jul 2000 13:18:34 +0000

Subject: NMD interfaith card

From: Tim Barner <timb@2020vision.org>

To: Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.org>

Howard:

The interfaith NMD cards are going out to the 28 signing groups today for distribution to their members/activists. I know that I also speak for Hop in personally acknowledging all of the work that you have done to make this possible in communicating directly with your interfaith working group on disarmament and calling other faith group leaders as well as advising us.

The text of our letter of "transmittal" is below.

I will get back to you shortly with a proposal about a national telephone conference.

Tim

\*\*\*\*\*

Dear \_\_\_\_\_ :

Thank you for your stand in opposing U.S. deployment of a national missile defense (NMD) and for joining in the collaborative grassroots interfaith action card on this issue. We got a great response and are very happy that 28 groups signed on and have committed to distributing 20,000 cards.

We appreciate your quick response and commitment to engage your followers. Enclosed are the \_\_\_\_\_ cards that you are distributing to your member or activist list.

As Hop Pham-Thi, our 20/20 Vision NMD Coordinator, has mentioned in phone conversation, we ask that you distribute these cards as quickly as possible. It's important to have a steady flow of letters opposing NMD coming into the White House because President Clinton will receive a Pentagon recommendation regarding NMD deployment by mid-August and could make his decision any time after that report.

The President needs to recognize that a good portion of citizens in faith communities are strongly opposed to the NMD program. Some of you said that Sunday, August 6, the date that the atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima, is an appropriate time to request action to oppose a government initiative that risks a new arms race.

20/20 Vision appreciates this opportunity to work with so many faith groups, and looks forward to further collaboration. If you have any other ideas or suggestions on how we can further awareness of this issue within your community, please call. We look forward to your feedback and to working with you again.

Sincerely,

Tim Barner, Program Director  
Hop Pham-Thi, NMD Campaign Coordinator

User-Agent: Microsoft-Outlook-Express-Macintosh-Edition/5.02.2022

Date: Thu, 20 Jul 2000 13:27:53 +0000

Subject: Re: Thanks

From: Tim Barner <timb@2020vision.org>

To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>

Thanks Howard,

I had just written a brief note to you minutes ago before I saw your letter. I'm glad our plans complemented each other and we look forward to longer range planning and collaboration in future months and years.

Tim

on 7/19/00 9:16 PM, Howard W. Hallman at mupj@igc.org wrote:

> Dear Jim,

>

> Now that the interfaith postcards on national missile defense are ready for  
> distribution, I want to thank all of you at 20/20 Vision for your  
> contribution to this cooperative venture. Hop Tham-Thi did a fantastic job  
> of keeping track of the details, making contact with many of the groups on  
> our list, and finding a few additional ones on her own. Your other staff  
> have the knowledge and experience in getting the cards printed. And you  
> have the funds to pay for the printing. It's a great deal for us!

>

> At a planning meeting on May 22 the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear  
> Disarmament decided to focus on NMD. Hop and Tim Barner came to our next  
> meeting on June 22 with an offer to get out the postcard. We readily  
> accepted, and the project took off from there. We are glad to say that  
> about 90 percent of the organizations participating in the Interfaith  
> Committee signed on.

>

> So we have picked up again on the cooperative working relationship we had  
> in the CTBT campaign. I look forward to other joint activities in the future.

>

> Shalom,

> Howard

>

> Howard W. Hallman, Chair

> Methodists United for Peace with Justice

> 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036

> Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail: mupj@igc.org

>

> Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a membership association of  
> laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any Methodist denomination.

>

X-Sender: abolition2000@abolition2000.org  
Date: Thu, 20 Jul 2000 09:32:15 -0800  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
From: Abolition 2000 <admin@abolition2000.org>  
Subject: Re: Duplicate postings

Dear Howard,

I am the one who actually suggested that you have two emails subscribed. I do not know who moderates the usa listserv and this has been problematic. I know how to subscribe/unsubscribe from listservs, so I will play around with it and see if I am successful.

Best,  
Carah

>Dear Carah,

>

>Do you handle the abolition-usa list serve? I receive two of ever posting.

> Somebody has suggested that this may because I am on the list-serve twice:

>as mupj@igc.org and mupj@igc.apc.org. If this is true, please remove the  
>latter listing.

>

>Thanks,

>Howard Hallman

>

>Howard W. Hallman, Chair

>Methodists United for Peace with Justice

>1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036

>Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail: mupj@igc.org

>

>Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a membership association of  
>laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any Methodist denomination.

X-eGroups-Return: sentto-1413460-971-964137201-mupj=igc.apc.org@returns.onelist.com  
X-Sender: abolition2000@abolition2000.org  
To: abolition-caucus@egroups.com, abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com,  
editor@abolitionjournal.org, Keiko Sakurai <sakurai-reiko@ocs.nhk.jp>,  
local-activists@rain.org  
From: Abolition 2000 <admin@abolition2000.org>  
Mailing-List: list abolition-caucus@egroups.com; contact abolition-caucus-owner@egroups.com  
Delivered-To: mailing list abolition-caucus@egroups.com  
List-Unsubscribe: <mailto:abolition-caucus-unsubscribe@egroups.com>  
Date: Thu, 20 Jul 2000 16:03:43 -0800  
Subject: [abolition-caucus] Abolition 2000 Grassroots Newsletter July 2000

Abolition 2000 Grassroots Newsletter  
July 2000  
Vol. II Number 5

\*\*\*\*\*

In This Edition...

\*\*\*\*\*

- I. Letter from the Editor
- II. Articles
- III. Abolition 2000 Organizations in the Year 2000
- IV. Announcements
- V. Calendar Events
- VI. Resources
- VII. Questionnaire

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*

Letter from the Editor

\*\*\*\*\*

Dear Friends and Activists,

In the next few weeks, you will be receiving a mailing compiled by the Abolition 2000 Coordinating Committee. Also, in the mailing, you will find the next steps that the network is taking to continue its work.

The Network is in great need of volunteers in various countries throughout the world to translate Abolition 2000 documents and help distribute future mailings. Additionally, contacts are needed to be a source of information on Abolition 2000 and anti-nuclear activities in the different regions throughout the world. If you are interested in volunteering, please contact me as soon as possible.

Enclosed, at the end of this newsletter is a questionnaire. Please complete the form and return either by email, fax or mail at your earliest convenience. The questionnaire will be used to update records and to get a better understanding of the direction in which the various members of the Network are moving.

Thank you for your continued support of the Network. I look

forward to hearing from you.

In peace and solidarity,  
Carah Ong  
Coordinator

\*\*\*\*\*

## Articles

\*\*\*\*\*

### Criticism and Protest Surround Anti-Missile System

The Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO) conducted its first full system test of the national missile defense (NMD) system on 7 July 2000. However, this \$100 million failed missile test did not escape criticism and protest.

More than 120 people gathered at the front gate of the Vandenberg Air Force Base to exercise their first amendment rights on Saturday, 1 July 2000. Organizations that supported the event included: American Friends Service Committee (Santa Barbara/San Luis Obispo), Atomic Mirror, California Peace Action, Global Network Against Weapons & Nuclear Power in Space, Green Party (Santa Barbara/San Luis Obispo), Green Peace, Grey Panthers, Guadalupe Catholic Worker, Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, Peace & Environmental Council (San Luis Obispo), San Luis Obispo County Environmental Toxic Coalition, and Santa Cruz Center for Non-Violence.

In the week leading up to the test, activists also held a vigil, coordinated by Greenpeace, at the front gate. Additionally, members of Greenpeace and the Santa Cruz Resource Center for Non-Violence infiltrated the military base and the Arctic Sunrise, a Greenpeace vessel, entered the "hazardous zone" in waters off the California coastline in attempts to stop the missile from being launched. Almost a dozen activists were arrested during the activities.

Other protests were also held throughout the US and the world to say no to the weaponization of space and a new arms race. Messages of solidarity were sent from Argentina, Australia, Fiji, the UK and many cities in the US, demonstrating broad consensus to halt plans to deploy the controversial anti-missile system.

Late in the evening on 7 June 2000 PDT, after a two hour delay, a target missile, carrying a warhead and a decoy, was launched from Vandenberg Air Force Base, California. Approximately twenty minutes after the target missile lifted off, an interceptor missile carrying a model "exoatmospheric kill vehicle," designed by Raytheon Corporation, was launch from Kwajalein Atoll in the Pacific Ocean and was directed toward the target, using data collected from the system's radars. However, the "hit to kill" weapon fired from Kwajalein Atoll did not separate from the second stage of its liftoff rocket. Of the three tests that have been conducted, two have failed. The Pentagon has scheduled 16 more tests of the system in the next five years.

The Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO) claims that the



subsequently announced it temporarily stopped discharging radioactive waste.

"This is a decisive moment with far reaching consequences," said Greenpeace International political director Remi Parmentier. "Never before has such a strong message been sent by so many countries calling for an end to reprocessing. This truly isolates the UK and France."

><< ><< ><< ><< ><< ><< ><< ><< ><< ><< ><< ><< ><<

### World Peace Council Meets in Athens

The World Peace Council (WPC) was held in Athens, Greece from 10-14 May 2000. More than 200 delegates from 44 countries attended the assembly and conference. with the participation of 200 delegates from 44 countries. The Conference & Assembly adopted an appeal entitled "Globalizing Action against New World Order for a 21st century of peace, security and development". The Appeal called upon the various peace movements of the world to work together in order to attain a 21st of peace and security.

The WPC Secretariat subsequently met in Athens from 11-12 July and adopted a statement reaffirming the validity of the Appeal. The Secretariat adopted a position on National Missile Defense, which calls upon the peace movements all over the world "to denounce these attempts, to inform public opinion, to demand the complete abolition of nuclear weapons and mobilize the peoples, especially on the occasion of the Anniversary of the atomic bombardments in Hiroshima and Nagasaki (6&9 August) It declares the 7th of October as a day of universal mobilization against the NMD and the US star war program."

For copies of the Appeal, the Statement issued by the WPC Secretariat or to receive more information about the World Peace Conference 2000, please email the WPC secretariat at eedye@otenet.gr.

><< ><< ><< ><< ><< ><< ><< ><< ><< ><< ><< ><< ><<

### Global Citizens' Assembly for the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons

Nagasaki, Japan was subjected to the horror of atomic bombing on August 9, 1945. In March 2000, the Nagasaki City Assembly as well as the Nagasaki Prefectural Assembly decided to host an International NGO Conference entitled "Global Citizens' Assembly for the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons." The Assembly will take place from 17-20 November 2000 in Nagasaki. Members of the Abolition 2000 Global Network who were present at the Annual General Meeting in New York officially endorsed the Nagasaki Assembly.

In this Assembly, approximately 800 people engaged in NGO activities around the world as well as in Japan are expected to come and discuss how we should address the abolition of nuclear weapons and the realization of lasting world peace.

Abolition 2000 has been invited to special meetings on 17 and 20 November in Nagasaki. The purpose of these meetings is to discuss Abolition 2000's foci in the 21st century, based upon the outcomes of the



While most of the forty-nine towns which have voted for the article did so by voice vote, there was an interesting trend in the towns where paper ballots were counted. In Burlington, 75% of those voting voted for the article; in Montpelier, 74%; in Middlebury 76%. Besides being remarkably consistent, these numbers closely reflect the results of national surveys gauging public sentiment about nuclear weapons abolition. Following these town meeting victories, the Vermont House of Representatives and Senate voted for a similar resolution, the Senate voting unanimously. It is clear that the people and representatives of Vermont want to see Vermont's congressional delegation working hard for a nuclear weapons abolition treaty. More than anything, the experience demonstrates voters want the abolition of nuclear weapons and will voice their opinion when given the opportunity.

With Senator James Jeffords, Vermont's junior US senator, and Congressman Bernie Sanders running for re-election in November, the abolition campaign will raise the issue of abolition at every public event where the candidates speak. Already, when asked by AFSC staff, Joseph Gainza, both candidates for the Democratic Party nomination have gone on record as favoring abolition.

The Vermont Campaign also utilizes a post card project which voters can send to congressional delegations. The post card calls upon congressional delegations to begin work now for an abolition treaty. Additionally, a newspaper ad will run in Vermont papers, detailing the reasons why nuclear weapons must be abolished, the present opportunities for doing so, and how Vermont voters and state representatives have called for a treaty. The ad will also call on the Congressional candidates to declare themselves as favoring abolition and on Senator Leahy, and whoever is successful in the November elections to make the abolition of nuclear weapons one of their highest priorities in Washington.

With Republican presidential hopeful George W. Bush calling for a reduction in the US nuclear stockpile, even as his promotion of a national missile defense system contradicts his proposal, questions about the need for these weapons must be an issue in the presidential campaign. This development provides abolitionists a rare opportunity to make the abolition of nuclear weapons a campaign issue in every state race for Congress. The Vermont Campaign is preparing to do just that.

For more information on the Vermont Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons, please contact:  
American Friends Service Committee in Vermont  
Email: [afscvt@together.net](mailto:afscvt@together.net)

><< ><< ><< ><< ><< ><< ><< ><< ><< ><< ><< ><<

## TIME TO GIVE FOR ABOLITION

Now that we have achieved our goal of having over 2000 groups in the network and have become the third largest NGO network in the world we need to ensure that we can continue to develop and become THE most influential movement in the world! To do this we need resources. When we established the network we asked groups to send donations but did not establish a

regular giving scheme. Now we need to be assured of a regular income from our own supporters for the next stage of our work. We are therefore asking that all groups please consider giving an annual donation to the Abolition 2000 network of between 10 and 1000 dollars depending on your own financial circumstances. If each group gives a minimum we will have a guaranteed income of 20,000 dollars a year! If we can rely on our own supporters for the resources to do the basic facilitation of the Abolition 2000 network we can plan our own agenda rather than (WORRY) about the priorities of other funders.

Please give generously but note that this is not a membership fee - if you are unable to give you will still be a member of the Network.

\*\*\*\*\*

### Abolition 2000 Organizations in the Year 2000

\*\*\*\*\*

The "Abolition 2000 Organizations in the Year 2000" highlights the activities of and statements from various organizations in Abolition 2000. If you would like to share your past, current or future activities and plans with other members of the Abolition 2000 Global Network, please email your statement to Carah Ong, the Abolition 2000 Grassroots News editor, at [admin@abolition2000.org](mailto:admin@abolition2000.org).

Women for the Future  
(Termopil, West Ukraine )  
[spitsa@mail.com](mailto:spitsa@mail.com)

The NGO, "Women for the Future" has started a course of lectures on disarmament and threatening of nuclear weapons in modern society for students. This course is designed for senior students of High schools. Since many members of Women for the Future work in schools, the course is an opportunity to spread peace keeping ideas among students.

From 13-18 April, Women for the Future participated in a national seminar that took place in Lugansk. Women for the Future gave a report on Abolition 2000, highlighting in particular the St. Petersburg Conference in June 2000.

