

From: "Dessart Veronique, CEC Brussels" <ved@cec-kek.be>
Subject: Final Communiqué Nuclear Issues, Brussels 5-6 October
Date: Fri, 6 Oct 2000 15:50:45 +0200

COMMUNIQUE
October 6, 2000

An international gathering of church representatives met in Brussels on Oct 5 and 6, 2000 to explore effective church responses to the current NATO review of its nuclear arms control and security policies. Present were American, Canadian, and European church staff with responsibility for public policy issues, individuals from related denominational and ecumenical committees and institutions, and representatives of 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. They were assisted by researchers in security and arms control, and benefitted from a session with a senior NATO official.

The consultation reminded the churches that the end of the Cold War has not meant an end to the threat of nuclear conflict and nuclear proliferation. While the recent Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference ended with "an unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear weapon states to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals," many other recent developments undermine progress toward nuclear disarmament. Notably, the defeat of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty in the US Senate, the nuclearization of South Asia, and the retention of Cold War-era nuclear postures by the United States and Russia have tended instead towards the indefinite retention and even the spread of nuclear capabilities. The looming prospect of missile defence deployment threatens further damage to nuclear arms control and disarmament efforts.

As part of the review process, NATO will over the next few months be making key decisions that will do much to determine the future of nuclear weapons and nuclear arms control and disarmament efforts. With that in mind, the consultation agreed:

1. to recommend to the ecumenical community that it should engage directly with the current NATO Review process with a view to encouraging NATO states and NATO itself to conform to the obligations undertaken in the Non Proliferation Treaty; and
2. to impress upon churches the need to re-energise their peace witness and, within the framework of the Decade to Overcome Violence to undertake education, public awareness activity, and advocacy regarding the continuing threat of nuclear weapons.

For more information contact Salpy Eskidjian, Program Executive,
International Relations, World Council of Churches.

Tel: 41 22 791 6111

E-mail: disarm@wcc-coe.org <<mailto:disarm@wcc-coe.org>>

To: dce@wcc-coe.org, sal@wcc-coe.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Suggested WCC action on nuclear disarmament
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\abolish.306.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Dwain and Salpy,

It was good to see you again at the meeting in Brussels. It was a good session to formulate a common approach to dealing with NATO.

Dwain, I was glad to hear that the WCC Central Committee may speak out again on nuclear disarmament at its meeting in January. The report you distributed shows the long heritage in dealing with this issue, which won't go away.

I would like to suggest that in addition to issuing a statement that the WCC appoint a delegation representing churches from different regions of the world to call upon the heads of nuclear- weapon states and their foreign ministers to demand that they move quickly to fulfill their NPT commitment to eliminate their nuclear weapons. First and foremost the delegation would go to the United States, Russia, United Kingdom, France, and China, secondarily to India, Pakistan, and Israel.

It would be useful to have the WCC delegation joined by a similar delegation from the Holy See, also representing different regions of the world. However, this wouldn't necessarily require a joint statement, as hard as that is to develop, but rather each delegation would have its own but similar message. I would be willing to use my contacts with Roman Catholics to encourage this kind of parallel initiative if you think it is desirable.

Attached are some suggestions for what might go into a WCC statement on the elimination of nuclear weapons. Also, you might want to look at the United Methodist resolution on "Nuclear Abolition" that I distributed at the Brussels meeting. I'll send you a copy if you don't have one.

Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Shalom,
Howard

Sample letters-to-editors for use between now and the election.

Letter Number One

It's amazing to me that the nuclear threat has hardly caused a ripple in the Presidential campaign. While both Vice President Gore and Governor Bush have tossed around various tax-cut numbers, there is a number they have failed to address—the five thousand nuclear weapons still on hair-trigger alert.

The fact is the U.S. and Russia have the equivalent of 100,000 Hiroshima sized bombs poised to be launched at a moments notice. In a time of crisis or perceived attack, decision makers on both sides have just minutes to decide whether to launch a massive nuclear strike. The security of the U.S.—and the world—now rests with deteriorating Russian early warning systems and a decaying nuclear command and control structure.

The recent Russian submarine tragedy reminds us that we are just an accident away from nuclear war. There's no debate about it, we need leaders who will act to get all nuclear weapons off the hair-trigger.

Letter Number Two

There's much talk in the Presidential campaign about the U.S. military not being “ready”. It's hard to believe that a nation that spends more on its military than the next twelve nations combined-- including Russia and China—isn't ready.

