

To: jnoble@rac.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Correction
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\abl.084.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Josh,

Earlier when I wrote you about the final version of the letter to presidential candidates, I sent the wrong attachment. Here is the correct one.

Howard

To: "Gary Baldrige" <gbaldrige@cbfnet.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Final version: letter to presidential candidates
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <s9a11f68.059@mail.cbfnet.org>
References:

At 12:23 PM 8/21/00 -0400, you wrote:
>Please do send a text version. Thanks.

Here it is:

August 18, 2000 imilar letter sent to:

The Honorable George W. Bush	Vice President Albert Gore, Jr.
State Capitol	Mr. Ralph Nader
100 E. 11th Street	Mr. Patrick J. Buchanan
Austin, TX 78701	Mr. John Hagelin

Dear Governor Bush:

Congratulations on your nomination by the Republican 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 one of the most important is 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 Democratic, 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

The Honorable George W. Bush

August 18, 2000

Page two

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 George 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 Bush in 1991 when he took unilateral action to deactivate a large number of U.S. strategic weapons and

The Honorable George W. Bush

August 18, 2000

Page three.

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,

Gary Baldrige, Global Missions Coordinator
Cooperative Baptist Fellowship
Atlanta, GA

The Most Reverend Victor H. Balke
Bishop, Catholic Diocese of Crookston
Crookston, MN

Bruce Birchard, General Secretary
Friends General Conference
Religious Society of Friends (Quakers)
Philadelphia, PA

The Rev. Leonard B. Bjorman, Co-Chair
Presbyterian Peace Fellowship
Syracuse, NY

The Right Reverend Frederick H. Borsch
Bishop, Episcopal Diocese of Los Angeles
Los Angeles, CA

J. Daryl Byler, Director
Washington Office
Mennonite Central Committee U.S.

Bishop Kenneth L. Carder
Nashville Area, United Methodist Church
Nashville, TN

C. Wayne Carter, General Secretary (Interim)
Friends United Meeting
Richmond, IN

The Rev. Dr. Forrest Church, Senior Minister
All Saints Unitarian Church
New York, NY

The Most Reverend Matthew H. Clark
Bishop, Catholic Diocese of Rochester
Rochester, NY

The Right Reverend John P. Croneberger
Bishop Coadjutor, Episcopal Diocese of Newark
Newark, NJ

The Rev. Dr. James Dunn, Visiting Professor
Wake Forest Divinity School
Winston-Salem, NC

The Most Reverend Patrick F. Flores
Archbishop, Catholic Archdiocese of San Antonio
San Antonio, TX

The Rev. Dr. James Forbes, Jr., Senior Minister
Riverside Church
New York, NY

Rabbi Arthur Green
Professor, Brandeis University
Waltham, MA

The Most Reverend Thomas Gumbleton
Auxiliary Bishop, Catholic Archdiocese of Detroit
Detroit, MI

The Right Reverend Ronald H. Haines
Bishop, Episcopal Diocese of Washington
Washington, DC

Howard W. Hallman, Chair
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
Bethesda, MD

The Right Reverend Sanford Z.K. Hampton
Assistant Bishop, Episcopal Diocese of Olympia
Seattle, WA

Dr. Susannah Heschel
Eli Black Professor of Jewish Studies
Dartmouth College
Hanover, NH

Kathleen S. Hurty, Executive Director
Church Women United
New York, NY

Thomas J. Jeavons, General Secretary
Philadelphia Yearly Meeting
Religious Society of Friends (Quakers)

Philadelphia, PA
Rabbi Michael Lerner
Editor, TIKKUN Magazine
San Francisco, CA

Rabbi Richard N. Levy,
Director of Rabbinical Studies, Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion
Los Angeles, CA

The Most Reverend Raymond A. Lucker
Bishop, Catholic Diocese of New Ulm
New Ulm, MN

Bishop Ernest S. Lyght
New York Area, United Methodist Church
White Plains, NY

The Rev. Dr. Clinton M. Marsh, Former Moderator
Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)
Atlanta, GA

Bishop Joel B. Martinez
Nebraska Area, United Methodist Church
Lincoln, NE

Rabbi Paul Menitoff, Executive Vice President
Central Conference of American Rabbis
New York, NY

The Right Reverend William D. Persell
Bishop, Episcopal Diocese of Chicago
Chicago, IL

Don Reeves, General Secretary (Interim)
American Friends Service Committee
Philadelphia, PA

The Rev. Meg A. Riley, Director
Washington Office for Faith in Action
Unitarian Universalist Association
Washington, DC

Rabbi David Saperstein, Director
Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism
Washington, DC

Dr. Ronald J. Sider, President
Evangelicals for Social Action
Wynnewood, PA

Dr. Glen Stassen, Professor
Fuller Theological Seminary
Pasadena, CA

The Rev. Ron Stief, Director

Justice and Witness Ministries
United Church of Christ
Washington, DC

The Most Reverend Walter F. Sullivan
Bishop, Catholic Diocese of Richmond
Richmond, VA

Bishop Melvin G. Talbert
California-Nevada Area, United Methodist Church
West Sacramento, CA

The Rev. John H. Thomas
General Minister and President
United Church of Christ
Cleveland, OH

Rabbi Arthur Waskow, Director
The Shalom Center
Philadelphia, PA
The Rev. Dr. Daniel W. Weiss, General Secretary
American Baptist Churches USA
Valley Forge, PA

Bishop C. Dale White
United Methodist Church
Newport, RI

Marilyn M. White, Co-Chair
Presbyterian Peace Fellowship
League City, TX

The Right Reverend Arthur B. Williams, Jr.
Bishop Suffragan, Episcopal Diocese of Ohio
Cleveland, OH

The Rev. Dr. Albert C. Winn, Former Moderator
Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)
Winston-Salem, NC

The Rev. L. William Yolton, Executive Secretary
Presbyterian Peace Fellowship
Alexandria, VA

Organizations are list for purpose of identification.

A reply to this letter may be address to the facilitator of this initiative:

Howard W. Hallman, Chair
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
6508 Wilmet Road

Bethesda, MD 20817

Phone/fax: 301 896-0013

E-mail: mupj@igc.org

To: Rlevy@huc.edu
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Final version: letter to presidential candidates
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\abl.084.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

To: Signers of letter to presidential candidates

I am sending as an attachment the final version of the letter from religious leaders to presidential candidates on nuclear disarmament issues and the list of 46 signers. Thanks for signing it. (If you want a text version rather than an attachment, please let me know.)

We have scheduled a news conference at the National Press Club for 2:00 p.m., Thursday, September 7 to release the replies from the candidates. In the meantime I'll be in touch with the candidates' offices to be certain that they received the letter and are going to respond.

When we receive their replies, I'll share them with you. After that we hope that you will encourage persons in your grassroots networks to raise questions with the candidates to clarify their positions on particular issues and to keep before them our conviction that nuclear disarmament is a moral issue, not merely a matter of military strategy.

With best regards,
Howard W. Hallman

To: "David Radcliff" <dradcliff_gb@brethren.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Letter to presidential candidates
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <s9a26286.016@brethren.org>
References:

At 11:22 AM 8/22/00 -0500, you wrote:

>Howard, our Executive Director just returned to the office and expressed willingness to sign on to this letter. Let me know if there's still time--although I know the deadline has passed.

>

>She's Judy Mills Reimer

>Executive Director

>Church of the Brethren General Board

David,

The letter was mailed on August 18 with 46 signers. However, we may add other endorsers at the time of the news conference with the candidates' replies on September 7. We can add Judy Mills Reimer's name then.

Howard

To: phil
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Allocation of Rockefeller contribution
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Phil,

I talked with my Rockefeller contacts about which of our funds their grant should go to. At first they said it was a 501(c)(3) grant, hence to the Methodists United Peace/Justice Education Fund. After I explained our need for 501(c)(4) funds related to activities dealing with the election campaign, they said we could assign \$10,000 to (c)(4) and \$5,000 to (c)(3). I know you put it all in the General Fund, so you'll need to reallocate \$5,000 to the Education Fund. I'll instruct you which expenditures to apply where.

Howard

To: mupjbd
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Progress report
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\icnd.031.doc; A:\abl.084.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

August 22, 2000

To: Board of Directors
Methodists United for Peace with Justice

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

During the last eight weeks I have been involved in several activities related to nuclear disarmament.

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair, met on June 22. We decided to work with 20/20 Vision on a postcard alert on National Missile Defense (NMD). 28 faith-group joined as cosponsors. More than 30,000 postcards have been printed and are being distributed. Previously I sent you one.

We also worked on a set of questions addressed to congressional candidates on nuclear disarmament issues, to be used by grassroots activists during the 2000 election campaign. The final version of these questions is attached. (If you want it in text format, let me know.)

I have worked with Dave Robinson of Pax Christi USA to develop a letter from religious leaders to presidential candidates, asking a set of questions on nuclear disarmament issues. With 46 signers we mailed the letter to the candidates of the Democratic, Republican, Green, and Reform parties on August 18. We have requested a reply by September 5 and have scheduled a news conference for September 7 to release their replies. A copy of the letter is attached. (Again if you want it in text format, let me know.)

In June we received a contribution of \$15,000 from an anonymous member of the Rockefeller in support of my work with the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. I have worked it out so that \$10,000 goes to our basic 501(c)(4) corporation and \$5,000 to the 501(c)(3) Methodists United Peace/Justice Education Fund. That means that the (c)(4) portion can be used for expenses related to the letter to presidential candidates, such as retaining a media consultant to help with the news conference.

We intend to follow up the news conference by contacting political reporters who are following the campaign and with talk show hosts and encouraging them to ask follow-up questions. We will also work through interfaith networks to get grassroots activists to attend rallies and forums with signs and questions. We want to particularly emphasize that the possession and possible use of nuclear weapons is a moral issue. You'll hear more about this in September.

Shalom,
Howard

August 22, 2000

To: Board of Directors

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

During the last eight weeks I have been involved in several activities related to nuclear disarmament.

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair, met on June 22. We decided to work with 20/20 Vision on a postcard alert on National Missile Defense (NMD). 28 faith-group joined as cosponsors. More than 30,000 postcards have been printed and are being distributed. Previously I sent you one.

We also worked on a set of questions addressed to congressional candidates on nuclear disarmament issues, to be used by grassroots activists during the 2000 election campaign. The final version of these questions is enclosed.

I have worked with Dave Robinson of Pax Christi USA to develop a letter from religious leaders to presidential candidates, asking a set of questions on nuclear disarmament issues. With 46 signers we mailed the letter to the candidates of the Democratic, Republican, Green, and Reform parties on August 18 (copy enclosed). We have requested a reply by September 5 and have scheduled a news conference for September 7 to release their replies.

In June we received a contribution of \$15,000 from an anonymous member of the Rockefeller in support of my work with the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. I have worked it out so that \$10,000 goes to our basic 501(c)(4) corporation and \$5,000 to the 501(c)(3) Methodists United Peace/Justice Education Fund. That means that the (c)(4) portion can be used for expenses related to the letter to presidential candidates, such as retaining a media consultant to help with the news conference.

We intend to follow up the news conference by contacting political reporters who are following the campaign and with talk show hosts and encouraging them to ask follow-up questions. We will also work through interfaith networks to get grassroots activists to attend rallies and forums with signs and questions. We want to particularly emphasize that the possession and possible use of nuclear weapons is a moral issue. You'll hear more about this in September.

To: enquist, wstarman@cathedral.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Letter to presidential candidates
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\abl.084.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Roy and Wendy,

With help from Dave Robinson of Pax Christi USA I have developed a letter from religious leaders to presidential candidates, asking questions on nuclear disarmament issues. Rather than seeking heads of communion to sign (with a few exceptions), we have recruited bishops and other leaders scattered around the country. The letter with the 46 signers is attached.

You will note that we quoted from the Washington National Cathedral statement of religious and military leaders. We also included a copy of that statement in the material we sent the candidates. Thus, we have made use of it in ways you cannot.

We have asked the candidates for response by September 5. We will hold a news conference at 2:00 p.m., Thursday, September 7 at the National Press Club to release the candidates' replies. You are invited to attend.

Shalom,
Howard

To: jdi@clw.org, dkimball@clw.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Letter to presidential candidates
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\abl.084.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear John and Daryl,

On August 18 we mailed the attached letter from religious leaders to presidential candidates of the Democratic, Republican, Reform, and Green parties, asking a series of questions on nuclear disarmament. We sent the letter to Vice President Gore to the attention of Leon Fuerth and the letter to Governor Bush to the attention of Condoleezza Rice. We asked for response by September 5 and told them we will be holding a news conference on Thursday afternoon, September 7 to release their replies. Participants in the news conference will include United Methodist Bishop C. Dale White and either Catholic Bishop Walter Sullivan or Bishop Thomas Gumbleton.

I am going to be in touch with the candidates' staffs to be certain that the right persons have the letter and that they will respond in a timely manner. In case one or more candidate doesn't respond we would like to have available an analysis of public statements that provide answers by candidates to the questions, including an indication of unanswered questions. Would you be willing to help us with this compilation? I believe you have been following the campaign and probably have material at hand. We are particularly interested in Gore and Bush, but also Nader and Buchanan if available. We included Hagelin as standby, but my guess is that Buchanan will be the Reform Party candidate recognized by the Federal Election Commission.

I will deeply appreciate your assistance.

Howard

P.S. The letter is for your information but not for wider circulation at this time.

X-Sender: susannah.heschel@dasher.dartmouth.edu
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.3 (32)
Date: Mon, 21 Aug 2000 10:51:01 -0400
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: Susannah Heschel <susannah.heschel@Dartmouth.EDU>
Subject: Re: Correction

Howard, a great letter!

At 10:45 AM 8/21/00 -0400, you wrote:

>To: Signers of letter to presidential candidates

>

>I sent the wrong attachment. Here is the correct one.

>

>Howard Hallman

>Attachment Converted: "C:\eudora\Attach\abl.084.doc"

>

>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.

Prof. Susannah Heschel

Eli Black Professor of Jewish Studies

Dartmouth College

6036 Thornton Hall

Hanover, NH 03755-3592

(603) 646-2386

Fax: (603) 646-1699

From: MLiebling@aol.com
Date: Mon, 21 Aug 2000 13:58:12 EDT
Subject: Re: Nukes: Letter to presidential candidates on nuclear arms control
To: mupj@igc.org
X-Mailer: AOL 5.0 for Windows sub 120

Dear Howard,
I would be pleased to sign onto the letter to the candidates

Rabbi Mordechai Liebling
Jewish Reconstructionist Federation and The Shefa Fund

Date: Tue, 22 Aug 2000 13:02:36 -0400 (EDT)
Comments: SoVerNet Verification (on garnet.sover.net)
arc4a80.bf.sover.net from arc4a80.bf.sover.net [209.198.114.18] 209.198.114.18
Tue, 22 Aug 2000 13:02:36 -0400 (EDT)
X-Sender: raphael@sover.net
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Version 1.4.4
To: mupj@igc.org
From: Mail Delivery Subsystem <MAILER-DAEMON@sover.net> (by way of raphael@sover.net (Rick Raphael))
Subject: Returned mail: Service unavailable

The original message was received at Sun, 20 Aug 2000 09:42:02 -0400 (EDT)
from arc5a152.bf.sover.net [209.198.80.153]

----- The following addresses had permanent fatal errors -----
<mupj@pop2.igc.org>

----- Transcript of session follows -----
... while talking to pop.igc.org.:
<<< 550 Access denied
554 <mupj@pop2.igc.org>... Service unavailable
Reporting-MTA: dns; pike.sover.net
Received-From-MTA: DNS; arc5a152.bf.sover.net
Arrival-Date: Sun, 20 Aug 2000 09:42:02 -0400 (EDT)

Final-Recipient: RFC822; mupj@pop.igc.org
Action: failed
Status: 5.5.0
Remote-MTA: DNS; pop.igc.org
Diagnostic-Code: SMTP; 550 Access denied
Last-Attempt-Date: Sun, 20 Aug 2000 09:42:04 -0400 (EDT)
Return-Path: <raphael@sover.net>
Received: from arc5a152.bf.sover.net (arc5a152.bf.sover.net [209.198.80.153])
by pike.sover.net (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id JAA20986
for <mupj@pop2.igc.org>; Sun, 20 Aug 2000 09:42:02 -0400 (EDT)
Date: Sun, 20 Aug 2000 09:42:02 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <200008201342.JAA20986@pike.sover.net>
Comments: SoVerNet Verification (on pike.sover.net)
arc5a152.bf.sover.net from arc5a152.bf.sover.net 209.198.80.153 209.198.80.153
Sun, 20 Aug 2000 09:42:02 -0400 (EDT)
X-Sender: raphael@sover.net
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Version 1.4.4
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: mupj@pop.igc.org
From: raphael@sover.net (Rick Raphael)
Subject: script

Hi Howard,

Thank-you for sending a copy of your screenplay. I just wanted you to know
that I have recieved it and look forward to reading it. I find it hard to
accept not having the time to read,but my father-in-law's cancer is

devouring more than his life. The interconnectedness is focused on him , a little work, and Ricky. School starts soon, and that rythum will focus my efforts. Leaving me free to breath. I hope.

Have you seen Space Cowboys? Also, comming Friday, The Crew. I haven't seen either, but these films are within your genera, shows that great minds etc. If they do well at the box-office, they will establish a commitment to this type film as the seniors tour tournaments has done for golf. A place for the legends to play.

Hope you are well. Love to Carlee.

Always, Leslie

To: AEidinger@yahoo.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Letter to presidential candidates
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\abl.084.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Adam:

On Friday, August 18 we mailed the attached letter from 46 religious leaders to presidential candidates -- Gore, Bush, Nader, Buchanan, and Hagelin -- asking questions about their position on nuclear disarmament issues. The signers represent a broad cross-section of faith groups and geographic areas. We asked for replies by September 5 and indicated that we would release their answers at a news conference on September 7. I have arranged for a room at the National Press Club for the afternoon of September 7. Our presenters will include United Methodist Bishop C. Dale White, either Catholic Bishop Walter Sullivan or Bishop Thomas Gumbleton, and perhaps one or two others.

We need assistance in staging the news conference, especially promoting attendance from both the secular and the religious press. We also want help in follow-through with political reporters following the campaign and with talk show hosts so that they will ask follow-up questions of the candidates. Please give me a proposal on how you can help us with these tasks and the budget for your services.

We ourselves will encourage activists in our grassroots networks to ask questions of the candidates and hold up signs at their campaign appearances around the country.

Our questions cover a range of nuclear disarmament issues, but we particularly want to stress that the possession and possible use of nuclear weapons is a moral issue and not merely a matter of military strategy.

With the letter we are sending the candidates a set of denominational statements on nuclear disarmament, the statement of religious and military leaders issued by the Washington National Cathedral in June, and excerpts from statements by Admiral Noel Gayler, General Colin Powell, General Charles Horner, and General Lee Butler on the lack of military utility of nuclear weapons. I'll show these to you when you return to Washington.

You can reach me by phone at 301 896-0013.

Shalom,
Howard

Date: Wed, 23 Aug 2000 15:22:56 -0400

From: William J Price <WorldPeaceMakers@compuserve.com>

Subject: Sept 7th Opportunity to Be Leaves for the Healing of Our Nation

Sender: William J Price <WorldPeaceMakers@compuserve.com>

To: Tom Huber <tomhub@erols.com>, Ted Gordon O <tgordon@cpsc.gov>, Bob Bayer <roliver@erols.com>, Paul Fitch <pvffitch@erols.com>, Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.org>, Harriet Hintz <momhh@aol.com>, Mike Little <mlittle@saminns.org>, Jean Matthews <minmon@erols.com>, Bill Yolton <lwyolton@prodigy.net>, Kip Landon <kpljr@bellatlantic.net>, Cynthia Cowner <kirkridge@fast.net>, Francis & Ken Monroe <Ken4Fran@aol.com>, "Jose L. Gutierrez" <JLGVNEWS@erols.com>, Jennifer Goode <jlg@cdrh.fda.gov>, Janet Hudson <janetehudson@compuserve.com>, Susan Burton <hall-burton@starpower.net>, Carol Wilkinson <dayspringretreat@prodigy.net>, Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>, Roger Geesey <argfeb94@aol.com>, Allen Holt <allen_holt@hotmail.com>, Annie Eustis <aeustis@mail.howard.K12.md.us>, Carolyn & Jerry Parr <jerryparr@iopener.net>, Richard Shaul <dickshaul@aol.com>

Dear Abolitionist Partners,

"The river of water of life, bright as crystal, (is) flowing from the throne of God and the Lamb through the middle of the street of the city (Washington DC) with the tree of life on either side, the leaves of which are for the healing of our nation".(Rev. 22)

You and I and our associates are invited to participate in sharing these leaves at a News Conference at the National Press Club (529 Fourteenth St NW) September 7th at 2:00 PM in the First Amendment Room.

Methodists United for Peace and Justice, lead by Howard Hallman and assisted by Dave Robinson of Pax Christi - USA, prepared a letter from religious leaders to presidential candidates, asking a series of questions on nuclear disarmament. Signed by 46 persons, representing a cross section of faith groups and geographical areas, the letter was mailed on August 18th, requesting their replies by September 5th, to be shared at the September 7th News Conference.

A media consultant is helping develop media attendance at the News Conference and the follow through for sharing about candidates responses . By many of us attending this News Conference and mingling with the press, we can help demonstrate how important a moral and political issue nuclear disarmament is. Also we can further prepare ourselves further for interacting with candidates in the crucial Fall election campaigns.

Please come if you can, share the invitations widely, particularly with Washington Area associates, and pray for the Holy Spirit to flow evermore fully through Project Abolition. This initiative, along with Nuclear

Reduction Disarmament Initiative of three dozen retired military leaders and heads of denominations – check <http://www.cathedral.org/cathedral/events/nuclear> – and much more, holds great promise for Project Abolition!

Your partner Bill

PS. Can't you envision our mantra "In the Name of God, let us abolish nuclear weapons NOW" emerging this Fall, and leading into a new life-giving path!? It's not beyond the imagination, and it's certainly not beyond the POWER of GOD. Our partner Jim Douglass put it very clearly when he wrote "the only genuine power which eschatological weapons (such as nuclear weapons) have is to provoke in us a complete re-examination of the nature of POWER itself". Our partner Richard Deats has been quietly sharing "Do you know the book "The Only Way Left?". John Dear shares succinctly "As dead as the nuclear abolition movement is throughout the USA, including our churches, with Jesus we can be sure that the US religious community can take the lead in abolishing nuclear weapons". And Jonathan Schell, a continual source of manna for our journey, underlined our "Gift of Time" at the July 1st service launching the Peoples Campaign for Nonviolence, with these words: "This is a historic moment in the nuclear age...I think God has given us an opportunity, a miraculous opportunity, which we did not deserve, to rid ourselves of an evil of our own making. If we can't do it, God have mercy on us, for we'll head into a world even more dangerous than the Cold War." (And check out his current article on the breakdown of arms control in the September-October Foreign Affairs Magazine, to be also published this Fall along with his January Harper's Magazine essay in a book entitled "THE UNFINISHED TWENTIETH CENTURY").

And what can we NOW learn about the true nature of POWER? Check out the new book by Richard Shaull and Walter Cesar in which Richard writes: "Vast numbers of people (in Brazil and elsewhere in South America), under the impact of the global economy of the market, facing ever greater impoverishment and marginalization by turning evermore toward their religion as their only hope, are being EMPOWERED in amazing ways. Richard closes his half of the book "The Reconstruction of Life and Power in the Spirit" with these words: "Pentecostals or mainline Christians, face the same challenge to work in community to empower such efforts and develop new forms of conscientization, and new strategies for action, which can contribute to the emergence of a new and more just order." (From PENTACOSTALISM AND THE FUTURE OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCHES, (Eerdmans. 2000). This is not only a disestablishment imagination. It's the Gospel and "THE ONLY WAY LEFT").

Date: Wed, 23 Aug 2000 15:51:02 -0400
From: William J Price <WorldPeaceMakers@compuserve.com>
Subject: September 7th Opportunity to Be Leaves for Healing Our
nation
Sender: William J Price <WorldPeaceMakers@compuserve.com>
To: Dave Robinson <dave@paxchristiusa.org>, Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.org>

Dear Dave, So glad you and Howard are continuing this so creative
partnership.

I look forward to seeing you on the 7th. Bill

-----Forwarded Message-----

From: William J Price,
To: Wendy Starman, INTERNET:wstarman@cathedral.org
Schuyler Rhodes , INTERNET:wesleycal@juno.com
David Krieger, INTERNET:wagingpeace@napf.org
Toni Smith, INTERNET:TSMITH943@cshore.com
Thomas O'Rourke, INTERNET:torepic@aol.com
Tyler Stevenson, INTERNET:Stevenson@gsinstitute.org
Jonathan Schell, INTERNET:Schellj@hotmail.com
Richard Taylor, INTERNET:rktpbt@worldnet.att.net
Kathy Railsbach, INTERNET:railsk@compuserve.com
Beth DeGrasse, INTERNET:ptlef@aol.com
Rabia Terri Harris, INTERNET:mpf@igc.apc.org
Mel Duncan , INTERNET:MnDuncan@AOL.com
Molly Rush, INTERNET:mertonctr@aol.com
Mary Evelyn Jegen, INTERNET:mejegen@yahoo.com
Bill Yolton, INTERNET:lwyolton@prodigy.net
Jean Paul Lederach, INTERNET:lederacj@emu.edu
Lauren Cannon, INTERNET:laurencan@rcn.com
Kevin Martin, INTERNET:kmartin@fourthfreedom.org
Judith Kelly, INTERNET:judithkell@aol.com
Don Mosley , INTERNET:jubileep@igc.apc.org
John Dear , INTERNET:johndear@forusa.org
Jim Wallis, INTERNET:JimWallis2@aol.com
JGChisholm, INTERNET:JGChisholm@aol.com
Glen Stassen , INTERNET:gstassen@fuller.edu
Marvin Clark, INTERNET:glodem@wizvax.net
George Cornelius, INTERNET:gcornel@icdc.com
Tony Blair, Prime Minister, Britain , INTERNET:gbrun@undp.org
Richard Deats , INTERNET:fellowship@forusa.org
Roy Enquist, INTERNET:enquist@starpower.net
Dan Ebener, INTERNET:ebener@davenportdiocese.org
Dee Dee Risher, INTERNET:DeeDee@TheOtherSide.org
Dave Robinson, INTERNET:dave@paxchristiusa.org
Tom Jackson, INTERNET:coffeeanon@yahoo.com
Urbane Byler, INTERNET:bylerju@juno.com
Bill Wylie-Kellerman, INTERNET:bill@thewitness.org
Barbara Wien, INTERNET:barbara_wien@usip.org
Allie Perry, INTERNET:APerry7247@aol.com
Alistair Millar, INTERNET:amillar@fourthfreedom.org
Allen Holt, INTERNET:allen_holt@hotmail.com

Andrea Ayvazian, INTERNET:aayvazia@mhc.mtholyoke.edu
David McClintock, INTERNET:3dmacs@email.msn.com
Dietrich Fischer, INTERNET:102464.1110@compuserve.com

Date: 8/23/2000 3:20 PM

RE: September 7th Opportunity to Be Leaves for Healing Our nation

Dear Abolitionist Partners,

"The river of water of life, bright as crystal, (is) flowing from the throne of God and the Lamb through the middle of the street of the city (Washington DC) with the tree of life on either side, the leaves of which are for the healing of our nation".(Rev. 22)

You and I and our associates are invited to participate in sharing these leaves at a News Conference at the National Press Club (529 Fourteenth St NW) September 7th at 2:00 PM in the First Amendment Room.

Methodists United for Peace and Justice, lead by Howard Hallman and assisted by Dave Robinson of Pax Christi - USA, prepared a letter from religious leaders to presidential candidates, asking a series of questions on nuclear disarmament. Signed by 46 persons, representing a cross section of faith groups and geographical areas, the letter was mailed on August 18th, requesting their replies by September 5th, to be shared at the September 7th News Conference.

A media consultant is helping develop media attendance at the News Conference and the follow through for sharing about candidates responses . By many of us attending this News Conference and mingling with the press, we can help demonstrate how important a moral and political issue nuclear disarmament is. Also we can further prepare ourselves further for interacting with candidates in the crucial Fall election campaigns.

Please come if you can, share the invitations widely, particularly with Washington Area associates, and pray for the Holy Spirit to flow evermore fully through Project Abolition. This initiative, along with Nuclear Reduction Disarmament Initiative of three dozen retired military leaders and heads of denominations check <http://www.cathedral.org/cathedral/events/nuclear> and much more, holds great promise for Project Abolition!

Your partner Bill

PS. Can't you envision our mantra "In the Name of God, let us abolish nuclear weapons NOW" emerging this Fall, and leading into a new life-giving path!? It's not beyond the imagination, and it's certainly not beyond the POWER of GOD. Our partner Jim Douglass put it very clearly when he wrote "the only genuine power which eschatological weapons (such as nuclear weapons) have is to provoke in us a complete re-examination of the nature of POWER itself". Our partner Richard Deats has been quietly sharing "Do you know the book "The Only Way Left?". John Dear shares succinctly "As dead as the nuclear abolition movement is throughout the USA, including our

churches, with Jesus we can be sure that the US religious community can take the lead in abolishing nuclear weapons". And Jonathan Schell, a continual source of manna for our journey, underlined our "Gift of Time" at the July 1st service launching the Peoples Campaign for Nonviolence, with these words: "This is a historic moment in the nuclear age...I think God has given us an opportunity, a miraculous opportunity, which we did not deserve, to rid ourselves of an evil of our own making. If we can't do it, God have mercy on us, for we'll head into a world even more dangerous than the Cold War." (And check out his current article on the breakdown of arms control in the September-October Foreign Affairs Magazine, to be also published this Fall along with his January Harper's Magazine essay in a book entitled "THE UNFINISHED TWENTIETH CENTURY").

And what can we NOW learn about the true nature of POWER? Check out the new book by Richard Shaull and Walter Cesar in which Richard writes: "Vast numbers of people (in Brazil and elsewhere in South America), under the impact of the global economy of the market, facing ever greater impoverishment and marginalization by turning evermore toward their religion as their only hope, are being EMPOWERED in amazing ways. Richard closes his half of the book "The Reconstruction of Life and Power in the Spirit" with these words: "Pentecostals or mainline Christians, face the same challenge to work in community to empower such efforts and develop new forms of conscientization, and new strategies for action, which can contribute to the emergence of a new and more just order." (From PENTACOSTALISM AND THE FUTURE OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCHES, (Eerdmans. 2000). This is not a disestablishment imagination. It's the Gospel and "THE ONLY WAY LEFT" ! .

User-Agent: Microsoft Outlook Express Macintosh Edition - 5.0 (1513)
Date: Wed, 23 Aug 2000 13:23:20 -0700
Subject: Re: Letter to presidential candidates
From: "[GSI] Tyler Stevenson" <stevenson@gsinstitute.org>
To: "Howard W.Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>

Dear Howard,

Sorry about the delay in replying. Unfortunately I don't know that GSI has any contacts who are currently prepared to make a 501(c)4 donation for this kind of activity. Please do know that I keep my eyes peeled for anyone willing to make donations to faith-based efforts, and if I come across anything (even after the fact) I'll certainly be in touch.

I wish I could be of more help. Best of luck, Howard.

Pax,
Tyler

To: davidculp@yahoo.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Election contests
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\icnd.031.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

David,

I was glad to see your e-mail address on the communication about mini-nukes, for I have been wanting to get in touch with you.

I'm hoping that some of the faith groups participating in the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament will encourage their grassroots activists to be in touch with candidates for the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives during the election campaign. To this end we have prepared the attached list of suggested questions.

Earlier in the year you prepared a list of Senate seats up for election with a priority ranking. Would you be willing to update this list and let me share it with faith groups, with or without attribution? If you want to talk about it, please give me a call.

Shalom,
Howard

From: Vmsmagic@cs.com
Date: Thu, 24 Aug 2000 09:01:18 EDT
Subject: Re: Allocation of Rockefeller contribution
To: mupj@igc.org
X-Mailer: CompuServe 2000 32-bit sub 103

I can easily follow your instructions.

I believe your payments have been assigned to the grant thus far. I've not allocated any administrative costs to the grant except for the room charge at the Press Club.

X-Lotus-FromDomain: UCC
From: copel@ucc.org
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Date: Thu, 24 Aug 2000 12:47:08 -0400
Subject: Re: Final version: letter to presidential candidates

Hello. I am Lorin Cope, Minister for Conference Relationship for the United Church of Christ. UCC President and General Minister, John Thomas has agreed to sign this letter. However, would it be possible for you to send us a copy of the letter. I could not open your e-mail attachment. Please send it as part of the text or fax it to our office marked to my attention at fax number 216-736-2103.

I think you are aware that John agreed to sign on to the letter, but can not be with you in September.

Thank you for your extra help.

Lorin Cope

"Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> on 08/21/2000 10:22:01 AM

To: mupj@mindspring.com
cc: (bcc: Lorin Cope/UCC)

Subject: Final version: letter to presidential candidates

To: Signers of letter to presidential candidates

I am sending as an attachment the final version of the letter from religious leaders to presidential candidates on nuclear disarmament issues and the list of 46 signers. Thanks for signing it. (If you want a text version rather than an attachment, please let me know.)

We have scheduled a news conference at the National Press Club for 2:00 p.m., Thursday, September 7 to release the replies from the candidates. In the meantime I'll be in touch with the candidates' offices to be certain that they received the letter and are going to respond.

When we receive their replies, I'll share them with you. After that we hope that you will encourage persons in your grassroots networks to raise questions with the candidates to clarify their positions on particular issues and to keep before them our conviction that nuclear disarmament is a moral issue, not merely a matter of military strategy.

With best regards,
Howard W. Hallman

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\abolish.286.doc"

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: copel@ucc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Final version: letter to presidential candidates
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <85256945.005C3576.00@UCCLN2.ucc.org>
References:

At 12:47 PM 8/24/00 -0400, you wrote:

>
>

>Hello. I am Lorin Cope, Minister for Conference Relationship for the
>United Church of Christ. UCC President and General Minister, John Thomas
>has agreed to sign this letter. However, would it be possible for you to
>send us a copy of the letter....

Lorin,

Here is the letter. We are pleased that Rev. Thomas signed. We'll keep you posted about the candidates' replies.