Under the influence of St. Petersburg Conference, Women for the Future wrote a letter to the President of Ukraine to close the Chernobyl Power Station and press for the reduction nuclear weapons around the world during the meeting of American and Ukrainian presidents.

\*\*\*\*\*

### Announcements

\*\*\*\*\*

Tri-Valley CAREs is extremely pleased to announce the release of an important, new report entitled "Managing the US. Nuclear Weapons Stockpile: A Comparison of Five Strategies," by Dr. Robert Civiak. This study is the first comprehensive analysis of the DOE's Stockpile Stewardship program and its alternatives. It is now available on the Tri-Valley CAREs website at







7 International Day of Protest to Stop the Militarization of Space  
Demonstration at Vandenberg Air Force Base

7-9 Nuclear Free Yucca Mountain Peace Camp. For more information, please  
contact:

Shundahai Network  
Tel: +1 702 647 3095  
Email: shundahai@shundahai.org

9 Nuremberg Day (Leaders held to account for crimes against peace, war  
crimes and crimes against humanity, 1946)

12-15 International Peace Bureau Triennial Assembly on "Globalization of  
Peace" at Nanterre Town Hall, near Paris France. For more information,  
contact:

International Peace Bureau  
Tel: 0041 22 731 6429  
Email: mailbox@ipb.org

19 Indigenous Peoples' Day (Indigenous peoples have suffered  
disproportionate effects of nuclear mining and testing)

20-21 Asia-Europe Meeting III (ASEM III) will be held in Seoul, South  
Korea. For more information, please contact: Gyung-Lan Jung  
jglan21@yahoo.com

24 Disarmament Week

24 United Nations Day

><>< ><>< ><>< ><>< ><>< ><>< ><>< ><>< ><>< ><>< ><>< ><>< ><><

November

4-5 International conference against depleted uranium will be held in  
Manchester, UK  
Register soon! Limited places available! The conference will be hosted by  
the Campaign Against Depleted Uranium. For more information, please  
contact:

CADU  
One World Centre, 6 Mount St., Manchester, M2 5NS England  
Email: gmdcnd@gn.apc.org  
Fax: +44-(0)161-834-8187  
Tel: +44-(0)161-834-8301; or 834-8176

17-20 Global Citizens' Assembly for the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons  
will be held in Nagasaki, Japan. The Assembly is hosted by the Organizing  
Committee of Global Citizens' Assembly for the Elimination of Nuclear  
Weapons in Nagasaki (Nagasaki Prefecture, Nagasaki City, Nagasaki  
Foundation for the Promotion of Peace, and Nuclear Weapons Abolition Year  
2000 Nagasaki Citizens' Council). For more information, please contact:

Nagasaki Foundation for the Promotion of Peace  
7-8 Hirano-machi, Nagasaki, 852-8117 Japan  
Tel: +81 0 95 844 3975

Fax: +81 0 95 846 5170

December

12 Free world peace prayer event in Hiroshima, Japan. For more information, please visit: <http://www.nttl-net.ne.jp/hiroshima2001>

\*\*\*\*\*

Resources

\*\*\*\*\*

WEB

\*Abolition 2000 Global Network

Visit the website and find out why Abolition 2000 was ranked "Number 4 Watchdog Organization on the Internet" by InfoSeek/Go.com and "One of the best informational sites on the internet" by Encyclopedia Britannica. The website has recently been updated. If you have any suggestions for improvement or comments, please send to Carah Ong at [admin@abolition2000.org](mailto:admin@abolition2000.org)  
URL: [Http://www.abolition2000.org](http://www.abolition2000.org)

\*The new edition of Disarmament Diplomacy (No. 47, June 2000) is now available on the website of the Acronym Institute (<http://www.acronym.org.uk>).

\*The Global Network Against Weapons and Nuclear Power in Space has a new web site: [Http://www.space4peace.org](http://www.space4peace.org)

\*On June 9, 2000 France ratified the Statute of the International Criminal Court. Unfortunately, France included a declaration saying that the Statute's war crimes provisions (not crimes against humanity or genocide provisions) do not apply to nuclear weapons. There is absolutely no basis for this position. Among other things, the Statute does not allow reservations, and the French position amounts to a reservation. The Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy has prepared a memorandum explaining the issue, and urging governments to object formally to the French declaration.  
[Http://www.lcnp.org/global/french.htm](http://www.lcnp.org/global/french.htm).

Schedule for NGO Summit Meetings/Events in Okinawa at:  
<http://www.rik.ne.jp/edic/nagocnet/data/ngoe.html>

><< ><< ><< ><< ><< ><< ><< ><< ><< ><< ><< ><< ><<

BOOKS

"New Nukes: India, Pakistan & Global Nuclear Disarmament" by Praful Bidwai and Achin Vanaik, with an introduction by Arundhati Roy. To order, send an inquiry to:  
Signal Books  
9, Park End Street  
Oxford OX1 1HH  
United Kingdom

Email: info@signalbooks.co.uk

\*\*\*\*\*

Questionnaire

\*\*\*\*\*

Abolition 2000 Global Network Member Questionnaire

\*Please complete this form and return to Carah Ong at:

Abolition 2000 Global Network  
PMB 121, 1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 1  
Santa Barbara, California USA 93108  
Email: Admin@abolition2000.org

Organization: \_\_\_\_\_  
Contact: \_\_\_\_\_  
Street Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
City: \_\_\_\_\_  
State/Region: \_\_\_\_\_  
Country: \_\_\_\_\_  
Postal Code: \_\_\_\_\_  
Telephone: \_\_\_\_\_  
Facsimile: \_\_\_\_\_  
Email: \_\_\_\_\_  
Website: \_\_\_\_\_

What issue does your organization focus on?

\_\_\_\_\_

What activities and events does your organization have planned to campaign for nuclear abolition? (please enclose additional pages if more space is needed)

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

How can the Network be more effective in its work?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

I will do the following to support the Network (please check all that apply):

- Send a donation in the amount of \$\_\_\_\_\_
- Translate Abolition 2000 documents into a foreign language
- Circulate the Abolition 2000 International Petition
- Enroll a new organization
- Introduce the Abolition 2000 municipal resolution to my local government
- Host a town meeting to raise public awareness about nuclear issues
- Subscribe to the Abolition 2000 Grassroots Newsletter
- Donate computer software or hardware for the International Office

Please send me further information about the following:

- Joining a Working Group or becoming a convenor
- Becoming a Regional Contact
- Joining the Abolition Global Caucus list-serv

Please send me:

- | Item                                                             | Quantity |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Abolition 2000 Brochures                | _____    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Abolition 2000 Buttons (US \$1.00 each) | _____    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Organization Enrollment forms           | _____    |

Carah Lynn Ong  
Coordinator, Abolition 2000  
PMB 121, 1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 1  
Santa Barbara CA 93108

Phone (805) 965 3443 FAX(805) 568 0466  
Email: [admin@abolition2000.org](mailto:admin@abolition2000.org)  
Website <http://www.abolition2000.org>

Join the Abolition-Global Caucus listserv to receive regular updates about the Abolition movement. The caucus provides an international forum for conversation on nuclear-related issues. Important articles and information relating to nuclear issues are also circulated to keep interested individuals and activists informed about nuclear issues.

To subscribe to the Abolition Global Caucus, please do one of the following:

1. Send a message to the list moderator at [admin@abolition2000.org](mailto:admin@abolition2000.org)
2. Visit the Abolition-caucus website at:  
[Http://www.egroups.com/list/abolition-caucus/](http://www.egroups.com/list/abolition-caucus/) and submit a membership form.
3. Visit the Abolition 2000 website and submit a membership form.
4. Send an e-mail to: [abolition-caucus-subscribe@egroups.com](mailto:abolition-caucus-subscribe@egroups.com) (leave the subject line and body of the message blank).

To post a message to the Abolition Global Caucus, send your message to:

[abolition-caucus@egroups.com](mailto:abolition-caucus@egroups.com)

To subscribe to the Abolition-USA listserve, send a message (with no subject) to:

[abolition-usa-request@lists.xmission.com](mailto:abolition-usa-request@lists.xmission.com)

In the body of the message, write:

"subscribe abolition-usa" (do not include quotation marks)

To post a message to the Abolition-USA list, mail your message to:  
abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

-----  
To email plain text is conventional, to add graphics is divine.  
We'll show you how at [www.supersig.com](http://www.supersig.com).  
[http://click.egroups.com/1/6811/3/\\_/91925/\\_/964137201/](http://click.egroups.com/1/6811/3/_/91925/_/964137201/)  
-----

To subscribe to the Abolition Global Caucus, send an email from the account you wish to be subscribed to: "abolition-caucus-subscribe@egroups.com"

Do not include a subject line or any text in the body of the message.



> Shalom,  
> Howard  
>  
> Howard W. Hallman, Chair  
> Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
> 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036  
> Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail: mupj@igc.org  
>  
> Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a membership association of  
> laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any Methodist denomination.  
>

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express for Macintosh - 4.01 (295)  
Date: Fri, 21 Jul 2000 16:22:36 -0400  
Subject: FW: press release on NMD interfaith card  
From: "NMD" <NMD@2020vision.org>  
To: mupj@igc.org

Dear Howard,

You will find below the text and quotes I emailed to Natalie, so she can edit, and insert quotes into a press release. I asked her to email you the final text, so you can review and comment on it before she sends it to the press (it should be finalized by Monday). Do not hesitate to call Natalie or Jim if necessary.

I will be gone for a few weeks starting Monday (I'll be in Paris). I hope you'll have a nice summer. Peace to you.

Hop

-----  
From: "NMD" <NMD@2020vision.org>  
To: Natalie@2020vision.org  
Subject: press release on NMD interfaith card  
Date: Fri, Jul 21, 2000, 4:16 PM

Natalie,

You will below the text and quotes for the press release (Rev. Siler said he would prepare a quote, but has to contact his ex. director in Denmark -- Does not know if he will get it in time. It would be worthwhile to include it, the Lutheran Church represents 5.2 million members).

Howard would like to review the draft before it goes to press. Please make sure he receives it before final print. His email is: mupj@igc.org.

if you want to call him and let him know you're sending the email, his phone is (301) 896 0013. Thank you.

-----  
NMD interfaith card press  
release

20/20 Vision in cooperation with the Interfaith Committee on Nuclear Disarmament has gathered a very large number (28) of national faith groups in a collective effort to oppose the deployment of the National Missile Defense Program.

Most of the major religious denominations are represented in this interfaith card which gathers Christian, Jewish, Buddhist and Muslim faith groups. Among the 28 national faith groups listed below, 5 represent major national churches : United Church of Christ Justice and Witness Ministries (1.4 million members), American Baptist Churches USA (1.5 million), Episcopal

Church (2.4 million), Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (5.2 million), General Board of Church and Society, the United Methodist Church (8.4 million).

The faith community is sponsoring an interfaith card that invites their members to let the President know about their strong opposition. Through this action the interfaith community is willing to affirm its commitment to nuclear disarmament, international and human peace and security. Most had concerns that the 60 billion dollars estimated cost of the NMD program would take away funds from much needed social and environmental programs.

(Jim's quote):

„We got a surprisingly big response to our outreach efforts because faith groups „get it „, on NMD. They know that STAR WARS is a far fetched idea that wastes money, won't protect us, and will take away funds needed for people, for health, education and kids. What's interesting is that we got agreement from most of the major religious denominations, not just the traditional „peace¾ churches. Look at our list and you'll find a wide array of faith representations. They understand that NMD presents a huge risk to the values and ethics of their respective faiths.¾

-----  
Dear Hop,

Here is a draft of a statement for inclusion in your news release. You may cut and edit as you choose. However, I would like to review the final draft before it is released.

Howard

###

Statement on interfaith card on NMD by Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament.

There is widespread feeling within the faith community that deployment of national missile defense is ill-advised. It seeks a technological fix for problems best solved through multilateral diplomacy. It risks starting a new nuclear arms race. The cost of unproven national missile defense is exorbitant and wastes resources better used to meet human and community needs. For these reasons 28 faith-based organizations have joined together in sending out the postcard alert opposing national missile defense.

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament is a coalition of faith-based organizations working together for the elimination of nuclear weapons.

You can add, though it's not totally necessary:  
Hallman is also chair of Methodists United for Peace with Justice, a national association of laity and clergy.

Howard W. Hallman, Chair  
Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036  
Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail: mupj@igc.org

Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a membership association of laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any Methodist denomination.

-----  
-----  
Hop,

I've written a little bit here that the Church of the Brethren would definitely back. I know it strays a bit from the usual argument and pushes the envelope a little further, so I'll not be offended if you chose not to use any of it--please use what you need or want.

Greg Laszakovits quotable materials:

Even if National Missile Defense was free (which it's not), guaranteed to work (which it isn't), and did not violate the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty with Russia (which it does), it would still be immoral. While it may give those of us privileged enough to live in the U.S. a so-called security-blanket, it would strike fear into the hearts of the rest of the world's inhabitants. A nation with a NMD has no accountability. It may strike without fear of retaliation, attack on a whim.

As people of faith, we have been ordained to a higher calling than strict self-interest or cold pragmatism. Called beyond simply protecting ourselves, we are commissioned to care for all peoples irrespective of human political boundaries.

-----  
-----  
According to Mark Pelavin, Associate Director of the Religious Action Center, the legislative office of the Reform Jewish Movement in North America:

"As Jews, we are mandated to "seek peace and pursue it." (Psalms 34:15) Deployment of a National Missile Defense system could provide the impetus for a new arms race, threatening not only our nation but, in this nuclear age, our planet . We must remove ourselves from the path of nuclear destruction, to a day when nation shall not lift up sword against nation, a day when our safety and security are not dependent on the very technology which threatens our very existence."

Josh Noble

Legislative Assistant

Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism  
2027 Massachusetts Ave., NW  
Washington DC, 20036  
202-387-2800 (ph)  
(202-667-9070 (fax)  
jnoble@religiousaction.org  
<http://rj.org/rac>

To: "Bill Yolton" <dengster@aol.com>  
From: "Howard W.Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Letter to presidential candidates  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Dear Bill,

The future of the global nuclear arsenal is an issue that deserves serious consideration in the U.S. presidential campaign. Accordingly, with assistance of Dave Robinson of Pax Christi USA, I have drafted the attached letter on this issue to candidates of the Democratic, Republican, Reform, and Green parties. Our intent is to mail this letter to the candidates and their top advisors on Friday, August 18 after the last nominating convention has ended (the Democratic on August 17). We will ask the candidates to reply by Tuesday, September 5 and then hold a news conference on September 7 to release their replies.

As initial signers we have United Methodist Bishop C. Dale White and Catholic Bishop Walter Sullivan. Bishop White chaired the committee of the United Methodist Council of Bishops that produced the 1986 report In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace. Bishop Sullivan is president of Pax Christi USA. I am requesting several other United Methodist bishops to sign, and Dave is asking several more Catholic bishops.