But one readiness problem the Presidential candidates aren't addressing is the fact that the US and Russia are all too ready to launch their nuclear arsenals at a moment's notice. Both sides still have thousands of weapons on hair-trigger alert—the equivalent of 100,000 Hiroshima bombs. With leaders having just minutes to make a decision on whether to launch their nuclear arsenals, this hair-trigger posture increases the chances that a nuclear war could start by a computer malfunction or human error.

The serious deterioration of Russia's radar and early warning systems only increases the danger.

We need a President who is ready to work with Russia to get all nuclear weapons off hair-trigger alert. This is a critical first step towards deep reductions in nuclear arsenals and the eventual elimination of the threat of nuclear war.

X-Sender: abolition2000@abolition2000.org
Date: Fri, 13 Oct 2000 14:40:40 -0800
To: abolition-caucus@egroups.com, abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
From: Abolition 2000 <admin@abolition2000.org>
Subject: (abolition-usa) Abolition 2000 Grassroots Newsletter October 2000 Vol. II Number 7
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

Abolition 2000 Grassroots Newsletter
October 2000
Vol. II Number 7

IN THIS EDITION

- I. Articles
- II. Abolition 2000 Organizations in the Year 2000
- III. Announcements
- IV. Calendar Events
- V. Resources

ARTICLES

International Day of Protest to Stop the Militarization of Space

7 October 2000 was designated the International Day to Stop the Militarization of Space by the Global Network Against Weapons and Power in Space. The Global Network urged individuals and organizations to organize an action at a military base, Department of Energy Laboratory, NASA facility, US Embassy, aerospace corporation, or academic institution working on military space. More than 63 actions in 16 countries and 38 US cities were held to demand that the US stop all plans to put weapons into space and that all nations support a treaty calling for a global ban on weapons in space.

Bruce Gagnon, Coordinator of the Global Network Against Weapons & Nuclear Power in Space, attended an action held at Vandenberg Air Force Base in California where testing of the proposed National Missile Defense (NMD) system is conducted. Approximately 200 people gathered at the main gate to practice their US Constitutional first amendment rights and oppose US plans to deploy any anti-ballistic missile system, a Trojan horse strategy by the Pentagon and aerospace corporations to weaponize and militarize Outer Space. In his speech, Gagnon compared the Nazi slogan "Deutschland uber allen" (Germany over all) to the self-proclaimed title "Master of Space" of the US Space Command. Other speakers at the rally included Medea Benjamin, Green party candidate for US Senate in California, Lawrence Turk representing Greenpeace, actor Martin Sheen and Carah Ong, Coordinator of the Abolition 2000 Global Network to eliminate nuclear weapons.

cooperation with the members of its Global Council (GC) in Japan, would like to convene the Abolition 2000 Review and Strategy Meeting as above, taking the opportunity of the Global Citizens' Assembly for the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons in Nagasaki (Nagasaki Assembly) to be held on Nov. 17-20. All those planning to attend the Nagasaki Assembly are encouraged to participate in this meeting. Please refer to the website at <http://www3.ocn.ne.jp/~gca.naga/> for the program and other details of Nagasaki Assembly. Also, please refer to the Nagasaki Update on the Abolition-caucus listserve issued by Japan Year 2000 Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapon. Apart from this Abolition 2000 Review and Strategy Meeting, Abolition 2000 activities will be introduced and discussed in the formal plenary and workshop sessions of Nagasaki Assembly.

Aims:

At the very end of the year 2000, it would be very important to review the past five years of the Abolition 2000 global network as well as to discuss our strategies and action programs for the future.

Draft program:

In the consultation among ACC, the following program and items are suggested for the meeting. Please feel free to offer opinions and make suggestions.

- 1) Introduction and history
- 2) Review and explain the Abolition 2000 Statement and each of its 11 points and Moorea Declaration
- 3) Abolition 2000 report card
- 4) Strengths and weaknesses of the network -- A2000 turning point after 5 years
- 5) Strategy discussion

Some items to be included in the strategy discussion:

- 1) National Missile Defense (NMD), Theater Missile Defense (TMD) and militarization of space
- 2) NPT 2000 Review Conference 13-point commitment; how to push for implementation
- 3) the Nuclear Weapons Convention
- 4) support for Kofi Annan's proposal for an international conference
- 5) Nuclear Weapon Free Zones
- 6) Follow-up to the International Court of Justice advisory opinion on nuclear weapons

Languages:

Official languages of this meeting are English and Japanese. Simultaneous interpretation will be available.