Howard Hallman

###

August 18, 2000 Similar letter sent to:

The Honorable George W. Bush	Vice President Albert Gore, Jr.
State Capitol	Mr. Ralph Nader
100 E. 11th Street	Mr. Patrick J. Buchanan
Austin, TX 78701	Mr. John Hagelin

Dear Governor Bush:

Congratulations on your nomination by the Republican 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 one of the most important is 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 Democratic, 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 George 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 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,

Gary Baldrige, Global Missions Coordinator
Cooperative Baptist Fellowship
Atlanta, GA

The Most Reverend Victor H. Balke
Bishop, Catholic Diocese of Crookston
Crookston, MN

Bruce Birchard, General Secretary
Friends General Conference
Religious Society of Friends (Quakers)
Philadelphia, PA

The Rev. Leonard B. Bjorman, Co-Chair
Presbyterian Peace Fellowship
Syracuse, NY

The Right Reverend Frederick H. Borsch
Bishop, Episcopal Diocese of Los Angeles
Los Angeles, CA

J. Daryl Byler, Director
Washington Office
Mennonite Central Committee U.S.

Bishop Kenneth L. Carder
Nashville Area, United Methodist Church
Nashville, TN

C. Wayne Carter, General Secretary (Interim)
Friends United Meeting
Richmond, IN

The Rev. Dr. Forrest Church, Senior Minister
All Saints Unitarian Church
New York, NY

The Most Reverend Matthew H. Clark
Bishop, Catholic Diocese of Rochester
Rochester, NY

The Right Reverend John P. Croneberger
Bishop Coadjutor, Episcopal Diocese of Newark
Newark, NJ

The Rev. Dr. James Dunn, Visiting Professor
Wake Forest Divinity School
Winston-Salem, NC

The Most Reverend Patrick F. Flores
Archbishop, Catholic Archdiocese of San Antonio
San Antonio, TX

The Rev. Dr. James Forbes, Jr., Senior Minister
Riverside Church
New York, NY

Rabbi Arthur Green
Professor, Brandeis University
Waltham, MA

The Most Reverend Thomas Gumbleton
Auxiliary Bishop, Catholic Archdiocese of Detroit
Detroit, MI

The Right Reverend Ronald H. Haines
Bishop, Episcopal Diocese of Washington
Washington, DC

Howard W. Hallman, Chair
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
Bethesda, MD

The Right Reverend Sanford Z.K. Hampton
Assistant Bishop, Episcopal Diocese of Olympia
Seattle, WA

Dr. Susannah Heschel
Eli Black Professor of Jewish Studies
Dartmouth College
Hanover, NH

Kathleen S. Hurty, Executive Director
Church Women United
New York, NY

Thomas J. Jeavons, General Secretary
Philadelphia Yearly Meeting
Religious Society of Friends (Quakers)
Philadelphia, PA
Rabbi Michael Lerner
Editor, TIKKUN Magazine
San Francisco, CA

Rabbi Richard N. Levy,
Director of Rabbinical Studies, Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion
Los Angeles, CA

The Most Reverend Raymond A. Lucker
Bishop, Catholic Diocese of New Ulm
New Ulm, MN

Bishop Ernest S. Lyght
New York Area, United Methodist Church
White Plains, NY

The Rev. Dr. Clinton M. Marsh, Former Moderator
Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)
Atlanta, GA

Bishop Joel B. Martinez
Nebraska Area, United Methodist Church
Lincoln, NE

Rabbi Paul Menitoff, Executive Vice President
Central Conference of American Rabbis
New York, NY

The Right Reverend William D. Persell
Bishop, Episcopal Diocese of Chicago
Chicago, IL

Don Reeves, General Secretary (Interim)
American Friends Service Committee
Philadelphia, PA

The Rev. Meg A. Riley, Director
Washington Office for Faith in Action
Unitarian Universalist Association
Washington, DC

Rabbi David Saperstein, Director
Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism
Washington, DC

Dr. Ronald J. Sider, President
Evangelicals for Social Action
Wynnewood, PA

Dr. Glen Stassen, Professor

Fuller Theological Seminary
Pasadena, CA

The Rev. Ron Stief, Director
Justice and Witness Ministries
United Church of Christ
Washington, DC

The Most Reverend Walter F. Sullivan
Bishop, Catholic Diocese of Richmond
Richmond, VA

Bishop Melvin G. Talbert
California-Nevada Area, United Methodist Church
West Sacramento, CA

The Rev. John H. Thomas
General Minister and President
United Church of Christ
Cleveland, OH

Rabbi Arthur Waskow, Director
The Shalom Center
Philadelphia, PA

The Rev. Dr. Daniel W. Weiss, General Secretary
American Baptist Churches USA
Valley Forge, PA

Bishop C. Dale White
United Methodist Church
Newport, RI

Marilyn M. White, Co-Chair
Presbyterian Peace Fellowship
League City, TX

The Right Reverend Arthur B. Williams, Jr.
Bishop Suffragan, Episcopal Diocese of Ohio
Cleveland, OH

The Rev. Dr. Albert C. Winn, Former Moderator
Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)
Winston-Salem, NC

The Rev. L. William Yolton, Executive Secretary
Presbyterian Peace Fellowship
Alexandria, VA

Organizations are list for purpose of identification.

A reply to this letter may be address to the facilitator of this initiative:

Howard W. Hallman, Chair
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
6508 Wilmett Road
Bethesda, MD 20817

Phone/fax: 301 896-0013

E-mail: mupj@igc.org

X-Lotus-FromDomain: UCC
From: copel@ucc.org
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Date: Thu, 24 Aug 2000 15:58:20 -0400
Subject: Re: Final version: letter to presidential candidates

Thank you for the copy of the letter.

Lorin Cope

X-Sender: abolition2000@abolition2000.org
Date: Thu, 24 Aug 2000 10:39:32 -0800
To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
From: Abolition 2000 <admin@abolition2000.org>
Subject: (abolition-usa) Bread Not Stones Bus Tour
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

>

>PLEASE FORWARD

>

>Bread Not Stones Bus Tour ~ Driving Home the Truth About Military Spending

>Sponsored by Pax Christi USA

>

>"Is there anyone among you who, if your child asks for bread, will give a
>stone?" - Matthew 7:9

>

>Goal of the Campaign

>

>The Bread Not Stones Bus Tour is part of Bread Not Stones: A National
>Catholic Campaign to Redirect Military Spending sponsored by Pax Christi
>USA. The campaign seeks to redirect exorbitant military spending to funding
>for social needs like health care, education, and job training. Pax
>Christi USA initiated the campaign in response to a statement by its bishop
>members in which they said, "In a time of unprecedented economic prosperity
>and budget surpluses, our political leaders cannot find the resources to
>provide a good education and reliable health care for tens of millions of
>our nation's children and we are told that we cannot afford targeted tax
>relief for millions of struggling families. We view the federal budget as
>a moral document that must reflect our degree of compassion for those who
>are poor and suffering in our own society. During this budget and election
>cycle we must marshal our resources and summon our moral courage to say
>"no" to a bloated military budget which robs those who are poor and
>vulnerable and "yes" to a budget which helps lift people out of poverty."

>

>Public Education on Wheels

>

>The bus tour will be the highlight of the public education phase of the
>Bread Not Stones campaign. The tour features the 40-foot long Moneymobile,
>painted with piles of money and a sign that says "MOVE OUR MONEY... INVEST
>IN OUR KIDS." Beginning in early September and lasting two months, the bus
>will begin in Los Angeles and travel from coast to coast, stopping in 30
>cities on its intended route. Using giant inflatable props and theatrics,
>the Moneymobile will be featured at college campuses, high schools,
>churches and public parks. Giant, colorful inflatable graphs and charts,
>some as high as 27 feet, will tell the story of U.S. military spending,
>revealing the consequences of spending too much money on the military and
>not enough on social needs. Consequences like 11 million children without
>health insurance... or the U.S. ranking 13th worldwide in infant mortality
>and 18th in student test scores. The props also show that the U.S. grossly
>exceeds all other countries in military spending and how the defense
>industry provides millions of dollars to political campaigns. As election
>campaigns heat up, our bus tour will give people the tools they need to

- >make military spending an election issue which cannot be ignored. The
- >Moneymobile is a creation of Business Leaders for Sensible Priorities and
- >it's being leased to Pax Christi USA to promote our campaign.

>
>Bus Tour Route (subject to change due to unforeseen circumstances)

>
>Anticipated Cities Anticipated Schedule

- >Los Angeles, CA September 5-6
- >Gallup, NM September 8-9
- >Amarillo, TX September 11
- >San Angelo, TX September 12-13
- >San Antonio, TX September 14
- >Houston, TX September 15
- >Dallas, TX September 16-17
- >Travel day September 20
- >St. Louis, MO September 21-22
- >New Ulm, MN September 24
- >Crookston, MN September 25-26
- >St. Cloud, MN September 27
- >Minneapolis, MN September 28-29
- >Travel day October 2
- >Chicago, IL October 3-4
- >South Bend, IN October 5
- >Grand Rapids, MI October 6
- >Lansing, MI October 7
- >Saginaw, MI October 8
- >Detroit, MI October 9-10
- >Ann Arbor, MI October 11
- >Columbus, OH October 14-15
- >Cleveland, OH October 16-17
- >Pittsburgh, PA October 18-19
- >Baltimore, MD October 20
- >Washington, DC October 21-22
- >Philadelphia, PA October 23-24
- >New York, NY October 27-28
- >Boston, MA October 29-30
- >Portland, ME October 31-Nov. 1
- >Burlington, VT November 2

>
>How to Get Involved

- >
- >If the bus tour is coming to your city, we need you! Help us organize a
- >Bread Not Stones Bus Tour event at a church, school, or other public
- >place...get the word out around your community... contact the media... and
- >much more! Complete the attached form and send it to us today!

- >
- >If the bus tour isn't coming to your city, you can still get involved! The
- >Bread Not Stones campaign is much bigger than the bus tour. Our brand new
- >Bread Not Stones education/organizing packet has everything you need to
- >participate in the campaign and organize others at the grassroots
- >level. Available from the Pax Christi USA national office for \$8.50,
- >including postage and handling.

>

>The Bread Not Stones campaign is sponsored by Pax Christi USA and endorsed
>by the Leadership Conference of Women Religious, the Conference of Major
>Superiors of Men's Institutes, NETWORK: A National Catholic Social Justice
>Lobby, the National Black Sisters' Conference, the Maryknoll Office for
>Global Concerns and the Sisters of St. Joseph of Peace.

>
>Response Form

>
>YES, I want to get involved in the Bread Not Stones campaign!

>
>Name _____

>
>Address _____

>
>City _____ State _____ Zip _____

>
>Phone _____ Fax _____

>
>E-mail _____

>
>Congressional District # _____

>
>_____ Please keep me updated on the Bread Not Stones bus tour (requires
>e-mail).

>
>_____ I'd like to help organize the Bread Not Stones bus tour in my city.

>
>_____ I'd like to make a financial contribution to the Bread Not Stones bus
>tour.

>
>_____ \$100 _____ \$75 _____ \$50 _____
>\$25 _____ other \$ _____

>
>(if making a financial contribution, please print out this form and send to
>the national office at address below).

>
>_____ I'd like to receive a Bread Not Stones education/organizing
>packet. Enclosed is \$8.50 to cover the cost of the packet plus postage and
>handling (please send form to national office at address below).

>
>Return to Pax Christi USA, 532 West 8th Street, Erie, PA 16502-1343,
>814-452-4784 (fax).

>
>----- eGroups Sponsor ----->

>GET A NEXTCARD VISA, in 30 seconds! Get rates
>of 2.9% Intro or 9.9% Ongoing APR* and no annual fee!
>Apply NOW!

>http://click.egroups.com/1/7872/7/_/_/_/967081851/

>----- _->

>
>To unsubscribe from this group, send an email to:

>globenet-unsubscribe@egroups.com

-

To unsubscribe to abolition-usa, send an email to "majordomo@xmission.com" with "unsubscribe abolition-usa" in the body of the message.

For information on digests or retrieving files and old messages send "help" to the same address. Do not use quotes in your message.

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

Date: Thu, 24 Aug 2000 16:06:45 +0000

Subject: Support of NMD activism in Alaska

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

To: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>,
Stephen Young <syoun@clw.org>,
Kathy Guthrie <kathy@fcnl.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@fcnl.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 <nuclear@wand.org>,
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>,
Dan Koslofsky <dan@clw.org>,
Lynn Erskine <lerskine@clw.org>,
Anna Smiles <annabananasmls@hotmail.com>,
Charlotte Baker <charolett baker@erols.com>

Fellow Nuclear Weapons WG members:

Jenny Randolph of Peace Action Ed Fund, Lynn Erskine at CLW and I have had several conversations with anti-NMD activists in Alaska in support of their organizing.

They are forming a statewide coalition and are looking for a speaker/expert that they can use for a tour/media organizing for a week this fall.

Given the distance from DC and our lack of knowledge about who might be available or interested in travelling there, I want to enlist your collective info and brainstorming.

Here are their attributes for the perfect speaker/expert, but we are also looking for someone who might already be doing something in the Northwest or West Coast that would make for lower costs and travel distance:

* knowledge of AK issues such as former weapon system "experiments" in AK

- * public name recognition
- * credibility (knowledge, experience) with military forces, since military voices against NMD would seem counter to the public's perception of uniform military support
- * fundability by funds outside of AK or from a grant source

Please suggest leads for follow-up.

Thanks for your help.

Tim Barner

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

Dave,

Have you been able to line up either Bishop Sullivan or Bishop Gumbleton for the news conference on Thursday afternoon, September 7?

I am going to use Adam Eiding as our media consultant.

I have been calling around to the candidates' offices to be certain that they have our letter and are preparing a reply. I know that the letter is there and is in the hands of issues staff. I think we will have replies but no verification yet. I've asked John Isaacs and Daryl Kimball to help us sort out answers to our questions from public statements of the candidates in case one or more doesn't reply.

I'll keep you informed.

Shalom,
Howard

To: Tim Barner <timb@2020vision.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Support of NMD activism in Alaska
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <B5CAF893.10E1%timb@2020vision.org>
References:

At 04:06 PM 8/24/00 +0000, you wrote:

>Fellow Nuclear Weapons WG members:

>

>

>Jenny Randolph of Peace Action Ed Fund, Lynn Erskine at CLW and I have had
>several conversations with anti-NMD activists in Alaska in support of their
>organizing.

>

>They are forming a statewide coalition and are looking for a speaker/expert
>that they can use for a tour/media organizing for a week this fall....

Tim,

If your Alaskan contacts haven't done so already, they should get in touch with Rev. Richard K. Heacock, Jr., executive director of Alaska Impact, an interfaith organization which opposes NMD. Address is 3012 Riverview Drive, Fairbanks, AK 99709. Fax/tel: 907 474-0700. E-mail: akimpact@mosquitonet.com.

One of my board members, Don C. Whitmore of Auburn, WA, has given speeches and conducted workshops on NMD in Alaska. Address: 16202 S.E. Lake Moneysmith Road, Auburn, WA 98002. Phone/fax: 206 833-2941. E-mail: 3rdM@gte.net.

Howard

Reply-To: "levee" <levee@erols.com>
From: "levee" <levee@erols.com>
To: "Patricia A. Juster" <Pjuster@aol.com>,
"Barbara Hemming" <bhemming@osd.pentagon.mil>,
"Carlee L. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>,
"Dottie and Joe Zetts" <mamazet@aol.com>,
"Freeman Walker Jr." <freemanw@wh.org>,
"Janet Camp" <janetcardinal@aol.com>,
"Peggy Eastman" <Peggyeastman@cs.com>,
"Sharmaine Allen" <sara@jamaicans.com>
Subject: Fw: Sandy Cove Writers' Conference
Date: Thu, 24 Aug 2000 15:29:42 -0400
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Dear Writer Friends,

The Sandy Cove Writers' Conference is really great. Dottie Zetts and I are planning on attending and hope to have a car full. Here are the main points about it and also a phone number to call to receive a brochure.

Love in Christ,

Luella LeVee

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

From: ccwriters@juno.com <ccwriters@juno.com>
To: CCWriters@juno.com <CCWriters@juno.com>
Date: Wednesday, August 23, 2000 3:26 PM
Subject: Sandy Cove Writers' Conference

TAKING THE WORD TO THE WORLD
Communicator's Conference at Sandy Cove
October 1-5, 2000

This year's conference will train conferees in communicating with fiction and novels, articles and nonfiction books, poetry, comedy and drama, as well as self-publishing, and electronic publishing. In addition to over forty seminars, eight continuing workshops are being offered

Sandy Cove Conference Center is located on the Chesapeake Bay in North East, Maryland. All rooms are under one roof and completely handicap accessible. Special diets can be accommodated.

FREE Manuscript Evaluations and Editorial Appointments
Conferees are entitled to one manuscript critique and one fifteen-minute appointment for each day they are registered at the conference. (Full-time conferees may have a maximum of three critiques and three

appointments; one-day conferees may have one critique and one appointment.)

Keynote Speakers:

Al Janssen is the author of twenty-two books and serves as Senior Director of Product Development at Focus on the Family where he oversees book products and "Adventures in Odyssey"

Cecil Murphey is a world-traveling speaker and ghost-writer for such people as Ben Carson, Franklin Graham (Rebel with a Cause), and B.J. Thomas, as well as his own forty-nine books.

Sharon Norris is a popular conference speaker, magazine publisher, music composer, and a high school teacher, as well as an assistant director of the conference.

Christine Tangvald is a prolific children's author and popular conference speaker, as well as host of the highly-rated "Good Morning, Sandy Cove."

Deni (Denise) Williamson is the author of the critically acclaimed novel *The Dark Sun Rises*, as well as an assistant director of the conference.

Also: "Peculiar People" aka Charlie and Ruth Jones and Jennifer Teague, comedy/drama ministry.

Specialty Tracks for Ministers and Students

Rates range from "Full Conference Package" including first-class accommodations, all meals, materials, seminars, evening sessions and three free manuscript evaluations as well as three private appointments with editors/professional writers from \$412-\$557 (depending on room occupancy) to a one day seminar for high school and college students at \$49

For Detailed Information:

<http://www2.fwi.com/~watkins/sandyco1.htm>

For a brochure or to make reservations, call 1-800-234-COVE (2683).

E-mail Jim Watkins, writers' conference director, or phone (219) 897-4121 or call (219) 897-2575

If you want to share a room with another CCW member, just reply to this e-mail and we will put you in touch with other members who are interested in attending.

Capital Christian Writers

P.O. Box 873, Centreville, VA 20122
Phone 703/803-9447
E-mail: CCWriters@juno.com
Web Page: www.ccwriters.org

Date: Fri, 25 Aug 2000 09:23:06 -0700 (PDT)
From: Adam Eiding <aeiding@yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: Letter to presidential candidates
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>

Dear Howard,

Thanks for seeking Mintwood's services. I have the time and would like to work on this project with you. I just got back late last night. Would it be O.K. if I had the proposal in your hands by Monday? I'm still putting out some fires from the conventions.

Sincerely,

Adam

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

> Dear Adam:

>
> On Friday, August 18 we mailed the attached letter
> from 46 religious
> leaders to presidential candidates -- Gore, Bush,
> Nader, Buchanan, and
> Hagelin -- asking questions about their position on
> nuclear disarmament
> issues. The signers represent a broad cross-section
> of faith groups and
> geographic areas. We asked for replies by September
> 5 and indicated that
> we would release their answers at a news conference
> on September 7. I have
> arranged for a room at the National Press Club for
> the afternoon of
> September 7. Our presenters will include United
> Methodist Bishop C. Dale
> White, either Catholic Bishop Walter Sullivan or
> Bishop Thomas Gumbleton,
> and perhaps one or two others.
>
> We need assistance in staging the news conference,
> especially promoting
> attendance from both the secular and the religious
> press. We also want
> help in follow-through with political reporters
> following the campaign and
> with talk show hosts so that they will ask follow-up
> questions of the
> candidates. Please give me a proposal on how you
> can help us with these
> tasks and the budget for your services.
>
> We ourselves will encourage activists in our

> grassroots networks to ask
> questions of the candidates and hold up signs at
> their campaign appearances
> around the country.
>
> Our questions cover a range of nuclear disarmament
> issues, but we
> particularly want to stress that the possession and
> possible use of nuclear
> weapons is a moral issue and not merely a matter of
> military strategy.
>
> With the letter we are sending the candidates a set
> of denominational
> statements on nuclear disarmament, the statement of
> religious and military
> leaders issued by the Washington National Cathedral
> in June, and excerpts
> from statements by Admiral Noel Gayler, General
> Colin Powell, General
> Charles Horner, and General Lee Butler on the lack
> of military utility of
> nuclear weapons. I'll show these to you when you
> return to Washington.
>
> You can reach me by phone at 301 896-0013.
>
> Shalom,
> Howard
>

> ATTACHMENT part 2 application/msword
name=abl.084.doc; x-mac-type=42494E41;
x-mac-creator=4D535744
>
> 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.

Do You Yahoo!?

Yahoo! Mail - Free email you can access from anywhere!

<http://mail.yahoo.com/>

To: Adam Eidinger <aeidinger@yahoo.com>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Letter to presidential candidates
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <20000825162306.26969.qmail@web4101.mail.yahoo.com>
References:

At 09:23 AM 8/25/00 -0700, you wrote:

>Dear Howard,

>

>Thanks for seeking Mintwood's services. I have the
>time and would like to work on this project with you.

>I just got back late last night. Would it be O.K. if

>I had the proposal in your hands by Monday? I'm still

>putting out some fires from the conventions.

>

>Sincerely,

>

>Adam.

Dear Adam,

Monday will be okay with me.

Howard

To: DKNUTSONR@aol.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: (no subject)
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <34.9a8764e.26d80b88@aol.com>
References:

At 01:48 PM 8/25/00 EDT, you wrote:

>Our plans are to arrive at your house September 22 sometime in the evening.
>We'll spend that night there before going to Pennsylvania on Saturday.
>Because Ben wants to ride along with Jeanette and me, we'll do PA on the
>weekend. We'll come back Monday and spend Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday
>nights with you if that works. Jeanette and I will spend the days in the
>District looking around. I'm so looking forward to this trip and seeing
>you. Marj
>

Marj,

Those dates are fine with us. Presumably you will be renting a car at the airport. Do you want instructions on how to get to our house? If so, from which airport? We'll be looking for you.

Howard

Date: Wed, 27 Jan 1904 22:12:04 -0800
From: Don Whitmore <3RDM@gte.net>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7C-CCK-MCD {C-UDP; EBM-APPLE} (Macintosh; I; PPC)
X-Accept-Language: en
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Progress report

Thanks for your report. Good going! Take care, Don Whitmore

"Howard W. Hallman" wrote:

> August 22, 2000
>
> To: Board of Directors
> Methodists United for Peace with Justice
>
> From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair
>
> During the last eight weeks I have been involved in several activities
> related to nuclear disarmament.
>
> The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair, met on
> June 22. We decided to work with 20/20 Vision on a postcard alert on
> National Missile Defense (NMD). 28 faith-group joined as cosponsors. More
> than 30,000 postcards have been printed and are being distributed.
> Previously I sent you one.
>
> We also worked on a set of questions addressed to congressional candidates
> on nuclear disarmament issues, to be used by grassroots activists during
> the 2000 election campaign. The final version of these questions is
> attached. (If you want it in text format, let me know.)
>
> I have worked with Dave Robinson of Pax Christi USA to develop a letter
> from religious leaders to presidential candidates, asking a set of
> questions on nuclear disarmament issues. With 46 signers we mailed the
> letter to the candidates of the Democratic, Republican, Green, and Reform
> parties on August 18. We have requested a reply by September 5 and have
> scheduled a news conference for September 7 to release their replies. A
> copy of the letter is attached. (Again if you want it in text format, let
> me know.)
>
> In June we received a contribution of \$15,000 from an anonymous member of
> the Rockefeller in support of my work with the Interfaith Committee for
> Nuclear Disarmament. I have worked it out so that \$10,000 goes to our
> basic 501(c)(4) corporation and \$5,000 to the 501(c)(3) Methodists United
> Peace/Justice Education Fund. That means that the (c)(4) portion can be
> used for expenses related to the letter to presidential candidates, such as
> retaining a media consultant to help with the news conference.
>
> We intend to follow up the news conference by contacting political
> reporters who are following the campaign and with talk show hosts and
> encouraging them to ask follow-up questions. We will also work through
> interfaith networks to get grassroots activists to attend rallies and

> forums with signs and questions. We want to particularly emphasis that the
> possession and possible use of nuclear weapons is a moral issue. You'll
> hear more about this in September.

>
> Shalom,
> Howard

>
> -----
> Name: icnd.031.doc
> icnd.031.doc Type: Microsoft Word Document (application/msword)
> Encoding: base64

>
> Name: abl.084.doc
> abl.084.doc Type: Microsoft Word Document (application/msword)
> Encoding: base64

>
> -----

>
> 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: Fri, 25 Aug 2000 13:05:22 +0000
Subject: Support of NMD activism- AK & other
From: Tim Barner <timb@2020vision.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>

Howard:

Thanks for the suggestion. Dick Heacock has been on one of the conference calls we had with the AK NMD organizing group. I talked to him earlier this week and rushed 100 of our interfaith NMD cards to him for his AK Impact annual dinner this evening.

FYI, one of our 20/20 members in Cordova, AK has asked for cards to distribute to 12 churches in her Prince William Sound area and another 150 for a religious retreat she was attending this weekend.

Hop told me you are quite busy with a project involving dozens of bishops on voicing support for nuclear disarmament. Congrats. We will keep you informed about plans for the September grass roots NMD conference call. I look forward to talking with you at some point about how the NMD issue is fitting with your broader work on disarmament for 2000-2001.

Tim

on 8/25/00 12:37 PM, Howard W. Hallman at mupj@igc.org wrote:

> At 04:06 PM 8/24/00 +0000, you wrote:

>> Fellow Nuclear Weapons WG members:

>>

>>

>> Jenny Randolph of Peace Action Ed Fund, Lynn Erskine at CLW and I have had
>> several conversations with anti-NMD activists in Alaska in support of their
>> organizing.

>>

>> They are forming a statewide coalition and are looking for a speaker/expert
>> that they can use for a tour/media organizing for a week this fall....

>

>

> Tim,

>

> If your Alaskan contacts haven't done so already, they should get in touch
> with Rev. Richard K. Heacock, Jr., executive director of Alaska Impact, an
> interfaith organization which opposes NMD. Address is 3012 Riverview
> Drive, Fairbanks, AK 99709. Fax/tel: 907 474-0700. E-mail:
> akimpact@mosquitonet.com.

>

> One of my board members, Don C. Whitmore of Auburn, WA, has given speeches
> and conducted workshops on NMD in Alaska. Address: 16202 S.E. Lake
> Moneysmith Road, Auburn, WA 98002. Phone/fax: 206 833-2941. E-mail:
> 3rdM@gte.net.

>

> 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-1413460-1219-967229495-mupj=igc.apc.org@returns.onelist.com

X-Sender: wslf@mail.earthlink.net

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.1

To: abolition-caucus@egroups.com, abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com,
bananas@lists.speakeasy.org, bob@fcnl.org, calmaps@cruzio.com,
abeier@earthlink.net, avboone@metro.net,
tsbrueni@wheel.dcn.davis.ca.us, johnburroughs@earthlink.net,
wslf@earthlink.net, maydm@jps.net, conjoin@asia.com, mduckles@aol.com,
petrelias@hotmail.com, roses4life@juno.com, capazaction@igc.org,
mcf@cats.ucsc.edu, quercus@concentric.net, rwg@pacbell.net,
peacentr@sonic.net, tasinaskawin@hotmail.com, riptideDH@aol.com,
ruth@cruzio.com, marylia@earthlink.net, sbeville@earthlink.net,
alichterman@worldnet.att.net, bubinish@cruzio.com, smcneil@afsc.org,
pmeidell@igc.org, mmercer471@aol.com, dnesbitt@idiom.com,
mecta@aol.com, olins@pacbell.net, cindypile@juno.com,
feprattmd@aol.com, philr@sonic.net, robbinsps@aol.com,
rodney@davis.com, sschwartz@afsc.org, petesh@cruzio.com,
ksmick@wenet.com, dennisthomas@hotmail.com, heal@kay-net.com,
wiednerb@aol.com, bpf@bpf.org, jcaseber@lmi.net, bhouston@davis.com,
aldrichl@igc.org, hadley3@jps.net, jwsadmit@nccn.net,
lightparty@aol.com, SDHPeace@aol.com, pacdc@miis.edu,
rainforest@ran.org, renv@rcnv.org, justice@wco.com, napf@napf.org,
rsteinhauer@compuserve.com, llefson@earthlink.net, jweil@dnai.com,
hankliz@thegrid.net, slbaker@calpoly.edu, clr2@igc.org,
sbeville@earthlink.net, sschwartz@afsc.org, sallight1@earthlink.net,
tbtaylor@princeton.edu

From: Jackie Cabasso <wslf@earthlink.net>

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: Fri, 25 Aug 2000 11:53:57 -0700

Subject: [abolition-caucus] Office move: New mailing address

Dear friends and colleagues -- Western States Legal Foundation is moving to a new office as of September 1. Please make a note our new mailing address: 1504 Franklin Street, Suite #202, Oakland, California 94612. All of our other contact information (phone, fax, e-mail) remains the same. (However, the office will effectively be closed August 29 - 31 while we move, so please be patient if you're trying to reach us.) Thanks. -- Jackie Cabasso

----- eGroups Sponsor ----->
Evolution is not necessarily collective...
Courses, consultations and free lectures online.
http://click.egroups.com/1/8670/3/_/91925/_/967229495/
----- _->

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.

X-Sender: slatera@204.141.205.3
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0.2
Date: Fri, 25 Aug 2000 16:03:25 -0400
To: abolition-caucus@egroups.com,abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com,
abolition-ny@lists.xmission.com
From: ASlater <aslater@gracelinks.org>
Subject: (abolition-usa) Fwd: FYI Disarmament in the General Assembly
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

>Date: Fri, 25 Aug 2000 11:00:33 -0400
>Subject: FYI Disarmament in the General Assembly
>To: updates@reachingcriticalwill.org
>Cc: wilpf-news@igc.topica.com
>From: flick@igc.org (flick@igc.org)
>
>@igc.apc.org
>web: www.wilpf.int.ch www.reachingcriticalwill.org
>

>***** ***** ***** *****

>APOLOGIES FOR CROSS POSTINGS

>
>
>Dear All,

>
>If you would like to be on an email list to receive reports and updates
>from the Disarmament Committee of the General Assembly (starting October
>3), this email is useful to you.

>
>Please send an email to me at flick@igc.org to get on this short term,
>single purpose list which will provide a weekly update, or more as
>activity in the 1st Committee reaches a peak towards the start of
>November.

>
>
>
>As you know, after opening statements from many of the 188 UN member
>governments, the General Assembly splits up into 6 Committees

>
>FIRST COMMITTEE Disarmament and International Security
>SECOND COMMITTEE Economic and Financial
>THIRD COMMITTEE Social, Humanitarian and Cultural
>FOURTH COMMITTEE Special Political and Decolonization
>FIFTH COMMITTEE Administrative and Budgetary
>SIXTH COMMITTEE Legal

>
>A group of NGOs based in New York are getting together to brainstorm the
>best way of reporting what is happening in the FIRST COMMITTEE to
>disarmament NGOs all over the world. It is our aim to reinforce and
>provide quick information to groups monitoring and lobbying their
>governments on disarmament. But of course, people physically in New York
>can only reinforce the work done in capitals, where the actual policies
>and positions are formed.

>
>Over the past two years, there has been a lot of excellent NGO activity
>around supporting the New Agenda Coalition Resolution which has been
>ESSENTIAL in building the strength and credibility of this innovative
>grouping that also really helped produce the results of the NPT.
>
>Putting pressure on governments before and during the FIRST Committee on
>Disarmament, starting this year on October 3, is an important part of our
>disarmament work. If we don't do it, who will? This question inspires
>many people to make contact and build relationships and especially put
>pressure on parliamentary representatives or people in foreign ministries.
> Speaking up in the media is also useful and important, if it is possible.
>
>This year, there will probably be a few topical resolutions on which you
>can write, or lobby your governments on, simply asking the way they intend
>to vote and why and including some of your views on how you would like to
>be represented.
>
>Don't be afraid to ask basic questions - force them to be fully
>accountable to you, and if you can, find out who your representatives will
>be in New York this year voting on:
>
>1. the resolution on the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, which Russia
>introduced last year to rouse some opposition to the US plans for an NMD
>
>2. the New Agenda Coalition Resolution, now in its third year
>
>3. the resolution on the Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space
>
>4. the resolution on the follow-up to the advisory opinion of the
>International Court of Justice on the Legality of the Threat or Use of
>Nuclear Weapons
>
>5. the resolutions on small arms and the illicit traffic in small arms
>
>6. the resolution on convening a fourth special session of the General
>Assembly devoted to disarmament
>
>
>All First Committee Resolutions from 1999 can be found at
><http://www.un.org/Depts/dhl/resguide/r54c1.htm>
>This page is a list of all 47 resolutions passed, with links to the texts.
>
>
>So you can refer to the exact General Assembly Agenda Item when you write,
>or speak to your reps, please see the Provisional Agenda for the 2000 -
>2001 55th General Assembly at
><http://www.un.org/ga/55/a55150.html>
>
>
>The agenda contains the following disarmament related items:
>
>Item 66. Reduction of military budgets (resolution 35/142 B of 12 December
>1980).

- >
- >
- >68. Maintenance of international security (resolutions 53/71 of 4 December 1998 and 54/62 of 1 December 1999):
 - > (a) Prevention of the violent disintegration of States (resolution 53/71);
 - > (b) Stability and development of South-Eastern Europe (resolution 54/62).
- >
- >
- >
- >73. Prevention of an arms race in outer space (resolution 54/53 of 1 December 1999).
- >
- >
- >
- >74. General and complete disarmament (resolutions 42/38 C of 30 November 1987, 53/77 A, D, H and L of 4 December 1998, 54/54 A and B, E to U of 1 December 1999 and 54/54 V of 15 December 1999; and decision 54/417 of 1 December 1999):
 - > (a) Notification of nuclear tests (resolution 42/38 C);
 - >
 - > (b) Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia (resolution 53/77 A and decision 54/417);
 - >
 - > (c) Mongolia's international security and nuclear-weapon-free status (resolution 53/77 D);
 - >
 - > (d) Measures to uphold the authority of the 1925 Geneva Protocol (resolution 53/77 L);
 - >
 - > (e) Preservation of and compliance with the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems (resolution 54/54 A);
 - >
 - > (f) Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction (resolution 54/54 B);
 - >
 - > (g) Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction (resolution 54/54 E);
 - >
 - > (h) Missiles (resolution 54/54 F);
 - >
 - > (i) Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: the need for a new agenda (resolution 54/54 G);
 - >
 - > (j) Consolidation of peace through practical disarmament measures (resolution 54/54 H);
 - >
 - > (k) Transparency in armaments (resolutions 54/54 I and O);
 - >

- >(l) Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and
>collecting them (resolution 54/54 J);
- >
- >(m) Reducing nuclear danger (resolution 54/54 K);
- >
- >(n) Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas (resolution
>54/54 L);
- >
- >(o) Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels
>(resolution 54/54 M);
- >
- >(p) Regional disarmament (resolutions 53/77 H and 54/54 N);
- >
- >(q) Nuclear disarmament (resolution 54/54 P);
- >
- >(r) Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of
>Justice on the Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons
>(resolution 54/54 Q);
- >
- >(s) Illicit traffic in small arms (resolution 54/54 R);
- >
- >(t) Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation
>of agreements on disarmament and arms control (resolution 54/54 S);
- >
- >(u) Relationship between disarmament and development (resolution 54/54 T);
- >
- >(v) Convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly
>devoted to disarmament (resolution 54/54 U);
- >
- >(w) Small arms (resolution 54/54 V).
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >75. Review and implementation of the Concluding Document of the Twelfth
>Special Session of the General Assembly (resolutions 53/78 E and G of 4
>December 1998 and 54/55 A to F of 1 December 1999):
- >
- >(a) Regional confidence-building measures: activities of the United
>Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central
>Africa (resolution 54/55 A);
- >
- >(b) United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa
>(resolution 54/55 B);
- >
- >(c) United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and
>the Pacific (resolution 54/55 C);
- >
- >(d) Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons
>(resolution 54/55 D);
- >
- >(e) United Nations regional centres for peace and disarmament (resolution
>54/55 E);
- >

>(f) United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development
>in Latin America and the Caribbean (resolution 54/55 F);

>
>(g) United Nations Disarmament Information Programme (resolution 53/78 E);

>
>(h) United Nations disarmament fellowship, training and advisory services
>(resolution 53/78 G).

>

>

>

>

>

>76. Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions
>adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session (resolutions
>38/183 O of 20 December
>1983, 39/148 H of 17 December 1984, 50/72 B of 12 December 1995 and 54/56
>A and B of 1 December 1999):

>

>(a) Report of the Disarmament Commission (resolution 54/56 A);

>

>(b) Report of the Conference on Disarmament (resolution 54/56 B);

>

>(c) Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters (resolution 38/183 O);

>

>(d) United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (resolution 39/148
>H);

>

>(e) Disarmament Week (resolution 50/72 B).

>

>

>

>

>77. The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East (resolution 54/57
>of 1 December 1999).

>

>

>

>

>78. Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain
>Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to
>Have Indiscriminate
>Effects (resolution 54/58 of 1 December 1999).

>

>

>

>79. Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region
>(resolution 54/59 of 1 December 1999).

>

>

>

>80. Consolidation of the regime established by the Treaty for the
>Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean (Treaty
>of Tlatelolco) (resolution 54/60
>of 1 December 1999).

>
>
>
>81. Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and
>Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their
>Destruction (resolution
>54/61 of 1 December 1999).
>
>
>
>82. Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (resolution 54/63 of 1 December
>1999).
>
>
>
>83. Effects of atomic radiation (resolution 54/66 of 6 December 1999).
>
>
>
>84. International cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space
>(resolutions 54/67 and 54/68 of 6 December 1999).
>
>
>
>For basic information about the General Assembly see
><http://www.un.org/ga/54/session/kit.htm>

>***** ***** ***** *****
>Felicity Hill,
>Director, United Nations Office
>Women's International League for Peace and Freedom
>777 UN Plaza, New York, NY 10017, USA
>
>Ph: 1 212 682 1265
>Fax: 1 212 286 8211
>email: flick@igc.apc.org
>web: www.wilpf.int.ch www.reachingcriticalwill.org

>***** ***** ***** *****
>

-
To unsubscribe to abolition-usa, send an email to "majordomo@xmission.com"
with "unsubscribe abolition-usa" in the body of the message.
For information on digests or retrieving files and old messages send
"help" to the same address. Do not use quotes in your message.