We are seeking three to five prominent leaders from other U.S. denominations to sign this letter. Would you be willing to help us obtain several Presbyterian leaders? They don't necessarily have to have official positions with the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A), but some kind of name recognition at least within denominational circles would be helpful. Also geographic spread and if possible racial, ethnic, and gender variety would be desirable. I will need to know their names, organizational identity, city, and state by Monday, August 14.

You can reply to me by e-mail at mupj@igc.org, by phone or fax at 301 896-0013.or by letter to Methodists United for Peace with Justice, 6508 Wilmet Road, Bethesda, MD 20817. If you have any questions, please call me.

Shalom,

Howard

###

Letter to U.S. Presidential Candidates from U.S. Religious Leaders

To be sent to nominees of Democratic, Republican, Reform, and Green parties  
after the nomination process has been completed (mid-August)

Sample for Vice President Al Gore. To be adapted for other candidates.

Dear Mr. Vice President:

Congratulations on your nomination by the Democratic Party for the office of President of the United States. We look forward to a wholesome debate among the candidates on significant issues that are of great importance to the American people.

Among these issues there is none more important than the future of the world's nuclear arsenal. Our own perspective is that the time has come for the United States to provide creative leadership to achieve the global elimination of nuclear

weapons. We hope you share this view.

In this letter we pose a series of questions on this matter. We would greatly appreciate receiving a reply from you by Tuesday, September 5, which is two months before the election. We will hold a news conference on September 7 to release your answers to our questions along with the replies of candidates of the Republican, Reform, and Green parties.

For decades numerous religious denominations, interfaith organizations, and religious leaders have questioned the morality of nuclear weapons and have called for their elimination.

Thus, the Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1983 stated: "We believe that that the time has come when the churches must unequivocally declare that the production and deployment as well as the use of nuclear weapons are a crime against humanity and that such activities must be condemned on ethical and theological grounds. Furthermore, we appeal for the institution of a universal covenant to this effect so that nuclear weapons and warfare are delegitimized and condemned as violations of international law."

Speaking for the Holy See, Archbishop Renato Martino in October 1997 told the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly: "Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21st century. They cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation.... The world must move to the abolition of nuclear weapons through a universal, non-discriminatory ban with intensive inspection by a universal authority."

In a message on January 1, 2000 His Holiness the Dalai Lama called for a step-by-step approach to external disarmament. He stated, "We must first work on the total abolishment of nuclear weapons and gradually work up to total demilitarization throughout the world."

In the United States numerous denominations have called for the elimination of nuclear weapons. Excerpts from these statements are attached. Recently 21 heads of communion and other religious leaders joined with 18 retired general and admirals to point out that "the long-term reliance of nuclear weapons in the arsenals of the nuclear powers, and the ever-present danger of their acquisition by others, is morally untenable and militarily unjustifiable. They constitute a threat to the security of our nation, a peril to world peace, a danger to the whole human family." Therefore, they called for "action leading to the international prohibition of these weapons."

(1) What are your views on the morality of possession, threatened use, and actual use of nuclear weapons? To what extent do you agree or disagree with the broad consensus that has emerged within the faith community on the inherent immorality of nuclear weapons?

(2) We are encouraged that the United States has joined with Russia, United Kingdom, France, and China in making a commitment to "an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals." This occurred in the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). This commitment carries forward the obligation for good faith negotiations on nuclear disarmament as expressed in Article VI of the NPT, an agreement signed by the United States in July 1968 and ratified by the U.S. Senate in March 1969. If elected president, what specifically will you do during your four-year term to fulfill this commitment?

(3) For instance, do you favor multilateral negotiations to achieve a global nuclear weapons convention that provides for total elimination of nuclear weapons within a timebound framework with effective verification and enforcement?

(4) There are interim steps to take in the quest for the elimination of nuclear weapons. For example, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) provides a means of controlling the spread of nuclear weapons. If elected president, will you seek ratification of the CTBT by the United States Senate?

(5) Many experts have pointed out the inherent danger of keeping U.S. and Russian strategic nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert. If elected president, will you embark upon a de-alerting initiative to take strategic weapons off hair-trigger alert? If so, please provide specifics.

(6) During the past fifteen years progress has been made in reduction of nuclear weapons through treaties between the

United States and the Soviet Union, then Russia. Two treaties were negotiated under President Ronald Reagan: the Intermediate Nuclear Force (INF) Treaty to eliminate an entire class of nuclear weapons and the first Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START I). Another treaty, START II, was negotiated under President Bush. Russian President Vladimir Putin has indicated a willingness to negotiate a START III agreement to reduce the number of deployed strategic warheads to 1,000 on each side. However, we understand that the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff insist upon keeping 2,500 warheads in active service because of the targeting requirements of current U.S. policy. If elected president, will you change U.S. policy so that deeper bilateral cuts in strategic weapons can occur? Will you negotiate a START III agreement with Russia? What level of strategic warheads will you seek?

(7) Complementary to nuclear arms reduction through treaties is the undertaking of reciprocal initiatives through executive action. This was the approach used by President George Bush in 1991 when he took unilateral action to deactivate a large number of U.S. strategic weapons and to withdraw most U.S. tactical nuclear weapons stationed outside the United States. A few weeks later Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev reciprocated with similar actions. Would you as president use similar reciprocal initiatives to achieve such objectives as de-alerting and significant reductions in the nuclear arsenal? If so, please provide specifics.

(8) We note that numerous retired generals, admirals, and national security civilian officials have indicated that nuclear weapons have no war-fighting utility. (See attached statements.) We also know that Presidents Truman and Eisenhower chose not to use nuclear weapons in the Korean War and that Presidents Johnson and Nixon chose not to use nuclear weapons in the Vietnam War. Do you see any utility for nuclear weapons in war? If so, please tell us the categories of targets you as commander-in-chief would consider legitimate to strike with nuclear weapons.

(9) If your reply indicates that nuclear weapons are useful only to deter other nuclear weapons, would not the wisest and safest course of action be to achieve the universal elimination of nuclear weapons through such measures as previously identified?

(10) Are there other initiatives you plan to undertake for the elimination of nuclear weapons?

We will greatly appreciate your response to these questions by September 5 prior to our news conference on September 7. If your busy schedule permits, a delegation of the signers would welcome an opportunity to meet with you to discuss these issues in greater detail.

Respectfully yours,

Signers

Attachments:

Excerpts from statements by U.S. religious bodies.  
Joint Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Statement by military professionals and religious leaders.  
Statements of retired military leaders on the lack of utility of nuclear weapons for war-fighting.

Drafted by Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice, with assistance of Dave Robinson, Program Director, Pax Christi USA.

July 21, 2000

To: epf@igc.org  
From: "Howard W.Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Letter to presidential candidates  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Dear Mary,

The future of the global nuclear arsenal is an issue that deserves serious consideration in the U.S. presidential campaign. Accordingly, with assistance of Dave Robinson of Pax Christi USA, I have drafted the attached letter on this issue to candidates of the Democratic, Republican, Reform, and Green parties. Our intent is to mail this letter to the candidates and their top advisors on Friday, August 18 after the last nominating convention has ended (the Democratic on August 17). We will ask the candidates to reply by Tuesday, September 5 and then hold a news conference on September 7 to release their replies.

As initial signers we have United Methodist Bishop C. Dale White and Catholic Bishop Walter Sullivan. Bishop White chaired the committee of the United Methodist Council of Bishops that produced the 1986 report In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace. Bishop Sullivan is president of Pax Christi USA. I am requesting several other United Methodist bishops to sign, and Dave is asking several more Catholic bishops.

We are seeking three to five prominent leaders from other U.S. denominations to sign this letter. Would you be willing to help us obtain several Episcopal leaders? They don't necessarily have to have official positions with the Episcopal Church, but some kind of name recognition at least within denominational circles would be helpful. Also geographic spread and if possible racial, ethnic, and gender variety would be desirable. I will need to know their names, organizational identity, city, and state by Monday, August 14.

You can reply to me by e-mail at mupj@igc.org, by phone or fax at 301 896-0013.or by letter to Methodists United for Peace with Justice, 6508 Wilmet Road, Bethesda, MD 20817. If you have any questions, please call me.

Shalom,

Howard

###

Letter to U.S. Presidential Candidates from U.S. Religious Leaders

To be sent to nominees of Democratic, Republican, Reform, and Green parties  
after the nomination process has been completed (mid-August)

Sample for Vice President Al Gore. To be adapted for other candidates.

Dear Mr. Vice President:

Congratulations on your nomination by the Democratic Party for the office of President of the United States. We look forward to a wholesome debate among the candidates on significant issues that are of great importance to the American people.

Among these issues there is none more important than the future of the world's nuclear arsenal. Our own perspective is that the time has come for the United States to provide creative leadership to achieve the global elimination of nuclear

weapons. We hope you share this view.

In this letter we pose a series of questions on this matter. We would greatly appreciate receiving a reply from you by Tuesday, September 5, which is two months before the election. We will hold a news conference on September 7 to release your answers to our questions along with the replies of candidates of the Republican, Reform, and Green parties.

For decades numerous religious denominations, interfaith organizations, and religious leaders have questioned the morality of nuclear weapons and have called for their elimination.

Thus, the Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1983 stated: "We believe that that the time has come when the churches must unequivocally declare that the production and deployment as well as the use of nuclear weapons are a crime against humanity and that such activities must be condemned on ethical and theological grounds. Furthermore, we appeal for the institution of a universal covenant to this effect so that nuclear weapons and warfare are delegitimized and condemned as violations of international law."

Speaking for the Holy See, Archbishop Renato Martino in October 1997 told the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly: "Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21st century. They cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation.... The world must move to the abolition of nuclear weapons through a universal, non-discriminatory ban with intensive inspection by a universal authority."

In a message on January 1, 2000 His Holiness the Dalai Lama called for a step-by-step approach to external disarmament. He stated, "We must first work on the total abolishment of nuclear weapons and gradually work up to total demilitarization throughout the world."

In the United States numerous denominations have called for the elimination of nuclear weapons. Excerpts from these statements are attached. Recently 21 heads of communion and other religious leaders joined with 18 retired general and admirals to point out that "the long-term reliance of nuclear weapons in the arsenals of the nuclear powers, and the ever-present danger of their acquisition by others, is morally untenable and militarily unjustifiable. They constitute a threat to the security of our nation, a peril to world peace, a danger to the whole human family." Therefore, they called for "action leading to the international prohibition of these weapons."

(1) What are your views on the morality of possession, threatened use, and actual use of nuclear weapons? To what extent do you agree or disagree with the broad consensus that has emerged within the faith community on the inherent immorality of nuclear weapons?

(2) We are encouraged that the United States has joined with Russia, United Kingdom, France, and China in making a commitment to "an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals." This occurred in the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). This commitment carries forward the obligation for good faith negotiations on nuclear disarmament as expressed in Article VI of the NPT, an agreement signed by the United States in July 1968 and ratified by the U.S. Senate in March 1969. If elected president, what specifically will you do during your four-year term to fulfill this commitment?

(3) For instance, do you favor multilateral negotiations to achieve a global nuclear weapons convention that provides for total elimination of nuclear weapons within a timebound framework with effective verification and enforcement?

(4) There are interim steps to take in the quest for the elimination of nuclear weapons. For example, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) provides a means of controlling the spread of nuclear weapons. If elected president, will you seek ratification of the CTBT by the United States Senate?

(5) Many experts have pointed out the inherent danger of keeping U.S. and Russian strategic nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert. If elected president, will you embark upon a de-alerting initiative to take strategic weapons off hair-trigger alert? If so, please provide specifics.

(6) During the past fifteen years progress has been made in reduction of nuclear weapons through treaties between the

United States and the Soviet Union, then Russia. Two treaties were negotiated under President Ronald Reagan: the Intermediate Nuclear Force (INF) Treaty to eliminate an entire class of nuclear weapons and the first Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START I). Another treaty, START II, was negotiated under President Bush. Russian President Vladimir Putin has indicated a willingness to negotiate a START III agreement to reduce the number of deployed strategic warheads to 1,000 on each side. However, we understand that the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff insist upon keeping 2,500 warheads in active service because of the targeting requirements of current U.S. policy. If elected president, will you change U.S. policy so that deeper bilateral cuts in strategic weapons can occur? Will you negotiate a START III agreement with Russia? What level of strategic warheads will you seek?

(7) Complementary to nuclear arms reduction through treaties is the undertaking of reciprocal initiatives through executive action. This was the approach used by President George Bush in 1991 when he took unilateral action to deactivate a large number of U.S. strategic weapons and to withdraw most U.S. tactical nuclear weapons stationed outside the United States. A few weeks later Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev reciprocated with similar actions. Would you as president use similar reciprocal initiatives to achieve such objectives as de-alerting and significant reductions in the nuclear arsenal? If so, please provide specifics.

(8) We note that numerous retired generals, admirals, and national security civilian officials have indicated that nuclear weapons have no war-fighting utility. (See attached statements.) We also know that Presidents Truman and Eisenhower chose not to use nuclear weapons in the Korean War and that Presidents Johnson and Nixon chose not to use nuclear weapons in the Vietnam War. Do you see any utility for nuclear weapons in war? If so, please tell us the categories of targets you as commander-in-chief would consider legitimate to strike with nuclear weapons.

(9) If your reply indicates that nuclear weapons are useful only to deter other nuclear weapons, would not the wisest and safest course of action be to achieve the universal elimination of nuclear weapons through such measures as previously identified?

(10) Are there other initiatives you plan to undertake for the elimination of nuclear weapons?

We will greatly appreciate your response to these questions by September 5 prior to our news conference on September 7. If your busy schedule permits, a delegation of the signers would welcome an opportunity to meet with you to discuss these issues in greater detail.

Respectfully yours,

Signers

Attachments:

Excerpts from statements by U.S. religious bodies.  
Joint Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Statement by military professionals and religious leaders.  
Statements of retired military leaders on the lack of utility of nuclear weapons for war-fighting.

Drafted by Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice, with assistance of Dave Robinson, Program Director, Pax Christi USA.

July 21, 2000

To: "Ron Stief" <uccwdc@erols.com>  
From: "Howard W.Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Letter to presidential candidates  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Dear Ron,

The future of the global nuclear arsenal is an issue that deserves serious consideration in the U.S. presidential campaign. Accordingly, with assistance of Dave Robinson of Pax Christi USA, I have drafted the attached letter on this issue to candidates of the Democratic, Republican, Reform, and Green parties. Our intent is to mail this letter to the candidates and their top advisors on Friday, August 18 after the last nominating convention has ended (the Democratic on August 17). We will ask the candidates to reply by Tuesday, September 5 and then hold a news conference on September 7 to release their replies.

As initial signers we have United Methodist Bishop C. Dale White and Catholic Bishop Walter Sullivan. Bishop White chaired the committee of the United Methodist Council of Bishops that produced the 1986 report In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace. Bishop Sullivan is president of Pax Christi USA. I am requesting several other United Methodist bishops to sign, and Dave is asking several more Catholic bishops.