Logistics:

Those who want to participate in the Nagasaki Assembly must register in advance by Oct. 20. For details, contact the Organizing Committee at gca.naga@viola.ocn.ne.jp. They will provide you the accommodation information. The Abolition 2000 meeting begins at 10 am on Nov. 17, so the participants of the meeting from overseas are suggested to arrive at Osaka (Kansai) or Tokyo (Narita) preferably in the morning of Nov. 16.

year the UNGA resolutions for abolition of nuclear weapons.

At the foreign ministry, Gensuikyo leaders met Yukio Takenouchi, director-general of Foreign Policy Bureau, and urged him that the Japanese Government should not cast an abstention vote any longer on the resolutions standing for the abolition of nuclear weapons as priority during this ongoing UN Millennium General Assembly. He admitted that it would not press for the "abolition as an ultimate goal", but did not promise that it would work together with New Agenda Coalition or any other Governments that stand for the abolition of nuclear weapons. Nor did he clearly say that Japan would support Non first use, Negative Security Assurance or any other urgent measures on nuclear weapons issues in the current disarmament discussions at the UN.

Gensuikyo further urged that since the Three Non-Nuclear Principles, i.e., not manufacturing, not possessing and not allowing nuclear weapons to be brought in the Japanese territories, were the principle adopted by the National Diet, Foreign Ministry should appreciate Kobe and other local Governments for their practice. They urge all visiting foreign warships to submit a certificate of non-presence of nuclear weapons on board prior to their port-call, thus loyally implementing the national principle, which the Japanese Government, the foreign ministry in particular, has long neglected to implement. The director general did not refute this argument, but refrained from thanking the local governments mentioned above.

Gensuikyo will continue its intensive campaign, including further collection of signatures, lobbying Japanese Government Agencies and diplomatic missions, sending a delegation to the permanent missions in New York and many sorts of grassroots actions until 30 October 2000.

For more information, please contact:

Hiroshi Taka

Japan Council against A & H Bombs

(Japan Gensuikyo)

E-mail: antiatom@twics.com

URL: [Http://www.twics.com/~antiatom/](http://www.twics.com/~antiatom/)

Fax: +81-3-3431-8781

><< ><< ><< ><< ><< ><< ><< ><< ><< ><< ><< ><<

Nix Mox Day in Russia

29 September 2000 was the 43rd anniversary of a terrible explosion of Mayak facility. In the entire nuclear history of the USSR, it was the only comparable accident to the Chernobyl catastrophe. As a result of Mayak explosion, tens of thousands of people were resettled from contaminated areas and many thousands died as direct consequence of contamination.

Ozersk, the city where the Mayak facility is located, has a population of approximately 8 000. Every family remembers the

A portion of the resolution states:

"BE IT RESOLVED by the 88th Senate of the Associated Students of the University of Hawaii at Manoa (ASUH), the elected body representing over 9,000 full-time classified undergraduate students declares itself a Nuclear Weapon Free Zone and supports the further development of Nuclear Weapon Free Zones throughout the world;

BE IT RESOLVED that the 88th ASUH stands in solidarity with the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation for the Abolition 2000 Global Campaign introduced by Richard Salvador, Ph.D. candidate, Political Science, University of Hawaii at Manoa;"

The next GOAL is to SHUT DOWN Pearl Harbor Nuclear storage facilities! For more information, please contact:

Richard Salvador

Email: salvador@hawaii.edu

ANNOUNCEMENTS

13 October 2000

Dear Friends and Activists,

The Abolition 2000 Coordinating Committee would like to bring a proposal to your attention regarding the amendment of the Abolition 2000 Statement. After consulting with the Global Council, the ACC would like to propose the deletion of the phrase "by the year 2000" from the Abolition 2000 Statement with a footnote explaining that this was removed in the year 2000.

The Statement currently reads:

1. Initiate immediately and conclude by the year 2000 negotiations on a nuclear weapons abolition convention that requires the phased elimination of all nuclear weapons within a timebound framework, with provisions for effective verification and enforcement.*

Under the proposed changes the Statement would read:

1. Initiate immediately and conclude negotiations on a nuclear weapons abolition convention that requires the phased elimination of all nuclear weapons within a timebound framework, with provisions for effective verification and enforcement.**

*The phrase "by the year 2000" was removed from this Statement at the end of the year 2000.