To: flick@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: FYI Disarmament in the General Assembly
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <E13SPpS-0004JW-00@lists.xmission.com>
References:

At 04:03 PM 8/25/00 -0400, you wrote:

>>Date: Fri, 25 Aug 2000 11:00:33 -0400

>>Subject: FYI Disarmament in the General Assembly

>>To: updates@reachingcriticalwill.org

>>Dear All,

>>

>>If you would like to be on an email list to receive reports and updates
>>from the Disarmament Committee of the General Assembly (starting October
>>3), this email is useful to you.

>>

>>Please send an email to me at flick@igc.org to get on this short term,
>>single purpose list which will provide a weekly update, or more as
>>activity in the 1st Committee reaches a peak towards the start of
>>November.

Felicity,

Yes, please include me on you e-mail list for weekly updates.

Thanks for all you do.

Howard Hallman
mupj@igc.org

User-Agent: Microsoft-Outlook-Express-Macintosh-Edition/5.02.2022
Date: Fri, 25 Aug 2000 18:47:07 +0000
Subject: FW: NMD campaign in Alaska
From: Tim Barner <timb@2020vision.org>
To: Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.org>

Howard:
FYI
Tim

From: "Richard K. Heacock, Jr." <akimpact@mosquitonet.com>
Organization: Alaska IMPACT
Reply-To: akimpact@mosquitonet.com
Date: Thu, 24 Aug 2000 16:59:23 +0000
To: Tim Barner <timb@2020vision.org>
Subject: Re: NMD campaign in Alaska

Dear Tim:

The cards arrived OK. Thanks for expediting them.

We will have a record turnout for our Alaska IMPACT Board meeting tomorrow with 18, including the Episcopal Bishop of Alaska (& President of Alaska Christian Conference - our State ecumenical organization).

I will be mailing information, including a card, to all who could not be present. Most of our Executives on our Advisory Board are in Anchorage - 360 miles from Fairbanks.

Haven't heard anything from Steve or Soren yet.

Dick

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\akimpact.vcf"

To: dave
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Format of news conference
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Dave,

Here is an outline of the news conference on the replies of presidential candidates to the letter from religious leaders on nuclear disarmament issues. What do you think of it? What refinements or changes would you suggest?

Howard

###

News Conference on Responses of Presidential Candidates
to Letter from Religious Leaders on Nuclear Disarmament Issues

2:00 p.m., Thursday, September 7, 2000
National Press Club, First Amendment Room
Washington, D.C.

Presenters:

Bishop Thomas Gumbleton, Catholic Archdiocese of Detroit
Bishop C. Dale White, United Methodist Church (ret.)
Rabbi David Saperstein, Director, Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism (invited)

Moderator:

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

Press Packet:

Letter from religious leaders to presidential candidates
Replies from candidates individually and consolidated
Denominational statements on nuclear disarmament
Joint statement of religious and military leaders (Washington National Cathedral)
What military commanders say about utility of nuclear weapons

Layout:

Theater style
Head table with podium in middle; three microphones

Presentation:

Welcome by Hallman

Point out that this is a nonpartisan event, that we are not seeking to endorse
any candidate

Indicate that we will be distributing candidates' replies to religious
grassroots networks

Brief statements on Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish perspectives on nuclear disarmament (two to three minutes each; no more than one page, double space)

Bishop Gumbleton

Bishop White

Rabbi Saperstein

Candidates response to ten questions

Rotate among three presenters, each in turn reading a question and the responses

Questions from the press

State name and news organization

Replies by presenters (and moderator if necessary)

To be developed: sample answers to possible questions, such as why we haven't dealt with national missile defense (because that issue is already well covered in the campaign), etc.

News Conference on Responses of Presidential Candidates
to Letter from Religious Leaders on Nuclear Disarmament Issues

2:00 p.m., Thursday, September 7, 2000
National Press Club, First Amendment Room
Washington, D.C.

Presenters:

Bishop Thomas Gumbleton, Catholic Archdiocese of Detroit
Bishop C. Dale White, United Methodist Church
Rabbi David Saperstein, Director, Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism (invited)

Moderator:

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

Press Packet:

Letter from religious leaders to presidential candidates
Replies from candidates individually and consolidated
Denominational statements on nuclear disarmament
Joint statement of religious and military leaders (Washington National Cathedral)
What military commanders say about utility of nuclear weapons

Layout:

Theater style
Head table with podium in middle; three microphones

Presentation:

Welcome by Hallman

Point out that this is a nonpartisan event, that we are not seeking to endorse any candidate

Indicate that we will be distributing candidates' replies to religious grassroots networks

Brief statements on Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish perspectives on nuclear disarmament

(two to three minutes each; no more than one page, double space)

Bishop Gumbleton

Bishop White

Rabbi Saperstein

Candidates response to ten questions

Rotate among three presenters, each in turn reading a question and the responses

Questions from the press

State name and news organization

Replies by presenters (and moderator if necessary)

To be developed: sample answers to possible questions, such as why we haven't dealt with national missile defense (because that issue is already well covered in the campaign), etc.

To: phil
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Request for payment
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Phil,

I am entering into a contract with Mintwood Media Collective to provide assistance in staging the news conference on the replies of presidential candidates on nuclear disarmament issues. Their fee will be \$2,000 plus some additional costs. They want half of the fee in advance. Therefore, please make out a check of \$1,000 payable to Mintwood Media Collective. It can be assigned to the Rockefeller grant in the General Fund.

Thanks,
Howard

To: dwhite11@edgenet.net
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: News conference
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Dale,

I've tried to reach you to discuss the September 7 news conference. Some of it I can accomplish through e-mail, but I still want to talk with you directly.

The letters to the candidates are out, and I'm talking with their offices to be certain that we will have a timely response.

The news conference will start at 2:00 p.m., Thursday, September 7 in the First Amendment Room of the National Press Club, 529 14th Street, NW. Participants should be there by 1:30 to go over our presentation. Catholic Bishop Thomas Gumbleton will join you as a presenter. I am also asking Rabbi David Saperstein. An outline of how we might proceed is attached.

We have retained a media consultant. Among other tasks he will try to line up TV and press interviews prior to and after the news conference. Would you be willing? If so, when are you arriving and leaving? Is there any time in the time bloc when you would not be available?

Your room reservation is at the Holiday Inn, 415 New Jersey, NW for Wednesday night, September 6. Confirmation number is 64331464. If you need a room for Thursday night as well, please let me know.

I have mailed you a copy of the letter to candidates and the attachments we sent along. As I get more and more into this project, I perceive that our primary message is that the nuclear disarmament is a moral issue and not merely a matter of military strategy. For that reason we are preparing a background banner that states: NUCLEAR WEAPONS - A MORAL ISSUE. If we can introduce this perspective into the presidential campaign, we will have succeeded.

Shalom,
Howard

###

News Conference on Responses of Presidential Candidates
to Letter from Religious Leaders on Nuclear Disarmament Issues

2:00 p.m., Thursday, September 7, 2000
National Press Club, First Amendment Room
Washington, D.C.

Presenters:
Bishop Thomas Gumbleton, Catholic Archdiocese of Detroit
Bishop C. Dale White, United Methodist Church (ret.)
Rabbi David Saperstein, Director, Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism (invited)

Moderator:
Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice

Press Packet:

Letter from religious leaders to presidential candidates

Replies from candidates individually and consolidated

Denominational statements on nuclear disarmament

Joint statement of religious and military leaders (Washington National Cathedral)

What military commanders say about utility of nuclear weapons

Layout:

Theater style

Head table with podium in middle; three microphones

Presentation:

Welcome by Hallman

Point out that this is a nonpartisan event, that we are not seeking to endorse any candidate

Indicate that we will be distributing candidates' replies to religious grassroots networks

Brief statements on Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish perspectives on nuclear disarmament (two to three minutes each; no more than one page, double space)

Bishop Gumbleton

Bishop White

Rabbi Saperstein

Candidates response to ten questions

Rotate among three presenters, each in turn reading a question and the responses

Questions from the press

State name and news organization

Replies by presenters (and moderator if necessary)

To be developed: sample answers to possible questions, such as why we haven't dealt with national missile defense (because that issue is already well covered in the campaign), etc.

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

Dear Adam,

Bishop C. Dale White will be available the morning of September 7 for interviews or appearance on a TV show. He has an early evening flight from BWI that day but could probably squeeze in an interview after the news conference, especially if it is at the National Press Club.

Bishop Gumbleton will be in town for another purpose for a couple of days next week as well as our news conference. I will find out when he might be available for interviews.

I've asked both of them for biographical information.

Shalom,
Howard

To: tjaget.juno.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: News conference, September 7
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Bishop Gumbleton,

I deeply appreciate your rearranging your schedule so that you can participate in the news conference in Washington, D.C. to present replies from presidential candidates to the letter from religious leaders on nuclear disarmament issues. As Dave Robinson has indicated, it will take place at 2:00 p.m., Thursday, September 7 at the National Press Club, 549 14th Street, NW. We are asking participants to meet there at 1:30 p.m. to review our approach. You will be joined as a presenter by United Methodist Bishop C. Dale White. We are also inviting Rabbi David Saperstein, director of Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism, to join us.

Our media consultant is trying to set up interviews with TV and print media outlets before and after the press conference. Would you be available? If so, what times and days will you be free during your Washington visit?

For purposes of outreach to these news sources, please provide me biographic information about yourself, a page or so. You can e-mail it to me at mupj@igc.org or fax it to 301 896-0013. The latter is also my phone number if you want to call me.

Shalom,
Howard

To: dwhite11@edgenet.net
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Biographical information
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Dale,

Last night on the phone I forgot to ask you for biographical material, a page or so, so that we can use it in setting up an interview or two the morning of September 7. You can e-mail it to me at mupj@igc.org or fax it to 301 896-0013.

Thanks,
Howard

Date: Tue, 29 Aug 2000 07:03:09 -0700 (PDT)
From: Adam Eiding <aeiding@yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: Interviews
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>

Thank you. The BIO info will be very helpful.

Adam

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

> Dear Adam,

>

> Bishop C. Dale White will be available the morning
> of September 7 for

> interviews or appearance on a TV show. He has an
> early evening flight from

> BWI that day but could probably squeeze in an
> interview after the news

> conference, especially if it is at the National

> Press Club.

>

> Bishop Gumbleton will be in town for another purpose
> for a couple of days

> next week as well as our news conference. I will

> find out when he might be

> available for interviews.

>

> I've asked both of them for biographical

> information.

>

> 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.

Do You Yahoo!?

Yahoo! Mail - Free email you can access from anywhere!

<http://mail.yahoo.com/>

Date: Tue, 29 Aug 2000 15:32:33 -0700 (PDT)
From: Adam Eiding <aeiding@yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: Interviews
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>

Dear Howard,

Check out this attached image we made for the podium sign and/or backdrop. We are looking into different ways of printing it or making a banner. More on costs tomorrow. Please let me know if you like the image.

Any replies to the survey today?

Cheers,
Adam

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

> Dear Adam,

>

> Bishop C. Dale White will be available the morning

> of September 7 for

> interviews or appearance on a TV show. He has an

> early evening flight from

> BWI that day but could probably squeeze in an

> interview after the news

> conference, especially if it is at the National

> Press Club.

>

> Bishop Gumbleton will be in town for another purpose

> for a couple of days

> next week as well as our news conference. I will

> find out when he might be

> available for interviews.

>

> I've asked both of them for biographical

> information.

>

> 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.

Do You Yahoo!?

Yahoo! Mail - Free email you can access from anywhere!

<http://mail.yahoo.com/>

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\METHODISTsmall.jpg"

To: info@towncreekfdn.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Inquiry on possible proposal
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Friends:

I would like to inquire whether you would consider a proposal from Methodists United for Peace with Justice for a grant of \$25,000 to support the leadership role we are playing in mobilizing interfaith action for nuclear disarmament. This occurs through my position as chair of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, an informal coalition that involves more than 30 faith-based organizations, both denominational offices and unofficial religious associations.

This activity began three years ago when I convened a meeting of representatives from faith-based organizations to developed support for Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). For the next two years the Interfaith Group for the CTBT, which I chaired, met monthly. We linked our efforts to activities of civil-sector organizations by engaging in some joint activities and by having representatives of such groups as the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Peace Action, Women's Action for New Direction, and 20/20 Vision attend our meetings. Our part of the CTBT ratification campaign involved interfaith mobilization in 25+ swing states, a petition drive, postcard alerts (with 20/20), grassroots delegations meeting with Senate staff, numerous letters to senators, contact by top religious leaders with their senators. Although the CTBT was defeated for political reasons beyond our influence, we gained the attention of senators. That was shown when 20 Republicans who eventually voted against the treaty signed a letter originated by Senators Warner and Moynihan asking for postponement of the vote. Nineteen came from states where we mobilized grassroots support for the CTBT. Informed persons on Capitol Hill said this reflected their nervousness of following the party line to vote against the treaty.

Subsequently we have reshaped our coalition into the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament with a broader agenda to encompass support for de-alerting, deep cuts in the nuclear arsenal, eventual elimination of all nuclear weapons, and ratification of the CTBT, and also opposition to national missile defense (NMD). Our approach is illustrated by how we are dealing with the latter issue.

The Interfaith Committee held an all-afternoon planning meeting on May 22. We decided to give priority attention to national missile defense. The Friends Committee on National Legislation took the lead in developing a sign-on letter to President Clinton, opposing NMD deployment. Because most faith-based groups have not worked on this issue, I obtained from the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers a three-page briefing paper on NMD and circulated it among our participating organizations. Because we had worked closely with 20/20 Vision during the CTBT campaign, I invited 20/20 representatives to attend our June 22 meeting. Out of this session came an agreement to develop a joint postcard alert on NMD. Two of our group worked with 20/20 staff to develop the text. I sent it via e-mail to our participating organizations, inviting them to cosponsor the card and send it to their grassroots activists. I made some follow-up calls, but most of the follow-up contact was handled by 20/20 staff. We obtained 28 cosponsors. 20/20 took care of production and printing (in part supported by a grant from the Town Creek Foundation, I believe). Over 30,000 cards were printed and distributed, and some organizations put out the text via e-mail. This was an effective partnership. 20/20 provided its know-how, and we mobilized the faith-based organizations. We couldn't have done this by ourselves, and 20/20 wouldn't have been able to get that many faith-based organizations involved by itself.

Now the Back-from-the-Brink Campaign has approached us about joining that initiative to promote de-alerting the nuclear arsenal. This will be on our agenda for our September meeting. We will also discuss how we can provide assistance to interfaith groups at the state and local levels so that they can prepare for making contacts with their senators and representatives in the next Congress. In that session we will once again work closely with civil-sector organizations to renew the campaign for CTBT ratification.

As I perform my role as chair of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, I serve as a catalyst to bring faith-based organizations together and to link them with civil-sector organizations. Rather than serving as a coordinator or attempting hierarchical command, I encourage various organizations to take the lead on specific activities and I promote horizontal relations among the faith groups and between them and civic-sector organizations. However, sometimes I give a nudge here and there, and I seek ways to fill gaps. My role is carried out mostly in the background with very little publicity. Some have told me that my role is indispensable for getting faith-based organizations to work together on nuclear disarmament and to carry out linkages with civil-sector organizations. If you want, you can get a reading on this by talking with some of your grantees, such as John Isaacs, Daryl Kimbal, Bob Musial, Jim Wyerman, Gordon Clark, Kimberly Robson.

If you are interested in a full proposal, I will further develop the contribution that Methodists United for Peace with Justice makes to interfaith mobilization for nuclear disarmament and will describe the activities to be undertaken in 2001. The \$25,000 mentioned earlier as a suggested grant amount is half the budget for my work with the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament.

I look forward to hearing from you.

With best regards,
Howard W. Hallman, Chair

To: Adam Eidinger <aeidinger@yahoo.com>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Interviews
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <20000829223233.2409.qmail@web4105.mail.yahoo.com>
References:

At 03:32 PM 8/29/00 -0700, you wrote:

>Dear Howard,
>
>Check out this attached image we made for the podium
>sign and/or backdrop. We are looking into different
>ways of printing it or making a banner. More on costs
>tomorrow. Please let me know if you like the image.
>
>Any replies to the survey today?
>
>Cheers,
>Adam

Adam,

I don't have capacity (or know how) to download images. I'm going to be out of town tomorrow. Maybe I'll try to come by your office Thursday afternoon

I had a call from a guy on Gore's staff this evening. He was grumpy about such short notice but seems willing to respond. They've had the letter since last Wednesday, hand delivered.

Howard

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express for Macintosh - 4.01 (295)
Date: Wed, 30 Aug 2000 16:19:30 -0400
Subject: National Conference Call on NMD - September 16, 2000
From: "NMD" <NMD@2020vision.org>
To: "Sr. Miriam Spencer" <mirspenc@juno.com>

, Diana Winston <dwinston@bpf.org>
, Stan Deboe <sdeboe@cmsm.org>
, jeff mandell <jmandell@rac.org>
, greg laszakovits <washofc@aol.com>
, tiffany heath <tlheath@churchwomen.org>
, jere skipper <jmskipper@aol.com>
, mary miller <epf@igc.org>
, russel siler <russ.siler@ecunet.org>
, ibrahim abdil muid ramey <disarm@forusa.org>
, kathy guthrie <kathy@fcnl.org>
, robin ringler <dringler@umc-gbcs.org>
, kee diamond <ldiamond@Knight-hub.com>
, marie dennis <chouleMM@aol.com>
, daryl byler <J_Daryl_Byler@mcc.org>
, howard hallman <mupj@igc.org>
, rabia <mpf@forusa.org>
, heather nolen <heather@nccusa.org>
, "curtiss ramsey-lucas" <ograbc@aol.com>
, dave robinson <dave@paxchristiusa.org>
, bill yolton <dengster@aol.com>
, sroyster@sistersofmercy.org
, charlotte davenport <csjp@igc.org>
, dwayne shank <dshank@sojourners.com>
, lawrence egbert <uuawo@aol.com>
, ron stief <stiefr@ucc.org>
, bill price <WorldPeacemakers@compuserve.com>

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

20/20 Vision

Campaign to Oppose National Missile Defense

1828 Jefferson Place NW

Washington DC 20036

August 30, 2000

Dear Colleague in Faith and Peace:

Thank you for working with us as one of 28 religious groups in distributing more than 40,000 "Interfaith" action cards on NMD to your members around the country during August. Requests for more cards for local distribution of this action alert are also being received. Because of continuing interest in this issue and commitments to action, 20/20 Vision will convene a national telephone conference call for activists working to oppose a US national missile defense on Saturday, September 16 from 12 Noon to 1:00 PM EDT.

This one hour program will feature:

... Update on NMD as an arms control issue:

Joseph Cirincione, Director of Non-Proliferation Project, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace

... The politics of NMD and getting this issue into the public debate of fall election campaigns

... Faith in action opportunities

Joe Volk, Executive Secretary, Friends Committee on National Legislation

... How-to skills review on writing Letters to the Editor and visiting newspaper editors
20/20 Vision staff

... Brief question and answer periods

We are asking members/constituents to take the following actions during September and October, but they will have an impact through the coming year(s):

- 1) Write to President Clinton and ask him to defer ANY NMD construction.
- 2) Ask Presidential candidates to shelve any national missile defense plans and to pursue national and global actions to reduce nuclear weapons and strengthen resources for conflict resolution and conflict prevention
- 3) Ask congressional candidates to make a statement opposing national missile defense and any funding for NMD by the new Congress.
- 4) Write a Letter to the Editor about NMD to make the issue more visible in the media
- 5) Visit the editorial board of a newspaper and ask the editor to oppose NMD

This period of election campaigns is a special moment for influencing the course of U.S. national security policy. Candidate positions on national missile defense and related issues of national security and common security are often undeclared and also left out of the public debate -- a debate that, at best, is rife with mutual accusations of being "weak on defense" rather than strong on peace.

We are inviting interested activists from other groups to join members of 20/20 Vision on this call by signing up through our office [202-833-2020), or by responding to this email. Please consider which of your activists might be interested in this national call and let us know about their participation.

Participants will call a central conference service number to be connected. 20/20 Vision will pay for the conferencing charges and ask participants to pay for their own long distance charges.

Sincerely,

Tim Barner, Program Director

Hop Pham-Thi, NMD Coordinator

To: tom@votenader.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Letter on nuclear disarmament issues
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\abl.080.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Mr. Adkins:

I am sending by attachment a copy of a letter sent to Mr. Nader on August 18, asking a series of questions about his views on nuclear disarmament issues. We have confirmation that it was received at your office on August 19. (If you need the letter via text, please let me know.)

We have scheduled a news conference for Thursday afternoon, September 7 at the National Press Club to present the responses from the Democratic, Republican, Reform, and Green party candidates. Catholic Bishop Thomas Gumbleton and United Methodist Bishop Dale White are coming to Washington for that occasion. Therefore, we would greatly appreciate a response from Mr. Nader by Tuesday, September 5 in time for us to complete our preparations for the news conference. A reply by mailed can be address to me at 6508 Wilmett Road, Bethesda, MD 20817, by e-mail at mupj@igc.org, or by fax to 301 896-0013. For further information, you can reach me at the same number.

Thanks for your cooperation,
Howard Hallman

X-eGroups-Return: sentto-1413460-1257-967740189-mupj=igc.apc.org@returns.onelist.com
To: "'Abolition-Caucus@igc.org'" <abolition-caucus@egroups.com>
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator: <03B89A554A86D311A1E8080009FE5B8A082244@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: Thu, 31 Aug 2000 12:34:40 -0400
Subject: [abolition-caucus]

----- eGroups Sponsor ----->
GET A NEXTCARD VISA, in 30 seconds! Get rates
of 2.9% Intro or 9.9% Ongoing APR* and no annual fee!
Apply NOW!
http://click.egroups.com/1/7872/3/_/91925/_/967740189/
----- _->

August 31, 2000

Friends,

Preparing for an AFSC meeting here in Cambridge, I reviewed the portion of a recent speech which describes the campaign for National Missile Defenses in the contexts of U.S. nuclear weapons and war policy and U.S. electoral politics. It is a bit different from most of what I have been reading in recent weeks, and I thought it might be worth sharing with a wider audience.

The full speech was given at the World Conference against A & H Bombs earlier this month in Hiroshima and is available by request at Jgerson@afsc.org.

With all best wishes,
Joseph Gerson

Ballistic (National) Missile Defense excerpts
from Joseph Gerson's speech at
The World Conference against A & H Bombs
Hiroshima - August, 2000

With the renewed debate over Star Wars - so called Ballistic Missile Defenses and the U.S. threat to withdraw from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treat - some in the U.S. and internationally have been asking "Does the U.S. have a nuclear weapons policy?" The answer is yes.
The U.S. "star wars" debate is taking place at a number of levels, only some of which are immediately transparent. First it is more about domestic politics than nuclear doctrine. No serious U.S. scientist or military planner has any illusions that a working BMD system can be deployed by the 2005 target date, but both Republicans and Democrats learned from Ronald Reagan that promoting star wars wins votes. Reagan showed that U.S. voters will cast their ballots for political hucksters who hold out the promise of a shield that can protect them from the horrors of the nuclear age. In a

extraordinarily dangerous example of Freudian projection and Machiavellian manipulation, the state which has most frequently prepared and threatened to initiate nuclear war, and which holds the world hostage to its Trident and other nuclear weapons, is mobilizing popular support by raising the specter of North Korean, Iraqi and Iranian nuclear attack. These are poor nations which even the CIA concedes pose not immediate threat to U.S. security. In fact, China, Russia, and ultimately U.S. allies like Japan are the real targets of star wars - a shield to enhance the U. S. sword, but politics and diplomacy prevent this simple truth from being said.

There is another hidden dimension to the star wars debate which helps to explain why Republicans and most Democratic leaders continue to shovel banks full of dollars down the star wars rat hole. Star wars, Ballistic Missile Defenses, are the "thin edge of the wedge" for U.S. weaponization of space. Star wars spending creates the technology for the eventual deployment of nuclear, laser, and other high-tech weapons in space, while the star wars "debate" creates its "intellectual" and political foundations. And, just as the LDP buys political support with construction spending in communities across Japan, the Pentagon has distributed R & D contracts for star wars in Congressional districts across the U.S., buying itself a potent political constituency.

Confusion also abounds over George Bush simultaneous calls for BMD deployments and unilateral cuts in the U.S. nuclear arsenal. Another confusion relates to Al Gore's insistence that the U.S. bottom line in START III negotiations must be 2,500 thermonuclear weapons, not the 1,500 proposed by Russia and supported by many arms control enthusiasts. Both Bush and Gore support BMD - even to the point of possibly abrogating the ABM Treaty. Bush's call for possible unilateral reductions is consistent with similar initiatives undertaken by his father which were designed to reduce the possibility of accidental nuclear war and the probabilities of nuclear weapons proliferation in ways that reinforce U.S. dominance. Gore, like Clinton, will not challenge the military or militarist voters. Thus he has refused break with the star wars political orthodoxy. If the Joint Chiefs tell him that a minimum of 2,500 strategic nuclear weapons are needed for a growing number of Russian and Chinese targets, that's what he'll promise them.

Finally, in the age of U.S. hegemony, the star wars debate illuminates divisions in the U.S. ruling elite between unilateralists who advocate maintaining and expanding the United States' global dominion on exclusively U.S. terms, and those who believe that military coercion usually requires the support of the United States' first world allies and the protective coloration of support from U.S. Third World dependents. These divisions, of course, are not absolute, and they apparently do not apply to the development and threatened deployment of Theater Missile Defenses. What is the U.S. military and nuclear doctrine? Although the details change from year to year, as the Pentagon's recently released "Joint Vision 2020" instructs us, it remains essentially the same as it has been for the past fifty-five years: ensuring "dominance." In this period, the Pentagon is committed to "full spectrum dominance" from counter-insurgency warfare to escalation dominance and nuclear terrorism. Diplomacy forbids naming China as the new "enemy" so the "rogue" North Korean state served as the public rationale for the expansion of the U.S.-Japan alliance, the for the new Guidelines and the reconsolidation of U.S. forces in Okinawa, and for increased U.S. military spending, including new nuclear weapons. With North Korea breaking out of its diplomatic isolation, this approach has outlived

its usefulness, thus the Joint Chiefs doctrine focuses on the "peer competitor" - China - that requires a "shift away from...Europe" to the Asia-Pacific.²

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]"

Date: Thu, 31 Aug 2000 16:57:12 -0400
From: Bill Robinson <brobinson@ploughshares.ca>
Organization: Project Ploughshares
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.0Gold (Win95; I)
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: Conference Brussels 5-6 October

Hi, Howard.

I'm writing to see if you would be interested in participating in a conference on the churches and nuclear weapons, in Brussels on 5-6 October. The event is being organized by Project Ploughshares, the Canadian Council of Churches, the Conference of European Churches, the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA, and the World Council of Churches. Its purpose is to examine and discuss the key nuclear-weapons-related decisions facing NATO states over the next few months and to use that information to equip the churches to take individual and collective action in support of nuclear disarmament.

The intended participants are American, Canadian, and European church staff and individuals from related denominational and ecumenical committees and institutions. I think we'll have about 20 people there. These will, for the most part, be people connected with the work of the councils on these issues, but we are also interested in encouraging attendance by people with other church-related peace connections, such as yourself.

There is no fee for the conference, but you would have to cover your own travel and accommodation costs. We have reserved a block of reasonably priced rooms for people interested in attending.

I recognize and apologize for the fact that this is extremely short notice. Unfortunately, we were able only recently to finalize the dates for it. (We have learned over the course of organizing this event that it is almost impossible to organize anything in Europe over the summer months, especially if it requires co-ordinating the plans of a large number of people.)

I have attached some additional information in the hope that it is not too late for you to consider attending.

Cheers,

Bill.

--

Bill Robinson, Project Ploughshares,
Conrad Grebel College, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada N2L 3G6
Phone: 519 885-0220 x264 Fax: 519 885-0806
E-mail: brobinson@ploughshares.ca
<http://www.ploughshares.ca>

Project Ploughshares is a member of the Canadian Network to Abolish

Nuclear Weapons (<http://watserv1.uwaterloo.ca/~plough/cnanw/cnanw.html>)

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\church.nuke.euro.agendaAug31.wpd"

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\church.nuke.nato.purpose.wpd"

From: David Culp <david@fcnl.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman (E-mail)" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Mini-Nuke Web Page
Date: Thu, 31 Aug 2000 17:00:29 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

The Friends Committee on National Legislation (FCNL) has put up a web page on "mini-nukes", with lots of links. The issue is currently being debated in the U.S. Congress. The material includes:

- * Washington Post article (June 12)
- * Albuquerque (New Mexico) Journal article on mini-nukes (August 15)
- * Los Alamos National Laboratory report on "Nuclear Weapons in the 21st Century"
- * Other background material

The address is <<http://www.fcnl.org/issues/arm/minnukeindx.htm>>.

David Culp

Friends Committee on National Legislation (Quakers)
245 Second Street, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20002-5795
Phone: (202)547-6000, ext. 146
Fax: (202)547-6019
E-mail: david@fcnl.org
Website: <http://www.fcnl.org>

Date: Sat, 02 Sep 2000 00:53:43 -0400
From: Mintwood Media Collective <adam@mintwood.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.73 [en]C-CCK-MCD BA45DSL (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: Final Draft of News Advisory

Dear Howard,

Here is the news advisory, attached. Please let me know what you think and email me back any edits.

Sincerely,

Adam

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\NEWS ADVISORY090500.doc"



Mintwood Media Collective

Sarah Austin Adam Eiding Kadd Stephens

1858 Mintwood Pl. NW, #4
Washington, DC 20009
Ph: 202-232-8997
Fax: 202-232-8340
www.mintwood.com

NEWS ADVISORY

September 5, 2000

CONTACT: Adam Eiding or Howard Hallman

202-986-6186 or 301-896-0013

RELIGIOUS LEADERS RELEASE SURVEY OF PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES ON NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Room.

WHO: Bishop Thomas Gumbleton, Catholic Archdiocese of Detroit

o

p C. Dale White, United Methodist Church

Howard Hallman, Chair, Methodists United for Peace with

Justice

WHAT: Release of Presidential Candidate Survey on Nuclear Weapons

WHEN: Thursday, September 7 at 2:00 PM

WHERE: First Amendment Room, National Press Club, Washington, DC

In mid-August nearly 50 leading religious leaders sent the survey to the four major presidential candidates. They were asked to respond by September 5. **Some of the survey questions include:**

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?

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." If elected president, what specifically will you do during your four-year term to fulfill this commitment?

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?

If elected president, will you seek ratification of the CTBT by the United States Senate?

If elected president, will you embark upon a de-alerting initiative to take strategic weapons off hair-trigger alert? If so, please provide specifics.

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?

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.

For a copy of the survey please contact Adam Eiding at 202-986-6186 or Howard Hallman at 301-896-0013.

###

From: "Willett, Don" <DWillett@georgewbush.com>
To: "'mupj@igc.org'" <mupj@igc.org>
Cc: "Willett, Don" <DWillett@georgewbush.com>
Subject: presidential candidate questionnaire
Date: Fri, 1 Sep 2000 12:24:01 -0500
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

Mr. Hallman,

Sarah Lenti passed along your questionnaire to me a couple of days ago.
(Aug. 30)

I know you have an event next Thurs.

The campaign, as you can imagine, gets buried in hundreds of questionnaires from every imaginable organization. I coordinate all the policy-related ones here at Bush-Cheney. Given the tremendous volume, we tell groups to expect a minimum of two weeks (and even that assumes everyone involved in the process is in town and not on the road). The researching, drafting, revising, approval process here is quite extensive as you can imagine.

Would it be OK with you if I sent to you copies of some other questionnaires we've done regarding nuclear disarmament issues, along with some pertinent fact sheets, speeches, press releases, etc. that discuss Governor Bush's views. Sarah thought you might find that helpful given the unlikelihood of turning around a question-by-question response to your questionnaire in time for your event.

This is a vital issue that merits thoughtful discussion, so I want to get you some good information.

Many thanks.

DRW

To: "Willett, Don" <DWillett@georgewbush.com>

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

Subject: Re: presidential candidate questionnaire

Cc:

Bcc:

X-Attachments:

In-Reply-To: <A370C30142F8D2118B910090276212DE039CE24B@apollo.georgewbush.com>

References:

At 12:24 PM 9/1/00 -0500, you wrote:

>Mr. Hallman,

>

>Sarah Lenti passed along your questionnaire to me a couple of days ago.

>(Aug. 30)....

Dear Mr. Willett:

I'm sorry the letter from the 46 religious leaders didn't reach you until August 30. We mailed it to Governor Bush at the Governor's Office on August 18 via express mail and we have written confirmation that it arrived Monday morning, August 21, which would have given you two weeks. Starting on August 23 I tried to make contact with some on the campaign staff who might be handling the response, but was unsuccessful. But that doesn't help you now, if you're the one to handle the response with not a lot of time to spare.

I talked with Sarah Lenti around midday today, September 1. You may or may not have talked with her after that and before you wrote me. She said that she would try to fax a reply to me by Thursday. My office is in the D.C. suburbs, so I'll be leaving for the 2:00 p.m. news conference around 12 noon, Eastern time on that day. For me to be able to get copies made, I would need it by 10:30 a.m. Thus, I would prefer to receive the reply via fax or e-mail on Wednesday afternoon or evening, September 6 at the latest.

I suppose we could make do with Governor Bush's speeches, particularly the one on May 23, 2000. But as far as I know, he hasn't addressed all of our questions. Thus, we would have to indicate "no comment" or "views unknown" on some of them. In fairness to Governor Bush, we would prefer that the answers come from him via you on the campaign staff.

My office is in my home, so if you want to talk to me about it this evening or during the Labor Weekend you can reach me at 301 896-0013.

Thanks for your help on this endeavor,

Howard Hallman

To: Mintwood Media Collective <adam@mintwood.com>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Final Draft of News Advisory
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <39B087D7.D6419F93@mintwood.com>
References:

At 12:53 AM 9/2/00 -0400, you wrote:

>Dear Howard,

>

>Here is the news advisory, attached. Please let me know what you think
>and email me back any edits.

Adam,

It looks good.

A few corrections. At end of first paragraph, capitalize "room". Under "WHO", it is Bishop C. Dale White, not Reverend. Rabbi Saperstein will be out of town, so strike his name. I may get somebody else from the Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism, but I won't know until Tuesday, too late for this release.

I'm assuming it will go to the religious press as well as your regular press list.

I'll be around this weekend, but it and out, if you need to call me.

With NMD out of the way, so to speak (though still an issue), maybe we'll be able to stir up an interest in nuclear disarmament issues.

Howard

X-Sender: jdi@[63.106.26.66]
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)
Date: Fri, 01 Sep 2000 13:24:23 -0400
To: jdi@clw.org
From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>
Subject: NMD decision: Bush, Gore reaction, W.H. fact sheet

Statement By Governor George W. Bush Regarding President Clinton's
Announcement

On A National Missile Defense System: Friday, September 1, 2000

"As President, I intend to develop and deploy an effective missile defense system at the earliest possible date to protect American citizens from accidental launches or blackmail by rogue nations. Today's announcement that President Clinton will leave this unfinished business for the next President underscores the fact that for seven years, the Clinton-Gore administration has failed to strengthen America's defenses.

President Clinton and Vice President Gore first denied the need for missile defenses, then delayed. Now they are leaving this important unfinished business for the next President, and I welcome the opportunity to act where they have failed to lead by developing and deploying effective missile defenses to protect all 50 states and our friends and allies."

=====

Statement by Al Gore On National Missile Defense NEWS RELEASE FOR IMMEDIATE
RELEASE - August 31, 2000

CONTACT: Douglas Hattaway, Chris Lehane 615-340 3251

NASHVILLE - August 31 - I agree with the President's decision to defer the decision to deploy a National Missile Defense (NMD) for the next administration. Now that he has made his decision, I feel free to express myself on the subject.

The United States faces the real possibility that countries such as North Korea or Iran will succeed in acquiring weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missiles able to deliver these weapons at intercontinental range.

Of course it is possible that North Korea or Iran might at some point change their intentions and remove this threat. We should be alert to such possibilities, but they are not in our grasp at this moment.

The NMD system which the Clinton-Gore Administration has under development is meant to be deployed in a timely way, and is explicitly designed to handle the type of threat that we could expect if our estimates are realized and we have to face a small number of deployed Inter-Continental Ballistic Missiles (ICBMs) with Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) warheads.

The President's decision allows time for additional testing of our NMD system. I welcome the opportunity to be more certain that these technologies actually work together properly. As the President said, there

are 16 additional intercept tests already scheduled. One could decide to proceed with deployment at any point along that process, once fully convinced that the technologies are ready.

Passage of more time also allows for more clarity about the costs of the system.

The President's decision also allows the next President time to conduct updated discussions with other countries.