We are seeking three to five prominent leaders from other U.S. denominations to sign this letter. Would you be willing to help us obtain several UCC leaders? They don't necessarily have to have official positions with the United Church of Christ, but some kind of name recognition at least within denominational circles would be helpful. Also geographic spread and if possible racial, ethnic, and gender variety would be desirable. I will need to know their names, organizational identity, city, and state by Monday, August 14.

You can reply to me by e-mail at mupj@igc.org, by phone or fax at 301 896-0013.or by letter to Methodists United for Peace with Justice, 6508 Wilmet Road, Bethesda, MD 20817. If you have any questions, please call me.

Shalom,

Howard

###

Letter to U.S. Presidential Candidates from U.S. Religious Leaders

To be sent to nominees of Democratic, Republican, Reform, and Green parties  
after the nomination process has been completed (mid-August)

Sample for Vice President Al Gore. To be adapted for other candidates.

Dear Mr. Vice President:

Congratulations on your nomination by the Democratic Party for the office of President of the United States. We look forward to a wholesome debate among the candidates on significant issues that are of great importance to the American people.

Among these issues there is none more important than the future of the world's nuclear arsenal. Our own perspective is that the time has come for the United States to provide creative leadership to achieve the global elimination of nuclear

weapons. We hope you share this view.

In this letter we pose a series of questions on this matter. We would greatly appreciate receiving a reply from you by Tuesday, September 5, which is two months before the election. We will hold a news conference on September 7 to release your answers to our questions along with the replies of candidates of the Republican, Reform, and Green parties.

For decades numerous religious denominations, interfaith organizations, and religious leaders have questioned the morality of nuclear weapons and have called for their elimination.

Thus, the Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1983 stated: "We believe that that the time has come when the churches must unequivocally declare that the production and deployment as well as the use of nuclear weapons are a crime against humanity and that such activities must be condemned on ethical and theological grounds. Furthermore, we appeal for the institution of a universal covenant to this effect so that nuclear weapons and warfare are delegitimized and condemned as violations of international law."

Speaking for the Holy See, Archbishop Renato Martino in October 1997 told the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly: "Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21st century. They cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation.... The world must move to the abolition of nuclear weapons through a universal, non-discriminatory ban with intensive inspection by a universal authority."

In a message on January 1, 2000 His Holiness the Dalai Lama called for a step-by-step approach to external disarmament. He stated, "We must first work on the total abolishment of nuclear weapons and gradually work up to total demilitarization throughout the world."

In the United States numerous denominations have called for the elimination of nuclear weapons. Excerpts from these statements are attached. Recently 21 heads of communion and other religious leaders joined with 18 retired general and admirals to point out that "the long-term reliance of nuclear weapons in the arsenals of the nuclear powers, and the ever-present danger of their acquisition by others, is morally untenable and militarily unjustifiable. They constitute a threat to the security of our nation, a peril to world peace, a danger to the whole human family." Therefore, they called for "action leading to the international prohibition of these weapons."

(1) What are your views on the morality of possession, threatened use, and actual use of nuclear weapons? To what extent do you agree or disagree with the broad consensus that has emerged within the faith community on the inherent immorality of nuclear weapons?

(2) We are encouraged that the United States has joined with Russia, United Kingdom, France, and China in making a commitment to "an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals." This occurred in the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). This commitment carries forward the obligation for good faith negotiations on nuclear disarmament as expressed in Article VI of the NPT, an agreement signed by the United States in July 1968 and ratified by the U.S. Senate in March 1969. If elected president, what specifically will you do during your four-year term to fulfill this commitment?

(3) For instance, do you favor multilateral negotiations to achieve a global nuclear weapons convention that provides for total elimination of nuclear weapons within a timebound framework with effective verification and enforcement?

(4) There are interim steps to take in the quest for the elimination of nuclear weapons. For example, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) provides a means of controlling the spread of nuclear weapons. If elected president, will you seek ratification of the CTBT by the United States Senate?

(5) Many experts have pointed out the inherent danger of keeping U.S. and Russian strategic nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert. If elected president, will you embark upon a de-alerting initiative to take strategic weapons off hair-trigger alert? If so, please provide specifics.

(6) During the past fifteen years progress has been made in reduction of nuclear weapons through treaties between the

United States and the Soviet Union, then Russia. Two treaties were negotiated under President Ronald Reagan: the Intermediate Nuclear Force (INF) Treaty to eliminate an entire class of nuclear weapons and the first Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START I). Another treaty, START II, was negotiated under President Bush. Russian President Vladimir Putin has indicated a willingness to negotiate a START III agreement to reduce the number of deployed strategic warheads to 1,000 on each side. However, we understand that the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff insist upon keeping 2,500 warheads in active service because of the targeting requirements of current U.S. policy. If elected president, will you change U.S. policy so that deeper bilateral cuts in strategic weapons can occur? Will you negotiate a START III agreement with Russia? What level of strategic warheads will you seek?

(7) Complementary to nuclear arms reduction through treaties is the undertaking of reciprocal initiatives through executive action. This was the approach used by President George Bush in 1991 when he took unilateral action to deactivate a large number of U.S. strategic weapons and to withdraw most U.S. tactical nuclear weapons stationed outside the United States. A few weeks later Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev reciprocated with similar actions. Would you as president use similar reciprocal initiatives to achieve such objectives as de-alerting and significant reductions in the nuclear arsenal? If so, please provide specifics.

(8) We note that numerous retired generals, admirals, and national security civilian officials have indicated that nuclear weapons have no war-fighting utility. (See attached statements.) We also know that Presidents Truman and Eisenhower chose not to use nuclear weapons in the Korean War and that Presidents Johnson and Nixon chose not to use nuclear weapons in the Vietnam War. Do you see any utility for nuclear weapons in war? If so, please tell us the categories of targets you as commander-in-chief would consider legitimate to strike with nuclear weapons.

(9) If your reply indicates that nuclear weapons are useful only to deter other nuclear weapons, would not the wisest and safest course of action be to achieve the universal elimination of nuclear weapons through such measures as previously identified?

(10) Are there other initiatives you plan to undertake for the elimination of nuclear weapons?

We will greatly appreciate your response to these questions by September 5 prior to our news conference on September 7. If your busy schedule permits, a delegation of the signers would welcome an opportunity to meet with you to discuss these issues in greater detail.

Respectfully yours,

Signers

Attachments:

Excerpts from statements by U.S. religious bodies.

Joint Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Statement by military professionals and religious leaders.

Statements of retired military leaders on the lack of utility of nuclear weapons for war-fighting.

Drafted by Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice, with assistance of Dave Robinson, Program Director, Pax Christi USA.

July 21, 2000

To: russ.siler@ecunet.org  
From: "Howard W.Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Letter to presidential candidates  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Dear Russell,

I am writing to you on a nuclear disarmament matter because I understand that Mark Brown, who handles this issue for your office, is out of town.

The future of the global nuclear arsenal is an issue that deserves serious consideration in the U.S. presidential campaign. Accordingly, with assistance of Dave Robinson of Pax Christi USA, I have drafted the attached letter on this issue to candidates of the Democratic, Republican, Reform, and Green parties. Our intent is to mail this letter to the candidates and their top advisors on Friday, August 18 after the last nominating convention has ended (the Democratic on August 17). We will ask the candidates to reply by Tuesday, September 5 and then hold a news conference on September 7 to release their replies.

As initial signers we have United Methodist Bishop C. Dale White and Catholic Bishop Walter Sullivan. Bishop White chaired the committee of the United Methodist Council of Bishops that produced the 1986 report In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace. Bishop Sullivan is president of Pax Christi USA. I am requesting several other United Methodist bishops to sign, and Dave is asking several more Catholic bishops.

We are seeking three to five prominent leaders from other U.S. denominations to sign this letter. Would you be willing to help us obtain several Lutheran leaders? They don't necessarily have to have official positions with the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, but some kind of name recognition at least within denominational circles would be helpful. Also geographic spread and if possible racial, ethnic, and gender variety would be desirable. I will need to know their names, organizational identity, city, and state by Monday, August 14.

You can reply to me by e-mail at mupj@igc.org, by phone or fax at 301 896-0013.or by letter to Methodists United for Peace with Justice, 6508 Wilmet Road, Bethesda, MD 20817. If you have any questions, please call me.

Shalom,

Howard

###

Letter to U.S. Presidential Candidates from U.S. Religious Leaders

To be sent to nominees of Democratic, Republican, Reform, and Green parties after the nomination process has been completed (mid-August)

Sample for Vice President Al Gore. To be adapted for other candidates.

Dear Mr. Vice President:

Congratulations on your nomination by the Democratic Party for the office of President of the United States. We look forward to a wholesome debate among the candidates on significant issues that are of great importance to the American people.

Among these issues there is none more important than the future of the world's nuclear arsenal. Our own perspective is that the time has come for the United States to provide creative leadership to achieve the global elimination of nuclear weapons. We hope you share this view.

In this letter we pose a series of questions on this matter. We would greatly appreciate receiving a reply from you by Tuesday, September 5, which is two months before the election. We will hold a news conference on September 7 to release your answers to our questions along with the replies of candidates of the Republican, Reform, and Green parties.

For decades numerous religious denominations, interfaith organizations, and religious leaders have questioned the morality of nuclear weapons and have called for their elimination.

Thus, the Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1983 stated: "We believe that that the time has come when the churches must unequivocally declare that the production and deployment as well as the use of nuclear weapons are a crime against humanity and that such activities must be condemned on ethical and theological grounds. Furthermore, we appeal for the institution of a universal covenant to this effect so that nuclear weapons and warfare are delegitimized and condemned as violations of international law."

Speaking for the Holy See, Archbishop Renato Martino in October 1997 told the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly: "Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21st century. They cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation.... The world must move to the abolition of nuclear weapons through a universal, non-discriminatory ban with intensive inspection by a universal authority."

In a message on January 1, 2000 His Holiness the Dalai Lama called for a step-by-step approach to external disarmament. He stated, "We must first work on the total abolishment of nuclear weapons and gradually work up to total demilitarization throughout the world."

In the United States numerous denominations have called for the elimination of nuclear weapons. Excerpts from these statements are attached. Recently 21 heads of communion and other religious leaders joined with 18 retired general and admirals to point out that "the long-term reliance of nuclear weapons in the arsenals of the nuclear powers, and the ever-present danger of their acquisition by others, is morally untenable and militarily unjustifiable. They constitute a threat to the security of our nation, a peril to world peace, a danger to the whole human family." Therefore, they called for "action leading to the international prohibition of these weapons."

(1) What are your views on the morality of possession, threatened use, and actual use of nuclear weapons? To what extent do you agree or disagree with the broad consensus that has emerged within the faith community on the inherent immorality of nuclear weapons?

(2) We are encouraged that the United States has joined with Russia, United Kingdom, France, and China in making a commitment to "an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals." This occurred in the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). This commitment carries forward the obligation for good faith negotiations on nuclear disarmament as expressed in Article VI of the NPT, an agreement signed by the United States in July 1968 and ratified by the U.S. Senate in March 1969. If elected president, what specifically will you do during your four-year term to fulfill this commitment?

(3) For instance, do you favor multilateral negotiations to achieve a global nuclear weapons convention that provides for total elimination of nuclear weapons within a timebound framework with effective verification and enforcement?

(4) There are interim steps to take in the quest for the elimination of nuclear weapons. For example, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) provides a means of controlling the spread of nuclear weapons. If elected president, will you seek ratification of the CTBT by the United States Senate?

(5) Many experts have pointed out the inherent danger of keeping U.S. and Russian strategic nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert. If elected president, will you embark upon a de-alerting initiative to take strategic weapons off hair-trigger

alert? If so, please provide specifics.

(6) During the past fifteen years progress has been made in reduction of nuclear weapons through treaties between the United States and the Soviet Union, then Russia. Two treaties were negotiated under President Ronald Reagan: the Intermediate Nuclear Force (INF) Treaty to eliminate an entire class of nuclear weapons and the first Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START I). Another treaty, START II, was negotiated under President Bush. Russian President Vladimir Putin has indicated a willingness to negotiate a START III agreement to reduce the number of deployed strategic warheads to 1,000 on each side. However, we understand that the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff insist upon keeping 2,500 warheads in active service because of the targeting requirements of current U.S. policy. If elected president, will you change U.S. policy so that deeper bilateral cuts in strategic weapons can occur? Will you negotiate a START III agreement with Russia? What level of strategic warheads will you seek?

(7) Complementary to nuclear arms reduction through treaties is the undertaking of reciprocal initiatives through executive action. This was the approach used by President George Bush in 1991 when he took unilateral action to deactivate a large number of U.S. strategic weapons and to withdraw most U.S. tactical nuclear weapons stationed outside the United States. A few weeks later Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev reciprocated with similar actions. Would you as president use similar reciprocal initiatives to achieve such objectives as de-alerting and significant reductions in the nuclear arsenal? If so, please provide specifics.

(8) We note that numerous retired generals, admirals, and national security civilian officials have indicated that nuclear weapons have no war-fighting utility. (See attached statements.) We also know that Presidents Truman and Eisenhower chose not to use nuclear weapons in the Korean War and that Presidents Johnson and Nixon chose not to use nuclear weapons in the Vietnam War. Do you see any utility for nuclear weapons in war? If so, please tell us the categories of targets you as commander-in-chief would consider legitimate to strike with nuclear weapons.

(9) If your reply indicates that nuclear weapons are useful only to deter other nuclear weapons, would not the wisest and safest course of action be to achieve the universal elimination of nuclear weapons through such measures as previously identified?

(10) Are there other initiatives you plan to undertake for the elimination of nuclear weapons?

We will greatly appreciate your response to these questions by September 5 prior to our news conference on September 7. If your busy schedule permits, a delegation of the signers would welcome an opportunity to meet with you to discuss these issues in greater detail.

Respectfully yours,

Signers

Attachments:

Excerpts from statements by U.S. religious bodies.

Joint Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Statement by military professionals and religious leaders.

Statements of retired military leaders on the lack of utility of nuclear weapons for war-fighting.

Drafted by Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice, with assistance of Dave Robinson, Program Director, Pax Christi USA.

July 21, 2000

To: "Larry Egbert" <uuawo@aol.com>  
From: "Howard W.Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Letter to presidential candidates  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Dear Larry,

The future of the global nuclear arsenal is an issue that deserves serious consideration in the U.S. presidential campaign. Accordingly, with assistance of Dave Robinson of Pax Christi USA, I have drafted the attached letter on this issue to candidates of the Democratic, Republican, Reform, and Green parties. Our intent is to mail this letter to the candidates and their top advisors on Friday, August 18 after the last nominating convention has ended (the Democratic on August 17). We will ask the candidates to reply by Tuesday, September 5 and then hold a news conference on September 7 to release their replies.