In November, Abolition 2000 will have a strategic planning meeting during the Nagasaki Global Citizens Assembly for the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons. During this time a final decision will be made on this proposal. The Abolition 2000 Coordinating

17-20 Global Citizens' Assembly for the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons will be held in Nagasaki, Japan. The Assembly is hosted by the Organizing Committee of Global Citizens' Assembly for the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons in Nagasaki (Nagasaki Prefecture, Nagasaki City, Nagasaki Foundation for the Promotion of Peace, and Nuclear Weapons Abolition Year 2000 Nagasaki Citizens' Council). For more information, please contact:

Nagasaki Foundation for the Promotion of Peace
7-8 Hirano-machi, Nagasaki, 852-8117 Japan
Tel: +81 0 95 844 3975
Fax: +81 0 95 846 5170

17-18 The Second Nuclear Age and the Academy A Conference at the Graduate Center, CUNY. For more information, please contact:

Education and Public Programs, The Graduate Center, CUNY
365 Fifth Avenue, Suite 8111
New York NY 10016-4309.
Tel: +1 (212) 817-8215
Email: continuinged@gc.cuny.edu.
URL: <http://web.gc.cuny.edu/cepp/>

December

10 Human Rights Day

12 Free world peace prayer event in Hiroshima, Japan. For more information, please visit: <http://www.nttl-net.ne.jp/hiroshima2001>

January 2001

26-29 Remember Operation Ranger-50th Anniversary of nuclear bombing at the Nevada Test Site. For more information, please contact Charles Hilfenhaus of the Alliance of Atomic Veterans at [<chilfenhaus@juno.com>](mailto:chilfenhaus@juno.com) or call Marc Page of Nevada Desert Experience at +1 702 646 4814

RESOURCES

WEB

*Abolition 2000 Global Network

Visit the website and find out why Abolition 2000 was ranked "Number 4 Watchdog Organization on the Internet" by InfoSeek/Go.com and "One of the best informational sites on the internet" by Encyclopedia Britannica. The website has recently been updated. If you have any suggestions for improvement or comments, please send to Carah Ong at admin@abolition2000.org
URL: [Http://www.abolition2000.org](http://www.abolition2000.org)

The latest edition of Disarmament Diplomacy (No. 50, September 2000) is now available on the website of the Acronym Institute at:
[Http://www.acronym.org.uk](http://www.acronym.org.uk)

New UK-based email groups:

rad-UK@egroups.com

For those interested in issues relating to ionizing radiation in the UK and Europe. The premise of the group is that current dose-risk estimates do not accurately reflect the real effect of internalized radionuclides.

URL: <http://www.egroups.com/group/rad-uk>

peacewomen@egroups.com

For women active in grassroots peace activism in the UK. Stories and messages relating to the women's peace camps at Aldermaston, Menwith Hill, Burghfield and Sellafield.

URL: <http://www.egroups.com/group/peacewomen>

ukwilpf@egroups.com

For members of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom based in the UK.

URL: <http://www.egroups.com/group/ukwilpf>

Information on the World Day of Actions in Japan can be found in Japanese and English at:

<http://ha5.seikyoku.ne.jp/home/tokebi>

VIDEO

"Nevada Desert Experience in the Nuclear Age" is a new video about the contemporary faith-based resistance to weapons testing. The video features comments from June Stark Casey, Ibrahim Abdil Mu'id Ramey, Joanna Macy, John Dear, sj, Sally Light, Greg Mello, St. Rosemary Lynch, ofm, Jackie Cabasso, Louis Vitale, ofm, Nancy Lynch, David Buer, ofm, Rabbi Mel Hecht, Dr. Rosalie Bertell, and Jonathan Schell. The video exposed the history of nuclearism, reminds us of the nonviolent activism to stop the foolish nuclear industries. It also explains the purpose and activities of the Nevada Desert Experience in the context of the movement to abolish nuclear weapons.

To order, please contact:

The Nevada Desert Experience

P.O. Box 46645

Las Vegas, Nevada 89114-6645 USA

nde@igc.org

BUDDHA WEEPS IN JADUGODA, duration 55 min. format Beta PAL, English subtitle.