As regards the Russian Federation, I think it important to state what my approach would be if I am the next President. I respect the Russians, concerns and would want the opportunity to persuade them that the NMD system would never become a threat to them.

I would be prepared to work hard to persuade the Government of the Russian Federation to modify the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) treaty. And, I would also look for very creative approaches for joint U.S. -Russian responses to a threat that can be aimed at either one or both of us.

But, at the end of the day, I would not be prepared to let Russian opposition to this system stand in the way of its deployment, if I should conclude that the technologies are mature enough to deploy and are both affordable and needed. I would also work to persuade the Chinese that a U.S. NMD system is not intended to threaten them, and to allay the concerns of our allies.

However, as President, I would oppose the kinds of missile defense systems that would unnecessarily upset strategic stability and threaten to open the gates for a renewed arms race with Russia and a new arms race with China including both offensive and defensive weapons.

It would be my objective as President to avoid such an outcome. Instead, I would aim for another round of deep negotiated reductions to levels agreed between the United States and Russia at the Helsinki summit. If the Russians wish to reduce unilaterally below that level for economic reasons they certainly can and should. But for the United States to go lower requires a thorough reexamination of the official nuclear doctrine which to this point guides our military in its planning. As President, I would initiate such a review and engage deeply in the process.

I have said before that the Senate's rejection of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty was an act of massive irresponsibility damaging to the security interests of the United States, and I repeat that if elected President I will immediately revive the ratification process and seek to rally the full force of American public opinion behind it.

If I am elected President, I would also plan to use the extra time created by President Clinton's decision for a serious bipartisan dialogue about defensive systems aimed at establishing a consensus that clearly does not exist at the present time. Of course, if I became convinced of a need to act I would propose moving forward whether or not it has been possible to establish this consensus, but it would clearly be in the nation's best interest if we could do so.

=====
THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary
For Immediate Release

September 1, 2000

FACT SHEET
National Missile Defense

The Clinton Administration is committed to the development of a limited National Missile Defense (NMD) system designed to protect all 50 states from the emerging ballistic missile threat from nations that threaten international peace and security. In the event of an attack, American satellites would detect the launch of missiles; radar would track the enemy warheads; and highly accurate, high-speed ground-based interceptors would destroy missiles before they reach targets in the United States.

NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE DECISION

President Clinton announced today that the NMD program is sufficiently promising and affordable to justify continued development and testing, but that there is not sufficient information about the technical and operational effectiveness of the entire NMD system to move forward with deployment.

In making this decision, the President considered the threat, the cost, technical feasibility and the impact overall on our national security of proceeding with NMD. He considered a thorough technical review by the Department of Defense as well as the advice of his top national security advisors.

The Pentagon has made progress on developing a system that can address the emerging missile threat. But we do not have sufficient information to conclude that it can work reliably under realistic conditions. Critical elements of the program, such as the booster rocket for the missile interceptor, have not been tested; and there are questions to be resolved about the ability of the system to deal with countermeasures. The President made clear we should not move forward until we have further confidence that the system will work and until we have made every reasonable diplomatic effort to minimize the costs.

The Pentagon will continue the development and testing of the NMD system. That effort is still at an early stage: three of the nineteen planned intercept tests have been held so far. Additional ground tests and simulations will also take place.

The development of our NMD is part of the Administration's comprehensive national security strategy to prevent potential adversaries from threatening the United States with such weapons and acquiring the weapons in the first place.

Arms control agreements with Russia are an important part of this strategy because they ensure stability and predictability between the United States

and Russia, promote the dismantling of nuclear weapons, and help complete the transition from confrontation to cooperation with Russia. The Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty of 1972 limits anti-missile defenses according to a simple principle: neither side should deploy defenses that would undermine the other's nuclear deterrent, and thus tempt the other to strike first in a crisis or take countermeasures that would make both our countries less secure.

This announcement will provide additional time to pursue with Russia the goal of adapting the ABM treaty to permit the deployment of a limited NMD that would not undermine strategic stability. The United States will also continue to consult with Allies and continue the dialogue with China and other states.

An NMD program that meets the projected threat

Last August, the President decided that the initial NMD architecture would include: 100 ground-based interceptors deployed in Alaska, one ABM radar in Alaska, and five upgraded early warning radars.

This approach is the fastest, most affordable, and most technologically mature approach to fielding an effective NMD against the projected threat. It would protect all 50 states against emerging threats from both North Korea and the Middle East and is optimized against the most immediate and certain threat, North Korea.

On July 23, 1999, President Clinton signed into law H.R. 4, the "National Missile Defense Act of 1999," stating that it is the policy of the United States to deploy as soon as technologically possible an effective NMD system. The legislation includes two amendments supported by the Administration: the first making clear that any NMD deployment must be subject to the authorization and appropriations process, and thus that no decision on deployment has been made; the second stating it is the policy of the United States to seek continued negotiated reductions in Russian nuclear forces, putting Congress on record as continuing to support negotiated reductions in strategic nuclear arms, reaffirming the Administration's position that missile defense policy must take into account important arms control and nuclear nonproliferation objectives.

NMD Budget

The Clinton Administration has spent approximately \$5.7 billion on NMD, and budgeted an additional \$10.4 billion in FY 2001-2005 to support possible deployment of the initial NMD architecture. Our current estimate for developing, procuring and deploying our initial system - 100 interceptors, an ABM radar, upgrades to 5 early warning radars, and command and control - is around \$25 billion (Fiscal Years 91-09). But to put that in perspective, it represents less than 1 percent of the defense budget over the coming six years.

Joint Statement of Principles on Strategic Stability

At the June 4 Moscow summit, Presidents Clinton and Putin signed a Joint Statement of Principles on Strategic Stability. The Principles state that

the international community faces a dangerous and growing threat of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery, including missiles and missile technologies, and that there is a need to address these threats, including through consideration of changes to the ABM Treaty. The Principles also record agreement to intensify discussions on both ABM issues and START III.

Joint Statement on Cooperation on Strategic Stability

The United States has made clear to Russia that we are prepared to engage in serious cooperation to address the emerging ballistic missile threat and have identified a number of specific ideas for discussion. At the June 4 Moscow Summit, Presidents Clinton and Putin signed an agreement to establish a Joint Center for exchanging early warning data on missile launches; they also agreed to explore more far-reaching cooperation to address missile threats.

On July 21 in Okinawa, Presidents Clinton and Putin issued a Joint Statement on Cooperation on Strategic Stability, which identifies specific areas and projects for cooperation to control the spread of missiles, missile technology and weapons of mass destruction.

###

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: Bill Robinson <brobinson@ploughshares.ca>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Conference Brussels 5-6 October
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <39AEC6A8.702D@ploughshares.ca>
References:

At 04:57 PM 8/31/00 -0400, you wrote:

>Hi, Howard.

>

>I'm writing to see if you would be interested in participating in a
>conference on the churches and nuclear weapons, in Brussels on 5-6
>October....

Dear Bill,

I would love to attend the meeting in Brussels on October 5 and 6. It relates closely to what I am trying to do as chair of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament in the United States and my personal outreach to the World Council of Churches and the Holy See.

Unfortunately at the moment I don't have any travel funds available. I am using up my discretionary funds for a news conference next week on responses from presidential candidates to questions from 46 religious leaders on nuclear disarmament issues.

Do you suppose that the National Council of Churches (U.S.) might be willing to pay my fare as an extension of their representation? Do you have a relationship that you could inquire in my behalf? Bob Edgar knows what I'm doing, but I'm reluctant to approach him directly.

If not that source, maybe something else will turn up. So please keep my invitation open.

Shalom,
Howard

To: phil
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: News conference on September 7
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\00901.02.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Phil,

The news conference will take place at 2:00 p.m., Thursday, September 7 at the National Press Club. The news advisory is attached.

We have the room at 1:30 to set up. Would you be willing to help with a table for press representatives to sign in?

Please bring a blank check with you from the General Fund so that we can pay the National Press Club.

When the transfer to the Education Fund has cleared, please pay me \$3,000 from the Rockefeller funds in that account for my services in August.

We are probably going to get replies from Gore, Bush, and Nader. Buchanan is doubtful. I think the project is going to be successful.

Shalom,
Howard

To: adam
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Miscellaneous matters
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Adam,

As things come to mind this weekend about our news conference, I'll write you.

- (1) We're probably not going to get anything from the Bush campaign until late Wednesday or Thursday morning. That will probably foreclose the possibility of giving the replies to a reporter for an exclusive story for Thursday morning.
- (2) In case we get nothing from Bush, I have standby answers to some of the questions derived from Bush's public statements, especially a May 23 speech. There are unanswered questions to label "views unknown". I'll use that if we have to.
- (3) I am fairly confident of getting something from Gore and Nader.
- (4) Do you want copies of any or all the attachments we sent the candidates for the news handout? If so, will you reproduce them, or do you want me to? If the latter, how many copies?
- (5) Who is on your list for special outreach to follow up the news advisory? Will you give them a copy of the letter with signers?
- (6) I'm hoping that you will call some of the religious press, especially the following. For denominational presses you can identify signers from the particular denominations. Last names are listed below. For special contact:
Religious News Service
Catholic News Service: Archbishop Flores, Bishops Balke, Clark, Gumbleton, Lucker, Sullivan.
Methodist News Service: Bishops Carder, Lyght, Martinez, Talbert, White plus myself.
Baptist News Service: Baldrige, Dunn, Stassen, Weiss
Jewish News Service: Green, Heschel, Lerner, Levy, Menitoff, Saperstein, Waskow
If there is an Episcopal News Service, the Episcopal bishops.

Call me if you need to over the holiday weekend.

Howard

Date: Sun, 3 Sep 2000 09:19:10 -0700 (PDT)
From: Adam Eiding <aeiding@yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: Miscellaneous matters
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>

Dear Howard,

Answers to your questions....

(4) Do you want copies of any or all the attachments we sent the candidates for the news handout? If so, will you reproduce them, or do you want me to? If the latter, how many copies?

*We will make the copies when we go to Kinkos on Tuesday. Are there any other things you sent out other than what you sent me?

(5) Who is on your list for special outreach to follow up the news advisory? Will you give them a copy of the letter with signers?

*All the major political producers, I know< at CNN, CBS, ABC, NBC, FOX, and PBS. I will also target a handful of newspapers, including Hannah Rosin at the Post, and Gustav Neighbor at te NY Times. There many others, but I'm not goin to list them now.

6) I'm hoping that you will call some of the religious press, especially the following. For denominational presses you can identify signers from the particular denominations. Last names are listed below.

*We will be calling all of them starting on Tuesday.

Onwards,

Adam

--- "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> wrote:
> Dear Adam,
>
> As things come to mind this weekend about our news
> conference, I'll write you.
>
> (1) We're probably not going to get anything from
> the Bush campaign until
> late Wednesday or Thursday morning. That will

> probably foreclose the
> possibility of giving the replies to a reporter for
> an exclusive story for
> Thursday morning.
>
> (2) In case we get nothing from Bush, I have standby
> answers to some of the
> questions derived from Bush's public statements,
> especially a May 23
> speech. There are unanswered questions to label
> "views unknown". I'll use
> that if we have to.
>
> (3) I am fairly confident of getting something from
> Gore and Nader.
>
> (4) Do you want copies of any or all the attachments
> we sent the candidates
> for the news handout? If so, will you reproduce
> them, or do you want me
> to? If the latter, how many copies?
>
> (5) Who is on your list for special outreach to
> follow up the news
> advisory? Will you give them a copy of the letter
> with signers?
>
> (6) I'm hoping that you will call some of the
> religious press, especially
> the following. For denominational presses you can
> identify signers from
> the particular denominations. Last names are listed
> below. For special
> contact:
> Religious News Service
> Catholic News Service: Archbishop Flores, Bishops
> Balke, Clark, Gumbleton,
> Lucker, Sullivan.
> Methodist News Service: Bishops Carder, Lyght,
> Martinez, Talbert, White
> plus myself.
> Baptist News Service: Baldrige, Dunn, Stassen,
> Weiss
> Jewish News Service: Green, Heschel, Lerner, Levy,
> Menitoff, Saperstein,
> Waskow
> If there is an Episcopal News Service, the Episcopal
> bishops.
>
> Call me if you need to over the holiday weekend.
>
> 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.

Do You Yahoo!?

Yahoo! Mail - Free email you can access from anywhere!

<http://mail.yahoo.com/>

To: brobinson@ploughshares.ca
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Brussels meeting
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Bill,

After writing you I checked airline schedules and fares to Brussels. I found a non-stop flight from Washington to Brussels on United Airlines for US\$657 roundtrip. It was too cheap to resist, so I booked it. So I'll be attending the meeting.

I will arrive on Wednesday, October 4 and depart on Sunday, October 8 to encompass an over Saturday night stay for the fare. Thus, I'll need a hotel room for four nights. What is the rate? Can you handle the reservation or should I?

I still need to raise some money to pay the costs. Depending on the hotel rate it should be in the US\$1,000 to 1,500 range.

I'm looking forward to this event. Is any preparation required?

Shalom,
Howard

From: Vmsmagic@cs.com
Date: Mon, 4 Sep 2000 09:47:04 EDT
Subject: Re: News conference on September 7
To: mupj@igc.org
X-Mailer: CompuServe 2000 32-bit sub 103

Howard,

I can be there at 1:30 p.m. to help set up and to sign in press but I have to leave no later than 2:30 for a meeting at Foundry.

Phil

Date: Mon, 4 Sep 2000 15:59:20 -0700 (PDT)
From: Adam Eiding <aeiding@yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: Further questions, information
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>

Dear Howard,

No need to come by. We have Mary on the list and I will call her. Your remarks will be helpful. I'll read them tonight.

No need to stop by. We are going to be on the phones all day.

Cheers,

Adam

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

> Dear Adam,

>

> Thanks for letting me know of your calling plans.

> It sounds like you have

> it under control.

>

> Is Mary McGory included in your call list? She

> attended the news

> conference on de-alerting last December and wrote a

> column on it.

>

> Is there any chance that C-SPAN would be interested?

> Congress probably

> won't be very active this week, so they may have

> some time.

>

> Attached is a draft of my opening remarks, with a

> couple of gaps. It may

> help you with your pitch.

>

> Also attached is a substitute final page of the

> letter to the candidates

> with two additional signers as an addendum. You can

> substitute it when you

> make copies of this letter.

>

> I'm going to Monday Lobby at midday on Tuesday. Is

> there any need for me

> to stop by your office afterwards? Otherwise you

> can reach me by phone

> before 11:00 and after 2:00.

>

>

> ATTACHMENT part 2 application/msword

name=abl.093.doc; x-mac-type=42494E41;
x-mac-creator=4D535744

> ATTACHMENT part 3 application/msword
name=abolish.289.doc; x-mac-type=42494E41;
x-mac-creator=4D535744

>
> 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.

Do You Yahoo!?

Yahoo! Mail - Free email you can access from anywhere!

<http://mail.yahoo.com/>

From: "Willett, Don" <DWillett@georgewbush.com>
To: "mupj@igc.org" <mupj@igc.org>
Cc: "Willett, Don" <DWillett@georgewbush.com>
Subject: candidate response to your survey
Date: Mon, 4 Sep 2000 21:54:44 -0500
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

Mr. Hallman -

Attached please find a number of items discussing Governor Bush's views on nuclear disarmament issues -- his May 23 remarks, the accompanying press release, and a thorough arms-related questionnaire, etc.

I regret that we are unable to provide you with a detailed, question-by-question response to your survey. The peculiar delay between the time the campaign mail room received it and the time it was routed to me (nine days later) made a quick, customized response not very feasible given the mammoth volume of questionnaires we're buried under right now.

I realize this response isn't ideal, but I hope it nonetheless gives your members, supporters, and readers some valuable and insightful information. Hopefully, getting it tonight will enable you to glean the needed information in advance of your Thurs. event.

Thank you very much for giving Governor Bush the opportunity to share his views with your organization.

Best,

DRW

<<Arms.Control.Assoc..doc>> <<dc05-23 nuclear policy.doc>>
<<NuclearStatementFINAL.doc>>

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\Arms.Control.Assoc..doc"

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\dc05-23 nuclear policy.doc"

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\NuclearStatementFINAL.doc"

From: "Willett, Don" <DWillett@georgewbush.com>
To: "mupj@igc.org" <mupj@igc.org>
Cc: "Willett, Don" <DWillett@georgewbush.com>
Subject: candidate response to your survey
Date: Mon, 4 Sep 2000 21:54:44 -0500
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

Mr. Hallman -

Attached please find a number of items discussing Governor Bush's views on nuclear disarmament issues -- his May 23 remarks, the accompanying press release, and a thorough arms-related questionnaire, etc.

I regret that we are unable to provide you with a detailed, question-by-question response to your survey. The peculiar delay between the time the campaign mail room received it and the time it was routed to me (nine days later) made a quick, customized response not very feasible given the mammoth volume of questionnaires we're buried under right now.

I realize this response isn't ideal, but I hope it nonetheless gives your members, supporters, and readers some valuable and insightful information. Hopefully, getting it tonight will enable you to glean the needed information in advance of your Thurs. event.

Thank you very much for giving Governor Bush the opportunity to share his views with your organization.

Best,

DRW

<<Arms.Control.Assoc..doc>> <<dc05-23 nuclear policy.doc>>
<<NuclearStatementFINAL.doc>>

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\Arms.Control.Assoc..doc"

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\dc05-23 nuclear policy.doc"

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\NuclearStatementFINAL.doc"

To: "Willett, Don" <DWillett@georgewbush.com>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: candidate response to your survey
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <A370C30142F8D2118B910090276212DE039CE282@apollo.georgewbush.com>
References:

At 09:54 PM 9/4/00 -0500, you wrote:

>Mr. Hallman -

>

>Attached please find a number of items discussing Governor Bush's views on
>nuclear disarmament issues -- his May 23 remarks, the accompanying press
>release, and a thorough arms-related questionnaire, etc.

>

>I regret that we are unable to provide you with a detailed,
>question-by-question response to your survey.....

Dear Mr. Willett:

Thanks for the material you provided. I had already seen and analyzed the May 23 speech, which contains answers to several of our questions. The response to the Arms Control Association questionnaires fills in a couple of gaps.

Altogether we have answers to five of our ten questions (#4, 5, 6, 7, and 10), a partial answer to one (#8), leaving four answered (#1, 2, 3, 9). We will record these as "views unknown" unless you want to help us fill in the gaps by Wednesday evening, May 6.

The unanswered questions and the one only partially answered are as follows:

- (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) If elected president, what specifically will you do during your four-year term to fulfill the U.S. commitment under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty to join other nuclear weapon states in "an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals"?
- (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?
- (8) 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.

Governor Bush has indicated, "Deterrence remains the first line of defense against nuclear attack." His views are unknown on war-fighting utility of nuclear weapons or specific targeting.

- (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?

After our news conference on September 7 these questions will enter the public domain. We imagine that some reporters may themselves seek answers from Governor Bush. Therefore, we would welcome a further response from

you so that his views may be expressed fully on these issues at this time.

With best regards,
Howard Hallman

To: "Willett, Don" <DWillett@georgewbush.com>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: candidate response to your survey

Dear Mr. Willett:

Thanks for the material you provided. I had already seen and analyzed the May 23 speech, which contains answers to several of our questions. The response to the Arms Control Association questionnaires fills in a couple of gaps.

Altogether we have answers to five of our ten questions (#4, 5, 6, 7, and 10), a partial answer to one (#8), leaving four answered (#1, 2, 3, 9). We will record these as "views unknown" unless you want to help us fill in the gaps by Wednesday evening, May 6.

The unanswered questions and the one only partially answered are as follows:

(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) If elected president, what specifically will you do during your four-year term to fulfill the U.S. commitment under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty to join other nuclear weapon states in "an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals"?

(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?

(8) 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.

Governor Bush has indicated, "Deterrence remains the first line of defense against nuclear attack." His views are unknown on war-fighting utility of nuclear weapons or specific targeting.

(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?

After our news conference on September 7 these questions will enter the public domain. We imagine that some reporters may themselves seek answers from Governor Bush. Therefore, we would welcome a further response from you so that his views may be expressed fully on these issues at this time.

With best regards,
Howard Hallman

Date: Tue, 05 Sep 2000 08:59:19 -0400
From: Mintwood Media Collective <adam@mintwood.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.73 [en]C-CCK-MCD BA45DSL (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
To: Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Final Release

Dear Howard,

Here is the release we sent at 8:45 this morning.

Adam

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\NEWS ADVISORY0905001.doc"

X-Lotus-FromDomain: MCC
From: J._Daryl_Byler@mail.mcc.org
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Date: Tue, 5 Sep 2000 10:15:46 -0400
Subject: Re: September 7 news conference

To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj @ igc.org>
From: J. Daryl Byler
Date: 9/5/2000 10:14:30 AM
Subj: Re: September 7 news conference

Hi Howard:

I hope this event goes very well and that the press will give it good coverage.
I leave Thursday morning for an MCC board meeting in California.

Blessings,
Daryl

From: David Culp <david@fcnl.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman (E-mail)" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: washingtonpost.com CQ Risk Ratings
Date: Tue, 5 Sep 2000 11:27:04 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com>> washingtonpost.com
<<http://www.washingtonpost.com>> Home |
<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/registration/benefits.htm>> Register
Web Search: <<http://www.google.com>> by Google

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/maps/mit_foto.map> channel navigation

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onpolitics/graphics/blue.gif>>
<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onpolitics/graphics/blue.gif>>
<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onpolitics/graphics/blue.gif>>
<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onpolitics/graphics/blue.gif>>
OnPolitics
<http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1d/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onpolitics/graphics/onpol_sub_top.gif>

<<http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1d/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/globalnav/images/spacer.gif>>

<<http://ad.doubleclick.net/jump/wpni.politics/elections/2000;dir=cqriskratings;kw=;pos=top;sz=468x60;tile=1;ord=>>>

<<http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1d/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/globalnav/images/spacer.gif>>

<<http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1d/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/globalnav/images/spacer.gif>>

<<http://ad.doubleclick.net/jump/wpni.promos/politics/elections;dir=;kw=;pos=right1;sz=105x60;tile=3;ord=>>>

<<http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1d/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/globalnav/images/spacer.gif>>

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/politics>> OnPolitics

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/politics/elections/2000/index.html>>
ELECTIONS 2000/ CQ Risk Ratings

ELECTIONS 2000/CQ Risk Ratings
<http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1d/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onpolitics/graphics/onpol_sub_rule.gif>

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/politics>> Front
<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/politics/news>> Political News
<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/politics/elections>> Elections
<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/politics/elections/2000>> Elections
2000
<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/politics/elections/2000/ads>> - Ad
Watch

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/politics/elections/2000/cqriskratings>>
CQ Risk Ratings

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/politics/elections/2000/governor>>
- Governors

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/politics/elections/2000/house>> -
U.S. House

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/politics/elections/2000/money>> -
Money Watch

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/politics/elections/2000/senate>> -
U.S. Senate

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/politics/elections/2000/states>> -
Races by State

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/politics/elections/2000/whitehouse>>
- White House

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/politics/specials>> The Issues

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/politics/fedpage>> Federal Page

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/politics/polls>> Polls

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/politics/columns>> Columns - Cartoons

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/politics/liveonline>> Live Online

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/politics/onlineextra>> Online Extras

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/politics/photogalleries>> Photo
Galleries

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/politics/videoaudio>> Video - Audio

<http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1d/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onpolitics/graphics/122799/corner_left_gray.gif>

PARTNERS

<<http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1d/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onpolitics/graphics/blue.gif>>

<http://www.msnbc.com/news/politics_front.asp> MSNBC

<<http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1d/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onpolitics/graphics/blue.gif>>

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/politics/news/cq/>> CQ

<<http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1d/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onpolitics/graphics/blue.gif>>

<http://avantgo.com/channels/_add_channel.pl?cha_id=1789> AvantGo

<<http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1d/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onpolitics/graphics/blue.gif>>

<<http://www.britannica.com/>> Britannica.com

<<http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1d/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onpolitics/graphics/blue.gif>>

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onpolitics/elections/wwb2000.htm>>

<<http://ad.doubleclick.net/jump/wpni.politics/elections/2000;dir=cqriskratings;kw=;pos=left4;sz=120x90;tile=7;ord=>>

<<http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1d/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onpolitics/graphics/blue.gif>>

ELECTION HANDICAPPER: Races to Watch

Use CQ's "risk ratings" to analyze this year's House, Senate and gubernatorial races. How

<<http://washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/politics/elections/2000/cqriskratings/A26369-2000May8.html>> CQ rates the races.

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/politics/news/cq/>> ElectionSearch 2000

1. Which races? House races Senate races Governor races 2. Who's favored?

Safe Democrat Democrat Favored Leans Democratic No Clear Favorite Leans Republican Republican Favored Safe Republican Safe Independent Independent Favored Leans Independent Not Ranked

3. Click 'Submit'

Regardless of which party holds a seat now, CQ political reporters and analysts rate the risk that either the Democrats or Republicans will control the seat after the November general election. Summary tables of the ratings for House, Senate and gubernatorial races are below. These numbers will be updated regularly.

house House Races to Watch

Democrats

<<http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1h/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/images/I13221-2000May5>>

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/cgi-bin/gx.cgi/AppLogic+FTContentServer?node=politics/elections/2000/cqriskratings&pagename=sectionfront&cache01=house&cache02=1>> 171

CQ Risk Ratings

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/cgi-bin/gx.cgi/AppLogic+FTContentServer?node=politics/elections/2000/cqriskratings&pagename=sectionfront&cache01=house&cache02=2>> 22

CQ Risk Ratings

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/cgi-bin/gx.cgi/AppLogic+FTContentServer?node=>

politics/elections/2000/cqriskratings&pagename=sectionfront&cache01=house&cache02=3> 13

CQ Risk Ratings

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/cgi-bin/gx.cgi/AppLogic+FTContentServer?node=politics/elections/2000/cqriskratings&pagename=sectionfront&cache01=house&cache02=4>> 19

CQ Risk Ratings

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/cgi-bin/gx.cgi/AppLogic+FTContentServer?node=politics/elections/2000/cqriskratings&pagename=sectionfront&cache01=house&cache02=5>> 10

CQ Risk Ratings

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/cgi-bin/gx.cgi/AppLogic+FTContentServer?node=politics/elections/2000/cqriskratings&pagename=sectionfront&cache01=house&cache02=6>> 27

CQ Risk Ratings

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/cgi-bin/gx.cgi/AppLogic+FTContentServer?node=politics/elections/2000/cqriskratings&pagename=sectionfront&cache01=house&cache02=7>> 172

CQ Risk Ratings Republicans

<<http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1h/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/images/I13231-2000May5>>

CQ Risk Ratings

<<http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1h/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/images/I13778-2000May5>>

Safe Independents: 2

senate

Senate Races to Watch

Democrats

<<http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1h/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/images/I13221-2000May5>>

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/cgi-bin/gx.cgi/AppLogic+FTContentServer?node=politics/elections/2000/cqriskratings&pagename=sectionfront&cache01=senate&cache02=1>> 8

CQ Risk Ratings

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/cgi-bin/gx.cgi/AppLogic+FTContentServer?node=politics/elections/2000/cqriskratings&pagename=sectionfront&cache01=senate&cache02=2>> 1

CQ Risk Ratings

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/cgi-bin/gx.cgi/AppLogic+FTContentServer?node=politics/elections/2000/cqriskratings&pagename=sectionfront&cache01=senate&cache02=3>> 3

CQ Risk Ratings

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/cgi-bin/gx.cgi/AppLogic+FTContentServer?node=politics/elections/2000/cqriskratings&pagename=sectionfront&cache01=senate&cache02=4>> 7

CQ Risk Ratings

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/cgi-bin/gx.cgi/AppLogic+FTContentServer?node=politics/elections/2000/cqriskratings&pagename=sectionfront&cache01=senate&cache02=5>> 4

CQ Risk Ratings

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/cgi-bin/gx.cgi/AppLogic+FTContentServer?node=politics/elections/2000/cqriskratings&pagename=sectionfront&cache01=senate&cache02=6>> 3

CQ Risk Ratings

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/cgi-bin/gx.cgi/AppLogic+FTContentServer?node=politics/elections/2000/cqriskratings&pagename=sectionfront&cache01=senate&cache02=7>> 8

CQ Risk Ratings Republicans

<<http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1h/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/images/I13231-2000May5>>

CQ Risk Ratings

<<http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1h/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/images/I13778-2000May5>>

governor

Gubernatorial Races to Watch

Democrats

<<http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1h/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/images/I13221-2000May5>>

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/cgi-bin/gx.cgi/AppLogic+FTContentServer?node=politics/elections/2000/cqriskratings&pagename=sectionfront&cache01=governor&cache02=1>> 2

CQ Risk Ratings

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/cgi-bin/gx.cgi/AppLogic+FTContentServer?node=politics/elections/2000/cqriskratings&pagename=sectionfront&cache01=governor&cache02=2>> 0

CQ Risk Ratings

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/cgi-bin/gx.cgi/AppLogic+FTContentServer?node=politics/elections/2000/cqriskratings&pagename=sectionfront&cache01=governor&cache02=3>> 3

CQ Risk Ratings

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/cgi-bin/gx.cgi/AppLogic+FTContentServer?node=politics/elections/2000/cqriskratings&pagename=sectionfront&cache01=governor&cache02=4>> 5

CQ Risk Ratings

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/cgi-bin/gx.cgi/AppLogic+FTContentServer?node=politics/elections/2000/cqriskratings&pagename=sectionfront&cache01=governor&cache02=5>> 0

CQ Risk Ratings

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/cgi-bin/gx.cgi/AppLogic+FTContentServer?node=politics/elections/2000/cqriskratings&pagename=sectionfront&cache01=governor&cache02=6>> 1

CQ Risk Ratings

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/cgi-bin/gx.cgi/AppLogic+FTContentServer?node=politics/elections/2000/cqriskratings&pagename=sectionfront&cache01=governor&cache02=7>> 0

CQ Risk Ratings Republicans

<<http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1h/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/images/I13231-2000May5>>

CQ Risk Ratings

<<http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1h/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/images/I13778-2000May5>>

<<http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1d/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onpolitics/graphics/blue.gif>>

ELECTION HANDICAPPER: Races to Watch

Use CQ's "risk ratings" to analyze this year's House, Senate and gubernatorial races. How

<<http://washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/politics/elections/2000/cqriskratings/A26369-2000May8.html>> CQ rates the races.

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/politics/news/cq/>> ElectionSearch 2000

1. Which races? House racesSenate racesGovernor races 2. Who's favored?

Safe DemocratDemocrat FavoredLeans DemocraticNo Clear FavoriteLeans RepublicanRepublican FavoredSafe RepublicanSafe IndependentIndependent FavoredLeans IndependentNot Ranked

3. Click 'Submit'

© 2000 The Washington Post Company

<<http://ad.doubleclick.net/jump/wpni.politics/elections/2000;dir=cqriskratings;kw=;pos=bottom;sz=468x60;tile=2;ord=>>

<<http://ad.doubleclick.net/jump/wpni.shop.box/politics;tile=shopboxtop;sz=130x119>>

<<http://ad.doubleclick.net/jump/wpni.shop.box/politics;tile=shopboxbottom;sz=130x31>>

SEARCH

News

Post Archives

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/globalnav/images/spacer.gif>>

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/searches/mainsrch.htm>> Advanced Search

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/globalnav/images/spacer.gif>>

Politics Where
You Live

Enter state abbrev.
or ZIP code

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onpolitics/graphics/onpol_sub_bottom.gif> <<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onpolitics/graphics/blue.gif>>

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com>> [washingtonpost.com](http://www.washingtonpost.com)
<<http://www.washingtonpost.com>> Home |
<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/registration/benefits.htm>> Register
Web Search: <<http://www.google.com>> by Google

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/maps/mit_foto.map> channel navigation

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onpolitics/graphics/blue.gif>>
<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onpolitics/graphics/blue.gif>>
<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onpolitics/graphics/blue.gif>>
<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onpolitics/graphics/blue.gif>>

Content-Type: image/gif;
name="channelnav_top_politics.gif"

Content-Disposition: attachment;
filename="channelnav_top_politics.gif"

Content-Location: http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/images/channelnav_top_politics.gif

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\channelnav_top_politics.gif"
Content-Type: image/gif;
name="google_politics.gif"

Content-Disposition: attachment;
filename="google_politics.gif"
Content-Location: http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/images/google_politics.gif

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\google_politics.gif"

Content-Type: image/gif;
name="channelnav_politics.gif"

Content-Disposition: attachment;
filename="channelnav_politics.gif"

Content-Location: [http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/ima
ges/channelnav_politics.gif](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/ima
ges/channelnav_politics.gif)

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\channelnav_politics.gif"

Content-Type: image/gif;
name="blue.gif"

Content-Disposition: attachment;
filename="blue.gif"

Content-Location: [http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onp
olitics/graphics/blue.gif](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onp
olitics/graphics/blue.gif)

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\blue.gif"

Content-Type: image/gif;
name="onpol_sub_top.gif"

Content-Disposition: attachment;
filename="onpol_sub_top.gif"

Content-Location: [http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1
d/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onpoliti
cs/graphics/onpol_sub_top.gif](http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1
d/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onpoliti
cs/graphics/onpol_sub_top.gif)

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\onpol_sub_top.gif"

Content-Type: image/gif;
name="spacer.gif"

Content-Disposition: attachment;
filename="spacer.gif"

Content-Location: [http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1
d/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/globalna
v/images/spacer.gif](http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1
d/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/globalna
v/images/spacer.gif)

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\spacer.gif"

Content-Type: application/octet-stream;
name="elections;dir=;kw=;pos=right1;sz=105x60;tile=3;ord="

Content-Disposition: attachment;
filename="elections;dir=;kw=;pos=right1;sz=105x60;tile=3;ord="

Content-Location: [http://ad.doubleclick.net/ad/wpni.promos
/politics/elections;dir=;kw=;pos=right1;
sz=105x60;tile=3;ord="](http://ad.doubleclick.net/ad/wpni.promos
/politics/elections;dir=;kw=;pos=right1;
sz=105x60;tile=3;ord=)

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\elections;dir=;kw=;pos=right1;sz=105x60;tile=3;ord="

Content-Type: image/gif;
name="onpol_sub_logo.gif"

Content-Disposition: attachment;
filename="onpol_sub_logo.gif"

Content-Location: <http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1>

d/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onpoliti
cs/graphics/onpol_sub_logo.gif

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\onpol_sub_logo.gif"

Content-Type: image/gif;
name="onpol_sub_rule.gif"

Content-Disposition: attachment;
filename="onpol_sub_rule.gif"

Content-Location: [http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1
d/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onpoliti
cs/graphics/onpol_sub_rule.gif](http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1d/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onpoliti
cs/graphics/onpol_sub_rule.gif)

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\onpol_sub_rule.gif"

Content-Type: image/gif;
name="reddot.gif"

Content-Disposition: attachment;
filename="reddot.gif"

Content-Location: [http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1
d/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/images/r
eddot.gif](http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1d/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/images/r
eddot.gif)

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\reddot.gif"

Content-Type: image/gif;
name="corner_left_gray.gif"

Content-Disposition: attachment;
filename="corner_left_gray.gif"

Content-Location: [http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1
d/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onpoliti
cs/graphics/122799/corner_left_gray.gif](http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1d/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onpoliti
cs/graphics/122799/corner_left_gray.gif)

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\corner_left_gray.gif"

Content-Type: image/gif;
name="blue.gif"

Content-Disposition: attachment;
filename="blue.gif"

Content-Location: [http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1
d/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onpoliti
cs/graphics/blue.gif](http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1d/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onpoliti
cs/graphics/blue.gif)

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\blue1.gif"

Content-Type: image/gif;
name="msnbc_icon.gif"

Content-Disposition: attachment;
filename="msnbc_icon.gif"

Content-Location: [http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1
d/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onpoliti
cs/graphics/122799/msnbc_icon.gif](http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1d/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onpoliti
cs/graphics/122799/msnbc_icon.gif)

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\msnbc_icon.gif"

Content-Type: image/gif;
name="cq.gif"

Content-Disposition: attachment;
filename="cq.gif"

Content-Location: <http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1d/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onpolitics/graphics/cq.gif>

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\cq.gif"

Content-Type: image/gif;
name="avantgo_logo.gif"

Content-Disposition: attachment;
filename="avantgo_logo.gif"

Content-Location: http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1d/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onpolitics/graphics/122799/avantgo_logo.gif

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\avantgo_logo.gif"

Content-Type: image/gif;
name="britan.gif"

Content-Disposition: attachment;
filename="britan.gif"

Content-Location: <http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1d/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onpolitics/graphics/britan.gif>

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\britan.gif"

Content-Type: image/gif;
name="wwb_partner.gif"

Content-Disposition: attachment;
filename="wwb_partner.gif"

Content-Location: http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1d/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onpolitics/graphics/wwb_partner.gif

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\wwb_partner.gif"

Content-Type: application/octet-stream;
name="2000;dir=cqriskratings;kw=;pos=left4;sz=120x90;tile=7;ord="

Content-Disposition: attachment;
filename="2000;dir=cqriskratings;kw=;pos=left4;sz=120x90;tile=7;ord="

Content-Location: [http://ad.doubleclick.net/ad/wpni.politics/elections/2000;dir=cqriskratings;kw=;pos=left4;sz=120x90;tile=7;ord="](http://ad.doubleclick.net/ad/wpni.politics/elections/2000;dir=cqriskratings;kw=;pos=left4;sz=120x90;tile=7;ord=)

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\2000;dir=cqriskratings;kw=;pos=left4;sz=120x90;tile=7;ord="

Content-Type: application/octet-stream;
name="I13221-2000May5"

Content-Disposition: attachment;
filename="I13221-2000May5"
Content-Location: <http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1h/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/images/I13221-2000May5>

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\I13221-2000May5"
Content-Type: application/octet-stream;
name="I13193-2000May5"

Content-Disposition: attachment;
filename="I13193-2000May5"
Content-Location: <http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1d/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/images/I13193-2000May5>

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\I13193-2000May5"
Content-Type: application/octet-stream;
name="I13208-2000May5"

Content-Disposition: attachment;
filename="I13208-2000May5"
Content-Location: <http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1d/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/images/I13208-2000May5>

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\I13208-2000May5"
Content-Type: application/octet-stream;
name="I13183-2000May5"

Content-Disposition: attachment;
filename="I13183-2000May5"
Content-Location: <http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1d/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/images/I13183-2000May5>

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\I13183-2000May5"
Content-Type: application/octet-stream;
name="I13231-2000May5"

Content-Disposition: attachment;
filename="I13231-2000May5"
Content-Location: <http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1h/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/images/I13231-2000May5>

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\I13231-2000May5"
Content-Type: application/octet-stream;
name="I13778-2000May5"

Content-Disposition: attachment;
filename="I13778-2000May5"
Content-Location: <http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1h/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/images/I13778-2000May5>

13778-2000May5

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\I13778-2000May5"

Content-Type: application/octet-stream;
name="politics;tile=shopboxtop;sz=130x119"

Content-Disposition: attachment;
filename="politics;tile=shopboxtop;sz=130x119"

Content-Location: <http://ad.doubleclick.net/ad/wpni.shopbox/politics;tile=shopboxtop;sz=130x119>

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\politics;tile=shopboxtop;sz=130x119"

Content-Type: application/octet-stream;
name="politics;tile=shopboxbottom;sz=130x31"

Content-Disposition: attachment;
filename="politics;tile=shopboxbottom;sz=130x31"

Content-Location: <http://ad.doubleclick.net/ad/wpni.shopbox/politics;tile=shopboxbottom;sz=130x31>

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\politics;tile=shopboxbottom;sz=130x31"

Content-Type: image/gif;
name="spacer.gif"

Content-Disposition: attachment;
filename="spacer.gif"

Content-Location: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/globalnav/images/spacer.gif>

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\spacer1.gif"

Content-Type: image/gif;
name="onpol_sub_bottom.gif"

Content-Disposition: attachment;
filename="onpol_sub_bottom.gif"

Content-Location: http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onpolitics/graphics/onpol_sub_bottom.gif

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\onpol_sub_bottom.gif"

Content-Type: image/gif;
name="onpol_sub_tile.gif"

Content-Disposition: attachment;
filename="onpol_sub_tile.gif"

Content-Location: http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/1d/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onpolitics/graphics/onpol_sub_tile.gif

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\onpol_sub_tile.gif"

From: "Grant Birks" <gbirks@ploughshares.ca>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Brussels meeting
Date: Tue, 5 Sep 2000 12:21:12 -0400
Organization: Project Ploughshares
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2314.1300
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300

Hello Howard,

Grant Birks here at Ploughshares. I'm forwarding on participant's information to the CEC in Brussels who are coordinating the local arrangements for this meeting. There are two hotel choices:

- 1) a standard hotel with breakfast at around \$70 US/night or
- 2) a Franciscan establishment, the Maison ND du Chant d'Oiseau, where the members of the CEC's peacebuilding working group are staying. Its somewhat dorm-like with separate floors for men and women and shared bathrooms but the price is around \$25 Us/night. (This includes, I think, some meals as well.)