As initial signers we have United Methodist Bishop C. Dale White and Catholic Bishop Walter Sullivan. Bishop White chaired the committee of the United Methodist Council of Bishops that produced the 1986 report In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace. Bishop Sullivan is president of Pax Christi USA. I am requesting several other United Methodist bishops to sign, and Dave is asking several more Catholic bishops.

We are seeking prominent leaders from other U.S. denominations to sign this letter. Would you be willing to help us obtain two or three Unitarian leaders? They don't necessarily have to have official positions with the Unitarian Universalist Association, but some kind of name recognition at least within denominational circles would be helpful. For example, Rev. Forrest Church, who you have mentioned to me, would be excellent. Also geographic spread and gender variety would be desirable. I will need to know their names, organizational identity, city, and state by Monday, August 14.

You can reply to me by e-mail at mupj@igc.org, by phone or fax at 301 896-0013.or by letter to Methodists United for Peace with Justice, 6508 Wilmet Road, Bethesda, MD 20817. If you have any questions, please call me.

Shalom,

Howard

###

Letter to U.S. Presidential Candidates from U.S. Religious Leaders

To be sent to nominees of Democratic, Republican, Reform, and Green parties  
after the nomination process has been completed (mid-August)

Sample for Vice President Al Gore. To be adapted for other candidates.

Dear Mr. Vice President:

Congratulations on your nomination by the Democratic Party for the office of President of the United States. We look forward to a wholesome debate among the candidates on significant issues that are of great importance to the American people.

Among these issues there is none more important than the future of the world's nuclear arsenal. Our own perspective is

that the time has come for the United States to provide creative leadership to achieve the global elimination of nuclear weapons. We hope you share this view.

In this letter we pose a series of questions on this matter. We would greatly appreciate receiving a reply from you by Tuesday, September 5, which is two months before the election. We will hold a news conference on September 7 to release your answers to our questions along with the replies of candidates of the Republican, Reform, and Green parties.

For decades numerous religious denominations, interfaith organizations, and religious leaders have questioned the morality of nuclear weapons and have called for their elimination.

Thus, the Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1983 stated: "We believe that that the time has come when the churches must unequivocally declare that the production and deployment as well as the use of nuclear weapons are a crime against humanity and that such activities must be condemned on ethical and theological grounds. Furthermore, we appeal for the institution of a universal covenant to this effect so that nuclear weapons and warfare are delegitimized and condemned as violations of international law."

Speaking for the Holy See, Archbishop Renato Martino in October 1997 told the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly: "Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21st century. They cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation.... The world must move to the abolition of nuclear weapons through a universal, non-discriminatory ban with intensive inspection by a universal authority."

In a message on January 1, 2000 His Holiness the Dalai Lama called for a step-by-step approach to external disarmament. He stated, "We must first work on the total abolishment of nuclear weapons and gradually work up to total demilitarization throughout the world."

In the United States numerous denominations have called for the elimination of nuclear weapons. Excerpts from these statements are attached. Recently 21 heads of communion and other religious leaders joined with 18 retired general and admirals to point out that "the long-term reliance of nuclear weapons in the arsenals of the nuclear powers, and the ever-present danger of their acquisition by others, is morally untenable and militarily unjustifiable. They constitute a threat to the security of our nation, a peril to world peace, a danger to the whole human family." Therefore, they called for "action leading to the international prohibition of these weapons."

(1) What are your views on the morality of possession, threatened use, and actual use of nuclear weapons? To what extent do you agree or disagree with the broad consensus that has emerged within the faith community on the inherent immorality of nuclear weapons?

(2) We are encouraged that the United States has joined with Russia, United Kingdom, France, and China in making a commitment to "an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals." This occurred in the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). This commitment carries forward the obligation for good faith negotiations on nuclear disarmament as expressed in Article VI of the NPT, an agreement signed by the United States in July 1968 and ratified by the U.S. Senate in March 1969. If elected president, what specifically will you do during your four-year term to fulfill this commitment?

(3) For instance, do you favor multilateral negotiations to achieve a global nuclear weapons convention that provides for total elimination of nuclear weapons within a timebound framework with effective verification and enforcement?

(4) There are interim steps to take in the quest for the elimination of nuclear weapons. For example, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) provides a means of controlling the spread of nuclear weapons. If elected president, will you seek ratification of the CTBT by the United States Senate?

(5) Many experts have pointed out the inherent danger of keeping U.S. and Russian strategic nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert. If elected president, will you embark upon a de-alerting initiative to take strategic weapons off hair-trigger alert? If so, please provide specifics.

(6) During the past fifteen years progress has been made in reduction of nuclear weapons through treaties between the United States and the Soviet Union, then Russia. Two treaties were negotiated under President Ronald Reagan: the Intermediate Nuclear Force (INF) Treaty to eliminate an entire class of nuclear weapons and the first Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START I). Another treaty, START II, was negotiated under President Bush. Russian President Vladimir Putin has indicated a willingness to negotiate a START III agreement to reduce the number of deployed strategic warheads to 1,000 on each side. However, we understand that the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff insist upon keeping 2,500 warheads in active service because of the targeting requirements of current U.S. policy. If elected president, will you change U.S. policy so that deeper bilateral cuts in strategic weapons can occur? Will you negotiate a START III agreement with Russia? What level of strategic warheads will you seek?

(7) Complementary to nuclear arms reduction through treaties is the undertaking of reciprocal initiatives through executive action. This was the approach used by President George Bush in 1991 when he took unilateral action to deactivate a large number of U.S. strategic weapons and to withdraw most U.S. tactical nuclear weapons stationed outside the United States. A few weeks later Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev reciprocated with similar actions. Would you as president use similar reciprocal initiatives to achieve such objectives as de-alerting and significant reductions in the nuclear arsenal? If so, please provide specifics.

(8) We note that numerous retired generals, admirals, and national security civilian officials have indicated that nuclear weapons have no war-fighting utility. (See attached statements.) We also know that Presidents Truman and Eisenhower chose not to use nuclear weapons in the Korean War and that Presidents Johnson and Nixon chose not to use nuclear weapons in the Vietnam War. Do you see any utility for nuclear weapons in war? If so, please tell us the categories of targets you as commander-in-chief would consider legitimate to strike with nuclear weapons.

(9) If your reply indicates that nuclear weapons are useful only to deter other nuclear weapons, would not the wisest and safest course of action be to achieve the universal elimination of nuclear weapons through such measures as previously identified?

(10) Are there other initiatives you plan to undertake for the elimination of nuclear weapons?

We will greatly appreciate your response to these questions by September 5 prior to our news conference on September 7. If your busy schedule permits, a delegation of the signers would welcome an opportunity to meet with you to discuss these issues in greater detail.

Respectfully yours,

Signers

Attachments:

Excerpts from statements by U.S. religious bodies.

Joint Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Statement by military professionals and religious leaders.

Statements of retired military leaders on the lack of utility of nuclear weapons for war-fighting.

Drafted by Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice, with assistance of Dave Robinson, Program Director, Pax Christi USA.

July 21, 2000

To: ken@bpfna.org  
From: "Howard W.Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Letter to presidential candidates  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Dear Ken,

The future of the global nuclear arsenal is an issue that deserves serious consideration in the U.S. presidential campaign. Accordingly, with assistance of Dave Robinson of Pax Christi USA, I have drafted the attached letter on this issue to candidates of the Democratic, Republican, Reform, and Green parties. Our intent is to mail this letter to the candidates and their top advisors on Friday, August 18 after the last nominating convention has ended (the Democratic on August 17). We will ask the candidates to reply by Tuesday, September 5 and then hold a news conference on September 7 to release their replies.

As initial signers we have United Methodist Bishop C. Dale White and Catholic Bishop Walter Sullivan. Bishop White chaired the committee of the United Methodist Council of Bishops that produced the 1986 report In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace. Bishop Sullivan is president of Pax Christi USA. I am requesting several other United Methodist bishops to sign, and Dave is asking several more Catholic bishops.

We are seeking three to five prominent leaders from other U.S. denominations to sign this letter. Would you be willing to help us obtain several Baptist leaders? They don't necessarily have to have official denominational position, but some kind of name recognition at least within denominational circles would be helpful. For example, Glen Stassen would be excellent. Also geographic spread and if possible racial, ethnic, and gender variety would be desirable. I will need to know their names, organizational identity, city, and state by Monday, August 14.

You can reply to me by e-mail at mupj@igc.org, by phone or fax at 301 896-0013.or by letter to Methodists United for Peace with Justice, 6508 Wilmet Road, Bethesda, MD 20817. If you have any questions, please call me.

Shalom,

Howard

###

Letter to U.S. Presidential Candidates from U.S. Religious Leaders

To be sent to nominees of Democratic, Republican, Reform, and Green parties  
after the nomination process has been completed (mid-August)

Sample for Vice President Al Gore. To be adapted for other candidates.

Dear Mr. Vice President:

Congratulations on your nomination by the Democratic Party for the office of President of the United States. We look forward to a wholesome debate among the candidates on significant issues that are of great importance to the American people.

Among these issues there is none more important than the future of the world's nuclear arsenal. Our own perspective is that the time has come for the United States to provide creative leadership to achieve the global elimination of nuclear

weapons. We hope you share this view.

In this letter we pose a series of questions on this matter. We would greatly appreciate receiving a reply from you by Tuesday, September 5, which is two months before the election. We will hold a news conference on September 7 to release your answers to our questions along with the replies of candidates of the Republican, Reform, and Green parties.

For decades numerous religious denominations, interfaith organizations, and religious leaders have questioned the morality of nuclear weapons and have called for their elimination.

Thus, the Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1983 stated: "We believe that that the time has come when the churches must unequivocally declare that the production and deployment as well as the use of nuclear weapons are a crime against humanity and that such activities must be condemned on ethical and theological grounds. Furthermore, we appeal for the institution of a universal covenant to this effect so that nuclear weapons and warfare are delegitimized and condemned as violations of international law."

Speaking for the Holy See, Archbishop Renato Martino in October 1997 told the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly: "Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21st century. They cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation.... The world must move to the abolition of nuclear weapons through a universal, non-discriminatory ban with intensive inspection by a universal authority."

In a message on January 1, 2000 His Holiness the Dalai Lama called for a step-by-step approach to external disarmament. He stated, "We must first work on the total abolishment of nuclear weapons and gradually work up to total demilitarization throughout the world."

In the United States numerous denominations have called for the elimination of nuclear weapons. Excerpts from these statements are attached. Recently 21 heads of communion and other religious leaders joined with 18 retired general and admirals to point out that "the long-term reliance of nuclear weapons in the arsenals of the nuclear powers, and the ever-present danger of their acquisition by others, is morally untenable and militarily unjustifiable. They constitute a threat to the security of our nation, a peril to world peace, a danger to the whole human family." Therefore, they called for "action leading to the international prohibition of these weapons."

(1) What are your views on the morality of possession, threatened use, and actual use of nuclear weapons? To what extent do you agree or disagree with the broad consensus that has emerged within the faith community on the inherent immorality of nuclear weapons?

(2) We are encouraged that the United States has joined with Russia, United Kingdom, France, and China in making a commitment to "an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals." This occurred in the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). This commitment carries forward the obligation for good faith negotiations on nuclear disarmament as expressed in Article VI of the NPT, an agreement signed by the United States in July 1968 and ratified by the U.S. Senate in March 1969. If elected president, what specifically will you do during your four-year term to fulfill this commitment?

(3) For instance, do you favor multilateral negotiations to achieve a global nuclear weapons convention that provides for total elimination of nuclear weapons within a timebound framework with effective verification and enforcement?

(4) There are interim steps to take in the quest for the elimination of nuclear weapons. For example, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) provides a means of controlling the spread of nuclear weapons. If elected president, will you seek ratification of the CTBT by the United States Senate?

(5) Many experts have pointed out the inherent danger of keeping U.S. and Russian strategic nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert. If elected president, will you embark upon a de-alerting initiative to take strategic weapons off hair-trigger alert? If so, please provide specifics.

(6) During the past fifteen years progress has been made in reduction of nuclear weapons through treaties between the

United States and the Soviet Union, then Russia. Two treaties were negotiated under President Ronald Reagan: the Intermediate Nuclear Force (INF) Treaty to eliminate an entire class of nuclear weapons and the first Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START I). Another treaty, START II, was negotiated under President Bush. Russian President Vladimir Putin has indicated a willingness to negotiate a START III agreement to reduce the number of deployed strategic warheads to 1,000 on each side. However, we understand that the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff insist upon keeping 2,500 warheads in active service because of the targeting requirements of current U.S. policy. If elected president, will you change U.S. policy so that deeper bilateral cuts in strategic weapons can occur? Will you negotiate a START III agreement with Russia? What level of strategic warheads will you seek?

(7) Complementary to nuclear arms reduction through treaties is the undertaking of reciprocal initiatives through executive action. This was the approach used by President George Bush in 1991 when he took unilateral action to deactivate a large number of U.S. strategic weapons and to withdraw most U.S. tactical nuclear weapons stationed outside the United States. A few weeks later Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev reciprocated with similar actions. Would you as president use similar reciprocal initiatives to achieve such objectives as de-alerting and significant reductions in the nuclear arsenal? If so, please provide specifics.

(8) We note that numerous retired generals, admirals, and national security civilian officials have indicated that nuclear weapons have no war-fighting utility. (See attached statements.) We also know that Presidents Truman and Eisenhower chose not to use nuclear weapons in the Korean War and that Presidents Johnson and Nixon chose not to use nuclear weapons in the Vietnam War. Do you see any utility for nuclear weapons in war? If so, please tell us the categories of targets you as commander-in-chief would consider legitimate to strike with nuclear weapons.

(9) If your reply indicates that nuclear weapons are useful only to deter other nuclear weapons, would not the wisest and safest course of action be to achieve the universal elimination of nuclear weapons through such measures as previously identified?

(10) Are there other initiatives you plan to undertake for the elimination of nuclear weapons?

We will greatly appreciate your response to these questions by September 5 prior to our news conference on September 7. If your busy schedule permits, a delegation of the signers would welcome an opportunity to meet with you to discuss these issues in greater detail.

Respectfully yours,

Signers

Attachments:

Excerpts from statements by U.S. religious bodies.

Joint Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Statement by military professionals and religious leaders.

Statements of retired military leaders on the lack of utility of nuclear weapons for war-fighting.

Drafted by Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice, with assistance of Dave Robinson, Program Director, Pax Christi USA.

July 21, 2000

To: J.\_Daryl\_Byler@mcc.org  
From: "Howard W.Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Letter to presidential candidates  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Dear Daryl,

The future of the global nuclear arsenal is an issue that deserves serious consideration in the U.S. presidential campaign. Accordingly, with assistance of Dave Robinson of Pax Christi USA, I have drafted the attached letter on this issue to candidates of the Democratic, Republican, Reform, and Green parties. Our intent is to mail this letter to the candidates and their top advisors on Friday, August 18 after the last nominating convention has ended (the Democratic on August 17). We will ask the candidates to reply by Tuesday, September 5 and then hold a news conference on September 7 to release their replies.