For more information about the film, please contact:

Shriprakash Kritika

30 Randhir pd street upper bazar

Ranchi 834001

India

ph + 91(0) 651 317461

kritikashri@yahoo.com

BOOKS

How Did That Sun Get Out

by Roger Burkholder
Suggested Price: \$22.95
ISBN: 0-595-00257-9
Pub. Date: Aug-2000

"Deeply moving. Well worth reading." Hanna Newcombe, Peace Research

Belonging to the first generation of collegiate students never to have experienced a time without the possibility of nuclear holocaust, C. J., Jack, and Leah, in their sometimes assured and other times hesitant movements toward each other, are struggling in the direction of a future they have always known they may not have. Then a crisis is inadvertently brought to all three lives by a psychiatrist involved in a lonely pursuit of definitions of global sanity. It is a crisis the psychiatrist himself comes to share and which soon begins to give voice to what have been silences central to our time. Respectfully nonviolent, this coming-of-age novel builds into an insightful and feelingly true exploration of quandaries basic to our era and ultimately touching all our lives, if only indirectly.

To order, please visit:

<http://www.iuniverse.com/marketplace/bookstore/book_detail.asp?isbn=0%2D595%2D00257%2D9>

EDITOR

Carah Ong

--

Carah Lynn Ong
Coordinator, Abolition 2000

"He aha te nui mea o te ao? He tangata, he tangata, he tangata" (A Maori saying)

Translation: "What is the most important thing in the world? It is the people, the people, the people."

PMB 121, 1187 Coast Village Rd, Suite 121
Santa Barbara, California 93108
Tel: (805) 965-3443 Fax: (805) 568-0466
email: admin@abolition2000.org
URL: <http://www.abolition2000.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.

From: "Jose Gutierrez" <jlgvnews@erols.com>
To: "Jose Gutierrez" <jlgvnews@erols.com>,
"William J Price" <WorldPeaceMakers@compuserve.com>,
"Tom Huber" <tomhub@erols.com>,
"Ted Gordon O" <tgordon@cpsc.gov>,
<peacetaxfund@igc.org>,
"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>,
"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>

Subject: Isreali Palestinian Conflict

Date: Sat, 14 Oct 2000 07:37:25 -0400

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2615.200

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2615.200

Pursuant to our membership (re)commitment to spare no effort, time or money to become "informed, mature Christians", I'm sharing the the following enlightening articles on on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The first is by a Palestinian professor at Colombia University. Another is by an Israeli Jewish Professor at Tel Aviv University. The others are by by American Jewish American Professors, one of which teaches at William Patterson University. You'd expect the Palestinian author to be sympathetic to the Palestinians. The gratifying surprise from a biblical people's perspective is that the Jewish authors, both Israeli and American, are equally so. Perhaps you can discuss these articles among World Peacemakers, since they reference conflict in the holy land between the two Semitic descendants of Abraham (his son Ishmael being the father of the Arabs or Ishmaelites and, of course, his grandson Jacob changed his name to Israel).

The US celebrates Serb freedom, but the case of the Palestinians is, apparently, different

Special Guardian report: Israel and the Middle East

Edward Said

Thursday October 12, 2000

Misreported and hopelessly flawed from the start, the Oslo peace process has entered its terminal phase - of violent

confrontation, disproportionately massive Israeli repression, widespread Palestinian rebellion and great loss of life, the vast majority of it Palestinian. Ariel Sharon's visit to Haram al-Sharif on September 28 could not have occurred without Ehud Barak's concurrence. How else could the paunchy old war criminal have appeared there with a thousand soldiers guarding him? Barak's approval rating rose from 20% to 50% after the visit, and the stage seems set for a national unity government ready to be still more violent and repressive.

The portents of this disarray, however, were there from the 1993 start. Labour and Likud leaders alike made no secret of the fact that Oslo was designed to segregate the Palestinians in non-contiguous enclaves, surrounded by Israeli-controlled borders, with settlements and settlement roads punctuating and essentially violating the territories' integrity, expropriations and house demolitions proceeding inexorably through the Rabin, Peres, Netanyahu and Barak administrations along with the expansion and multiplication of settlements (200,000 Israeli Jews added to Jerusalem, 200,000 more in Gaza and the West Bank), military occupation continuing and every tiny step taken toward Palestinian sovereignty - including agreements to withdraw in minuscule, agreed-upon phases - stymied, delayed, cancelled at Israel's will.