Please reply asap since I have to get back to the folks in Brussels by Sept 7th.

Regards,

Grant

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

From: Howard W. Hallman <mupj@igc.org>
To: <brobins@ploughshares.ca>
Sent: Monday, September 04, 2000 8:26 AM
Subject: Brussels meeting

> Dear Bill,

>
> After writing you I checked airline schedules and fares to Brussels. I
> found a non-stop flight from Washington to Brussels on United Airlines for
> US\$657 roundtrip. It was too cheap to resist, so I booked it. So I'll be
> attending the meeting.

>
> I will arrive on Wednesday, October 4 and depart on Sunday, October 8 to
> encompass an over Saturday night stay for the fare. Thus, I'll need a
> hotel room for four nights. What is the rate? Can you handle the
> reservation or should I?

>
> I still need to raise some money to pay the costs. Depending on the hotel
> rate it should be in the US\$1,000 to 1,500 range.

>
> I'm looking forward to this event. Is any preparation required?

>

> 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: "Grant Birks" <gbirks@ploughshares.ca>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Brussels meeting
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <009f01c01755\$570861c0\$370e6181@uwaterloo.ca>
References: <3.0.3.32.20000904082628.00690914@pop2.igc.org>

Grant,

I'll take the standard hotel. I need it for four nights, October 4 to 7, leaving Sunday morning, October 8. Please give me instructions for transportation from the Brussels airport.

Thanks for your assistance,
Howard

X-Sender: jdi@[63.106.26.66]
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)
Date: Tue, 05 Sep 2000 14:31:40 -0400
To: jdi@clw.org
From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>
Subject: Anatomy of a victory: National Missile Defense

September 5, 2000
John Isaacs

ANATOMY OF A VICTORY: CLINTON DECIDES AGAINST NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE

On September 1, President Clinton surprised the nation when he announced that he would leave to his successor the decision on whether to deploy a National Missile Defense (NMD). In a speech at Georgetown University, Clinton told his audience that "the system as a whole is not yet proven."

Last year, observers almost unanimously anticipated a Presidential "yes" to deployment. Even after recent test failures, many still predicted that the President would try to "triangulate": directing the Pentagon to approve construction of a key radar station on Shemya Island in Alaska in spring 2001, but leaving the deployment decision to the next President. Some Administration lawyers had provided him with legal opinions suggesting that early radar construction would not violate the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty. Defense Secretary William Cohen strongly favored this option.

In the end, the President did not try to split the decision. In a clear victory for missile defense opponents, the President vowed to continue research and testing, but to take no action that would commit the nation toward deployment. Clinton stated: "I simply cannot conclude with the information I have today that we have enough confidence in the technology, and the operational effectiveness of the entire NMD system, to move forward to deployment."

The President's speech marked a clear and unambiguous victory for common sense -- and for the beleaguered arms control movement that had suffered a devastating loss when the Senate defeated the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty in October 1999. This resurgence was accomplished by effective and targeted work by numerous arms control organizations backed by generous support from major foundations. The effort received invaluable if unintentional assistance from the Boeing Corporation's abject failures even in carefully controlled tests of the NMD system. Other critical roles were played by credible, independent panels that corroborated some of the major contentions of NMD opponents, an international community virtually unanimously opposed to deployment, Republicans who provided the President cover by opposing a deployment decision this year in the perhaps mistaken belief that a Republican would take over the White House in 2001 and unpredictable events such as warming relations on the Korean peninsula.

In June 1999, representatives of many arms control organizations under the auspices of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers met in Washington, D.C. to plot strategy in preparation for an NMD decision that was then scheduled for June 2000. Recognizing that termination of the program was not an achievable goal, they united on the following strategy: "Postpone a decision to deploy an NMD system beyond June 2000 into the next

Administration, and prevent withdrawal from or abrogation of the ABM Treaty."

The community recognized that there were several advantages in the battle ahead compared to the test ban fight. There was a clear deadline for action. The target audience was much smaller this time, consisting of Clinton Administration decision makers and not conservative Republicans. The groups had better contact with these decision makers. The opinions of Democratic lawmakers could make a difference in the White House, where they had little weight with swing Senators. The views of U.S. allies had a direct bearing on the ability of the U.S. to proceed with deployment.

The game plan sketched out last year stressed that the planned tests of the new system would not provide a sufficient basis to make an informed decision because:

- a) Only three of 19 tests would have been completed by the decision date;
- b) The tests will not be against realistic targets that have effective countermeasures;
- c) The tests will use substitute hardware and not actual components slated for deployment.

In his September 1 speech, President Clinton essentially acknowledged the validity of the first two of these arguments. Subsequent newspaper analyses of the decision added that delays in producing the actual components, particularly the booster rocket, played a role as well.

The plan of action also focused on the four major criteria that the President had decreed would be used to make his decision: the cost, the threat, the status of the technology and the program's impact on arms control and national security. Senator Carl Levin (D-MI), the ranking Democrat on the Senate Armed Services Committee, prodded the Administration repeatedly to keep these four criteria front and center. The groups developed arguments that NMD failed on all four counts.

In Friday's announcement not to proceed with NMD, the President detailed the criteria: the technology was not ready, deployment would undermine U.S. security and the U.S. has taken a number of diplomatic steps to reduce the threat from "states of concern." He never mentioned the fourth criterion, cost.

The arms control community made a major contribution to the debate. In one of the most significant developments, a group of experts under the guidance of the Union of Concerned Scientists and the MIT Security Studies Program produced a report on April 11, 2000 that provided some of the most devastating arguments against the Clinton Administration plan. These scientists argued that simple countermeasures from new missile states will defeat the planned U.S. NMD. Moreover, they found that the current testing program was not capable of assessing the system's effectiveness against a realistic attack.

Pentagon planners disputed both these contentions vigorously, but never were able to lay this argument to rest. They were undermined by the Pentagon's director of operational testing and evaluation, Phillip E. Coyle III, who consistently questioned the adequacy of the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization's (BMDO) testing program. Senator Dick Durbin (D-IL) incorporated the UCS/MIT concerns into an amendment requiring additional testing he offered in July 2000 which attracted 47 votes.

These contentions were accepted by the President, who acknowledged: "There are also questions to be resolved about the ability of the system to deal with countermeasures . . . We need more tests against more challenging targets."

Another part of the arms control organizations' plan was to encourage

highly respected "validators" to advise that a deployment decision should be put off. The most significant hit was by a letter urging deferral that was put together by the Carnegie Corporation and the MacArthur Foundation. The letter stated: "We respectfully urge you to defer a decision to deploy, and not be forced by artificial deadlines, but to further the debate that has now begun in earnest." Signers of the letter who had special credibility with the Clinton Administration included former Defense Secretary William Perry, former Senator Sam Nunn, retired Generals John Shalikashvili and Andrew Goodpaster and retired Admiral William Owens.

On June 9, 33 experts on Russia sent a letter to the President urging no deployment at this time, followed by a June 29 letter signed by 45 experts on China. Both letters had been organized by Council for a Livable World Education Fund. A similar statement signed by 50 Nobel Laureates that had been organized by Federation of American Scientists was released at a July 6 press conference.

All these letters garnered significant press attention, added to the credibility of the opposition and were cited many times during the subsequent debate.

Arms control organizations also helped to mobilize important Democratic support for deferring deployment. At first, few members of the President's party were willing to speak out against an Administration priority. This reticence was particularly apparent after 42 of 45 Senate Democrats, and a majority of House Democrats, voted for the March 1999 Cochran bill endorsing NMD deployment "as soon as technologically feasible."

Only seven Democrats signed a February 2000 letter circulated by Sen. Byron Dorgan (D-ND) urging more testing before deployment. However, after much prodding by activists, assisted tremendously by the July 7 test failure, that number quadrupled when 31 Senators signed a letter organized by Dorgan and Durbin in late July urging a deferral, and 61 House members signed a similar letter circulated by Rep. Tom Allen (D-ME). On July 13, all 45 Democrats voted for the Durbin amendment requiring additional testing.

Another key moment came when Senate Minority Leader Tom Daschle, joined by Senator Levin and ranking Foreign Relations Committee Democrat Joseph Biden (D-DE) (an early foe of deployment), held a news conference on July 13 to urge the President to defer deployment.

Separately, a number of key Republicans also either endorsed delay or signaled that deferral was politically acceptable. The list included the two major Republican presidential candidates, Governor George W. Bush and Senator John McCain (R-AZ), as well as Senators Chuck Hagel (R-NE) and Gordon Smith (R-OR), and former government officials such as Henry Kissinger, Robert McFarland and Richard Perle. While these officials were enthusiastic NMD backers and were hoping for a Republican President to make the deployment decision, they provided election-year political cover for the President should he not agree to deployment.

Certainly there were a number of independent factors that were crucial to the President's September 1 decision. Coyle's reports helped, including an August 11 internal report suggesting that a deployment decision was premature. A Pentagon panel of independent experts headed by General Larry Welch, USAF (ret.), produced three separate reports that warned about the risk of proceeding too quickly, calling it at one point a "rush to failure," a memorable phrase that has stuck like glue to the program.

In April, the independent Congressional Budget Office delivered a severe blow to the Administration's plans with its estimate of the cost of building and operating the system at almost \$60 billion. This April 28

report, produced at the request of Senators Levin and Frank Lautenberg (D-NJ), belied Pentagon estimates (accurate for what they measured) that the Pentagon's plan would cost a modest \$12.7 billion over the next six years. The \$60 billion figure also became a permanent part of the debate, as in "the \$60 billion national missile defense system."

A September 3 New York Times analysis of the decision-making process makes it clear that objections from other countries also played a critical role in stopping momentum toward deployment. Reinvigorated Russian leadership under President Vladimir Putin knocked a key prop away from the Administration's plans by refusing to negotiate any changes to the ABM Treaty to permit deployment. Putin stirred the international pot by pushing the Russian Duma to approve START II and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and by vehemently opposing NMD. Many NATO allies who were less-than-enthusiastic about NMD refused to support any deployment that would abrogate the ABM Treaty and prompt Russian and Chinese nuclear buildups. As Great Britain and Denmark had to approve radar construction on British and Greenland soil, this lack of support could not be easily dismissed. French, German and even the normally loyal British governments weighed in against NMD.

China, with whom the U.S. was trying to tie down a major trade package, was intensely opposed to the program. A classified National Intelligence Estimate (NIE) completed in August confirmed the adverse effects of National Missile Defense deployment on international relations that the arms control community had warned about. The NIE predicted China might increase its offensive nuclear weapons stockpile 10-fold following a U.S. deployment decision.

Newspaper editorial pages overwhelmingly opposed deployment. Aside from the reliably conservative Wall Street Journal and Washington Times, most of the nation's leading newspapers counseled restraint. Between January 1 and August 2000, 61 newspapers called for delay, 20 for abandoning the program, and 15 for deployment.

In the final weeks before the decision, arms control advocates raised awareness of the legal and diplomatic risks of a Clinton decision to approve construction contracts.

All these factors still might not been enough, had it not been for the ineptitude of the defense contractors trying to build a national missile defense. The Pentagon set the bar for success extremely low when its plan called for only two successful NMD intercepts. Despite testing in carefully controlled conditions with minimal decoys and countermeasures, Boeing and its subcontractors could not even reach this bar. The first intercept test in October 1999 was an ambiguous success. The second test in January was an abysmal failure. On July 7, with the national media and the political community paying close attention because of the imminence of the President's decision, the kill vehicle failed to detach from the booster rocket.

Had that test succeeded, pressure would have remained intense on the President to take some steps toward deployment. Instead, according to a senior defense official quoted in the September 3 New York Times, "After that test failed, it pretty much confirmed that the deployment would be kicked back. We lost the momentum."

In the end, it was Defense Secretary Cohen against the White House, the National Security Council and the State Department. The President had never been enthusiastic about the program. One official quoted in the New York Times confirmed that the President "didn't want to be the president

that killed the ABM treaty." With mounting evidence that the 2005 date for an operational defense system had slipped to 2006 or 2007, the President could circumvent the legal debate over when the ABM Treaty would be violated and reject Cohen's recommendation to permit radar construction to proceed.

On September 1, the President could make the right choice without fear of forcing Vice President Al Gore to pay a political price. There is little doubt that he had his own public opinion polls confirming numerous private and public polls showing that national missile defense had not been and would not be a voting issue for Americans.

President John F. Kennedy said that victory has a thousand fathers, while defeat is an orphan. Undoubtedly there will be many parties claiming — with some justification — to have had a hand in the postponement of national missile defense. Moreover, the delay only means that the issue will have to be debated all over again in 2001 and beyond. National missile defense has been resurrected from the dead many times over the past three decades. Nonetheless, the arms control community can claim a major portion of the credit for the success achieved on September 1. We established a goal and succeeded.

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: ipnd
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: September 7 news conference
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\00901.02.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Colleagues:

The news conference to release replies from presidential candidates to a letter from religious leaders on nuclear disarmament issues will commence at 2:00 p.m., Thursday, September 7 in the First Amendment Room of the National Press Club, 549 14th Street, NW, Washington, D.C. The room opens at 1:30 for set-up and for earlier arrivals. Presenters include Catholic Bishop Thomas Gumbleton and United Methodist Bishop C. Dale White. More details are provided on the attachment.

We hope you can come to hear the candidates' responses and to mingle with the press.

Shalom,
Howard

To: adam
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Bush's answers
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\abolish.288.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Adam,

Here is my current draft of Bush's answers to our questions. It is based upon material provided by the campaign staff. I have asked them for replies to the unanswered questions. But if we receive nothing else, I'm prepared to go with this.

Howard

To: jfilteau@nccbuscc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Letter to presidential candidates
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\abl.084.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Jerry,

I'm sending as an attachment the letter from 46 religious presidential candidates, asking a series of questions on nuclear disarmament issues. It contains the questions of our survey. If I can, I'll supply you an embargoed copy of their answers prior to the news conference. (We don't have all the replies yet.)

Howard

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

Dear Rabbi Liebling:

Thanks for signing the letter to presidential candidates, asking questions about nuclear disarmament issues. Would you please tell me your city and state so that I may include this information with our list of signers.

I'll send you the candidates' answers as soon as they are in.

Howard

From: WStarman@cathedral.org To: mupj@igc.org Subject: RE: Letter to presidential candidates Date: Wed, 6 Sep 2000 08:47:26 -0400 X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

Hi Howard,

I just returned from vacation and had an opportunity to read this. Good luck with the press conference. I will be interested to hear how the candidates reply.

Unfortunately, due to my heavy work load that piled up during my absence, I will not be able to attend.

I hope the candidates respond to your letter. Please keep us posted.

Best Regards,

Wendy

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Tuesday, August 22, 2000 5:30 PM
To: enquist@starpower.net; wstarman@cathedral.org
Subject: Letter to presidential candidates

Dear Roy and Wendy,

With help from Dave Robinson of Pax Christi USA I have developed a letter from religious leaders to presidential candidates, asking questions on nuclear disarmament issues. Rather than seeking heads of communion to sign (with a few exceptions), we have recruited bishops and other leaders scattered around the country. The letter with the 46 signers is attached.

You will note that we quoted from the Washington National Cathedral statement of religious and military leaders. We also included a copy of that statement in the material we sent the candidates. Thus, we have made use of it in ways you cannot.

We have asked the candidates for response by September 5. We will hold a news conference at 2:00 p.m., Thursday, September 7 at the National Press Club to release the candidates' replies. You are invited to attend.

Shalom,
Howard

To: adam
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: My opening statement (final), etc.
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\abolish.289.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Adam,

Here is the final version of my opening remarks.

I'm expecting Nader's reply this morning via e-mail.

A contact in the Vice President's office is checking with the campaign staff about Gore's reply. If nothing is in by this afternoon, I will fill in the blanks with information from the Gore web site and Gore's answers to a November 1999 survey of the Council for a Livable World. This would leave some questions unanswered.

I'm developing a combined answer document with three parts: (1) the faith perspective, drawn from the first page of our letter, (2) the questions and the candidates' answers, and (3) the list of signers. It can be our handout and the basis for your final news release. We can give it to news contacts in advance. When is the latest you need it for the latter purpose?

Howard

To: DWillett@georgewbush.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Unanswered questions
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Mr. Willett:

For our news conference on Thursday afternoon I am preparing a final document that combines the answers we have received from Governor Bush, Vice President Gore, and Mr. Nader. We will give it to some of our news contacts in advance on an embargoed basis, either this evening or the first thing in the morning.

Will you be able to provide us replies to the unanswered questions on nuclear disarmament issues? I sent them to you yesterday morning. If so, when can I expect them? We need them as soon as possible.

We appreciate your cooperation,

Howard

Date: Wed, 6 Sep 2000 07:17:41 -0700 (PDT)
From: Adam Eiding <aeiding@yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: My opening statement (final), etc.
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>

Well I guess the latest would be tomorrow morning, but if I get the document as late as after the press conference I could still work with it.

Adam

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

> Adam,

>

> Here is the final version of my opening remarks.

>

> I'm expecting Nader's reply this morning via e-mail.

>

> A contact in the Vice President's office is checking

> with the campaign

> staff about Gore's reply. If nothing is in by this

> afternoon, I will fill

> in the blanks with information from the Gore web

> site and Gore's answers to

> a November 1999 survey of the Council for a Livable

> World. This would

> leave some questions unanswered.

>

> I'm developing a combined answer document with three

> parts: (1) the faith

> perspective, drawn from the first page of our

> letter, (2) the questions and

> the candidates' answers, and (3) the list of

> signers. It can be our

> handout and the basis for your final news release.

> We can give it to news

> contacts in advance. When is the latest you need it

> for the latter purpose?

>

> Howard

>

> ATTACHMENT part 2 application/msword
name=abolish.289.doc; x-mac-type=42494E41;
x-mac-creator=4D535744

>

> 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.

Do You Yahoo!?

Yahoo! Mail - Free email you can access from anywhere!

<http://mail.yahoo.com/>

To: Adam Eiding <aeiding@yahoo.com>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: My opening statement (final), etc.
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <20000906141741.21511.qmail@web4105.mail.yahoo.com>
References:

Adam,

I'll definitely have the combined document the first thing in the morning. How early will you be available?

We can get in the room at the National Press Club as early as 12:30 p.m. to start setting up.

Howard

A

To: jbash@gorenet.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Questions on nuclear disarmament
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\abolish.293.doc; C:\My Documents\00901.02.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Mr. Bash:

Regarding the ten questions on nuclear disarmament from 46 religious leaders to presidential candidates, the attached document formulates Vice President Gore's views on these issues, as derived from the identified sources. We will incorporate these into the document that combines the responses of Governor Bush and Ralph Nader. We will give it to the press tomorrow, September 7, starting with embargoed release to key reporters in the morning. The document will be presented and discussed at our news conference at 2:00 p.m. (See attached announcement.)

If you want to add to or modify the answers, please do so and indicate sources. I will need your reply no later than 5:00 p.m., EDT, this afternoon, September 6.

Thanks for your assistance,

Howard Hallman

Date: Wed, 6 Sep 2000 14:07:55 -0700 (PDT)
From: Adam Eidinger <aeidinger@yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: Final document
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>

H-

Thank you. Maybe you should give the campaigns a later deadline with a warning that other candidates have answered all the questions and that CNN is very interested, along with the NY Times, Dallas Morning News and others why they won't answer all the questions. It now seems the news is the fact we don't know their stand on this tough moral issue, even though there has been so much talk about faith and values, like just last week with the Liberman piety stories.

Onwards,

Adam

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

> Adam,
>
> Here is the final document with the combined answers
> of Bush, Gore, and
> Nader. I believe that it is a substantive product
> even with the gaps. The
> gaps themselves are a story.
>
> I have offered Bush and Gore campaign staffs an
> opportunity to provide
> answers to the unanswered questions and have
> indicated a 5:00 p.m. today
> deadline. I didn't give the other candidates'
> answers to the respective
> campaigns. You can use this document as is with the
> understand that there
> might be an addendum this evening.
>
> Howard

> ATTACHMENT part 2 application/msword
name=abolish.292.doc; x-mac-type=42494E41;
x-mac-creator=4D535744

>
> 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.

Do You Yahoo!?

Yahoo! Mail - Free email you can access from anywhere!

<http://mail.yahoo.com/>

Date: Wed, 06 Sep 2000 23:19:56 -0400
From: Mintwood Media Collective <adam@mintwood.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.73 [en]C-CCK-MCD BA45DSL (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
To: Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Final Draft Release

Dear Howard,

Here is my final draft. Please call in the morning after 8:00 to discuss edits.

Cheers,

Adam

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\RELEASE050700.doc"

To: adam
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Press release
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\abolish.300.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Adam,

You provided an excellent first draft of the news release. I've edited it as shown in the attachment. If you have further editing to suggest, give me a call. Otherwise go ahead with it.

Howard

To: ealsgaard@umc-gbcs.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Survey of presidential candidates
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\abolish.292.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Erik,

Attached is the results of the survey of presidential candidates on nuclear disarmament issues. Several UM bishops signed the letter to candidates. Bishop Dale White is appearing at a news conference today to release the results.

Would it be possible to put this document on the GBCS web site? If so, we would like to indicate this location in a news release that we will distribute today at our 2:00 p.m. news conference.

Please call me at 301 896-0013.

Shalom,
Howard

To: moag@publicedcenter.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Survey of presidential candidates
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\abolish.300.doc; C:\My Documents\abolish.292.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Jeff:

Attached are a news release and survey results on a set of questions which 48 religious leader asked presidential candidates on nuclear disarmament issues. I hope that you can make use of this material as an editorial advisories and in other services.

If you have any questions, please call me at 301 896-0013.

Shalom,
Howard Hallman

To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com, abolition-caucus@egroups.com,
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: SURVEY OF PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES EXPOSES DIFFERENCES ON NUCLEAR WEAPONS
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <4.0.2.20000907183607.00b93cb0@204.141.205.3>
References:

Dear Friends,

Alice Slater sent out the results of our survey by religious leaders of presidential candidates on nuclear disarmament issues. If anyone would like the survey report as an attachment in Word format, please let me know. We also have Ralph Nader's answers to the ten questions in the same format.

As you study the replies, you will note that Vice President Gore and Governor Bush failed to answer

Howard Hallman

To: DWillett@georgewbush.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Survey of presidential candidates
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\abolish.292.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Mr. Willett:

I am sending via an attachment the results of our survey of presidential candidates on nuclear disarmament issues, which we released at a news conference yesterday in Washington, D.C.

For Governor Bush's answers, we used the material you provided us. However, there were gaps. Therefore, we are still interested in learning his views on three unanswered questions, as follows:

- (1) What are your views on the morality of possession, threatened use, and actual use of nuclear weapons?
- (2) If elected president, what specifically will you do during your four-year term to fulfill the U.S. commitment under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty to join the other nuclear weapon states in "an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals"?
- (3) 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?

The campaign still has almost two months remaining. Therefore, we would appreciate receiving an answer to these questions by Governor Bush at least by the end of September if not earlier.

Sincerely yours,
Howard Hallman

To: jbash@gorenet.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Religious leaders survey on nuclear issues
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\abolish.292.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

ear Mr. Bash:

I am sending via an attachment the results of our survey of presidential candidates on nuclear disarmament issues, which we released yesterday at a news conference in Washington, D.C.

We regret that you were unable to respond in time to our survey. However, we were able to use information on Vice President Gore's position available on public record.

We are still interested in getting the Vice President's views on three unanswered questions, as follows:

- (1) What are your views on the morality of possession, threatened use, and actual use of nuclear weapons?
- (2) If elected president, what specifically will you do during your four-year term to fulfill the U.S. commitment under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty to join the other nuclear weapon states in "an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals"?
- (3) 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?

The campaign still has almost two months remaining. Therefore, we would appreciate receiving an answer to these questions by Vice President Gore at least by the end of September if not earlier.

Sincerely yours,
Howard Hallman

To: dushoff@votenader.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Survey of presidential candidates
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\abolish.292.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Mr. Dushoff:

For your information I am sending via an attachment the results of our survey of presidential candidates on nuclear disarmament issues. Thanks for your assistance in providing Mr. Nader's views.

Sincerely,
Howard Hallman

To: mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Responses from presidential candidates
Cc:
Bcc: ipnd
X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\abolish.292.doc; C:\My Documents\abolish.294.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Colleagues,

Yesterday we released the attached results of the responses of presidential candidates to the ten questions from religious leaders on nuclear disarmament issues. Thanks to those who attended the news conference. Unfortunately none of the mainline media showed up, but we hope that some will make use of the release. Anyway we are far from done.

Ralph Nader provided a full set of answers to our questions. A copy is attached. The Bush campaign staff furnished material for us to extract the answers. The Gore staff provided nothing, so we had to dig into other sources for Gore's views, including the campaign web site. The morning before the news conference I sent the Gore staff the answers I had formulated and offered them an opportunity to make corrections and fill in the blanks. I had no reply. Similarly I sent the Bush staff a list of the unanswered questions and requested answers. I had no reply.

As follow up, you and your grassroots network may want to contact the candidates, express disappointment that they didn't reply to the religious leaders on these important issues, and ask for the candidates' views. You can incorporate your own denomination's policies into your query. The main unanswered questions are the following:

What are your views on the morality of possession, threatened use, and actual use of nuclear weapons?

If elected president, what specifically will you do during your four-year term to fulfill the U.S. commitment under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty to join the other nuclear weapon states in "an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals"?

Do 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?

Addresses for the candidates are as follows:

The Honorable Albert Gore, Jr.
Attn: Mr Leon Fuerth
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

The Honorable George W. Bush
State Capitol
100 E. 11th Street
Austin, TX 78701

On the first question in particular you may want to write to Senator Lieberman, indicating that with his concern for moral values, you are interested in the approach of the Gore-Lieberman ticket to the morality of nuclear weapons. His address is:

The Honorable Joseph I. Lieberman
706 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

We'll talk more about this at the meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament on Tuesday, September 19 from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m., Conference Room 4, The Methodist Building, Washington, D.C.

Shalom,
Howard

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

Dear Dave,

I sent you a report on the letter to presidential candidates as part of an e-mailing to the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. Attached is the final document and the Nader response. It suggests some follow up activities.

In spite of hard work by Adam Eiding, our media consultant, we attracted no mainline media to the news conference. Adam believes that it was because we had no new news on the candidates position. We had representatives of the Religious News Service and Catholic, Methodist, and Baptist news services. We hope, though, that some of the mainline media will make use of the news release.

Adam is going to help with follow up, such as with reporters and talk show hosts who can ask our unanswered questions. I will draft an op-ed piece, ask Bishop Gumbleton and Bishop White to sign it (I'll send you the draft), and have Adam place it.

I'll call you late morning on Monday, September 11 to discuss this further.

To: mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Responses of presidential candidates
Cc:
Bcc: gbaldrige@cbfnet.org, bruceb@fgcquaker.org, J._Daryl_Byler@mail.mcc.org, cwayne@aol.com, green@brandeis.edu, susannah.heschel@dasher.dartmouth.edu, khurty@churchwomen.org, thomj@pym.org, Ashreynu@aol.com, bishop@umcneb.org, dpanoff@ccarnet.org, Dreeves@afsc.org, uuawo@aol.com, uccwdc@erols.com, copel@ucc.org, Awaskow@aol.com, Rlevy@huc.edu, lwyolton@prodigy.net, dradcliff_gb@brethren.org, MLiebling@aol.com
X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\abolish.292.doc; C:\My Documents\abolish.294.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

To: Signers of Letter to Presidential Candidates

Yesterday we released the responses of presidential candidates to the ten questions from religious leaders on nuclear disarmament issues. A copy is attached.

Ralph Nader provided a full set of answers to our questions (copy attached). The Bush campaign staff furnished material for us to extract the answers. The Gore staff provided nothing, so we had to dig into other sources for Gore's views, including the campaign web site. The morning before the news conference I sent the Gore staff the answers I had formulated and offered them an opportunity to make corrections and fill in the blanks. I had no reply. Similarly I sent the Bush staff a list of the unanswered questions and requested answers. I had no reply.

Catholic Bishop Thomas Gumbleton and United Methodist Bishop C. Dale White spoke at the news conference. We had religious news services representatives in attendance, but no mainline media showed up in spite of strong promotion. Our media consultant believes that this is due to lack of news in the form of candidates' answers to questions they hadn't previously addressed.

We will continue to seek answers and will enlist reporters to ask our questions to the candidates.

You yourself may want to write the candidates. You can express your disappointment that they didn't reply to our questions on these important issues and ask for their views on the following unanswered questions. You can incorporate your own faith perspective into the letter.

What are your views on the morality of possession, threatened use, and actual use of nuclear weapons?

If elected president, what specifically will you do during your four-year term to fulfill the U.S. commitment under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty to join the other nuclear weapon states in "an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals"?

Do 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?

Addresses for the candidates are as follows:

The Honorable Albert Gore, Jr.
Attn: Mr Leon Fuerth
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

The Honorable George W. Bush
State Capitol

100 E. 11th Street
Austin, TX 78701

On the first question in particular you may want to write to Senator Lieberman, indicating that with his concern for moral values, you are interested in the approach of the Gore-Lieberman ticket to the morality of nuclear weapons. His address is:

The Honorable Joseph I. Lieberman
706 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

If you get any replies, please share them with me.

With best regards,
Howard

To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Responses of presidential candidates
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\abolish.294.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Friends:

Earlier today my computer sent off my message to you before I was done. I have decided to put Ralph Nader's answers to the questions from the religious leaders as an attachment. I can also send you the composite answer, which Alice Slater sent you as text, in Word format as an attachment on request.

Vice President Gore and Governor Bush didn't provide answers to three important questions. As follow up, you and your grassroots network may want to contact the candidates, express disappointment that they didn't reply to the religious leaders on these important issues, and ask for the candidates' views. The unanswered questions are the following:

What are your views on the morality of possession, threatened use, and actual use of nuclear weapons?

If elected president, what specifically will you do during your four-year term to fulfill the U.S. commitment under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty to join the other nuclear weapon states in "an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals"?

Do 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?

Addresses for the candidates are as follows:

The Honorable Albert Gore, Jr.
Attn: Mr Leon Fuerth
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

The Honorable George W. Bush
State Capitol
100 E. 11th Street
Austin, TX 78701

If you hear anything, please let me know.

Shalom,
Howard

Date: Fri, 08 Sep 2000 13:10:10 -0400
From: Norman & Karen Cohen <norco@bellatlantic.net>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.72 [en] (Win98; I)
X-Accept-Language: en
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: word format yes

Yes please, word format. & nader.
thanks
norm

"Howard W. Hallman" wrote:

> Dear Friends,
>
> Alice Slater sent out the results of our survey by religious leaders of
> presidential candidates on nuclear disarmament issues. If anyone would
> like the survey report as an attachment in Word format, please let me know.
> We also have Ralph Nader's answers to the ten questions in the same format.
>
> A

Coalition for Peace and Justice and the UNPLUG Salem Campaign; 321 Barr Ave.,
Linwood, NJ 08221; 609-601-8537 or 609-601-8583 (8583: fax, answer machine);
norco@bellatlantic.net; UNPLUG SALEM WEBSITE: <http://www.unplugsalem.org/>
COALITION FOR PEACE AND JUSTICE WEBSITE:
<http://members.bellatlantic.net/~norco/> ICQ# 54268619; The Coalition for Peace
and Justice is a chapter of Peace Action.
"We have two lives, the one we're given, and the other one we make" (Mary
Chapin Carpenter)
"Get up, stand up, stand up for your rights...Get up, stand up, don't give up
the fight!" (Bob Marley)

To: Norman & Karen Cohen <norco@bellatlantic.net>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: word format yes
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\abolish.292.doc;
In-Reply-To: <39B91D72.683EF410@bellatlantic.net>
References:

At 01:10 PM 9/8/00 -0400, you wrote:

>Yes please, word format. & nader.

>thanks

>norm.

Attached is the survey results in Word. Since I wrote previously, I have sent the Nader response to the abolition-usa list. If you didn't get it, please let me know.

Howard

X-Sender: pmeidell@pop.igc.org
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.5 (32)
Date: Fri, 08 Sep 2000 08:16:18 -0700
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Pamela S. Meidell" <pamela@atomicmirror.org>
Subject: Nader's answers

Hi Howard,

Wonderful thing you've done with the survey! Would you please send me Nader's answers to the survey? I am active in California with the Green Party and it would be great to have this in one document for tabling--especially in a conservative county like mine!