As initial signers we have United Methodist Bishop C. Dale White and Catholic Bishop Walter Sullivan. Bishop White chaired the committee of the United Methodist Council of Bishops that produced the 1986 report In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace. Bishop Sullivan is president of Pax Christi USA. I am requesting several other United Methodist bishops to sign, and Dave is asking several more Catholic bishops.

We are seeking prominent leaders from other U.S. denominations to sign this letter. Would you be willing to help us obtain one or two Mennonite leaders? They don't necessarily have to have official denominational positions, but some kind of name recognition at least within denominational circles would be helpful. I will need to know their names, organizational identity, city, and state by Monday, August 14.

You can reply to me by e-mail at mupj@igc.org, by phone or fax at 301 896-0013.or by letter to Methodists United for Peace with Justice, 6508 Wilmet Road, Bethesda, MD 20817. If you have any questions, please call me.

Shalom,

Howard

###

Letter to U.S. Presidential Candidates from U.S. Religious Leaders

To be sent to nominees of Democratic, Republican, Reform, and Green parties  
after the nomination process has been completed (mid-August)

Sample for Vice President Al Gore. To be adapted for other candidates.

Dear Mr. Vice President:

Congratulations on your nomination by the Democratic Party for the office of President of the United States. We look forward to a wholesome debate among the candidates on significant issues that are of great importance to the American people.

Among these issues there is none more important than the future of the world's nuclear arsenal. Our own perspective is that the time has come for the United States to provide creative leadership to achieve the global elimination of nuclear weapons. We hope you share this view.

In this letter we pose a series of questions on this matter. We would greatly appreciate receiving a reply from you by Tuesday, September 5, which is two months before the election. We will hold a news conference on September 7 to release your answers to our questions along with the replies of candidates of the Republican, Reform, and Green parties.

For decades numerous religious denominations, interfaith organizations, and religious leaders have questioned the morality of nuclear weapons and have called for their elimination.

Thus, the Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1983 stated: "We believe that that the time has come when the churches must unequivocally declare that the production and deployment as well as the use of nuclear weapons are a crime against humanity and that such activities must be condemned on ethical and theological grounds. Furthermore, we appeal for the institution of a universal covenant to this effect so that nuclear weapons and warfare are delegitimized and condemned as violations of international law."

Speaking for the Holy See, Archbishop Renato Martino in October 1997 told the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly: "Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21st century. They cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation.... The world must move to the abolition of nuclear weapons through a universal, non-discriminatory ban with intensive inspection by a universal authority."

In a message on January 1, 2000 His Holiness the Dalai Lama called for a step-by-step approach to external disarmament. He stated, "We must first work on the total abolishment of nuclear weapons and gradually work up to total demilitarization throughout the world."

In the United States numerous denominations have called for the elimination of nuclear weapons. Excerpts from these statements are attached. Recently 21 heads of communion and other religious leaders joined with 18 retired general and admirals to point out that "the long-term reliance of nuclear weapons in the arsenals of the nuclear powers, and the ever-present danger of their acquisition by others, is morally untenable and militarily unjustifiable. They constitute a threat to the security of our nation, a peril to world peace, a danger to the whole human family." Therefore, they called for "action leading to the international prohibition of these weapons."

(1) What are your views on the morality of possession, threatened use, and actual use of nuclear weapons? To what extent do you agree or disagree with the broad consensus that has emerged within the faith community on the inherent immorality of nuclear weapons?

(2) We are encouraged that the United States has joined with Russia, United Kingdom, France, and China in making a commitment to "an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals." This occurred in the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). This commitment carries forward the obligation for good faith negotiations on nuclear disarmament as expressed in Article VI of the NPT, an agreement signed by the United States in July 1968 and ratified by the U.S. Senate in March 1969. If elected president, what specifically will you do during your four-year term to fulfill this commitment?

(3) For instance, do you favor multilateral negotiations to achieve a global nuclear weapons convention that provides for total elimination of nuclear weapons within a timebound framework with effective verification and enforcement?

(4) There are interim steps to take in the quest for the elimination of nuclear weapons. For example, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) provides a means of controlling the spread of nuclear weapons. If elected president, will you seek ratification of the CTBT by the United States Senate?

(5) Many experts have pointed out the inherent danger of keeping U.S. and Russian strategic nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert. If elected president, will you embark upon a de-alerting initiative to take strategic weapons off hair-trigger alert? If so, please provide specifics.

(6) During the past fifteen years progress has been made in reduction of nuclear weapons through treaties between the United States and the Soviet Union, then Russia. Two treaties were negotiated under President Ronald Reagan: the

Intermediate Nuclear Force (INF) Treaty to eliminate an entire class of nuclear weapons and the first Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START I). Another treaty, START II, was negotiated under President Bush. Russian President Vladimir Putin has indicated a willingness to negotiate a START III agreement to reduce the number of deployed strategic warheads to 1,000 on each side. However, we understand that the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff insist upon keeping 2,500 warheads in active service because of the targeting requirements of current U.S. policy. If elected president, will you change U.S. policy so that deeper bilateral cuts in strategic weapons can occur? Will you negotiate a START III agreement with Russia? What level of strategic warheads will you seek?

(7) Complementary to nuclear arms reduction through treaties is the undertaking of reciprocal initiatives through executive action. This was the approach used by President George Bush in 1991 when he took unilateral action to deactivate a large number of U.S. strategic weapons and to withdraw most U.S. tactical nuclear weapons stationed outside the United States. A few weeks later Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev reciprocated with similar actions. Would you as president use similar reciprocal initiatives to achieve such objectives as de-alerting and significant reductions in the nuclear arsenal? If so, please provide specifics.

(8) We note that numerous retired generals, admirals, and national security civilian officials have indicated that nuclear weapons have no war-fighting utility. (See attached statements.) We also know that Presidents Truman and Eisenhower chose not to use nuclear weapons in the Korean War and that Presidents Johnson and Nixon chose not to use nuclear weapons in the Vietnam War. Do you see any utility for nuclear weapons in war? If so, please tell us the categories of targets you as commander-in-chief would consider legitimate to strike with nuclear weapons.

(9) If your reply indicates that nuclear weapons are useful only to deter other nuclear weapons, would not the wisest and safest course of action be to achieve the universal elimination of nuclear weapons through such measures as previously identified?

(10) Are there other initiatives you plan to undertake for the elimination of nuclear weapons?

We will greatly appreciate your response to these questions by September 5 prior to our news conference on September 7. If your busy schedule permits, a delegation of the signers would welcome an opportunity to meet with you to discuss these issues in greater detail.

Respectfully yours,

Signers

Attachments:

Excerpts from statements by U.S. religious bodies.

Joint Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Statement by military professionals and religious leaders.

Statements of retired military leaders on the lack of utility of nuclear weapons for war-fighting.

Drafted by Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice, with assistance of Dave Robinson, Program Director, Pax Christi USA.

July 21, 2000

To: witness\_GB@brethren.org  
From: "Howard W.Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Letter to presidential candidates  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Dear David,

The future of the global nuclear arsenal is an issue that deserves serious consideration in the U.S. presidential campaign. Accordingly, with assistance of Dave Robinson of Pax Christi USA, I have drafted the attached letter on this issue to candidates of the Democratic, Republican, Reform, and Green parties. Our intent is to mail this letter to the candidates and their top advisors on Friday, August 18 after the last nominating convention has ended (the Democratic on August 17). We will ask the candidates to reply by Tuesday, September 5 and then hold a news conference on September 7 to release their replies.

As initial signers we have United Methodist Bishop C. Dale White and Catholic Bishop Walter Sullivan. Bishop White chaired the committee of the United Methodist Council of Bishops that produced the 1986 report In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace. Bishop Sullivan is president of Pax Christi USA. I am requesting several other United Methodist bishops to sign, and Dave is asking several more Catholic bishops.

We are seeking prominent leaders from other U.S. denominations to sign this letter. Would you be willing to help us obtain one or two Brethren leaders? They don't necessarily have to have official denominational positions, but some kind of name recognition at least within denominational circles would be helpful. I will need to know their names, organizational identity, city, and state by Monday, August 14.

You can reply to me by e-mail at mupj@igc.org, by phone or fax at 301 896-0013.or by letter to Methodists United for Peace with Justice, 6508 Wilmett Road, Bethesda, MD 20817. If you have any questions, please call me.

Shalom,

Howard

###

Letter to U.S. Presidential Candidates from U.S. Religious Leaders

To be sent to nominees of Democratic, Republican, Reform, and Green parties  
after the nomination process has been completed (mid-August)

Sample for Vice President Al Gore. To be adapted for other candidates.

Dear Mr. Vice President:

Congratulations on your nomination by the Democratic Party for the office of President of the United States. We look forward to a wholesome debate among the candidates on significant issues that are of great importance to the American people.

Among these issues there is none more important than the future of the world's nuclear arsenal. Our own perspective is that the time has come for the United States to provide creative leadership to achieve the global elimination of nuclear weapons. We hope you share this view.

In this letter we pose a series of questions on this matter. We would greatly appreciate receiving a reply from you by Tuesday, September 5, which is two months before the election. We will hold a news conference on September 7 to release your answers to our questions along with the replies of candidates of the Republican, Reform, and Green parties.

For decades numerous religious denominations, interfaith organizations, and religious leaders have questioned the morality of nuclear weapons and have called for their elimination.

Thus, the Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1983 stated: "We believe that that the time has come when the churches must unequivocally declare that the production and deployment as well as the use of nuclear weapons are a crime against humanity and that such activities must be condemned on ethical and theological grounds. Furthermore, we appeal for the institution of a universal covenant to this effect so that nuclear weapons and warfare are delegitimized and condemned as violations of international law."

Speaking for the Holy See, Archbishop Renato Martino in October 1997 told the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly: "Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21st century. They cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation.... The world must move to the abolition of nuclear weapons through a universal, non-discriminatory ban with intensive inspection by a universal authority."

In a message on January 1, 2000 His Holiness the Dalai Lama called for a step-by-step approach to external disarmament. He stated, "We must first work on the total abolishment of nuclear weapons and gradually work up to total demilitarization throughout the world."

In the United States numerous denominations have called for the elimination of nuclear weapons. Excerpts from these statements are attached. Recently 21 heads of communion and other religious leaders joined with 18 retired general and admirals to point out that "the long-term reliance of nuclear weapons in the arsenals of the nuclear powers, and the ever-present danger of their acquisition by others, is morally untenable and militarily unjustifiable. They constitute a threat to the security of our nation, a peril to world peace, a danger to the whole human family." Therefore, they called for "action leading to the international prohibition of these weapons."

(1) What are your views on the morality of possession, threatened use, and actual use of nuclear weapons? To what extent do you agree or disagree with the broad consensus that has emerged within the faith community on the inherent immorality of nuclear weapons?

(2) We are encouraged that the United States has joined with Russia, United Kingdom, France, and China in making a commitment to "an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals." This occurred in the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). This commitment carries forward the obligation for good faith negotiations on nuclear disarmament as expressed in Article VI of the NPT, an agreement signed by the United States in July 1968 and ratified by the U.S. Senate in March 1969. If elected president, what specifically will you do during your four-year term to fulfill this commitment?

(3) For instance, do you favor multilateral negotiations to achieve a global nuclear weapons convention that provides for total elimination of nuclear weapons within a timebound framework with effective verification and enforcement?

(4) There are interim steps to take in the quest for the elimination of nuclear weapons. For example, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) provides a means of controlling the spread of nuclear weapons. If elected president, will you seek ratification of the CTBT by the United States Senate?

(5) Many experts have pointed out the inherent danger of keeping U.S. and Russian strategic nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert. If elected president, will you embark upon a de-alerting initiative to take strategic weapons off hair-trigger alert? If so, please provide specifics.

(6) During the past fifteen years progress has been made in reduction of nuclear weapons through treaties between the United States and the Soviet Union, then Russia. Two treaties were negotiated under President Ronald Reagan: the

Intermediate Nuclear Force (INF) Treaty to eliminate an entire class of nuclear weapons and the first Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START I). Another treaty, START II, was negotiated under President Bush. Russian President Vladimir Putin has indicated a willingness to negotiate a START III agreement to reduce the number of deployed strategic warheads to 1,000 on each side. However, we understand that the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff insist upon keeping 2,500 warheads in active service because of the targeting requirements of current U.S. policy. If elected president, will you change U.S. policy so that deeper bilateral cuts in strategic weapons can occur? Will you negotiate a START III agreement with Russia? What level of strategic warheads will you seek?

(7) Complementary to nuclear arms reduction through treaties is the undertaking of reciprocal initiatives through executive action. This was the approach used by President George Bush in 1991 when he took unilateral action to deactivate a large number of U.S. strategic weapons and to withdraw most U.S. tactical nuclear weapons stationed outside the United States. A few weeks later Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev reciprocated with similar actions. Would you as president use similar reciprocal initiatives to achieve such objectives as de-alerting and significant reductions in the nuclear arsenal? If so, please provide specifics.

(8) We note that numerous retired generals, admirals, and national security civilian officials have indicated that nuclear weapons have no war-fighting utility. (See attached statements.) We also know that Presidents Truman and Eisenhower chose not to use nuclear weapons in the Korean War and that Presidents Johnson and Nixon chose not to use nuclear weapons in the Vietnam War. Do you see any utility for nuclear weapons in war? If so, please tell us the categories of targets you as commander-in-chief would consider legitimate to strike with nuclear weapons.

(9) If your reply indicates that nuclear weapons are useful only to deter other nuclear weapons, would not the wisest and safest course of action be to achieve the universal elimination of nuclear weapons through such measures as previously identified?

(10) Are there other initiatives you plan to undertake for the elimination of nuclear weapons?

We will greatly appreciate your response to these questions by September 5 prior to our news conference on September 7. If your busy schedule permits, a delegation of the signers would welcome an opportunity to meet with you to discuss these issues in greater detail.

Respectfully yours,

Signers

Attachments:

Excerpts from statements by U.S. religious bodies.

Joint Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Statement by military professionals and religious leaders.

Statements of retired military leaders on the lack of utility of nuclear weapons for war-fighting.

Drafted by Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice, with assistance of Dave Robinson, Program Director, Pax Christi USA.

July 21, 2000

To: jnoble@uahc.org  
From: "Howard W.Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Letter to presidential candidates  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Dear Josh,

The future of the global nuclear arsenal is an issue that deserves serious consideration in the U.S. presidential campaign. Accordingly, with assistance of Dave Robinson of Pax Christi USA, I have drafted the attached letter on this issue to candidates of the Democratic, Republican, Reform, and Green parties. Our intent is to mail this letter to the candidates and their top advisors on Friday, August 18 after the last nominating convention has ended (the Democratic on August 17). We will ask the candidates to reply by Tuesday, September 5 and then hold a news conference on September 7 to release their replies.