This method was politically and strategically absurd, even suicidal. Occupied East Jerusalem was placed out of bounds by a bellicose Israeli campaign to decree the intractably divided city off limits to Palestinians and to claim it as Israel's "eternal, undivided capital". The 4m Palestinian refugees - now the largest and longest existing such population anywhere - were told that they could forget about any idea of return or compensation.

With his own corrupt and stupidly repressive regime supported both by Israel's Mossad and the CIA, Yasser Arafat continued to rely on US mediation, even though the US peace team was dominated by former Israeli lobby officials and a president whose ideas about the Middle East were those of a Christian fundamentalist Zionist with no exposure to or understanding of the Arab-Islamic world. Compliant, but isolated and unpopular Arab chiefs (especially Egypt's President Mubarak) were compelled humiliatingly to toe the American line, thereby further diminishing their eroded credibility at home. Israel's priorities were always put first, as was its bottomless insecurity and its preposterous demands. No attempt was made to address the fundamental injustice done when Palestinians as a people were dispossessed in 1948.

Behind the peace process were two unchanging Israeli/American presuppositions, both of them derived from a startling incomprehension of reality. First was that given enough punishment and beating over the years since 1948, Palestinians would ultimately give up, accept the compromised compromises Arafat did in fact accept, and call the whole Palestinian cause off, thereafter excusing Israel for everything it has done.

Thus, for example, the "peace process" gave no considered attention to immense Palestinian losses of land and goods, none to the links between

past dislocation and present statelessness, while as a nuclear power with a formidable military, Israel nevertheless continued to claim the status of victim and demand restitution for genocidal anti-semitism in Europe. Incongruously, there has still been no official acknowledgement of Israel's (by now amply documented) responsibility for the tragedy of 1948, even as the US went to war in Iraq and Kosovo on behalf of other refugees. But one can't force people to forget, especially when the daily reality was seen by all Arabs as endlessly reproducing the original injustice.

Second, after seven years of steadily worsening economic and social conditions for Palestinians everywhere, Israeli and US policymakers persisted (stupidly, I think) in trumpeting their successes, excluding the UN and other interested parties, bending the disgracefully partisan media to their wills, distorting the actuality into ephemeral victories for "peace".

With the entire Arab world up in arms over Israeli helicopter gunships and heavy artillery demolishing Palestinian civilian buildings, with almost 100 fatalities and almost 2,000 wounded (including many children) and with Palestinian Israelis up in arms against their treatment as third-class, non-Jewish citizens, the misaligned and skewed status quo is falling apart. Isolated in the UN and unloved everywhere in the Arab world as Israel's unconditional champion, the US and its lame duck president have little to contribute any more.

Neither does the Arab and Israeli leadership, even though they are likely to cobble together another interim agreement. Most shocking has been the total silence of the Zionist peace camp in the US, Europe and Israel. The slaughter of Palestinian youths goes on and this band of supposed peace-lovers either backs Israeli brutality or expresses disappointment at Palestinian ingratitude. Worst of all is the US media, completely cowed by the fearsome Israeli lobby, with commentators and anchors spinning distorted reports about "crossfire" and "Palestinian violence" that eliminate the fact that Israel is in military occupation and that Palestinians are fighting it, not "laying siege to Israel", as the ghastly Mrs Albright put it. While the US celebrates the Serbian people's victory over Slobodan Milosevic, Clinton and his minions refuse to see the Palestinian insurgency as the same kind of struggle against injustice.

My guess is that some of the new Palestinian intifada is directed at Arafat, who has led his people astray with phony promises, and maintained a battery of corrupt officials holding down commercial monopolies even as they negotiate incompetently and weakly on his behalf. Some 60% of the public budget is disbursed by Arafat to bureaucracy and security, only 2% to the infrastructure. Three years ago his own accountants admitted to an annual \$400m in disappeared funds. His international patrons accept this in the name of the "peace process", certainly the most hated phrase in the Palestinian lexicon today.