Hope you are doing well.
In peace,
Pamela

Pamela S. Meidell
Director
The Atomic Mirror
P.O. Box 220
Port Hueneme, CA 93044
tel: 805 985 5073
fax: 805 985 7563
email: pamela@atomicmirror.org

"Politics is the art of the possible,
Creativity is the art of the impossible."
Ben Okri

To: "Pamela S. Meidell" <pamela@atomicmirror.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Nader's answers
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <3.0.5.32.20000908081618.00836100@pop.igc.org>
References:

At 08:16 AM 9/8/00 -0700, you wrote:

>Hi Howard,

>

>Wonderful thing you've done with the survey! Would you please send me

>Nader's answers to the survey?..... .

Pam,

Since my first communication I have sent Nader's answer to the abolition-usa list serve. If you didn't get it, please let me know.

Howard

Subject: Re: Inquiry on possible proposal
Date: Fri, 8 Sep 00 13:32:56 -0000
x-sender: towncrk@mail-pop.dmv.com
x-mailer: Claris EMailer 1.1
From: towncrk <info@towncreekfdn.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>

Dear Mr. Hallman,

Thank you for your letter briefly describing the work of the Methodists United for Peace with Justice and the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. Per your request, we are interested in reviewing a full funding proposal for the activities described in your letter, particularly in regards to organizing the faith community to respond to these issues. If you are able to prepare a proposal in time for our upcoming deadline on September 15th, we will review it along with other proposals in our final grantmaking cycle for 2000. The final decisions will be announced in late November. Our first grants cycle next year will have an application deadline of January 15, 2001, and those grants will be announced in March.

Our application guidelines for preparing a funding application are available on our web site at www.towncreekfdn.org. If you are unable to obtain the guidelines from our web site, we can send a paper copy if you send us a self-addressed regular business envelope (unstamped). Please be aware that our guidelines specifically exclude grants for ministry or religious programs, and our interest relates to your description of the faith community's participation in halting the threat of nuclear weapons.

With a budget for work with the Interfaith Committee at roughly \$50,000, your request should not exceed the \$25,000 you mentioned. Though we are interested in reviewing a full funding proposal, we already have a number of commitments and expectations for our November meeting and cannot guarantee that a grant will be made.

We look forward to receiving a proposal from you.

Sincerely yours,

Christine B. Shelton
Executive Director
Town Creek Foundation
P. O. Box 159
Oxford, Maryland 21654
410-226-5315
cshelton@towncreekfdn.org

From: Kathy Guthrie <kathy@fcnl.org>
To: "'Howard W. Hallman'" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: Responses from presidential candidates
Date: Fri, 8 Sep 2000 13:32:55 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

Howard,
I am including a short description of the Back from the Brink project, which perhaps you can add to what you're sending out for the 9/19 meeting.

Thanks.
Kathy

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Friday, September 08, 2000 10:29 AM
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: Responses from presidential candidates

Dear Colleagues,

Yesterday we released the attached results of the responses of presidential candidates to the ten questions from religious leaders on nuclear disarmament issues. Thanks to those who attended the news conference. Unfortunately none of the mainline media showed up, but we hope that some will make use of the release. Anyway we are far from done.

Ralph Nader provided a full set of answers to our questions. A copy is attached. The Bush campaign staff furnished material for us to extract the answers. The Gore staff provided nothing, so we had to dig into other sources for Gore's views, including the campaign web site. The morning before the news conference I sent the Gore staff the answers I had formulated and offered them an opportunity to make corrections and fill in the blanks. I had no reply. Similarly I sent the Bush staff a list of the unanswered questions and requested answers. I had no reply.

As follow up, you and your grassroots network may want to contact the candidates, express disappointment that they didn't reply to the religious leaders on these important issues, and ask for the candidates' views. You can incorporate your own denomination's policies into your query. The main unanswered questions are the following:

What are your views on the morality of possession, threatened use, and actual use of nuclear weapons?

If elected president, what specifically will you do during your four-year term to fulfill the U.S. commitment under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty to join the other nuclear weapon states in "an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals"?

Do 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?

Addresses for the candidates are as follows:

The Honorable Albert Gore, Jr.
Attn: Mr Leon Fuerth
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

The Honorable George W. Bush
State Capitol
100 E. 11th Street
Austin, TX 78701

On the first question in particular you may want to write to Senator Lieberman, indicating that with his concern for moral values, you are interested in the approach of the Gore-Lieberman ticket to the morality of nuclear weapons. His address is:

The Honorable Joseph I. Lieberman
706 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

We'll talk more about this at the meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament on Tuesday, September 19 from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m., Conference Room 4, The Methodist Building, Washington, D.C.

Shalom,
Howard

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\back from brink"

Date: Fri, 8 Sep 2000 15:06:53 -0400

From: William J Price <WorldPeaceMakers@compuserve.com>

Subject: religious leaders' survey of presidential candidates on
nuclear weapons

Sender: William J Price <WorldPeaceMakers@compuserve.com>

To: "Intern2" <intern2@fourthfreedom.org>, Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.org>

Dear Partners

Howard! and Dave and "Intern2" Thank you for all your work in making this
even possible and
this very useful report.

A great report! The event was a very important one! Both Bishops were
brilliant and powerful! Let's each do anything we can think of to get
Nader into the Presidential Debates! Bill

X-Originating-IP: [207.172.11.147]

From: "Esther Pank" <estherpank@hotmail.com>

To: timb@2020vision.org, dkimball@clw.org, syoung@clw.org, kathy@fcnl.org, ieer@ieer.org, kathycrandall@earthlink.net, wand@wand.org, disarmament@igc.org, agallivan@psr.org, jsmith@clw.org, tcollina@ucsusa.org, estherpank@hotmail.com, sara@fcnl.org, ggilhool@ix.netcom.com, kroberts@psr.org, amillar@fourthfreedom.org, Paul@Taxpayer.net, wilpfdc@wilpf.org, irashorr@hotmail.com, mbutcher@psr.org, jbridgman@peace-action.org, fen_broughton@hotmail.com, jspykerman@ucsusa.org, peacelinks1@erols.com, dadelman@nrdc.org, mupj@igc.org, cferg@fas.org, dan@clw.org, alise@taxpayer.net, annabananasmls@hotmail.com, charolett baker@erols.com, vgosse@peaceaction.org, gclark@peaceaction.org

Subject: Notes from Brink meeting

Date: Fri, 08 Sep 2000 19:33:07 GMT

X-OriginalArrivalTime: 08 Sep 2000 19:33:08.0387 (UTC) FILETIME=[9DDBFF30:01C019CB]

Thanks to all who participated in the Back from the Brink campaign strategy session yesterday (9/7/00). The next meeting will be to develop congressional legislative strategy and will be held soon after the October recess. We will notify you.

NOTES- Brink Campaign Strategy Session - Sept. 7th

Participating: Representatives from PSR, Peace Links, WILPF, FCNL, 20/20, Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, WAND

1. Overview of Current De-alerting Plans and Activities:

a. Presidential Debates-- PSR and the Brink Campaign are working on getting op-eds and letters-to-the editor in targeted states, using debates as a

hook. Message-"Candidates need to address the real missile threat-nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert." Other issues can be woven in.

FOLLOW-UP: (debate dates yet to be set) Brink and PSR will provide sample letters and op-eds. Groups are encouraged to identify op-ed and letter signors

in their network. Contact Anne Gallivan at PSR or Ira

at the Brink campaign to discuss placements. There is a possibility of doing some national ads.

NEW IDEA: Brink and PSR will explore possibility of small market newspaper ad if

debates are held in Danville, KY or Winston-Salem, NC.

b Brink Campaign De-alerting State Activities: Events and organizing projects are underway-or planned-in CA, CT, KS, IN, IA, MA, MN, MS, NE, NJ, NY,

RI, TX, WI. Grant requests are still welcome for local organizing that takes

place through the spring of 2001.

FOLLOW-UP - groups can contact Esther at the Brink office to hook up their local

activists. Help is welcome for promoting the Brink campaign's efforts to provide grant money for local organizing. With expanded timeline we look to send out updated "call" for proposals to grassroots groups, through partner networks.

c Faith Based Organizing Project: FCNL is spearheading an effort on a "de-alerting sign-on letter" for national religious leaders, along with the National Council of Churches. Brink campaign is providing resources, and new

faith-based material will be drafted.

Winter 2000-2001: meetings will be set up with religious leaders and transition

team for new President, and with new administration officials. Followed by meetings with key congressional leaders.

Grassroots faith-based efforts will be discussed at September 19th meeting of

the Interfaith Alliance.

FOLLOW-UP: Brink campaign will contact the National Cathedral Project to foster

cooperation.

d. Peace Link's Conference: The December conference will bring together

woman activists and women new to the issue, for inspiration and training.

De-alerting will be a focal point for education at the conference and for organizing efforts that follow. Contact Peace Links to participate.

e. Brink Web Site - the site is being re-designed. The Brink campaign is

also moving to hire a "Internet Outreach/Organizer" who will focus on Internet

networking with religious, environmental, social justice and other constituencies, as well as creating a marketing strategy for the site.

f. De-alerting material - new brochures with added campaign partners; Q&A

four-pager; hair-trigger Timeline Chart; and a poster will be available.

Brochures are available for those groups who agreed to send them to their activists' contacts.

2. Focus on the New President (post election-March 2001)

a Transition Team - "White Paper" will be written by Bruce Blair, Frank Von Hippel; for use with meetings with transition team by religious leaders and

other elites. A suggestions was made to engage some of the ex military leaders via CDI.

b. Grassroots Actions -

(1) "Holiday Card" to new President: mixed feelings about post card campaigns in general (recognizing that "letters" are most

effective). But consensus on having post cards available as grassroots action

"tool." Message for cards should reflect context of disarmament work, i.e.

"President should move to reduce the nuclear threat by de-alerting, deep reductions," etc. Holiday Card (if we move forward) might be more focused

on

De-alerting as action step, other cards more broadly worded.

FOLLOW-UP: see if there's interest from religious groups at Sept. 19 meeting.

(2) "Call-in-E-mail Day(s)" to White House in late January. Broad disarmament message, de-alerting as first step. Work with 20/20 on action alert in December. Incorporate as many groups as possible.

3. Focus on New Congress

a House- binding de-alerting legislation (i.e. "Department of defense required to take steps to assess impact of de-alerting on security.") Republican sponsors. Participate in nuclear force posture review hearings.

b Senate - generate support, foster de-alerting in force posture review,

FOLLOW-UP:

a. Grassroots Activities: Post cards, letters, and local organizational endorsements, district meetings with Senators and House reps., faith-based outreach.

SPECIAL NOTE. There will be a congressional legislative strategy session to discuss "inside the beltway" de-alerting strategies to work with Congress and elites). Participants to include community legislative staff plus, and if possible, Hill staff, Bruce Blair, Frank Von Hippel, Sam Nunn.

Martin Butcher (PSR), Ira Shorr (Brink) and Daryl Kimball will draft a memo on potential strategies for meeting. Anyone else wishing to participate in the draft should contact the Brink office. The meeting will be held soon after Congressional recess.

Ira Shorr and Esther Pank for
Back from the Brink Campaign

Get Your Private, Free E-mail from MSN Hotmail at <http://www.hotmail.com>.

Share information about yourself, create your own public profile at <http://profiles.msn.com>.

To: tjgdet@aol.com, dwhite11@edgenet.net
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Proposed op-ed article
Cc: aeidinger@yahoo.com, dave@paxchristiusa.org
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\abolish.302.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Tom and Dale,

I greatly appreciate your participation in the news conference to release candidates' responses to questions on nuclear disarmament issues. Although we weren't able to draw in the mainstream press, it was a useful beginning to our effort to make nuclear disarmament a campaign issue. By getting a full set of answers from Ralph Nader, we are putting pressure on Vice President Gore especially to be more forthcoming on these issues.

After conferring with Adam Eiding, our media consultant, about next steps, I have drafted the attached op-ed article. Would the two of you be willing to be cosigners? If so, Adam will try to place in a major newspaper.

At around 1,000 words the article may be somewhat too long. Other than that, do you have any editorial changes to suggest? I would appreciate hearing from you as soon as possible.

Shalom,
Howard

X-Sender: pmeidell@pop.igc.org
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.5 (32)
Date: Sat, 09 Sep 2000 09:30:22 -0700
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Pamela S. Meidell" <pamela@atomicmirror.org>
Subject: Re: Nader's answers

Hi Howard,

No, I didn't get it. The message I saw on the listserv said:

"Alice Slater sent out the results of our survey by religious leaders of presidential candidates on nuclear disarmament issues. If anyone would like the survey report as an attachment in Word format, please let me know. We also have Ralph Nader's answers to the ten questions in the same format."

Based on that, I wrote to ask for Nader's questions and answers in Word format. I would also like the survey report in that format please.

Thanks again. Great work!

In peace,
Pamela

At 04:28 PM 9/8/2000 -0400, you wrote:

>At 08:16 AM 9/8/00 -0700, you wrote:

>>Hi Howard,

>>

>>Wonderful thing you've done with the survey! Would you please send me

>>Nader's answers to the survey?.....

>

>

>Pam,

>

>Since my first communication I have sent Nader's answer to the
>abolition-usa list serve. If you didn't get it, please let me know.

>

>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.

>

Pamela S. Meidell

Director

The Atomic Mirror

P.O. Box 220

Port Hueneme, CA 93044

tel: 805 985 5073

fax: 805 985 7563

email: pamela@atomicmirror.org

"Politics is the art of the possible,
Creativity is the art of the impossible."
Ben Okri

To: "Pamela S. Meidell" <pamela@atomicmirror.org>

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

Subject: Re: Nader's answers

Cc:

Bcc:

X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\abolish.292.doc; C:\My Documents\abolish.294.doc;

In-Reply-To: <3.0.5.32.20000909093022.007abc50@pop.igc.org>

References: <3.0.3.32.20000908162819.0069300c@pop2.igc.org>

<3.0.5.32.20000908081618.00836100@pop.igc.org>

Pamela,

The two documents are attached.

Howard

anna rich <arich@fas.org>, BASIC <basicus@basicint.org>,
bill hartung
<hartung@newschool.edu>, bob musil <bmusil@psr.org>,
brian hughes
<brian@taxpayer.net>,
"bridget @ work" <moixb@newschool.edu>,
caleb rossiter <calebrun@igc.apc.org>, catherine <catherine@fcnl.org>,
cena swisher <cena@taxpayer.net>,
charles mccollough <mccolloc@ucc.org>,
chris hellman <chellman@cdi.org>, chris paine <cpaine@nrdc.org>,
chuck ferguson <cferg@fas.org>, chuck woolery <chuck@wfa.org>,
corey gay <cgay@isis-online.org>, cunr@cunr.org,
dan koslofsky <dan@clw.org>, dan plesch
<dplesch@basicint.org>,
danya greenfield <dgreenfield@clw.org>,
darryl fagin <adaction@ix.netcom.com>,
daryl kimball <dkimball@clw.org>,
Disarmament Clearinghouse <disarmament@igc.org>,
edith villastrigo
<cedar@tfn.net>, erica.seager@oberlin.edu,
erik floden <efloden@clw.org>,
fran teplitz <fteplitz@peace-action.org>,
francyne harrigan
<fharrigan@hotmail.com>,
gillian gilhool <ggilhool@ix.netcom.com>,
gordon clark <gclark@peace-action.org>,
greg speeter <info@natprior.org>, howard diamond
<howard@armscontrol.org>,
james wyerman
<jwyerman@2020vision.org>,
jean sammon
<jsammon@networklobby.org>,
jen washburn <washburj@newschool.edu>,
jenefer ellingston <jellingston@erols.com>,
jenny smith <jsmith@clw.org>, john isaacs <jdi@clw.org>,
john pike <johnpike@fas.org>, kate joseph
<kjoseph@basicint.org>,
kathy crandall
<kathycrandall@earthlink.net>,
"kevin o'neill" <koneill@isis-online.org>,
kimberly robson <wand@wand.org>, larry ekin <info@paxworld.org>,
lee vander laan <vfp@igc.org>,
liesl heeter <heeter@csbahome.com>,
"Linda Jamison (E-mail)"
<ljamison@clw.org>,
luke warren
<lwarren@clw.org>,
lynn fredriksson <etandc@igc.org>,
mara kaufman
<mkaufman@peace-action.org>,
marcus corbin <defense@pogo.org>, marissa vitagliano <marissa@vi.org>,
martha honey <ipsps@igc.org>,
"Maureen Eldredge (E-mail)" <maureene@earthlink.net>, mda4@duke.edu,
meg riley <uuawo@aol.com>, melissa becker <will@wand.org>,
michelle bazie
<bazie@cbpp.org>,
"Michelle Ciarrocca (E-mail)" <ciarrm01@newschool.edu>,
mike fonte <mfonte@clw.org>, miriam pemberton <ipsps@igc.org>,

peter davies <PJDAVIES@aol.com>,
piers wood
<pwood@cdi.org>, rachel stohl <rstohl@cdi.org>,
ralph de gennaro
<ralph@taxpayer.net>,
robert courtnage <chapter@spusa.org>,
robert vandivier <bobvan@erols.com>, sandy ionno <sionno@spusa.org>,
scott nathanson <Pdd@clark.net>,
"Scott Nathanson (E-mail)" <CRB_DC@hotmail.com>,
spurgeon keeny
<smk@armscontrol.org>,
stacey towles <towles@csbahome.com>,
steve kosiak
<kosiak@csbahome.com>,
"Steven Young (E-mail)" <syoun@clw.org>, suzy kerr <skerr@clw.org>,
tamar gabelnick <tamarg@fas.org>, todd perry
<tperry@ucsusa.org>,
tom cardamone <cardamone@clw.org>, tom collina
<tcollina@ucsusa.org>,
tom graham <tgraham@lawsens.org>,
"Virginia Witt (E-mail)" <virginia@businessleaders.org>,
wade boese
<wade@armscontrol.org>,

From: Rachel Labush <rlabush@rac.org>
To: "mupj@igc.org" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Interfaith Committee on Nuclear Disarmament
Date: Mon, 11 Sep 2000 14:36:28 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

Dear Mr. Hallman,

I am the new Legislative Assistant covering Arms control at the Religious Action Center, and my predecessor Josh Noble left me a memo strongly urging me to contact you about the Interfaith Committee on Nuclear Disarmament. I would love to come to the next meeting of the Committee and meet you and representatives from the other religious groups involved. You can contact me by any of the methods listed below. I look forward to hearing from you.

Thanks,

Rachel Labush, Legislative Assistant
Religious Action Center
2027 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036
phone: 202-387-2800
fax: 202-667-9070
rlabush@rac.org
<http://www.rac.org>

To: Rachel Labush <rlabush@rac.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Interfaith Committee on Nuclear Disarmament
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <23B701418684D21182F600A0C9D60D0544B235@RACSRV>
References:

Dear Rachel,

Welcome to peace and justice work in Washington, D.C. We are looking forward to your joining the work of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. Our next meeting is from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m., Tuesday, September 19 at the Methodist Building, Conference Room 4, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE, across the street from the Supreme Court Building. I'll send out the agenda prior to the meeting.

Shalom,
Howard

At 02:36 PM 9/11/00 -0400, you wrote:

>Dear Mr. Hallman,
> I am the new Legislative Assistant covering Arms control at the
>Religious Action Center, and my predecessor Josh Noble left me a memo
>strongly urging me to contact you about the Interfaith Committee on Nuclear
>Disarmament. I would love to come to the next meeting of the Committee and
>meet you and representatives from the other religious groups involved. You
>can contact me by any of the methods listed below. I look forward to hearing
>from you.
>
>Thanks,
>
>Rachel Labush, Legislative Assistant
>Religious Action Center
>2027 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
>Washington, DC 20036
>phone: 202-387-2800
>fax: 202-667-9070
>rlabush@rac.org
><http://www.rac.org>
>
>
>

X-Sender: jdi@[63.106.26.66]
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)
Date: Mon, 11 Sep 2000 14:54:21 -0400
To: jdi@clw.org
From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>
Subject: Recent Senate election polling

RECENT POLLING ON SENATE 2000 CAMPAIGNS
September 2000 update

=====
California

=====
51% - Senator Dianne Feinstein (D)
34% - Rep. Tom Campbell (R)
10% - Undecided
The Field Poll conducted August 18-22, 2000 - 416 likely voters

=====
Connecticut

=====
71% - Sen. Joseph Lieberman (D)
14% - Philip Giordano (R)
15% - Undecided
Quinnipiac University poll conducted July 12-17, 2000 - ? registered voters

=====
Delaware

=====
45% - Gov. Tom Carper (D)
43% - Sen. Bill Roth (R)
12% - Undecided
University of Delaware poll conducted July 24- August 1, 2000 - 365
registered voters

=====
Florida

=====
45% - Bill Nelson (D)
34% - Bill McCollum (R)
5% - Willie Logan (I)
15% - Undecided
Florida Voting poll conducted July 17-26, 2000 - 608 likely voters

=====
Georgia

=====
61% - Sen. Zell Miller (D)
21% - Mack Mattingly (R)
18% - Undecided
Mellman Group (Democratic) poll conducted July 28- 30, 2000 - 500 likely
voters

=====
Indiana

=====
63% - Sen. Dick Lugar (R)
13% - David Johnson (D)
24% - Undecided, other
Market Shares Corp. conducted August 24-27, 2000 for the Indianapolis Star
- 600 registered likely voters

=====
Maryland

=====
61% - Sen. Paul Sarbanes (D)
27% - Delegate Paul Rappaport (R)
12% - Undecided
Gonzales/Arscott Research and Communications poll conducted August 23-28,
2000 - 649 "regular" voters

=====
Massachusetts

=====
68% - Sen. Edward Kennedy (D)
16% - Michael Sullivan (R)
16% - Undecided
Boston Herald poll conducted August 29 - 31, 2000 - 410 likely voters

=====
Michigan

=====
48% - Sen. Spencer Abraham (R)
43% - Rep. Debbie Stabenow (D)
9% - Undecided
EPIC-MRA poll conducted August 20-22, 2000 - 604 likely voters

=====
Minnesota

=====
Democratic primary:
42% - Mark Dayton
18% - Michael Ciresi
14% - Jerry Janezich
12% - Rebecca Yanisch
14% - Others, undecided
Minneapolis Star Tribune poll conducted September 5 - 8, 2000 - 607 likely
Democratic voters

General election:
44% - Mark Dayton (D)
41% - Michael Ciresi (D)
4% - James Gibson (I)
11% - Undecided

42% - Sen. Rod Grams (R)
42% - Michael Ciresi (D)

4% - James Gibson (I)
12% - Undecided

43% - Sen. Rod Grams (R)
39% - Jerry Janezich (D)
4% - James Gibson (I)
16% - Undecided

44% - Sen. Rod Grams (R)
35% - Rebecca Yanisch
4% - James Gibson (I)
17% - Undecided

Mason-Dixon poll conducted August 21-23, 2000 for the St. Paul Pioneer
Press and Minnesota Public Radio - 621 regular voters

=====
Missouri

=====
45% - Sen. John Ashcroft (R)
43% - Gov. Mel Carnahan (D)
12% - undecided

Zogby International poll conducted September 5-7, 2000 for St. Louis Post
Dispatch - 601 likely voters

=====
Montana

=====
49% - Sen. Conrad Burns (R)
40% - Brian Schweitzer (D)
11% - Undecided

Talmey-Drake (Democratic) poll conducted September 4-6, 2000 - 507 likely
voters

=====
Nebraska

=====
53% Ben Nelson (D)
29% Don Stenberg (R)
13% Undecided

Omaha World-Herald poll conducted May 2-4, 2000 by RKM Research and Comm.
of Portsmouth, NH - 1,402 adults

=====
Nevada

=====
56% - Former Rep. John Ensign (R)
36% - Ed Bernstein (D)
8% - Undecided

Mason-Dixon poll conducted June 12-15, 2000 - 637 regular voters

=====
New Jersey

=====
43% - Jon Corzine (D)

35% - Rep. Bob Franks (R)
23% - Undecided
Quinnipiac Univ. poll conducted August 18-22, 2000 - 802 registered voters

29% - Rep. Bob Franks (R)
24% - Jon Corzine (D)
44% - Undecided
Gannett New Jersey poll conducted August 24 - 27, 2000 - 430 likely voters

=====
New Mexico
=====

51% - Sen. Jeff Bingaman (D)
35% - Former Rep. Bill Redmond (R)
14% - Undecided
Mason-Dixon poll conducted 8/30-31, 1999 - 420 registered voters

=====
New York
=====

47% - Hillary Clinton (D)
45% - Rep. Rick Lazio (R)
8% - Don't know, other
Zogby International poll conducted September 6-8, 2000 for Buffalo News -
716 likely voters

=====
North Dakota
=====

63% - Sen. Kent Conrad (D)
27% - Duane Sand (R)
14% - Undecided
Garin-Hart-Yang (Democratic) poll conducted June 14-17, 2000 - 504 likely
voters

=====
Ohio
=====

54% - Sen. Mike DeWine (R)
32% - Ted Celeste (D)
14% - undecided, other
Columbus Dispatch poll conducted August 25 - Sept. 1, 2000

=====
Pennsylvania
=====

48% - Sen. Rick Santorum (R)
35% - Rep. Ron Klink (D)
17% - Undecided
Pulse of PA poll conducted August 27-29, 2000 by Decision Forecasting -
1,078 registered voters

=====
Rhode Island

=====

Democratic primary:

41% - Rep. Robert Weygand

29% - Richard Licht

30% - Undecided

General Election:

48% - Sen. Lincoln Chafee (R)

31% - Rep. Robert Weygand (D)

21% - Undecided, other

50% - Sen. Lincoln Chafee (R)

21% - Richard Licht (D)

29% - Undecided, other

Brown University poll conducted August 26-30, 2000 - 438 registered voters,
including 300 likely Democratic primary voters

=====

Tennessee

=====

62% - Sen. Bill Frist (R)

24% - John Kay Hooker (D)

22% - Undecided

Mason-Dixon poll conducted March 16-18, 2000 - 626 regular voters

=====

Texas

=====

56% - Sen. Kay Bailey Hutchison (R)

21% - Gene Kelly (D)

23% - Undecided

Scripps Data Center poll conducted May 22 - June 16, 2000 - 1,000 adults

=====

Utah

=====

59% - Sen. Orrin Hatch (R)

27% - Scott Howell (D)

13% - undecided

Salt Lake Tribune poll conducted August 29-31, 2000 by Valley Research -
1,258 registered voters

=====

Vermont

=====

Democratic primary:

42% - Ed Flanagan (D)

41% - Jan Backus (D)

17% - Undecided

General election:

61% - Sen. Jim Jeffords (R)

28% - Ed Flanagan (D)

11% - Undecided

61% - Sen. Jim Jeffords (R)

24% - Jan Backus (D)

15% - Undecided

Mason Dixon poll conducted August 28-30, 2000 for the Burlington Free Press

- 621 regular voters

=====

Virginia

=====

53% - Ex-Governor George Allen (R)

45% - Sen. Chuck Robb (D)

2% - Undecided

Washington Post poll conducted August 24-27, 2000 - 1,013 registered voters

=====

Washington

=====

Open primary:

37% - Sen. Slade Gorton (R)

30% - Maria Cantwell (D)

12% - Deborah Senn (D)

21% - Undecided, other candidates

General election:

40% - Sen. Slade Gorton (R)

40% - Maria Cantwell (D)

20% - Undecided, other candidates

Elway poll conducted August 24-29, 2000 - 445 registered voters

=====

Wisconsin

=====

64% - Sen. Herbert Kohl (D)

25% - John Gillespie (R)

11% - Undecided

Mason Dixon poll conducted May 16-17, 2000 - 428 likely voters

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

Date: Mon, 11 Sep 2000 12:09:55 -0400
From: Mintwood Media Collective <adam@mintwood.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.73 [en]C-CCK-MCD BA45DSL (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
To: Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Revised Op_Ed

Dear Howard,

I hope you had a nice weekend. Attached is my revised version of your op-ed. I shortened it to about 960 words. It still needs to be cut down more. I was thinking rather than talk about how the faith community has found nuclear weapons immoral, we actually should make the moral case against them. I think Gumbleton and White would be more eloquent than me.

Let me know what you think. I'd like to act tomorrow on getting this it out to the Washington Post as an exclusive.

Sincerely,

Adam

P.S. - I will be sending you a final invoice today for the work, however, as far as I'm concerned I will continue to push this survey, especially if we get another response by Bush or Gore.

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\draft op-ed survey(revised).doc"

What are the Candidates Views on Nuclear Disarmament? **by Bishop Thomas J. Gumbleton and Bishop C. Dale White**

Last week on behalf of 48 religious leaders from a variety of faiths and denominations we released a survey of the presidential candidates on what Vice-President Al Gore calls the, "Single most important issue." Nuclear weapons are a very serious issue and the sole decision for the next president that encapsulates the fate of all life on this planet. One would think this survey would be considered an opportunity to engage Americans on the candidates unique approach, but sadly the survey answers have captured the attention of people of faith not for what they said, but rather for what they didn't say.

Only Ralph Nader of the Green party answered specific questions into his moral thinking on the possession, threatened use and actual use of nuclear weapons as well as important U.S. obligations like the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Governor George Bush and Vice-President Al Gore sent copies of policy speeches that leave us to wonder if the candidates really think this is an important issue.

Out of frustration and with the desire to engage this oversight by the major candidates we are calling on them to answer these questions as soon as possible. With five weeks remaining before election day, we ask the major party candidates to answer the following questions.

(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?

Clearly the world faith community has condemned nuclear weapons. The Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1983 declared that "the production and deployment as well as the use of nuclear weapons are a crime against humanity." Pope John Paul II has called for the abolition of nuclear weapons. So has the Dalai Lama.

In the United States many denominations have spoken against nuclear weapons and called for their elimination. The National Council of Catholic Bishops in 1983 condemned any use of nuclear weapons, even in retaliation for a nuclear attack because it "would indiscriminately take many wholly innocent lives, lives of people who are in no way responsible for reckless action of their government." Three years later the United Methodist Council of Bishops joined in this condemnation of any use of nuclear weapons and also denounced the doctrine nuclear deterrence.

Just this May the United Methodist General Conference, the denomination's official governing body, declared: "We reaffirm the finding that nuclear weapons, whether used or threatened, are grossly evil and morally wrong. As an instrument of mass destruction, nuclear weapons slaughter the innocent and ravage the environment. When used as instruments of deterrence, nuclear weapons hold innocent people hostage for political and military purposes. Therefore, the doctrine of nuclear deterrence is morally corrupt and spiritually bankrupt.

This is what the churches say. What do you say, Vice President Gore and Governor Bush?

(2) If elected president, what specifically will you do during your four-year term to fulfill the U.S. commitment under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty to join the other nuclear weapon states in "an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals"?

The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) has been effect since 1970 and is signed by ___ nations. During the ratification process the NPT had the support of both President Lyndon Johnson and President Richard Nixon.

Article VI of the NPT states: "Each of the Parties to the Treaty undertakes to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament, and on a Treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control." In 1996 the International Court of Justice unanimously ruled, "There exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control." At the May 2000 NPT Review Conference the United States agreed to the Final Document containing the unequivocal commitment quoted above.

General Colin Powell, when he was chair of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said, "I declare my hope that we will eventually see the time when the number of nuclear weapons is down to zero and the world is a much better place." Ralph Nader has provided a six-point action program to move toward this goal. Governor Bush and Vice President Gore, what are your plans?

(3) Do you see any utility for nuclear weapons in war? If so, please tell us the categories or targets you as commander-in-chief would consider legitimate to strike with nuclear weapons?

Numerous admirals and generals have stated that nuclear weapons have no military utility. When Admiral Noel Gayler was commander-in-chief in the Pacific in the 1970s, he could find no area under his command "where it would conceivably have made sense to explode nuclear weapons in order to carry out our military objectives." His command encompassed maritime Russia, the Korean peninsula, Vietnam, the Middle East.

When General Charles Horner was the allied air forces commander in the Gulf War, he saw no utility for nuclear weapons. Prior to his retirement he explained to a group of defense writers, "What are nuclear weapons good for? Busting cities. What president of the United States is going to take out Pyongyang." General Lee Butler, who served as commander-of-chief of the U.S. Strategic Command, opposes retaliation with nuclear weapons. "What target would warrant such retaliation?" he asks. "Would we hold an entire society accountable for the decision of single demented leader?"

Vice President Gore and Governor Bush, how would you answer General Butler's question? What use of nuclear weapons are you prepared to authorize?

We eagerly await your response.

X-Sender: dkimball@[63.106.26.66]
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)
Date: Mon, 11 Sep 2000 08:50:29 -0400
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: Re: Presidential candidates on nuclear disarmament issues

Howard:

Thanks for the update. Just to remind you, Arm Control Today has sent a questionnaire to Bush and Gore on nuclear weapons issues and their responses will be published in Arms Control Today next week.

DK

At 08:10 AM 9/11/00 -0400, you wrote:

>Dear Monday Lobby Colleagues:

>

>I would like to share with you the attached responses of presidential
>candidates to ten questions from religious leaders on nuclear disarmament
>issues. We released them at a news conference on September 7. This
>document is available on the web site of the United Methodist General Board
>of Church and society at www.umc-gbcs.org/whatsnew.htm.

>

>Ralph Nader provided a full set of answers to our questions (copy
>attached). The Bush campaign staff furnished material for us to extract
>the answers. The Gore staff provided nothing, so we had to dig into other
>sources for Gore's views, including the campaign web site. The morning
>before the news conference I sent the Gore staff the answers I had
>formulated and offered them an opportunity to make corrections and fill in
>the blanks. I had no reply. Similarly I sent the Bush staff a list of the
>unanswered questions and requested answers. I had no reply. We have gone
>back to the Bush and Gore campaign staffs and asked them to provide answers
>to fill the gaps.

>

>As follow up, you and your grassroots networks may want to seek the
>candidates' views on these issues. The main unanswered questions are the
>following:

>

>What are your views on the morality of possession, threatened use, and
>actual use of nuclear weapons?

>

>If elected president, what specifically will you do during your four-year
>term to fulfill the U.S. commitment under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation
>Treaty to join the other nuclear weapon states in "an unequivocal
>undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals"?

>

>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?

>

>If you do this and get any response, please let me know.

>
>Shalom,
>Howard
>
>
>
>Attachment Converted: "c:\eudora\attach\abolish.292.doc"
>
>Attachment Converted: "c:\eudora\attach\abolish.294.doc"
>
>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.

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 x136 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

X-Sender: danfine@pop2.igc.org
Date: Mon, 11 Sep 2000 16:20:50 -0400
To: mupj@igc.org
From: danfine@igc.org (Daniel Fine)
Subject: Re: (abolition-usa) SURVEY OF PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES EXPOSES DIFFERENCES ON NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Please send survey and responses as attachment in MS WORD for Mac.

Thank you---

Dan Fine, PSR-Pittsburgh

>Dear Friends,

>
>Alice Slater sent out the results of our survey by religious leaders of
>presidential candidates on nuclear disarmament issues. If anyone would
>like the survey report as an attachment in Word format, please let me know.
>We also have Ralph Nader's answers to the ten questions in the same format.

>
>As you study the replies, you will note that Vice President Gore and
>Governor Bush failed to answer

>
>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.

>
>-
> To unsubscribe to abolition-usa, send an email to "majordomo@xmission.com"
> with "unsubscribe abolition-usa" in the body of the message.
> For information on digests or retrieving files and old messages send
> "help" to the same address. Do not use quotes in your message.

To: danfine@igc.org (Daniel Fine)
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: (abolition-usa) SURVEY OF PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES EXPOSES DIFFERENCES ON NUCLEAR WEAPONS
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\abolish.292.doc;
In-Reply-To: <v02140b01b5deb67e5c2c@[207.205.223.30]>
References:

At 04:20 PM 9/11/00 -0400, you wrote:

>Please send survey and responses as attachment in MS WORD for Mac.

>

>Thank you---

>

>Dan Fine, PSR-Pittsburgh

Dan,

I have in Word only. It is attached. I hope you have a way of downloading it.

Howard

Date: Mon, 11 Sep 2000 16:23:54 -0400
From: Mintwood Media Collective <adam@mintwood.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.73 [en]C-CCK-MCD BA45DSL (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
To: Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Invoice

Dear Howard,

Attached is the invoice for work completed. Please note that the invoice indicates we plan to continue outreach as this story develops further.

If you have any questions please don't hesitate to call.