As initial signers we have United Methodist Bishop C. Dale White and Catholic Bishop Walter Sullivan. Bishop White chaired the committee of the United Methodist Council of Bishops that produced the 1986 report In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace. Bishop Sullivan is president of Pax Christi USA. I am requesting several other United Methodist bishops to sign, and Dave is asking several more Catholic bishops.

We are seeking prominent leaders from other faith groups to sign this letter. Would Rabbi David Saperstein be willing to sign? Would you be able to help us get two or three other Jewish leaders. They don't necessarily have to have official positions with a Jewish organization, but some kind of name recognition would be helpful. I will need to know their names, organizational identity, city, and state by Monday, August 14.

You can reply to me by e-mail at mupj@igc.org, by phone or fax at 301 896-0013.or by letter to Methodists United for Peace with Justice, 6508 Wilmet Road, Bethesda, MD 20817. If you have any questions, please call me.

Shalom,

Howard

###

Letter to U.S. Presidential Candidates from U.S. Religious Leaders

To be sent to nominees of Democratic, Republican, Reform, and Green parties  
after the nomination process has been completed (mid-August)

Sample for Vice President Al Gore. To be adapted for other candidates.

Dear Mr. Vice President:

Congratulations on your nomination by the Democratic Party for the office of President of the United States. We look forward to a wholesome debate among the candidates on significant issues that are of great importance to the American people.

Among these issues there is none more important than the future of the world's nuclear arsenal. Our own perspective is that the time has come for the United States to provide creative leadership to achieve the global elimination of nuclear weapons. We hope you share this view.

In this letter we pose a series of questions on this matter. We would greatly appreciate receiving a reply from you by Tuesday, September 5, which is two months before the election. We will hold a news conference on September 7 to release your answers to our questions along with the replies of candidates of the Republican, Reform, and Green parties.

For decades numerous religious denominations, interfaith organizations, and religious leaders have questioned the morality of nuclear weapons and have called for their elimination.

Thus, the Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1983 stated: "We believe that that the time has come when the churches must unequivocally declare that the production and deployment as well as the use of nuclear weapons are a crime against humanity and that such activities must be condemned on ethical and theological grounds. Furthermore, we appeal for the institution of a universal covenant to this effect so that nuclear weapons and warfare are delegitimized and condemned as violations of international law."

Speaking for the Holy See, Archbishop Renato Martino in October 1997 told the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly: "Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21st century. They cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation.... The world must move to the abolition of nuclear weapons through a universal, non-discriminatory ban with intensive inspection by a universal authority."

In a message on January 1, 2000 His Holiness the Dalai Lama called for a step-by-step approach to external disarmament. He stated, "We must first work on the total abolishment of nuclear weapons and gradually work up to total demilitarization throughout the world."

In the United States numerous denominations have called for the elimination of nuclear weapons. Excerpts from these statements are attached. Recently 21 heads of communion and other religious leaders joined with 18 retired general and admirals to point out that "the long-term reliance of nuclear weapons in the arsenals of the nuclear powers, and the ever-present danger of their acquisition by others, is morally untenable and militarily unjustifiable. They constitute a threat to the security of our nation, a peril to world peace, a danger to the whole human family." Therefore, they called for "action leading to the international prohibition of these weapons."

(1) What are your views on the morality of possession, threatened use, and actual use of nuclear weapons? To what extent do you agree or disagree with the broad consensus that has emerged within the faith community on the inherent immorality of nuclear weapons?

(2) We are encouraged that the United States has joined with Russia, United Kingdom, France, and China in making a commitment to "an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals." This occurred in the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). This commitment carries forward the obligation for good faith negotiations on nuclear disarmament as expressed in Article VI of the NPT, an agreement signed by the United States in July 1968 and ratified by the U.S. Senate in March 1969. If elected president, what specifically will you do during your four-year term to fulfill this commitment?

(3) For instance, do you favor multilateral negotiations to achieve a global nuclear weapons convention that provides for total elimination of nuclear weapons within a timebound framework with effective verification and enforcement?

(4) There are interim steps to take in the quest for the elimination of nuclear weapons. For example, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) provides a means of controlling the spread of nuclear weapons. If elected president, will you seek ratification of the CTBT by the United States Senate?

(5) Many experts have pointed out the inherent danger of keeping U.S. and Russian strategic nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert. If elected president, will you embark upon a de-alerting initiative to take strategic weapons off hair-trigger alert? If so, please provide specifics.

(6) During the past fifteen years progress has been made in reduction of nuclear weapons through treaties between the United States and the Soviet Union, then Russia. Two treaties were negotiated under President Ronald Reagan: the

Intermediate Nuclear Force (INF) Treaty to eliminate an entire class of nuclear weapons and the first Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START I). Another treaty, START II, was negotiated under President Bush. Russian President Vladimir Putin has indicated a willingness to negotiate a START III agreement to reduce the number of deployed strategic warheads to 1,000 on each side. However, we understand that the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff insist upon keeping 2,500 warheads in active service because of the targeting requirements of current U.S. policy. If elected president, will you change U.S. policy so that deeper bilateral cuts in strategic weapons can occur? Will you negotiate a START III agreement with Russia? What level of strategic warheads will you seek?

(7) Complementary to nuclear arms reduction through treaties is the undertaking of reciprocal initiatives through executive action. This was the approach used by President George Bush in 1991 when he took unilateral action to deactivate a large number of U.S. strategic weapons and to withdraw most U.S. tactical nuclear weapons stationed outside the United States. A few weeks later Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev reciprocated with similar actions. Would you as president use similar reciprocal initiatives to achieve such objectives as de-alerting and significant reductions in the nuclear arsenal? If so, please provide specifics.

(8) We note that numerous retired generals, admirals, and national security civilian officials have indicated that nuclear weapons have no war-fighting utility. (See attached statements.) We also know that Presidents Truman and Eisenhower chose not to use nuclear weapons in the Korean War and that Presidents Johnson and Nixon chose not to use nuclear weapons in the Vietnam War. Do you see any utility for nuclear weapons in war? If so, please tell us the categories of targets you as commander-in-chief would consider legitimate to strike with nuclear weapons.

(9) If your reply indicates that nuclear weapons are useful only to deter other nuclear weapons, would not the wisest and safest course of action be to achieve the universal elimination of nuclear weapons through such measures as previously identified?

(10) Are there other initiatives you plan to undertake for the elimination of nuclear weapons?

We will greatly appreciate your response to these questions by September 5 prior to our news conference on September 7. If your busy schedule permits, a delegation of the signers would welcome an opportunity to meet with you to discuss these issues in greater detail.

Respectfully yours,

Signers

Attachments:

Excerpts from statements by U.S. religious bodies.

Joint Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Statement by military professionals and religious leaders.

Statements of retired military leaders on the lack of utility of nuclear weapons for war-fighting.

Drafted by Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice, with assistance of Dave Robinson, Program Director, Pax Christi USA.

July 21, 2000

Date: Sun, 23 Jul 2000 21:00:00 -0400  
From: "Ken Sehested" <ken@mail.bpfna.org>  
Reply-To: <ken@mail.bpfna.org>  
To: "Howard W.Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: Letter to presidential candidates  
X-Mailer: <IMail v6.00>

Howard,

Yes, Stassen is a good choice. Others would be:

--Daniel Vestal, general secretary of the American Baptist Churches USA (Valley Forge, PA).

--James Dunn, recently-retired director of the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs. (He's teaching at the Baptist seminary at Wake Forest U. in Winston-Salem, NC, so I'm not sure where he's living this summer. He still maintains a home there in DC. Here's the seminary number: 800 393-4244

--If you can't get him, his successor, Brent Walker, would probably sign on. (Since the BJC is funded by many Baptist denominations, their name is known--and generally-respected--across Baptist denominational lines.)

--You should try to get Denton Lotz, general secretary of the Baptist World Alliance, to sign on (McLean, VA; 703 790-8980). The BWA is on record several times opposing nuclear weapons, so Denton has justification. He's fairly progressive, but also a cautious man, particularly if you don't know him. But he also likes to see his name in print.

--I would also encourage you to get Daniel Vestal to sign on. He's coordinator of the Cooperative Baptist Fellowship, the second and larger of the two Southern Baptist splinter groups. (Atlanta, GA: 800 352-8741) A number of us are trying to get the CBF to spend more time addressing public issues and less time trading insults with SBC leaders. Daniel is pretty progressive and would probably sign on. (And if he does, the Associated Baptist Press would have reason to do a news release about the letters, thus getting that info in front of a larger number of mainstream Baptists.) If Dan's not there, ask for Gary Baldrige, co-coordinator of their Global Missions work. Gary's the true progressive in that office (and you could use my name if you speak to him) and would probably help you track Dan down if he's on the road.

--Among African American Baptist leaders, Tyrone Pitts there in DC is your best bet. He's general secretary of the Progressive National Baptist Convention, the smallest but most publicly engaged of the four black Baptist bodies. (It was King's affiliation.) Tyrone, or Denton, could tell give you leads on other black Baptist denominational leaders--I'm weak at this point. (And it's true, generally, that in black Baptist life, pastors of large congregations often have more visibility and name recognition than their denominational leaders. In this regard--if you wanted to go here--you might want to contact Calvin Butts, pastor of Abyssinian Baptist in New York City (a seminary classmate of mine and rumored to be a future mayor of NYC). His number: (212) 862-7474.

--You should attempt to get Billy Graham to sign on to the letters. Unfortunately, we don't have reliable communication links to him; but a good friend of mine does: John Sundquist is director of the American Baptist Board of International Ministries (800 222-3872 x2200); John helped us get a letter from Graham to some warring Naga guerilla leaders (in India) with whom we mediating several years ago.

--You should also consider someone like Jimmy Carter. Again, we don't have any good connections. Denton Lotz does, but he might not be willing to help you. James Dunn could probably do this.

Hope this is helpful. I'm on the road, beginning tomorrow, for the rest of the week. In fact, I'll be there in DC Thursday night. We've taken one of the days (Friday) of the "People's Campaign for Nonviolence. I thought about trying to get by to meet you; but I'm in and out so fast that that's not feasible.

Good luck with the letters.

Ken Sehested

----- Original Message -----

From: "Howard W.Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>

Date: Sun, 23 Jul 2000 14:33:13 -0400

>Dear Ken,

>

>The future of the global nuclear arsenal is an issue that deserves serious  
>consideration in the U.S. presidential campaign. Accordingly, with  
>assistance of Dave Robinson of Pax Christi USA, I have drafted the attached  
>letter on this issue to candidates of the Democratic, Republican, Reform,  
>and Green parties. Our intent is to mail this letter to the candidates and  
>their top advisors on Friday, August 18 after the last nominating  
>convention has ended (the Democratic on August 17). We will ask the  
>candidates to reply by Tuesday, September 5 and then hold a news conference  
>on September 7 to release their replies.

>

>As initial signers we have United Methodist Bishop C. Dale White and  
>Catholic Bishop Walter Sullivan. Bishop White chaired the committee of the  
>United Methodist Council of Bishops that produced the 1986 report In  
>Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace. Bishop Sullivan  
>is president of Pax Christi USA. I am requesting several other United  
>Methodist bishops to sign, and Dave is asking several more Catholic bishops.

>

>We are seeking three to five prominent leaders from other U.S.  
>denominations to sign this letter. Would you be willing to help us obtain  
>several Baptist leaders? They don't necessarily have to have official  
>denominational position, but some kind of name recognition at least within  
>denominational circles would be helpful. For example, Glen Stassen would  
>be excellent. Also geographic spread and if possible racial, ethnic, and  
>gender variety would be desirable. I will need to know their names,  
>organizational identity, city, and state by Monday, August 14.

>

>You can reply to me by e-mail at mupj@igc.org, by phone or fax at 301  
>896-0013.or by letter to Methodists United for Peace with Justice, 6508  
>Wilmet Road, Bethesda, MD 20817. If you have any questions, please call me.

>

>Shalom,

>

>Howard

>

>###

>

>Letter to U.S. Presidential Candidates from U.S. Religious Leaders

>

>To be sent to nominees of Democratic, Republican, Reform, and Green parties  
>after the nomination process has been completed (mid-August)

>

>Sample for Vice President Al Gore. To be adapted for other candidates.

>

>Dear Mr. Vice President:

>

>Congratulations on your nomination by the Democratic Party for the office  
>of President of the United States. We look forward to a wholesome debate  
>among the candidates on significant issues that are of great importance to  
>the American people.

>  
>Among these issues there is none more important than the future of the  
>world's nuclear arsenal. Our own perspective is that the time has come  
>for the United States to provide creative leadership to achieve the global  
>elimination of nuclear weapons. We hope you share this view.

>  
>In this letter we pose a series of questions on this matter. We would  
>greatly appreciate receiving a reply from you by Tuesday, September 5,  
>which is two months before the election. We will hold a news conference on  
>September 7 to release your answers to our questions along with the replies  
>of candidates of the Republican, Reform, and Green parties.

>  
>For decades numerous religious denominations, interfaith organizations, and  
>religious leaders have questioned the morality of nuclear weapons and have  
>called for their elimination.

>  
>Thus, the Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1983 stated:  
>"We believe that that the time has come when the churches must  
>unequivocally declare that the production and deployment as well as the use  
>of nuclear weapons are a crime against humanity and that such activities  
>must be condemned on ethical and theological grounds. Furthermore, we  
>appeal for the institution of a universal covenant to this effect so that  
>nuclear weapons and warfare are delegitimized and condemned as violations  
>of international law."

>  
>Speaking for the Holy See, Archbishop Renato Martino in October 1997 told  
>the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly: "Nuclear  
>weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21st century. They  
>cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation.... The world must move to  
>the abolition of nuclear weapons through a universal, non-discriminatory  
>ban with intensive inspection by a universal authority."

>  
>In a message on January 1, 2000 His Holiness the Dalai Lama called for a  
>step-by-step approach to external disarmament. He stated, "We must first  
>work on the total abolishment of nuclear weapons and gradually work up to  
>total demilitarization throughout the world."

>  
>In the United States numerous denominations have called for the elimination  
>of nuclear weapons. Excerpts from these statements are attached. Recently  
>21 heads of communion and other religious leaders joined with 18 retired  
>general and admirals to point out that "the long-term reliance of nuclear  
>weapons in the arsenals of the nuclear powers, and the ever-present danger  
>of their acquisition by others, is morally untenable and militarily  
>unjustifiable. They constitute a threat to the security of our nation, a  
>peril to world peace, a danger to the whole human family." Therefore, they  
>called for "action leading to the international prohibition of these weapons."

>  
>(1) What are your views on the morality of possession, threatened use, and  
>actual use of nuclear weapons? To what extent do you agree or disagree  
>with the broad consensus that has emerged within the faith community on the

>inherent immorality of nuclear weapons?