Sincerely,

Adam Eiding
Mintwood Media Collective

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\Invoice 091000.doc"



Mintwood Media Collective

Lauri Apple Sarah Austin Adam Eiding Kadd Stephens

1858 Mintwood Pl. NW, #4
Washington, DC 20009
Ph: 202-232-8997
Fax: 202-232-8340
www.mintwood.com

INVOICE

For

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

September 11, 2000

WORK COMPLETED

Mintwood contacted by phone, fax and email target media nationwide including reporters covering religion, national security, the white house, politics, foreign policy, the United Nations as well as general assignment. There was an aggressive effort to secure TV and radio interviews for spokespeople identified by the Methodists both in advance and following the release of the presidential survey responses on September 7. We also developed a graphic backdrop for the press conference and will continue to flack the survey as more responses are returned by the candidates in the form of op-eds or additional news releases.

COSTS

For these services, the Methodists agreed to pay Mintwood a consultation fee of \$2,000 and expenses to cover all time and labor contributed to the project by collective members Adam Eiding, Kadd Stephens, and Sarah Austin.

Consultation	\$2,000.00
Deposit received	- \$1,000.00
Blast Fax	\$100.00
Long Distance	\$30.00
Postage/Couriers	\$17.00
Printing/Press Kits/backdrop/graphic design	\$369.92

TOTAL**\$1516.92**

Additional expenses may be billed later.

The Mintwood Media Collective is a worker-owned and operated public relations firm.

X-eGroups-Return: sentto-1300601-211-968709074-mupj=igc.org@returns.onelist.com
To: bumc@egroups.com
X-Mailer: AOL 5.0 for Windows sub 119
From: mingomae@aol.com
Mailing-List: list bumc@egroups.com; contact bumc-owner@egroups.com
Delivered-To: mailing list bumc@egroups.com
List-Unsubscribe: <mailto:bumc-unsubscribe@egroups.com>
Date: Mon, 11 Sep 2000 17:51:10 EDT
Subject: [bumc] Fwd: UMNS #399-Religious leaders urge Bush, Gore to address nuclear weapons

----- eGroups Sponsor ----->

GET A NEXTCARD VISA, in 30 seconds! Get rates
of 2.9% Intro or 9.9% Ongoing APR* and no annual fee!
Apply NOW!

http://click.egroups.com/1/9146/5/_/118274/_/968709074/

----- _->

One of our congregants, Howard Hallman, is mentioned in this article.

~ Sandy Long

Return-Path: <owner-umnsdn@LISTSERV.UMC.ORG>

Received: from rly-zd05.mx.aol.com (rly-zd05.mail.aol.com [172.31.33.229]) by air-zd02.mail.aol.com (v75_b3.11) with ESMTP; Mon, 11 Sep 2000 17:37:18 -0400

Received: from smtp.umcom.net (host81.umcom.org [209.194.114.81]) by rly-zd05.mx.aol.com (v75_b3.9) with ESMTP; Mon, 11 Sep 2000 17:36:17 -0400

Received: from umcom2c01 (com.umcom.org [209.194.114.78] (may be forged))
by smtp.umcom.net (8.9.3/8.8.7) with ESMTP id QAA26305;
Mon, 11 Sep 2000 16:38:32 -0400

Received: from LISTSERV.UMC.ORG by LISTSERV.UMC.ORG (LISTSERV-TCP/IP release
1.8d) with spool id 5044 for UMNSDN@LISTSERV.UMC.ORG; Mon, 11 Sep
2000 16:29:42 -0700

Received: from 10.1.2.10 by LISTSERV.UMC.ORG (SMTP release 1.0d) with TCP;
Mon, 11 Sep 2000 16:29:42 -0700

Received: by mail.umcom.web with Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8) id
<SND4JHWC>; Mon, 11 Sep 2000 16:25:29 -0500

X-Message-Flag:

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8)

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"

Message-ID: <F081FCEC704BD3118DA700105A61DECAA8EEB5@mail.umcom.web>

Date: Mon, 11 Sep 2000 16:25:21 -0500

Reply-To: newsdesk@UMCOM.UMC.ORG

Sender: UMNS Daily News <UMNSDN@LISTSERV.UMC.ORG>

From: NewsDesk <NewsDesk@UMCOM.UMC.ORG>

Subject: UMNS #399-Religious leaders urge Bush,
Gore to address nuclear weapons

To: UMNSDN@LISTSERV.UMC.ORG

Religious leaders urge Bush, Gore to address nuclear weapons

Sept. 11, 2000 News media contact: Joretta Purdue·(202)546-8722·Nashville, Tenn. 10-21-71B{399}

WASHINGTON (UMNS) - It is time for the leading presidential candidates to discuss nuclear disarmament as a moral issue in the election campaign, according to an interfaith group of religious leaders.

Vice President Al Gore and Texas Gov. George W. Bush made no comments on the morality of holding and using nuclear weapons when quizzed in writing by a group of nearly 50 religious leaders. The survey was prepared by Pax Christi USA, a part of the international Catholic peace movement, and Methodists United for Justice and Peace, an unofficial United Methodist group.

Howard Hallman, chairman of Methodists United for Peace with Justice, expressed concern that these topics remain unaddressed by the country's two leading candidates.

"There is a lot of talk about moral values in the election campaign," Hallman said. "We believe that nuclear weapons constitute a moral issue, not merely a matter of military strategy, and should be discussed as such."

Democrat Gore and Republican Bush also have not responded to survey questions dealing with elimination of the U.S. nuclear arsenal under a treaty ratified in 1969 and with the kind of targets each candidate believes appropriate for the use of nuclear weapons.

Bush aides sent copies of a speech and answers to a similar unpublished survey and let the religious survey group select quotes that fit the questions. However, the material supplied did not answer all 10 questions. The Gore answers were gleaned from his campaign Web site and a survey to which he responded during the primaries.

The survey group provided copies of the selections to the offices of both candidates before presenting them in a Sept. 7 press conference.

Only Ralph Nader, nominee of the Green Party, responded specifically to the survey questions. Neither candidate from the Reform Party replied to the survey.

Bishop Thomas Gumbleton, founding president of Pax Christi and pastor of St. Leo's Catholic Church in Detroit, stressed the importance of considering the morality or immorality of holding and using nuclear weapons. He said he sees this lack of response on the part of Bush and Gore as "a glaring failure because each of them has put forth their religious convictions as the reason for running for public life."

Gumbleton said he found Nader's response encouraging. Nader called the U.S. government's refusal to adopt a no-first-use policy "an example of political immorality." "As the first country to use nuclear weapons and the perennial leader in new technologies for using these horrifying weapons of mass destruction, the United States has a moral obligation to take the lead in working for their elimination," Nader said in the survey.

"All religious communities condemn the use of weapons of mass destruction,"

Gumbleton said. He added that to contemplate destruction of a biosphere - Earth - that has existed for more than 400 million years "is a blasphemy."

Bishop C. Dale White, who headed the United Methodist Council of Bishops' churchwide study and action program "In Defense of Creation" in 1986, spoke against the concept of nuclear weapons as a deterrence to war.

"Over the past few years, communities of faith around the world have declared the deterrence doctrine, the only conceivable rationalization for holding nuclear weapons, spiritually and ethically bankrupt," he said. He noted that in 1986 the United Methodist bishops said deterrence could not receive the church's blessing.

Last May, the United Methodist Church's General Conference reaffirmed "the finding that nuclear weapons, whether used or threatened, are grossly evil and morally wrong."

White also recalled that 60 senior military officers issued a statement in December 1996 saying "that as experienced military commanders they are convinced that nuclear weapons are 'of sharply reduced utility' in any legitimate military purpose." And he noted that in 1996, at the urging of the World Health Assembly and the U.N. General Assembly, the International Court of Justice declared the deterrence doctrine legally bankrupt.

"Clearly," White said, "communities of faith in the United States are justified in calling every candidate for high office in the country to state clearly the steps that they will take to eliminate nuclear terror as a political instrument, and to rid the world of nuclear devices and the means to produce them."

###

United Methodist News Service
Photos and stories also available at:
<http://umns.umc.org>

You may leave the list at any time by going to
<http://umns.umc.org/unsubscribe.html>

To leave this list at any time, please send an email to listserv@listserv.umc.org with SIGNOFF UMNSDN in the body.

From: "Surratt, Doris" <DSurratt@NAPAWASH.ORG>
To: zz Social Equity Panel <SocEqPanel@NAPAWASH.ORG>
Subject: Hold the Date!!!
Date: Mon, 11 Sep 2000 17:55:50 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

The first full panel meeting of the Standing Panel on Social Equity will be held in conjunction with the Academy's Fall Meeting, on November 16th, 9:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m., at the Westin Hotel, Washington, D.C. More details to follow.

To bring you up to date on the activities of the working groups, the meeting notes from the July 14th meeting of the Coordinating Committee and the August 4th meeting of the Working Group on Social Equity Issue Definition are attached.

<<Minutes Coord Cmte 7-14.doc>> <<Social Equity 8-4-00 Meeting Summary.doc>>
Doris Surratt
PH: 202-347-3190
dsurratt@napawash.org

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\Minutes Coord Cmte 7-14.doc"

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\Social Equity 8-4-00 Meeting Summary.doc"

Date: Mon, 11 Sep 2000 20:43:52 -0400
From: "C. Dale White" <dwhite11@edgenet.net>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.02 [en]C-DIAL (Win95; U)
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: Op-ed Piece

Dear Howard--The op-ed piece looks fine. Joretta's account of the event came out quite well, I think. Putting the questions and answers on the internet was great idea. Good work, Howard! Let me know if any follow-up activities are considered. Sincerely, Dale.

Date: Tue, 12 Sep 2000 22:44:44 -0400
From: "C. Dale White" <dwhite11@edgenet.net>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.02 [en]C-DIAL (Win95; U)
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: Op-ed Piece

Dear Howard--The op-ed article is fine; no doubt the shorter version is more likely to find a publisher. Readers might want to know who White and Gumbleton are; a sentence or two following the article might be possible. Many thanks for your leadership. Dale.

To: tjgdet@aol.com, dwhite11@edgenet.net
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Revised op-ed piece
Cc: dave@paxchristiusa.org
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\abolish.304.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Tom and Dale,

I have polished the op-ed piece addressed to the candidates, incorporated suggestions from Adam Eiding, our media consultant, and shortened it a little. Is it acceptable in this revised form?

Adam wants to offer it to the Washington Post as an exclusive as soon as possible (such as, this afternoon). If the Post won't take it, he'll try elsewhere.

Shalom,
Howard

To: adam@mintwood.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Revised op-ed piece
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\abolish.304.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Adam,

Attached is a revision of the op-ed piece. It takes into account your suggestions and shortens it to under 900 words.

The piece makes the moral case against nuclear weapons by quoting the Catholic bishops and the United Methodist General Conference.

Bishop White approved the first draft. I haven't heard from Bishop Gumbleton, but I'll call him before the morning is over. Even if I don't reach him, I may have you go ahead this afternoon and try to place it. I'll call you.

Howard

To: tjgdet@juno.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Op-ed piece
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\abolish.304.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Tom,

I have polished the op-ed piece addressed to the candidates, incorporated suggestions from Adam Eiding, our media consultant, and shortened it a little. Is it acceptable in this revised form?

Adam wants to offer it to the Washington Post as an exclusive as soon as possible. If the Post won't take it, he'll try elsewhere.

Shalom,
Howard

To: mupj@igc.org

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

Subject: Presidential candidates on nuclear disarmament issues

Cc:

Bcc: anna rich <arich@fas.org>, BASIC <basicus@basicint.org>, bill hartung <hartung@newschool.edu>, bob musil <bmusil@psr.org>, brian hughes <brian@taxpayer.net>, "bridget @ work" <moixb@newschool.edu>, caleb rossiter <calebrun@igc.apc.org>, catherine <catherine@fcn1.org>, cena swisher <cena@taxpayer.net>, charles mccollough <mccolloc@ucc.org>, chris hellman <chellman@cdi.org>, chris paine <cpaine@nrdc.org>, chuck ferguson <cferg@fas.org>, chuck woolery <chuck@wfa.org>, corey gay <cgay@isis-online.org>, cunr@cunr.org, dan koslofsky <dan@clw.org>, dan plesch <dplesch@basicint.org>, danya greenfield <dgreenfield@clw.org>, darryl fagin <adaction@ix.netcom.com>, daryl kimball <dkimball@clw.org>, Disarmament Clearinghouse <disarmament@igc.org>, edith villastrigo <cedar@tfn.net>, erica.seager@oberlin.edu, erik floden <efloden@clw.org>, fran teplitz <fteplitz@peace-action.org>, francyne harrigan <fharrigan@hotmail.com>, gillian gilhool <ggilhool@ix.netcom.com>, gordon clark <gclark@peace-action.org>, greg speeter <info@natprior.org>, howard diamond <howard@armscontrol.org>, james wyerman <jwyerman@2020vision.org>, jean sammon <jsammon@networklobby.org>, jen washburn <washburj@newschool.edu>, jenefer ellingston <jellingston@erols.com>, jenny smith <jsmith@clw.org>, john isaacs <jdi@clw.org>, john pike <johnpike@fas.org>, kate joseph <kjoseph@basicint.org>, kathy crandall <kathycrandall@earthlink.net>, "kevin o'neill" <koneill@isis-online.org>, kimberly robson <wand@wand.org>, larry ekin <info@paxworld.org>, lee vander laan <vfp@igc.org>, liesl heeter <heeter@csbahome.com>, "Linda Jamison (E-mail)" <ljamison@clw.org>, luke warren <lwarren@clw.org>, lynn fredriksson <etandc@igc.org>, mara kaufman <mkaufman@peace-action.org>, marcus corbin <defense@pogo.org>, marissa vitagliano <marissa@vi.org>, martha honey <ipsps@igc.org>, "Maureen Eldredge (E-mail)" <maureene@earthlink.net>, mda4@duke.edu, meg riley <uuawo@aol.com>, melissa becker <will@wand.org>, michelle bazie <bazie@cbpp.org>, "Michelle Ciarrocca (E-mail)" <ciarrm01@newschool.edu>, mike fonte <mfonte@clw.org>, miriam pemberton <ipsps@igc.org>, peter davies <PJDAVIES@aol.com>, piers wood <pwood@cdi.org>, rachel stohl <rstohl@cdi.org>, ralph de gennaro <ralph@taxpayer.net>, robert courtnage <chapter@spusa.org>, robert vandivier <bobvan@erols.com>, sandy ionno <sionno@spusa.org>, scott nathanson <Pdd@clark.net>, "Scott Nathanson (E-mail)" <CRB_DC@hotmail.com>, spurgeon keeny <smk@armscontrol.org>, stacey towles <towles@csbahome.com>, steve kosiak <kosiak@csbahome.com>, "Steven Young (E-mail)" <syoung@clw.org>, suzy kerr <skerr@clw.org>, tamar gabelnick <tamarg@fas.org>, todd perry <tperry@ucsusa.org>, tom cardamone <cardamone@clw.org>, tom collina <tcollina@ucsusa.org>, tom graham <tgraham@lawsens.org>, "Virginia Witt (E-mail)" <virginia@businessleaders.org>, wade boese <wade@armscontrol.org>.

X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\abolish.292.doc; C:\My Documents\abolish.294.doc;

In-Reply-To:

References:

Dear Monday Lobby Colleagues:

I would like to share with you the attached responses of presidential candidates to ten questions from religious leaders on nuclear disarmament issues. We released them at a news conference on September 7. This document is available on the web site of the United Methodist General Board of Church and society at www.umc-gbcs.org/whatsnew.htm.

Ralph Nader provided a full set of answers to our questions (copy attached). The Bush campaign staff furnished material for us to extract the answers. The Gore staff provided nothing, so we had to dig into other sources for Gore's views, including the campaign web site. The morning before the news conference I sent the Gore staff the answers I had formulated and offered them an opportunity to make corrections and fill in the blanks. I had no reply. Similarly I sent the Bush staff a list of the unanswered questions and requested answers. I had no reply. We have gone back to the Bush and Gore campaign staffs and asked them to provide answers to fill the gaps.

As follow up, you and your grassroots networks may want to seek the candidates' views on these issues. The main unanswered questions are the following:

What are your views on the morality of possession, threatened use, and actual use of nuclear weapons?

If elected president, what specifically will you do during your four-year term to fulfill the U.S. commitment under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty to join the other nuclear weapon states in "an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals"?

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?

If you do this and get any response, please let me know.

Shalom,
Howard

To: phil
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Invoice from Mintwood
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\00911.11.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Phil,

Please pay the attached invoice for \$1,516.92 from Mintwood Media Collective for services rendered in connection with the news conference. It is a Rockefeller grant expense. When combined with the payment to the National Press Club, we may be slightly over the Rockefeller balance in the General Fund. That's okay. For now, consider the extra amount to be a regular General Fund expenditure.

If you can't download the attachment, let me know, and I'll get it to you in some other fashion.

Howard

To: dringler@umc-gbcs.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Request for travel grant
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\00831.03;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Robin,

I've been invited to participate in a consultation on the churches and nuclear weapons in Brussels on October 5 and 6. The event is being organized by Project Ploughshares in Canada, the Canadian Council of Churches, the Conference of European Churches, the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA, and the World Council of Churches. There will be about 20 participants, mostly drawn from these bodies, but including some others like myself from church-related peace connections. The purpose is to examine and discuss the key nuclear-weapons-related decisions facing NATO states over the next few months and to use that information to equip the churches to take individual and collective action in support of nuclear disarmament.

With low airfares this fall and reasonable accommodations in Brussels, my travel expenses will be somewhat under \$1,000. Unfortunately Methodists United for Peace with Justice lacks funds in its budget for this purpose. I therefore would like to request a grant of \$500 from the peace with justice discretionary fund of the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society.

Attached is the letter of invitation. If you need further information, please let me know.

Shalom,
Howard

To: wdanvers@griffinjohnson.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Candidates response on nuclear disarmament
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\abolish.292.doc; A:\00911.12.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Mr. Danvers:

I am contacting you at the suggestion of Brian Moran on Senator Dorgan's staff because he says you are involved in the Gore election campaign.

In a project initiated by my organization, Methodists United for Peace with Justice, and Pax Christi USA, a national association of Catholics, 48 religious leaders wrote the presidential candidates with a series of questions on nuclear disarmament issues. As the attachment indicates, we received a full set of answers from Ralph Nader. We were able to find some answers for Governor Bush from material his campaign staff provided us. For Vice President Gore we received nothing but were able to construct some answers from the campaign web site and answers received by another organization during the primary campaign. We sent these to Jeremy Bash in Nashville (he had contacted us at the last minute) with a request for additional information, but received nothing by the time we released the responses at a news conference on September 7.

Catholic Bishop Thomas J. Gumbleton and United Methodist Bishop C. Dale White were the presenters at the news conference. As a sample of coverage, I am attaching the news story written by the United Methodist News Service. The survey results are now on the web site of the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society: www.umc-cbcs.org/whatsnew.htm.

We are still interested in Vice President Gore's answers to these important questions. In particular we are seeking answers to the questions about the morality of nuclear weapons (#1), their utility (#8), and nuclear disarmament plans under the NPT commitment (#2). We would also be interested in elaboration of Vice President Gore's views on other issues, such as de-alerting (#5).

We would be pleased to update the web site with additional answers from Vice President Gore. We would also share additional replies with various faith-based networks inasmuch as their grassroots activists are closely following the election campaign and what the candidates are saying about peace and justice issues.

We will appreciate whatever assistance you can provide. If you need further information, please call me at 301 896-0013.

With best regards,
Howard Hallman

To: adam
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Op-ed: go ahead
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Adam,

Bishop Gumbleton signs off on the op-ed piece. The first draft was okay with Bishop White, and because the revision isn't substantively different, I'm certain he will approve. So let it roll.

If you have suggestions for editing my revised draft, please call me. Otherwise get it out.

Howard

To: "C. Dale White" <dwhite11@edgenet.net>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Op-ed Piece
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <39BEEA1C.B1A6A016@edgenet.net>
References:

At 10:44 PM 9/12/00 -0400, you wrote:

>Dear Howard--The op-ed article is fine; no doubt the shorter version is
>more likely to find a publisher. Readers might want to know who White
>and Gumbleton are; a sentence or two following the article might be
>possible. Many thanks for your leadership. Dale.

Dale,

After I sent you the op-ed I added information about our renowned bishops. I'll let you know when and where it is published.

Howard

X-eGroups-Return: sentto-1413460-1325-968763289-mupj=igc.apc.org@returns.onelist.com
To: "Abolition Caucus" <abolition-caucus@egroups.com>
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2919.6600
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6600
From: "Suzy Pearce" <mpi@ippnw.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: Tue, 12 Sep 2000 08:56:17 -0400
Subject: [abolition-caucus] MPI Panel "Nuclear Disarmament: 13 Commitments by 187 Nations" Sept. 7

----- eGroups Sponsor ----->
Free @Backup service! Click here for your free trial of @Backup.
@Backup is the most convenient way to securely protect and access
your files online. Try it now and receive 300 MyPoints.
http://click.egroups.com/1/6348/3/_/91925/_/968763289/
----- _->

Report on MPI Panel, "Nuclear Disarmament: 13 Commitments by 187 Nations"
at the State of the World Forum, New York, September 7, 2000

Further progress on freezing development of long-range ballistic
missiles in North Korea could reduce pressure on the next U.S.
Administration to proceed with a National Missile Defense system, a high
U.S. official told a panel at the State of the World Forum in New York
September 7.

But a New Agenda spokesperson warned of "ominous" developments ahead
with the possible overturning of the framework for nuclear arms reductions
as a result of the militarization of outer space.

The panel, convened by the Middle Powers Initiative, examined the 13
commitments made by all 187 States Parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty
(NPT) at the 2000 Review.

The prospect for the fulfilment of these commitments before the 2005
Review were gloomy.

Gary Samore, Special Assistant to the President and Senior Director for
Non-Proliferation and Export Controls, U.S. National Security Council, said
some progress in START III is possible, but not likely enough to draw the
U.K., France and China into comprehensive negotiations.

He foresaw the CTBT being blocked by India even if the U.S. ratifies
the treaty. A ban on the production of fissile material remains unlikely,
though reductions in U.S. and Russian stocks will continue. The U.S. is
prepared to work with Russia on an international effort to develop nuclear
power without reliance on weapons-grade material.

Regional issues are particularly discouraging, Mr. Samore said. The
Iraq stand-off continues. The danger of nuclear weapons development in Iraq
is propelling Iran in the nuclear field and could lead to a crisis with the

IAEA. Absent a comprehensive Middle East peace agreement, Israel will stand outside the NPT. In South Asia, India is committed to developing its long-range nuclear capabilities, with Pakistan following suit, and there is no chance either India or Pakistan will join the NPT.

North Korea, he added, offers the most optimistic scenario, since it is likely to maintain its current freeze on the production of plutonium. With "hard work and good luck," a curtailment on the development of long-range ballistic missiles "could reduce pressure on the next U.S. Administration for an NMD."

But overall, Mr. Samore concluded, the NPT community is not likely to fulfill all the 13 commitments over the next five years.

Darach MacFhionnbhairr, head of the Government of Ireland's Disarmament and Non-Proliferation Department, said the 13 steps are a "road map" leading to a nuclear weapon-free world and are based on the "unequivocal commitment to accomplish the total elimination of nuclear weapons." This commitment cannot be allowed to be held hostage to progress in other fields of disarmament.

He said the accomplishment of NPT 2000 was a step in the globalization if not the democratization of the diplomacy of international security. The onus is now on the nuclear weapon states and their allies to give concrete expression through negotiation and action to their commitments. The 13 steps, taken together, will lead to a global ban on nuclear weapons.

This approach is different than one definitive negotiation for a single instrument to ban nuclear weapons. NPT 2000 had chosen the 13-step approach as "the best last chance" to get a global ban. "Inaction on our part will allow developments that fast outstrip our capacity to hold together a non-proliferation regime."

Dr. MacFhionnbhairr hailed the many developments leading up to NPT 2000, particularly the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice, the Canberra Commission, and the sustained efforts of NGOs. He cited the Middle Powers Initiative "as a model in this connection."

It was too early to expect results from NPT 2000. "Yet we can have no illusions that there has been any halo effect arising out of the success of NPT 2000."

Opening the panel, Senator Douglas Roche, MPI Chairman, drew attention to new statements that buttressed NPT 2000.

-- The Millennium Declaration of the U.N. General Assembly Summit resolved: "To strive for the elimination of weapons of mass destruction, particularly nuclear weapons and to keep all options open for achieving this aim, including the possibility of convening an international conference to identify ways of eliminating nuclear dangers."

-- The Millennium World Peace Summit of Religious and Spiritual Leaders, meeting the week before the U.N. Summit, declared its commitment and determination: "To join with the United Nations in the call for all

nation states to work for the universal abolition of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction for the safety and security of life on this planet."

-- At the opening of the State of the World Millennium Forum, Prime Minister Helen Clark of New Zealand said: "We do believe that the NPT Review Conference broke new ground. The outcome exceeded expectations, invigorating the NPT at a time when pervasive pessimism about the nuclear disarmament agenda threatened to weaken the Treaty's credibility and play into the hands of the nuclear proliferators."

Senator Roche paid tribute to the New Agenda as the "foremost political instrument" in making the words of the declaration and the NPT 13 steps come alive.

Dr. Randy Rydell, Senior Political Affairs Officer in the Department for Disarmament Affairs at the United Nations, said it was difficult to see that nations were giving a priority to nuclear disarmament, despite the declarations. He drew attention to the NPT 2000 Review's statement that the only absolute guarantee that nuclear weapons will not be used is their total elimination.

Dr. Maj-Britt Theorin, Member of the European Parliament and President of the Council of Parliamentarians for Global Action, advised striving for action on the steps that do not involve the Conference on Disarmament, which is in paralysis. She stressed the principle of irreversibility, further unilateral reductions, the development of a register at the U.N. of nuclear stocks to promote transparency, greater reduction of non-strategic nuclear weapons, de-alerting, and a diminishing role for nuclear weapons in the security policies of States. She expressed some optimism on getting the U.K., France and China into nuclear talks with the U.S. and Russia.

Jonathan Granoff, Chief Executive Officer of the Global Security Institute, moderated the panel.

Suzanne Pearce, Coordinator
Middle Powers Initiative
727 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02139, USA
Tel: 617 492-9189 Fax: 617 868-2560
MPI webpage: www.middlepowers.org

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.

X-Authentication-Warning: oscar.speakeasy.net: majordom set sender to owner-dealertorg@lists.speakeasy.org using -f
X-Originating-IP: [64.20.3.208]
From: "Ira Shorr" <irashorr@hotmail.com>
To: dealertorg@lists.speakeasy.org
Subject: Excellant De-alerting/Disarmament Piece
Date: Wed, 13 Sep 2000 10:21:17 EDT
X-OriginalArrivalTime: 13 Sep 2000 14:21:17.0856 (UTC) FILETIME=[E1944A00:01C01D8D]
Sender: owner-dealertorg@lists.speakeasy.org

Friends,

Here is a great overview of de-alerting and connections to BMD and disarmament, that was just on the Tom Paine Florence Fund web site.

Ira Shorr
Back From the Brink
202-545-1001

#23 MORT WANTS TO KNOW: George W.'s Wise Policy on Nuclear Weapons Keeping Our Forces on Hair-Trigger Alert Is Dangerous and Stupid

Morton Mintz is a former chairman of the Fund for Investigative Journalism. He was a Washington Post reporter for nearly thirty years before departing in 1988.

Editor's Note: Before every presidential and congressional election, journalists should but often fail to ask candidates about a wide range of issues that powerfully affect us all -- our safety, our health, our pocketbooks, our very lives. To help improve press performance this time 'round, TomPaine.com commissioned Mort to ask the questions journalists have been neglecting. Click here to read Mort's earlier articles. This is his latest piece.

Question: There are hair-trigger alerts on the 2,000 or so nuclear warheads atop the intercontinental ballistic missiles targeted by Russia at the United States, on the 2,000 nuclear warheads on the ICBMs targeted by the U.S. at Russia, and on the approximately 1,000 nuclear warheads on the submarine-based missiles targeted by the two nations at each other. The 5,000 warheads have a combined destructive power equivalent to 100,000 times the power of the bomb that leveled Hiroshima.

Would you argue that a National Missile Defense would do more or less to safeguard the people of the U.S. -- and of the world -- from nuclear destruction than would working with the Russians to remove the hair-trigger from these missiles?

Background: Hair-trigger alert means this: The missiles are

armed and fueled at all times. Their targets have been programmed by internal computers. They will launch on receipt of three computer-delivered messages. Launch crews -- on duty every second of every day -- will send the messages on receipt of a single computer-delivered command.

In a few minutes -- "two, at the most, if all would go well," says Bruce G. Blair, who has been acclaimed as the country's foremost authority on nuclear command and control -- Russia or the United States could launch missiles at the predetermined targets: Washington, New York; Moscow, St. Petersburg. The early-warning systems on which the launch crews rely would detect the missiles within minutes, causing the intended -- or accidental -- enemy to scramble to mount retaliatory strikes. "Within a half-hour there could be a nuclear war that would extinguish all of us," Blair declares. "It would be, basically, a nuclear war by check-list, by rote."

Blair described the possibility of a check-list nuclear war in a talk at the Aspen Institute in Colorado in July and in subsequent interviews. De-alerting being of supreme importance to the survival of the planet, it's worth pausing a moment to look at his credentials as an expert on U.S. and Russian security policies.

Blair served in the Air Force as a Minuteman ICBM launch control officer and as a support officer for the Strategic Command. He has a doctorate degree in operations research, was awarded a Russian Language Institute Fellowship at Yale, has studied the Russian military-industrial economy extensively, and taught security studies as a visiting professor at Yale and Princeton. In 1999, he was awarded a MacArthur Fellowship for his leadership in de-alerting. In March, after thirteen years as a Brookings Institution Senior Fellow in the Foreign Policy Studies program, he became president of the Center for Defense Information.

If the possibility of nuclear attack on the United States is to be eliminated, "nothing is more important" than for the U.S. to seek to remove the hair-trigger alert on Russian nuclear missiles -- that is, lengthening the time needed to launch from "minutes to weeks or even months," Blair said. That the Russians would not agree to de-alert their missiles unless we agree to de-alert ours goes without saying, which is "why the United States and Russia must jointly undertake de-alerting." (Russia also has on hair-trigger alert a relatively small number of strategic nuclear missiles targeted at other NATO countries and China.)

But de-alerting has a long way to go to win official favor in Washington. Neither Bill Clinton nor Democratic presidential contender Al Gore has provided leadership in seeking it. Few legislators support de-alerting, either. Among the most prominent backers are three leading Democrats, Senate Minority

Leader Tom Daschle (South Dakota), retiring Senator Bob Kerrey (Nebraska), and former Senator Sam Nunn (Georgia), who was chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

By contrast, Republican presidential nominee George W. Bush gave de-alerting an important boost in a May 23 speech, which was later reflected by strong language in the GOP platform, and which surely merited more press and pundit attention than it got. "[T]he United States should remove as many weapons as possible from high-alert, hair-trigger status -- another unnecessary vestige of Cold War confrontation," the governor declared. He went on to say:

Preparation for quick launch -- within minutes after warning of an attack -- was the rule during the era of superpower rivalry. But today, for two nations at peace, keeping so many weapons on high alert may create unacceptable risks of accidental or unauthorized launch. So, as president, I will ask for an assessment of what we can safely do to lower the alert status of our forces. ...

There is a precedent that proves the power of leadership. In 1991, the United States invited the Soviet Union to join it in removing tactical nuclear weapons from the arsenal. Huge reductions were achieved in a matter of months, making the world much safer, more quickly.

What Bush implied but did not say was remarkable: He was flatly repudiating the long-standing position of his fellow Republicans on Capitol Hill, many of whom were, Blair said, "motivated by hatred of Bill Clinton." Despite Senator Kerrey's best efforts, Republican majorities have by law, for four years, prohibited the president -- the Commander-in-Chief -- from undertaking any effort to de-alert our missiles. "Bush flew in the face of this law," Blair said.

The vehicle for the prohibition was the Defense Authorization Act. Initially in 1996 and annually since then, congressional GOP majorities wrote the prohibition into the act. They did this even though, Blair said, "it is probably unconstitutional, because it interferes with the right of a Commander-in-Chief to make decisions regarding the readiness of the armed forces."

"The general public is oblivious to this issue of truly transcendent importance, not completely, but mostly," Blair said. This is clearly the product of the meager attention paid to the issue by politicians and the press. Indeed the president, in announcing an agreement with Prime Minister Boris Yeltsin in 1994, asserted that Russia's missiles were no longer aimed at the United States, and ours no longer aimed at Russia. The president "completely misrepresented reality," Blair said.

The vice president, Blair continued, "has had many opportunities over many years to say something positive about de-alerting, but never did; and he criticized Bush for suggesting that the United States should reduce and de-alert U.S. nuclear forces, even unilaterally, on the grounds that it

would weaken our security. Gore sounded like a reactionary Republican usually sounds on this kind of thing."

FALSE ALARMS

In an environment like this it's not surprising that four false alarms which put the planet on the razor's edge of catastrophe -- two in Russia, in 1983 and 1995, and two in the United States, both during the Cold War -- have pretty much vanished like pixels from the public screen.

Although the false alarms had twice put the United States and Russia each within minutes of a launch, the equality in numbers does not remotely warrant an assumption that a launch based on misinterpreted or misunderstood information is higher in the U.S. than in Russia. The reverse is true: the danger in Russia is higher by several magnitudes than it is here.

The primary reason is that the Russian military is "a complete disaster," Blair said. Eighty percent of the strategic rocket forces live below the poverty line, as compared with 50 percent of the population as a whole. Their ground radar and related early-warning facilities are "wearing out and increasingly susceptible to false alarms." Finally, their training to use those facilities is substandard, at a level the U.S. military would not tolerate.

It was only weeks after Blair pointed out these grim deficiencies that the Russian nuclear submarine Kursk sank, in a tragedy that validated his concerns. These were deepened by the Russian defense minister himself. In a nationally televised interview on August 21, the New York Times reported from Moscow, Marshal Igor D. Sergeev, told his countrymen that "the armed forces of the once-powerful Soviet empire had been 'robbed and stripped' in the last decade and were operating on half the budget required."

The 1995 false alarm in Russia originated in a rocket that the U.S. National Aeronautics and Space Administration had provided for a U.S. science experiment, which was directed by a Cornell professor, and which Norway launched under contract. Seeking information on the geomagnetic character of the Northern Lights, the scientists launched the rocket toward the North Pole from the island of Andoya in the Norwegian Sea.

The rocket had been cobbled together from various U.S. military missiles. As a result, it exhibited the same characteristics -- for example, the number of missile stages and trajectory -- as do missiles of the kind carried by U.S. Trident nuclear submarines. The Russian military were unaware of this when their radar detected the rocket moments after it was launched from Andoya.

Russian officers probably notified Yeltsin that an attack might be underway, possibly from a Trident submarine. High-level commanders and others in the nuclear chain of command, probably including launch crews, began their extremely short count-down for a counter-strike.

The 1983 Russian false alarm was also "pretty serious," Blair said.

HAIR-TRIGGERS: HOW THEY WORK

The principal Russian early-warning facilities are near Moscow; ours are in the Cheyenne Mountains near Colorado Springs. The United States has fifty-five two-person launch crews -- some including women -- on constant alert. They control 550 missiles tipped with 2,000 nuclear warheads. The launch facilities are in six states. All of the missiles are aimed at Russia, just as Russian missiles with 2,000 nuclear warheads are aimed at the U.S. (Some additional U.S. nuclear missiles that are not on hair-trigger alert are aimed at other countries, including China.)

Russian and U.S. launch procedures are essentially similar. Blair described those that would be set in motion were the U.S. early-warning system to detect what would be feared or believed to be an incoming Russian missile:

The crew on duty would execute its standing orders to determine, within three minutes, whether the attack was real or phantom. Then it would notify the Pentagon "war room," where a general is in command at all times (several back-up war rooms are scattered around the country).

The general would alert the president immediately, whereupon an emergency telecommunications conference involving him and his top advisors would be convened. During this missile-attack conference, as it is called, the Strategic Command officer in charge in Omaha, Nebraska, would brief the president on his nuclear response options and their consequences. The officer is allowed thirty seconds to do this.

A president's order to launch would be relayed by the war room to duty launch crews. Each crew would follow this simple sequence, which would take, Blair said, "two minutes at the most":

The crew would send a short message simultaneously to all of the missiles it controls. On receipt of the message, probably consisting of two digits, such as "23," each missile would know where to fly. "It's like sending an e-mail," Blair said. "It literally takes a few seconds." (The fact that the missiles know their targets exposes the falsity of President Clinton's public interpretation of his 1994 agreement with Yeltsin.)

The crew would dial the eight numbers that tell the missile to unlock its safeguards against an unauthorized launch signal,

thus freeing it to receive the authorized signal.

The two crew members would each take a key, normally kept in a safe, and turn it simultaneously in a special lock. This would be the "launch vote" -- the authorized signal.

As is chillingly apparent, the process from start to finish would take about as much time as preparing a continental breakfast: three minutes for the determination whether the incoming missile is real, a few more minutes for presidential briefing and decision-making, then the instant transmission of the launch order, and, finally, a couple of minutes for the launch crews to carry out the order.

When Boris Yeltsin was told of the rocket supposedly heading toward his homeland, his military began a countdown for a retaliatory strike against the United States. The Russian protocol from time of initial detection to time of presidential decision is ten minutes, eight of which were used. The U.S. time-line is similar. Both sides, however, would adjust their time-lines as needed to ensure that they would be able to send the launch order once it's determined just when enemy missiles are expected to hit.

Within the deadline to launch before incoming missiles would destroy U.S. missiles, a president of the United States could take a maximum of twelve minutes. Under some scenarios, an attack from Russian submarines close to the United States, for example -- currently this is not a threat -- the time for decision could be effectively zero.

It was only because the Russian leaders waited for what was, in this context, an eternity that they were able to see that the trajectory of the suspect rocket was not taking it to Russia.

What set off the two U.S. alarms were, Blair said, "false indications of a massive Soviet attack." The alarms occurred despite great precautions. Our early-warning and launch facilities are state-of-the-art and meticulously maintained. Our crews are scrupulously screened to assure their expertise, fitness and professionalism. They are extremely well-trained. Their sole mission is to evaluate any and every indication of a possible nuclear attack.

In 1979 and again in 1980, the duty crew in Cheyenne Mountain -- the same crew -- saw what it feared were indications of an incoming nuclear missile, but followed the protocol of contacting the U.S. early-warning ground facilities. Two years in a row, the sensors had detected nothing to confirm the indications.

As would happen a few years later in Russia, the duty crew exceeded the allowed time to determine whether the alarm was true or false. What made the alarms false, Blair said, was "human error" in interpreting indications of an attack, which

in one case were themselves generated by human error, and in the other by a faulty computer chip. The Air Force fired the crew.

It may be scant comfort, but Trident submarine launch procedures take a long time, relatively speaking: about twelve minutes, or some ten minutes longer than land-based launches. Four Tridents -- two in the Atlantic, two in the Pacific -- are always on full alert. Each is assigned 200 nuclear warheads although actually carrying 150, Blair said. Unlike ground-based missile launch facilities, which each side targets, the submarines are invulnerable.

ALL TOO HUMAN

For many decades, most Americans assumed that "someone" was taking care to assure the safety of their medicines; they learned, in 1962, that the Food and Drug Administration had come extremely close to approving the marketing of thalidomide, a sedative/tranquilizer that turned out in other countries to have caused the birth of thousands of armless, legless, and limbless babies. The FDA had many months to deliberate over whether to release thalidomide.

Americans are inclined to make a similar but infinitely more optimistic assumption about control of nuclear weapons in an emergency: there's a careful, deliberative process in place to protect us. The reality is something else. On receiving a report of a Russian nuclear attack, perhaps in the middle of the night, our Commander-in-Chief must decide whether the report is true or false and whether to order a retaliatory strike that would shatter life on earth, and he must do so in mere minutes.

"Even if such reports turn out in the end to be false alarms, they powerfully bias the president to launch our missiles before missiles possibly aimed at us hit," Blair said. "It's easy to see our leaders being swept away in all of this. So the optimism is misplaced."

Enormous benefit to the United States -- indeed, to the entire planet -- would flow from an American pledge to undertake serious negotiations with the Russians to achieve a comprehensive de-alerting program. Blair described the benefits this way:

"By precluding an unauthorized launch or a mistaken launch even on strong warning of an incoming missile, the United States and Russia would buy a huge margin of safety for themselves."

"By creating an international norm of operational safety for nuclear weapons, the United States and Russia would be saying to the world that no country should have or strive to have nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert. The norm would most urgently affect India and Pakistan, where the great issue is no

longer nuclear proliferation, but the desire in both countries to follow in the footsteps of U.S. hair-trigger-alert procedures."

"The United States and Russia would strengthen and validate their appeal to other nations to sign the nuclear non-proliferation treaty."

"Extensive de-alerting would be a major step toward the abolition of nuclear weapons everywhere, for these reasons: De-alerted missiles would be put in storage. Military planners would write them off, making it a lot easier to get rid of them altogether. That's because of the time needed to remove the missiles from storage and put them on hair-trigger alert: days or weeks for a few, but about three years to reconstitute the warheads for the entire arsenal.

"By comparison, it would take perhaps as little as six months to begin producing nuclear bombs in quantity (probably to be delivered by aircraft if all missiles had been eliminated). I myself could devise deep de-alerting measures that would take as long to reverse as it would take to manufacture nuclear weapons if we were to abolish them completely."

[#14 in this series, posted in February, pointed out that the United States spends tens of billions of dollars annually to maintain a nuclear arsenal sufficient to destroy every major city in the world ten times over; to destroy those cities only four times over would save \$15 billion a year. In fact, Blair said, the 5,000 strategic nuclear weapons that the United States and Russia target at each other and that are on hair-trigger alert constitute less than half of the two nations' inventories of these weapons.

[George W. Bush addressed the size of our nuclear arsenal in his May 23 speech: "The premises of Cold War nuclear targeting should no longer dictate the size of our arsenal. ... I will pursue the lowest number consistent with our national security. It should be possible to reduce the number of American nuclear weapons significantly further than what has been agreed to under Start II ... We should not keep weapons that our military planners do not need. These unneeded weapons ... do nothing to make us more secure." The GOP platform was specific: "We can safely eliminate thousands more of these horrific weapons."]

NMD AND HAIR-TRIGGERS

Criticisms of National Missile Defense (NMD) having been widely reported, I need but summarize them here in order to be able to turn quickly to two additional points that are of extreme importance but that are not widely perceived:

The basic rationale for NMD -- that it was needed to intercept and down nuclear missiles not from China or Russia, but from North Korea -- has all but evaporated, as has the bitter enmity between North Korea and South Korea (see #20 in this series).

It's simply implausible that a North Korea which has become friendly with South Korea (at last) is a nuclear threat to the United States.

When South Korean President Kim Dae Jung "returned from his three-day televised love fest in the North Korean capital of Pyongyang, he was able to announce that, for the first time since World War II, there was no longer any danger of a war between the two Koreas," Bill Mesler wrote in the September Progressive. "[T]he rapprochement has been so rapid that recent polls show the South Korean public now holding a 90 percent favorable rating of North Korea."

Numerous qualified civilian and military experts say that NMD can't work, or doubt that it can be made to work, or predict that by the time it could be made to work possible enemies would have developed decoys and other effective defenses. Indeed, fifty American winners of the Nobel Prize wrote to President Clinton to warn that "any movement toward [NMD] deployment would be premature, wasteful and dangerous."

Professor Theodore Postol of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, who was a missile advisor in the Reagan administration, suggested skullduggery in NMD tests. The Department of Defense, he alleged, concealed certain results that questioned the system's feasibility by stamping them "classified." Assigning a security classification to a document to hide fraud and wrongdoing violates the law. Led by Representative Dennis Kucinich, an Ohio Democrat, fifty-three members of Congress have formally requested the FBI to investigate what they labeled "well-documented and serious allegations of fraud."

There have been only three hits of missiles in eighteen NMD test firings since 1983. On July 7 -- after Postol had alleged skullduggery -- the current system failed the second of three tests.

China and Russia have from the start viewed NMD as destabilizing of relations among the major powers, and many critics -- including Americans -- have seen NMD as a violation of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty to which the U.S. and the Soviet Union were the original signatories.

On July 18, China and Russia joined in condemning NMD as a U.S. attempt to dominate the world and in pledging to act together in defiance of American power. Three weeks later, leading news organizations carried profoundly disturbing stories on a highly classified intelligence report on the impacts of a U.S. decision to proceed with NMD. The report "warns," Steven Lee Myers wrote in the New York Times, "that deploying an American national missile defense could prompt China to expand its nuclear arsenal tenfold and lead Russia to place multiple warheads on ballistic missiles that now carry only one." In

other words, NMD threatens a new arms race.

NMD would cost (or waste) an estimated \$60 billion, much of it corporate welfare for military contractors. Sixty billion dollars could go very far to provide health care and shelter for millions who don't have it, rebuild schools, and meet a host of other pressing needs (as was documented by #22 in this series).

Influenced by the foregoing concerns, President Clinton announced on September 1 that he had decided not to deploy a limited NMD. Although Gore defended the decision, the Washington Post reported, he had "remained largely noncommittal on the subject"; although Bush attacked the decision, his dilemma was "[h]ow to criticize Clinton for failing to push ahead with a system that Republicans have denounced as insufficient."

Now to the two additional objections to NMD. The first is this: even if eventually successful, NMD would be impotent against non-missile means of attack. "A nuclear bomb that could easily wipe out Manhattan and kill 100,000 people is a ball of plutonium weighing about fifteen pounds," Blair pointed out. "It is a little bigger than a softball. One such bomb could be carried into the United States in a suitcase, and if one could, many could."

The second objection is directly related to the main thrust of this article. NMD and the endless discussions and disputes it has incited have inadvertently obscured if not buried the more urgent issue of de-alerting those 5,000 missiles with a destructive power 100,000 times that of the atomic bomb that leveled Hiroshima.

LOOKING FOR A FEW GOOD MEN OR WOMEN

I would close by rephrasing the ending of #21: If it isn't asking too much of the generals, colonels and majors who mobilized 15,000 journalists for the Republican and Democratic national conventions, and if volunteers do not step forward, perhaps they would muster a few good reporters to ask a question like this of our presidential, vice-presidential and House and Senate candidates:

Would a National Missile Defense do more or less to safeguard the American people and the planet from nuclear destruction than would working with the Russians to remove the hair-trigger alert on our combined total of 5,000 nuclear warheads?

Copyright 1999-2000 The Florence Fund

Get Your Private, Free E-mail from MSN Hotmail at <http://www.hotmail.com>.

Share information about yourself, create your own public profile at

<http://profiles.msn.com>.

X-Sender: flick@pop.igc.org
Date: Wed, 13 Sep 2000 14:19:49 -0400
To: updates@reachingcriticalwill.org
From: Felicity Hill <flick@igc.org>
Subject: NAC Press Conference & Communique
Cc: wilpf-news@igc.topica.com

APOLOGIES FOR CROSS POSTINGS

PLEASE CIRCULATE WIDELY

Reaching Critical Will Advisors and Friends,

Our First Committee work has begun.

The New Agenda Coalition met at Ministerial level today in New York and held a short press conference at 1 pm.

Anna Lindh, the Swedish Foreign Minister speaking on behalf of the group of Foreign Ministers from Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, New Zealand, Mexico, South Africa and Sweden said:

- the group had discussed both short-term and long-term initiatives, the short term being a resolution in the First Committee of the General Assembly, and the long-term being actions towards the next NPT Review Conference.
- the NPT was a success which was very much based on the New Agenda Coalition. This cooperation and success leads us to look forward to continue to work together in the future.
- from the 2000 NPT Review Conference there was a real recognition that nuclear weapons cannot be allowed to exist and this is an important step forward. But the fight is not won, there are obstacles and problems, and it is therefore important to now work for the implementation of the NPT commitments.
- the New Agenda Coalition states will therefore jointly and bi-laterally demarche ** on the capitals of the nuclear weapon states asking for the implementation of the 2000 NPT Review Conference commitments.

In essence, the New Agenda Coalition are strongly united and will continue to work together. The most immediate task is the First Committee resolution, and future initiatives towards the 2005 NPT Review Conference which, according to one Ambassador, includes the International Conference on Nuclear Dangers which was agreed to, in principle, by over 150 heads of state at the Millennium Summit.

Below you will find the communique issued from this Ministerial

Meeting. It is a useful tool to begin the lobbying work in support of the NAC resolution at this years General Assembly.

Please send this communique to your local press, or better still, political representative or foreign ministry. Add a covering letter asking how your government intends to vote for the New Agenda Coalition resolution, and how it intends to facilitate the implementation of the commitments made at the NPT Review Conference.

Last year the NAC resolution passed 111 to 13 against with 39 abstentions. If you are in any of these countries that voted against or abstained, your activity is particularly needed:

Against: Bulgaria, Estonia, France, Hungary, India, Israel, Monaco, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Russian Federation, United Kingdom, United States.

Abstain: Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, China, Czech Republic, Denmark, Federated States of Micronesia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mauritius, Myanmar, Netherlands, Norway, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, Uzbekistan.

Meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the New Agenda Coalition Countries
(Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, New Zealand, Mexico, South Africa, Sweden)

New York, 13 September, 2000

Communique

Meeting to review progress on their joint initiative Towards a Nuclear Weapon Free World: The Need For A New Agenda, the Ministers noted that their initiative had advanced the agenda for the total elimination of nuclear weapons. They stressed that this goal remains a matter of real urgency and must be delivered through an accelerated process of negotiations on all fronts.

The Ministers warmly welcomed the positive and substantial outcome of the 2000 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Review Conference. The unequivocal political undertaking given by the five nuclear weapon States "to accomplish the total elimination of nuclear arsenals" demonstrates a new determination to achieve a world free of nuclear weapons. Recognition that nuclear weapons cannot be allowed to exist indefinitely was a singular step forward.

This has been achieved against a background of limited progress in negotiations in the field of non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament, and a failure to grasp the opportunities of the post-cold war security environment. The programme of action agreed

at the 2000 NPT Review Conference must now be implemented fully and progress reported regularly through the review mechanism of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT)

The Ministers expressed concern at on-going challenges to the non-proliferation regime. They urged the international community to redouble its efforts to achieve universal adherence to NPT. They repeated their call on those three States, (India, Pakistan, Israel) which are not parties to the NPT and which operate unsafeguarded nuclear facilities, to accede to the Treaty as non-nuclear weapon States and to place their nuclear facilities under comprehensive IAEA safeguards.

They stressed the importance of full compliance with the provisions of the NPT.

The Ministers called for the early commencement of negotiations on nuclear arms reductions between the United States and the Russian Federation in light of the NPT outcome. They looked forward to early action by the five nuclear weapon States on the series of undertakings made by them at the NPT Review Conference. All States must contribute to the achievement of the objectives agreed at the Review Conference.

They called on the parties to the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty (ABM) to preserve its integrity and validity. They reiterated their call on them to refrain from the implementation of any measure that would undermine the Treaty's purpose. They encouraged them in this way to contribute to the creation of more favourable conditions for further negotiations on limiting strategic arms to which they have committed themselves at the NPT Review Conference.

In this context, they called on all States to refrain from decisions that could impact negatively on nuclear disarmament, lead to a new arms race or be inconsistent with the commitment to the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

The Ministers regretted that the agreement at the NPT Review Conference for the immediate establishment of a body to deal with nuclear disarmament in the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva has not yet been acted upon.

The Ministers underlined the importance of the NPT Review Conference agreement for the entry into force of the CTBT and the negotiation of a ban on the production of fissile material. They also welcomed the agreement to begin consideration of the broader verification regime that will be required in a world without nuclear weapons.

The Ministers concluded that international peace and stability can best be maintained and enhanced with the involvement of the international community as a whole. Multilateral engagement and further progress on disarmament is crucial to this. The Ministers would continue to pursue the New Agenda initiative with determination.

They announced that they will table a draft resolution at the First Committee of the 55th session of the United Nations General Assembly session.

ends

Felicity Hill,
Director, United Nations Office
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom
777 UN Plaza, New York, NY 10017, USA

Ph: 1 212 682 1265
Fax: 1 212 286 8211
email: flick@igc.apc.org
web: www.wilpf.int.ch www.reachingcriticalwill.org

From: "JamesHipkins" <JamesHipkins@emailmsn.com>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Where are you?
Date: Wed, 13 Sep 2000 11:13:17 -0400
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2615.200
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2615.200

We are now back on line, Our new email address is jameshipkn@sssnet.com I hope to revive the MSN but this is all I have been able to negotiate at this point. This move move has been a bear. We are in , but the midstof some chaos. Eventually we will be settled.

----- 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.
>

From: "Jason Lee United Methodist Church" To: "Jane Hill \ (E-mail\)" , "Annis R. Henson" , "David Helms-Pey" , "Holly Hedeem" , "Annie Heart" , "Marcia Hauer" , "Mark Harrison" , "Sidney Harris" , "Rev. Scott Harkness" , "Jan Harkness" , "LiAnne Hargie" , "William & Brenda Hardt" , "Ken Hammer" , "Judy Halverson" , "Howard Hallman" , "Bee Hall" , "Patricia Hale" , "Jean Haldorson" , "Vernon A. Groves" , "Carol Green" , "greathouse" , "Mary Gosney" , "Marilyn Gorski" , "Margaret Golden" , "Jerry Gilmore" , "Nadine Gilmore \ (E-mail\)" , "Joyce Georgieff" , "Bill Gates" , "Bill Gardner" Subject: Advent Booklet Order Form Date: Thu, 14 Sep 2000 12:02:20 -0700 X-MSMail-Priority: Normal X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2919.6600 X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6600

ORDER YOUR 2000 ADVENT BOOKLETS Early!

OREGON-IDAHO UNITED METHODIST CONFERENCE

PEACE WITH JUSTICE

2000 ADVENT BOOKLET

"Remember the Poor"

Luke 10:33-37:

A Samaritan while traveling came near a wounded one; and when he saw him, he was moved with pity. He went to him and bandaged his wounds, having poured oil and wine on them. Then he put him on his own animal, brought him to an inn, and took care of him.. The next day he took out two denarii, gave them to the innkeeper, and said, 'Take care of him; and when I come back, I will repay you whatever more you spend.' Which of these three, do you think, was a neighbor to the man who fell into the hands of the robbers?" He said, "The one who showed him mercy." Jesus said to him, "Go and do likewise."

The annual Peace with Justice Advent Booklet serves a tool to provide daily devotions and/or encourage group discussion during the season of Advent. The focus this year is Children & Poverty. Laity and clergy serving on the Bishop's Task Force on Children & Poverty and others from our annual conference will share their personal stories and reflections.

As you begin the booklet and reflect on the parable of the Good Samaritan it is our hope that you will also reflect on the good news of peace that the Christmas Gospel brings and remember to ask the question: "Who is my neighbor?"

Proceeds from the Advent Booklet will provide scholarships to the 11th annual Parenting for Peace and Justice Family Camp that our conference co-sponsors.

ORDER FORM

Order your 2000 Peace with Justice Advent Booklet no later than November 1...Payment must

accompany all orders.

Make checks payable to: CONFERENCE TREASURER

Send to: ADVENT BOOKLET PRICE:

United Methodist Conference Center \$1.50 each

1505 SW 18th Ave. Total Number Ordered _____

Portland, Or 97201 \$ _____ Amount Enclosed

Name: _____

Church: _____

Address: _____

From: Kathy Guthrie <kathy@fcnl.org>
To: 'Howard' <mupj@igc.org>
Cc: 'Ira Schorr' <IRARR84@aol.com>
Subject: meeting next week
Date: Thu, 14 Sep 2000 14:22:10 -0400
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator: <E9BA445D76C0D21182F30090273DFAF64CF794@local.fcnl.org>
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

Howard,
For the meeting next week, will you please allow some time on the agenda for
Ira and Esther to talk about the BFB campaign?
Thanks.
Kathy

Kathy Guthrie
Field Program Secretary
Friends Committee on National Legislation
245 Second Street NE
Washington, DC 20002
202-547-6000 (phone)
202-547-6019 (fax)
www.fcnl.org

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\meeting next week"

From: David Culp <david@fcnl.org>
To: David Culp <david@fcnl.org>
Subject: Berrigan and Ciarrocca, "Paving the Way for New Nuclear Testing."
<<http://www.nyu.edu/globalbeat/syndicate/Berrigan090600.html>>
Date: Thu, 14 Sep 2000 15:23:40 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

<<http://www.nyu.edu/globalbeat/gifs/synlogo.gif>>

© 2000 New York University. All Rights Reserved.

Paving the Way for New Nuclear Testing

By Frida Berrigan and Michelle Ciarrocca *

September 6, 2000

NEW YORK -- Although presidential candidates Al Gore and George W. Bush have both expressed their continued support for the global moratorium on nuclear-test explosions through their respected party platforms, a provision included in the new defense authorization bill currently being considered by Congress could actually lead to new weapons tests.

The measure, sponsored by Senators John Warner (R-Va) and Wayne Allard (R-Co), calls for the secretaries of Defense and Energy to undertake a study on how to destroy hardened and deeply buried targets, such as Saddam Hussein's command bunker or a "state of concern's" buried weapons. But what the senators' proposal really does is lay the groundwork for a resumption of nuclear testing for the purpose of developing new, low-yield nuclear warheads, or "mini-nukes."

Of course, the United States already has such a tactical nuclear weapon -- the B-61 -- which, according to a former Pentagon official, is capable of burrowing about 100 meters into solid rock. But what's needed now, according to this same official, is a bomb that can "threaten a bunker tunneled under 300 meters of granite without killing the surrounding population."

But is the provision a response to a new threat or a symptom of an old sense

of self-preservation on the part of the nation's nuclear-weapons developers? It should come as no surprise that the most ardent supports of funding for research and development of these new nuclear weapons are the employees at two of the nation's leading nuclear weapons laboratories.

According to Paul Robinson, head of Sandia National Laboratories, "The United States will eventually need a new, low-yield nuclear weapon" because, in essence, the very size of current, silo-busting thermonuclear warheads deters the U.S. from using them. A new report by Stephen Younger at Los Alamos Laboratories voices the same concern, noting that "the principal role of nuclear weapons is to deter adversaries from an attack on the U.S.," but "such a reliance on high-yield strategic weapons could lead to 'self deterrence.'"

The essential argument coming from the labs is: Let's build a nuclear weapon we can actually use. As Greg Mello, head of the Los Alamos Study Group in Santa Fe, noted, the nuclear laboratories are suffering from an "ongoing crisis of legitimacy."

But building new nuclear weapons requires nuclear testing, a move that will surely collapse the current global moratorium. The measure proposed by Senators Warner and Allard marks the continuation of a policy that has moved the nation away from eliminating nuclear weapons and stands in stark contrast to the United States' reaffirmed commitment under the auspices of the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty "to pursue negotiations in good faith" towards a nuclear-free world.

The nation seems unable or unwilling to wean itself from its dangerous and expensive nuclear arsenal. With an annual price tag of \$35 billion, the U.S. possesses a massive nuclear force consisting of more than 10,000 nuclear warheads, 7,200 of which are still operational. While shaming India and Pakistan for developing their own nuclear arsenals, the U.S. shows no sign of being willing to eliminate its own.

From their failure to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty to their reluctance to pursue arms-reduction talks with Russia to the current push for a National Missile Defense system, U.S. officials continue to regard nuclear weapons as the key element in insuring U.S. security.

The whole idea of maintaining a large nuclear stockpile was premised on the Cold War era theory of deterrence and Mutually Assured Destruction. The idea that the U.S. could develop a "safe" nuclear weapon goes against that logic. As Retired Navy Rear Admiral Eugene Carroll, of the Center for Defense Information, points out, "This is the ultimate antithesis of deterrence . . ."

As Congress returns this week, members of the House Armed Services Committee will consider the Warner-Allard amendment which has already been approved by the Senate. Hopefully, House members will realize that what the U.S. needs now is not the testing and building of new nuclear weapons for new missions, but stronger commitments to nuclear nonproliferation and disarmament to truly enhance our national security.

Frida Berrigan and Michelle Ciarrocca are Senior Research Associates at the

World Policy Institute <<http://www.worldpolicy.org/>> , New School University
in New York.

© 2000 New York University. All Rights Reserved. The Global Beat Syndicate,
a service of New York University's Center for War, Peace, and the News
Media, provides editors with commentary and perspective articles on critical
global issues from contributors around the world. For more information,
check out <http://www.nyu.edu/globalbeat/syndicate/>
<<http://www.nyu.edu/globalbeat/syndicate/>> .

<<http://www.nyu.edu/globalbeat/syndicate/>> Home | About
<<http://www.nyu.edu/globalbeat/syndicate/aboutGBS.html>>
<<http://www.nyu.edu/globalbeat/syndicate/GBSContact.html>> | Archives |
<<http://www.nyu.edu/globalbeat/syndicate/archives.html>> Advisors |
<<http://www.nyu.edu/globalbeat/syndicate/GBSBoard.html>>
<<http://www.nyu.edu/globalbeat/syndicate/GBSStaff.html>> Staff

**WORKING GROUP ON SOCIAL EQUITY ISSUE DEFINITION
AUGUST 4, 2000 MEETING SUMMARY**

Participants: Valerie Lemmie (Chair, Working Group on Social Equity Issue Definition); Phillip Rutledge (Chair, Standing Panel on Social Equity Steering Committee); Gail Christopher (Chair, Working Group on Resources Development and Inter-Panel Relations); Walter Broadnax (Working Group on Panel Forums/Meetings); Mitchell Rice (Working Group on International Social Equity Opportunities); George Frederickson; James Carroll; Royce Hanson; David Mora; Howard Hallman; Harvey White; Norman Johnson; Joseph Wholey (via phone); Charles Washington (via phone); James Murley (via phone)

BACKGROUND

The Standing Panel on Social Equity established four working groups to help it define the purpose of the Panel and prepare a workplan for the upcoming year. This meeting was the first held by any of the working groups. The task for the Working Group on Social Equity Issue Definition is to draft an issue paper that identifies issues of social equity in governance for further exploration by the Panel. The Standing Panel hopes that the paper will be the focus of a summit on social equity in Spring 2001. The working group's goal is to have a first draft of the paper by mid-September 2000. It will be circulated for review and comment to the working group and the Standing Panel's Steering Committee. At the Academy's Fall meeting, the working group will present the paper to the first full meeting of the Standing Panel (November 16, 2000). The Standing Panel hopes to present the paper to the entire Academy at the Fall meeting and perhaps have a featured speaker or panel to introduce the work done thus far.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Several working group members had submitted written thoughts on the subject of social equity. The Chair summarized those and then asked meeting participants for their thoughts on how best to proceed with their task and what role they could play. The major topics discussed are summarized below.

Defining the Problem

The problem of social equity in this country has evolved over the past four decades. The number of minorities and their level of sophistication have increased significantly since the 1960s. In such a multi-racial, multi-cultural society, social equity has evolved to something quite different than what it was several decades ago. Participants agreed that the paper would need to clearly define the problem of social equity in today's terms. They also agreed, however, that the paper needs to present some historical context of the role of governance in social equity. The group believes that historical data can be used as a backdrop for the paper, but cautions against describing an historical perspective that is open to debate. Because of the complexity of the topic, the paper will need to be somewhat philosophical. Participants identified resources on the Internet, such as the *Kerner Commission Report* and John Hope Franklin's *President's Commission on Race*, that could help frame this discussion. They also agreed that the definition of social equity should be grounded in the nation's founding documents, such as the *Constitution* and the *Declaration of Independence*.

The group discussed the need for indicators of social equity and agreed that they should be part of its definition. The Academy should use existing data to point out inequities in society. Indicators could include income, wealth, due process health, etc.

The participant's comments about social equity fell into three distinct categories.

1. social equity within the public service
2. social equity as a product of public service
3. social equity as it relates to the profile of the Academy

NAPA and Social Equity

Participants discussed several areas within the Academy internal operations that it could focus on with respect to social equity, including the Academy's ability to identify minorities for nomination to the Academy and factors that make the Academy attractive to minorities. One participant noted that the process the Academy uses to transform itself could be a case study. The working group also focused on questions external to the internal operations of the Academy, including:

What is the Academy's niche – where can the Academy add value to the discussion of social equity?

Is the Academy willing to provide leadership in this area?

How does the Academy couch this initiative in terms of its mission in order to elevate this issue?

The group identified three possible areas where the Academy can lend expertise:

1. The Academy can accept the responsibility of the professions to ensure there is social equity within the Academy and how it carries out its responsibilities.

2. In its advisory role to Congress, the executive branch, and state and local governments, the Academy can look at government organizations' performance with respect to social equity on a more systematic basis. The Academy's established efforts in its Performance Consortium and growing emphasis in e-governance provide a platform for focusing on social equity in the public sector.
3. The Academy can develop tools and indicators to test the progress of government organizations in the area of social equity.

The working group agreed that the issue paper should not address the internal management of the Academy. One participant suggested that the paper be a positive factor that describes where the Academy goes in the future with respect to social equity.

Issues to Consider and Approaches

There are a number of issues that the working group will need to consider as it develops its paper. Because of the lack of leadership within the public sector, the group believes it is timely to look at what other government agencies are doing in the area of social equity. The Academy can contribute to the knowledge base by focusing outward on events that are currently taking place. The Academy can use the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) and the Academy's Performance Consortium to expand how government agencies look at their activities in this area. On Tuesday and Thursday of the last week of September and the first week of October, the Academy's Performance Consortium is meeting to discuss important GPRA issues. These meetings may provide an opportunity to ensure that social equity is part of those discussions.

The group discussed the relationship between efficiency, inefficiency, and social equity. One issue that the paper will need to address is how social inequity leads to inefficiency. There also is the opposing situation where, in the interest of social equity, the American public accepts inefficiency in many service delivery programs, such as firefighting, and medical emergency response. The group recognized that some laws, if carried out efficiently, would be very inequitable. In addition, sometimes short-term inefficiencies may be needed to obtain long-term social equity and, therefore, efficiency. This inherent conflict might be a potential forum discussion topic at a future Academy meeting.

There also are issues related to the delivery of equitable services. The equitable distribution of services often means that services go to everyone, including those who are not necessarily in need. This then dilutes the quality and/or quantity of services available to those truly in need. As part of its examination into social equity, participants believe the Academy will need to address the delivery mechanisms for services.

Participants also discussed the conflict between the pace of today's society and efforts to address issues of social equity. Addressing social equity issues will be a lengthy process, because to do so requires time to listen to people's concerns. However, in today's digital society, people expect things to happen at the touch of a button. This dichotomy will present a challenge to the Academy as it attempts to address issues of social equity.

Attachment A is a summary list of ideas that the working group hopes to include in the issue paper.

Approaches and Products

The participants agreed that the products from the Standing Panel need to have an external focus. Two such products could be a self-assessment tool that federal, state, and local agencies use to determine how they are promoting social equity; and report cards on social equity. Whatever the Academy does must be relevant to the prospective audience(s). It is important that the first project establishes the legitimacy of the Academy in the arena of social equity. The issue paper should be bold and forthright. It should state that there are social equity issues in this country, provide examples, and declare the Academy's role to deal with them. Participants also recognized that the subject of social equity could create a backlash. They emphasized that presentations must be developed thoughtfully and carefully, and only works that make significant contributions to the dialogue on social equity should be published.

Participants suggested several projects that the Academy could explore to establish its place in the social equity arena, including:

- the effect of state school system organization, funding, and management systems on access to high quality educational opportunities
- management barriers/improving management systems to provide equitable assistance in dealing with the AIDS epidemic in Africa and Asia
- closing the digital divide
- reconciling efficiency, equity, and effectiveness in managing a national health care system
- social equity in the criminal justice and administration systems

NEXT STEPS

George Frederickson was named Vice Chair of the working group. He will lead the effort to develop the group's issue paper on social equity. Mitchell Rice offered to develop a bibliography of documents to be used as potential resources. Joseph Wholey will work with Mr. Frederickson to develop indicators of social equity. Other work group members will draft two additional papers on the relationship of social equity to sustainable development. Costis Toregas will draft a paper on social equity and the digital divide. Harvey White will draft a paper on environmental justice and social equity.

Ideas for the Working Paper

One or two paragraphs to describe social equity. What is the problem? Social equity is a comprehensive phrase to include many terms, including equality, affirmative action, etc.

NAPA organizational history/mission

References from this Standing Panel's charter

Role of government/governance. How government systems/management affects social equity. Keep it results focused.

Focus on federal, state, and local levels

Feelings among citizens that they are disconnected from their governments; they don't have input. Citizen input into the decision making process.

Rapidly changing demographics and how that affects social equity

Block quality – black/white; young/old; immigrant/non-immigrant. There are issues of race, gender, age, etc. There should be greater balance between the blocks. The race block is the most contentious.

Segmented equity – the level of education, opportunities, skills, etc. There is a tension between the ways of viewing equality. The civil service view – how you did on the test – versus an affirmative action view of equity.

Hierarchies – elaborate ways for how to deal with differences. To those you add the complexity of race, gender, etc.

Equalities of opportunity – patterns of inequality to achieve equitable outcomes (choosing to do things that are unfair because you know the outcomes will be fair)

Markets. A laissez-faire economy is inherently unjust. Governments traditionally compensate for that, for example, health care moving to managed care.

Fairness inside public organizations – human resources, contracting, etc.

Fairness in the public world. Tension between individual rights and fairness.

Public officials as advocates for fairness and justice, as well as for their own areas of interest.

How much should the paper focus on issues related to African Americans? Stay wedded to context – the country we live in. The people who cry out are people of color. The President's Commission paper may help with language for this as well as the charges given to federal agencies.

Tension between efficiency and equity. If you're a citizen, efficiency for whom? Do all citizens see it as efficiently as you. Tie to good governance.

Roles of all levels of government. Stress the importance of having local level implementation.

Role of the Academy and how it can be relevant

Does direct democracy enhance social equity?



Mintwood Media Collective

Sarah Austin Adam Eidinge Kadd Stephens

1858 Mintwood Pl. NW, #4
Washington, DC 20009
Ph: 202-232-8997
Fax: 202-232-8340
www.mintwood.com

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
September 7, 2000

CONTACT: Adam Eidinge or Howard Hallman
202-986-6186 or 301-896-0013

SURVEY OF PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES EXPOSES DIFFERENCES ON NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Bush and Gore Fail to Answer Morality Questions

WASHINGTON, DC – On behalf of 48 religious leaders from a cross-section of faith groups, Catholic Bishop Thomas Gumbleton and Methodist Bishop C. Dale White have released a new ten question survey of presidential candidates on nuclear weapons and disarmament. During a news conference today, the religious leaders expressed concern that neither George W. Bush or Al Gore answered questions specifically dealing with the morality of nuclear weapons. **The complete survey with candidate responses can be found online at <http://www.?????????.org>.**

“It’s disappointing when faith and values are commonly used to describe the guiding philosophy of the major party candidates yet neither Bush or Gore will address the question of the morality of nuclear weapons,” said Howard Hallman, coordinator of the survey and Chair of Methodists United for Peace with Justice. Only Green Party presidential candidate Ralph Nader answered all ten of the survey questions. Neither Reform Party candidate responded to the survey.

When asked, “What are your views on the morality of possession, threatened use, and actual use of nuclear weapons?” Both Bush and Gore failed to provide an answer even though the survey was hand delivered to them three weeks ago. Ralph Nader responded by saying, “Nuclear weapons have no moral or practical use for any purpose except as a deterrent to nuclear threats.” Calling the U.S. refusal to adopt a no-first-use policy “political immorality” Mr. Nader said if elected the “U.S. will never be the first to use a nuclear weapon in any conflict.”

The Bush and Gore camps did however enjoin a handful of policy speeches which partially addressed the survey questions. On the question of de-alerting nuclear weapons now on hair-trigger alert, Bush and Nader agree the U.S. should de-alert its nuclear stockpile. Gore emphasized that neither the U.S. or Russia have nuclear weapons targeted at each other. He suggested that taking nuclear weapons off high alert might risk U.S. security during a period of crisis when nuclear warheads would need to be reunited with their delivery systems.

Another question left unanswered by Bush and Gore was how they plan to carry out the obligation under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty to achieve nuclear disarmament. A review of the treaty on it’s 30th Anniversary at the United Nations last May produced the strongest commitment to total elimination of nuclear weapons, yet practically no steps have been taken by the Clinton/Gore Administration to achieve this goal other than support for the CTBT. Nader offered a six point plan that over time would meet the goals of the NPT.

On the START III negotiations the survey reveals a strong commitment by all three candidates to further reductions of the U.S. strategic arsenal, but only Nader specifically said he would be willing to reduce the number of nuclear weapons below the Russian proposed limit of 1000 warheads. Gore and Nader agree the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) should be ratified and is an important step to stopping the spread of nuclear weapons, while Bush says the treaty “offers only words and false hopes and high intentions.”

For a copy of the survey results please contact Adam Eidinge at 202-986-6186 or Howard Hallman at 301-896-0013.

###