>

>(2) We are encouraged that the United States has joined with Russia, United Kingdom, France, and China in making a commitment to "an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals."

> This occurred in the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). This commitment carries forward the obligation for good faith negotiations on nuclear disarmament as expressed in Article VI of the NPT, an agreement signed by the United States in July 1968 and ratified by the U.S. Senate in March 1969. If elected president, what specifically will you do during your four-year term to fulfill this commitment?

>

>(3) For instance, do you favor multilateral negotiations to achieve a global nuclear weapons convention that provides for total elimination of nuclear weapons within a timebound framework with effective verification and enforcement?

>

>(4) There are interim steps to take in the quest for the elimination of nuclear weapons. For example, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) provides a means of controlling the spread of nuclear weapons. If elected president, will you seek ratification of the CTBT by the United States Senate?

>

>(5) Many experts have pointed out the inherent danger of keeping U.S. and Russian strategic nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert. If elected president, will you embark upon a de-alerting initiative to take strategic weapons off hair-trigger alert? If so, please provide specifics.

>

>(6) During the past fifteen years progress has been made in reduction of nuclear weapons through treaties between the United States and the Soviet Union, then Russia. Two treaties were negotiated under President Ronald Reagan: the Intermediate Nuclear Force (INF) Treaty to eliminate an entire class of nuclear weapons and the first Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START I). Another treaty, START II, was negotiated under President Bush. Russian President Vladimir Putin has indicated a willingness to negotiate a START III agreement to reduce the number of deployed strategic warheads to 1,000 on each side. However, we understand that the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff insist upon keeping 2,500 warheads in active service because of the targeting requirements of current U.S. policy. If elected president, will you change U.S. policy so that deeper bilateral cuts in strategic weapons can occur? Will you negotiate a START III agreement with Russia? What level of strategic warheads will you seek?

>

>(7) Complementary to nuclear arms reduction through treaties is the undertaking of reciprocal initiatives through executive action. This was the approach used by President George Bush in 1991 when he took unilateral action to deactivate a large number of U.S. strategic weapons and to withdraw most U.S. tactical nuclear weapons stationed outside the United States. A few weeks later Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev reciprocated with similar actions. Would you as president use similar reciprocal initiatives to achieve such objectives as de-alerting and significant reductions in the nuclear arsenal? If so, please provide specifics.

>

>(8) We note that numerous retired generals, admirals, and national security

>civilian officials have indicated that nuclear weapons have no war-fighting  
>utility. (See attached statements.) We also know that Presidents Truman  
>and Eisenhower chose not to use nuclear weapons in the Korean War and that  
>Presidents Johnson and Nixon chose not to use nuclear weapons in the  
>Vietnam War. Do you see any utility for nuclear weapons in war? If so,  
>please tell us the categories of targets you as commander-in-chief would  
>consider legitimate to strike with nuclear weapons.

>  
>(9) If your reply indicates that nuclear weapons are useful only to deter  
>other nuclear weapons, would not the wisest and safest course of action be  
>to achieve the universal elimination of nuclear weapons through such  
>measures as previously identified?

>  
>(10) Are there other initiatives you plan to undertake for the elimination  
>of nuclear weapons?

>  
>We will greatly appreciate your response to these questions by September 5  
>prior to our news conference on September 7. If your busy schedule  
>permits, a delegation of the signers would welcome an opportunity to meet  
>with you to discuss these issues in greater detail.

>  
>Respectfully yours,

>  
>Signers

>  
>Attachments:

>  
>Excerpts from statements by U.S. religious bodies.  
>Joint Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Statement by military professionals and  
>religious leaders.  
>Statements of retired military leaders on the lack of utility of nuclear  
>weapons for war-fighting.

>  
>Drafted by Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Methodists United for Peace with  
>Justice, with assistance of Dave Robinson, Program Director, Pax Christi USA.

>  
>July 21, 2000

>  
>  
>Howard W. Hallman, Chair  
>Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
>1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036  
>Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail: mupj@igc.org

>  
>Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a membership association of  
>laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any Methodist denomination.

>

To: <ken@mail.bpfna.org>  
From: "Howard W.Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: Letter to presidential candidates  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To: <200007232100.AA2471821610@mail.bpfna.org>  
References:

Ken,

Thanks for your prompt reply. I'll follow through on your suggestions.

Do you have an address or phone number for Glen Stassen?

Howard

To: DReeves@afsc.org  
From: "Howard W.Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Letter to presidential candidates  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Dear Don Reeves,

The future of the global nuclear arsenal is an issue that deserves serious consideration in the U.S. presidential campaign. Accordingly, with assistance of Dave Robinson of Pax Christi USA, I have drafted the attached letter on this issue to candidates of the Democratic, Republican, Reform, and Green parties. Our intent is to mail this letter to the candidates and their top advisors on Friday, August 18 after the last nominating convention has ended (the Democratic on August 17). We will ask the candidates to reply by Tuesday, September 5 and then hold a news conference on September 7 to release their replies.

As initial signers we have United Methodist Bishop C. Dale White and Catholic Bishop Walter Sullivan. Bishop White chaired the committee of the United Methodist Council of Bishops that produced the 1986 report In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace. Bishop Sullivan is president of Pax Christi USA. I am requesting several other United Methodist bishops to sign, and Dave is asking several more Catholic bishops.

We are seeking prominent leaders from other faith groups to sign this letter. Would you be willing to sign as interim executive secretary of the American Friends Service Committee? Would you be able to help us get one or two prominent Quakers to sign? I will need to know their names, organizational identity, city, and state no later than Monday, August 14.

You can reply to me by e-mail at mupj@igc.org, by phone or fax at 301 896-0013.or by letter to Methodists United for Peace with Justice, 6508 Wilmet Road, Bethesda, MD 20817. If you have any questions, please call me.

Shalom,

Howard

###

Letter to U.S. Presidential Candidates from U.S. Religious Leaders

To be sent to nominees of Democratic, Republican, Reform, and Green parties  
after the nomination process has been completed (mid-August)

Sample for Vice President Al Gore. To be adapted for other candidates.

Dear Mr. Vice President:

Congratulations on your nomination by the Democratic Party for the office of President of the United States. We look forward to a wholesome debate among the candidates on significant issues that are of great importance to the American people.

Among these issues there is none more important than the future of the world's nuclear arsenal. Our own perspective is that the time has come for the United States to provide creative leadership to achieve the global elimination of nuclear weapons. We hope you share this view.

In this letter we pose a series of questions on this matter. We would greatly appreciate receiving a reply from you by Tuesday, September 5, which is two months before the election. We will hold a news conference on September 7 to release your answers to our questions along with the replies of candidates of the Republican, Reform, and Green parties.

For decades numerous religious denominations, interfaith organizations, and religious leaders have questioned the morality of nuclear weapons and have called for their elimination.

Thus, the Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1983 stated: "We believe that that the time has come when the churches must unequivocally declare that the production and deployment as well as the use of nuclear weapons are a crime against humanity and that such activities must be condemned on ethical and theological grounds. Furthermore, we appeal for the institution of a universal covenant to this effect so that nuclear weapons and warfare are delegitimized and condemned as violations of international law."

Speaking for the Holy See, Archbishop Renato Martino in October 1997 told the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly: "Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21st century. They cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation.... The world must move to the abolition of nuclear weapons through a universal, non-discriminatory ban with intensive inspection by a universal authority."

In a message on January 1, 2000 His Holiness the Dalai Lama called for a step-by-step approach to external disarmament. He stated, "We must first work on the total abolishment of nuclear weapons and gradually work up to total demilitarization throughout the world."

In the United States numerous denominations have called for the elimination of nuclear weapons. Excerpts from these statements are attached. Recently 21 heads of communion and other religious leaders joined with 18 retired general and admirals to point out that "the long-term reliance of nuclear weapons in the arsenals of the nuclear powers, and the ever-present danger of their acquisition by others, is morally untenable and militarily unjustifiable. They constitute a threat to the security of our nation, a peril to world peace, a danger to the whole human family." Therefore, they called for "action leading to the international prohibition of these weapons."

(1) What are your views on the morality of possession, threatened use, and actual use of nuclear weapons? To what extent do you agree or disagree with the broad consensus that has emerged within the faith community on the inherent immorality of nuclear weapons?

(2) We are encouraged that the United States has joined with Russia, United Kingdom, France, and China in making a commitment to "an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals." This occurred in the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). This commitment carries forward the obligation for good faith negotiations on nuclear disarmament as expressed in Article VI of the NPT, an agreement signed by the United States in July 1968 and ratified by the U.S. Senate in March 1969. If elected president, what specifically will you do during your four-year term to fulfill this commitment?

(3) For instance, do you favor multilateral negotiations to achieve a global nuclear weapons convention that provides for total elimination of nuclear weapons within a timebound framework with effective verification and enforcement?

(4) There are interim steps to take in the quest for the elimination of nuclear weapons. For example, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) provides a means of controlling the spread of nuclear weapons. If elected president, will you seek ratification of the CTBT by the United States Senate?

(5) Many experts have pointed out the inherent danger of keeping U.S. and Russian strategic nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert. If elected president, will you embark upon a de-alerting initiative to take strategic weapons off hair-trigger alert? If so, please provide specifics.

(6) During the past fifteen years progress has been made in reduction of nuclear weapons through treaties between the United States and the Soviet Union, then Russia. Two treaties were negotiated under President Ronald Reagan: the

Intermediate Nuclear Force (INF) Treaty to eliminate an entire class of nuclear weapons and the first Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START I). Another treaty, START II, was negotiated under President Bush. Russian President Vladimir Putin has indicated a willingness to negotiate a START III agreement to reduce the number of deployed strategic warheads to 1,000 on each side. However, we understand that the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff insist upon keeping 2,500 warheads in active service because of the targeting requirements of current U.S. policy. If elected president, will you change U.S. policy so that deeper bilateral cuts in strategic weapons can occur? Will you negotiate a START III agreement with Russia? What level of strategic warheads will you seek?

(7) Complementary to nuclear arms reduction through treaties is the undertaking of reciprocal initiatives through executive action. This was the approach used by President George Bush in 1991 when he took unilateral action to deactivate a large number of U.S. strategic weapons and to withdraw most U.S. tactical nuclear weapons stationed outside the United States. A few weeks later Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev reciprocated with similar actions. Would you as president use similar reciprocal initiatives to achieve such objectives as de-alerting and significant reductions in the nuclear arsenal? If so, please provide specifics.

(8) We note that numerous retired generals, admirals, and national security civilian officials have indicated that nuclear weapons have no war-fighting utility. (See attached statements.) We also know that Presidents Truman and Eisenhower chose not to use nuclear weapons in the Korean War and that Presidents Johnson and Nixon chose not to use nuclear weapons in the Vietnam War. Do you see any utility for nuclear weapons in war? If so, please tell us the categories of targets you as commander-in-chief would consider legitimate to strike with nuclear weapons.

(9) If your reply indicates that nuclear weapons are useful only to deter other nuclear weapons, would not the wisest and safest course of action be to achieve the universal elimination of nuclear weapons through such measures as previously identified?

(10) Are there other initiatives you plan to undertake for the elimination of nuclear weapons?

We will greatly appreciate your response to these questions by September 5 prior to our news conference on September 7. If your busy schedule permits, a delegation of the signers would welcome an opportunity to meet with you to discuss these issues in greater detail.

Respectfully yours,

Signers

Attachments:

Excerpts from statements by U.S. religious bodies.

Joint Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Statement by military professionals and religious leaders.

Statements of retired military leaders on the lack of utility of nuclear weapons for war-fighting.

Drafted by Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice, with assistance of Dave Robinson, Program Director, Pax Christi USA.

July 21, 2000

Date: Sun, 23 Jul 2000 21:00:00 -0400  
From: "Ken Sehested" <ken@mail.bpfna.org>  
Reply-To: <ken@mail.bpfna.org>  
To: "Howard W.Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: Letter to presidential candidates  
X-Mailer: <IMail v6.00>

Howard,

Yes, Stassen is a good choice. Others would be:

--Daniel Vestal, general secretary of the American Baptist Churches USA (Valley Forge, PA).

--James Dunn, recently-retired director of the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs. (He's teaching at the Baptist seminary at Wake Forest U. in Winston-Salem, NC, so I'm not sure where he's living this summer. He still maintains a home there in DC. Here's the seminary number: 800 393-4244

--If you can't get him, his successor, Brent Walker, would probably sign on. (Since the BJC is funded by many Baptist denominations, their name is known--and generally-respected--across Baptist denominational lines.)

--You should try to get Denton Lotz, general secretary of the Baptist World Alliance, to sign on (McLean, VA; 703 790-8980). The BWA is on record several times opposing nuclear weapons, so Denton has justification. He's fairly progressive, but also a cautious man, particularly if you don't know him. But he also likes to see his name in print.

--I would also encourage you to get Daniel Vestal to sign on. He's coordinator of the Cooperative Baptist Fellowship, the second and larger of the two Southern Baptist splinter groups. (Atlanta, GA: 800 352-8741) A number of us are trying to get the CBF to spend more time addressing public issues and less time trading insults with SBC leaders. Daniel is pretty progressive and would probably sign on. (And if he does, the Associated Baptist Press would have reason to do a news release about the letters, thus getting that info in front of a larger number of mainstream Baptists.) If Dan's not there, ask for Gary Baldrige, co-coordinator of their Global Missions work. Gary's the true progressive in that office (and you could use my name if you speak to him) and would probably help you track Dan down if he's on the road.

--Among African American Baptist leaders, Tyrone Pitts there in DC is your best bet. He's general secretary of the Progressive National Baptist Convention, the smallest but most publicly engaged of the four black Baptist bodies. (It was King's affiliation.) Tyrone, or Denton, could tell give you leads on other black Baptist denominational leaders--I'm weak at this point. (And it's true, generally, that in black Baptist life, pastors of large congregations often have more visibility and name recognition than their denominational leaders. In this regard--if you wanted to go here--you might want to contact Calvin Butts, pastor of Abyssinian Baptist in New York City (a seminary classmate of mine and rumored to be a future mayor of NYC). His number: (212) 862-7474.

--You should attempt to get Billy Graham to sign on to the letters. Unfortunately, we don't have reliable communication links to him; but a good friend of mine does: John Sundquist is director of the American Baptist Board of International Ministries (800 222-3872 x2200); John helped us get a letter from Graham to some warring Naga guerilla leaders (in India) with whom we mediating several years ago.

--You should also consider someone like Jimmy Carter. Again, we don't have any good connections. Denton Lotz does, but he might not be willing to help you. James Dunn could probably do this.

Hope this is helpful. I'm on the road, beginning tomorrow, for the rest of the week. In fact, I'll be there in DC Thursday night. We've taken one of the days (Friday) of the "People's Campaign for Nonviolence. I thought about trying to get by to meet you; but I'm in and out so fast that that's not feasible.

Good luck with the letters.

Ken Sehested