An alternative peace plan and leadership is slowly emerging among Israeli, West Bank, Gaza and diaspora Palestinians. No return to the Oslo framework; no compromise on the original UN resolutions (242, 338, and 194) "mandating the Madrid conference in 1991; removal of all settlements and military roads; evacuation of all the territories annexed or occupied in 1967;

boycott of Israeli goods and services. A new sense may actually be dawning that only a mass movement against Israeli apartheid (similar to the South African variety) will work. Certainly it is sheer idiocy for Barak and Albright to hold Arafat responsible for what he no longer fully controls. Rather than dismissing the new framework being proposed, Israel's supporters would be wise to remember that the question of Palestine concerns an entire people, not an ageing and discredited leader. Besides, peace in Palestine/Israel can only be made between equals once the military occupation has ended. No Palestinian, not even Arafat, can really accept anything less.

.Edward Said's book, *The End of the Peace Process*, is published by Granta. and is available in the Montgomery County Libraries

====

Mount Temple
By Tanya Reinhart

In today's setting, it is hard to recall that just a few years ago, only some fringe lunatics demanded Israeli control of 'Mount-temple'. Every time they tried to enter the place and pray, Israeli police would be there to block their entrance or drag them out. Even the word 'mount temple' was perceived as belonging to the bizarre vocabulary of religious fanatics. Today it is the Israeli government that launches the holy war. Israel's foreign affairs minister - the ex-liberal Shlomo Ben-Ami - declares day and night that "no nation can give up its sacred sites" and the world nods and accepts. Sharon could not have entered the site without approval of Barak and the government. His visit has been carefully planned, with a thousand soldiers securing it and taking shooting positions on the roofs in advance. It is not Sharon who is responsible for the present massacre, but Barak, Ben Ami, the Israeli government, and Israel's "peacenicks" who have been supporting them all the way through.

Israel's claim on 'mount temple' is completely new (brought up only since the recent Camp David negotiations). In 1995's Beilin-Abu Maazen plan for the final agreement, which is the basis for the present 'negotiations', it was still stated that the area will be in 'exterritorial Palestinian sovereignty'(1). The more Arafat gives in, the more new demands are brought up by Israel.

The Beilin Abu-Mazen document, itself, is a shameful document, which leaves all the settlements untouched, and acknowledges Israeli sovereignty over most of the central West Bank. It was agreed that Arafat will renounce, on behalf of the Palestinians, any claim on Jerusalem, and the Palestinian institutions will move to the village Abu-Dis, bordering with Jerusalem. In return, Arafat will be allowed to call Abu-Dis the capital of the Palestinian state. The verbal trick was that Abu-Dis will be named Al-Kuds, so it can be presented like the city is divided to the Jewish part

'Jerusalem' and the Palestinian part 'Al Kuds'. Arafat has agreed to this long time ago. E.g. in 'Haaretz' 5.5.98 (Akiva Eldar) it is reported that "Yaser Arafat accepts the idea that the capital of the Palestinian state will be Abu-dis, neighboring Jerusalem, and sees the understandings included in Beilin-Abu maazen agreement as a realistic option for the final agreement with Israel." "In a meeting with the Middle East section of the foreign affairs council whose center is in New-York... Arafat was asked if it is possible to reach an agreement with Israel also on the question of Jerusalem. Arafat: 'Certainly, it is possible to accept the idea of Abu-Dis, which belonged to Al-Kuds also under Jordanian rule.'"

Even that was not good enough for Barak. In the original Beilin Abu-Mazen plan, only the land with the Jewish settlements of the central WB (labelled "Jerusalem") was to be annexed. - So they prepared a rather windy map that surrounds these settlements but includes no Palestinians. Israel's interest in doing it this way was to avoid the need of giving these Palestinians Israeli citizenship including social rights - health etc, or political rights of voting. Barak 'straightened' the maps. The annexation proposed in Camp David will include also the areas with Palestinian residents. But these residents will not be given Israeli citizenship, since "they will vote for the Palestinian state." So this enables annexing the land without giving any rights to the annexed Palestinian residents (2).

It appears that the Palestinian negotiators in Camp David have also agreed to this proposal. Or at least we have never heard otherwise. But then Barak came up with the new demand that the Palestinians will also renounce their hold in Al Aksa (Mount Temple). Even a collaborator like Arafat cannot accept such a demand and survive.

No rational account could tie these facts together. It is hard to avoid the conclusion that Barak is not interested now in any formal agreement with the Palestinians, not even in the full surrender that Arafat was willing to accept. Barak and Sharon, who may soon join him in power, see only one solution to the 'Palestinian problem' - elimination! It is not at all impossible that in their sick general's mind they believe that if one applies sufficient force, it may be possible to drive more and more Palestinians out of Jerusalem and the central bank, and get this land Arab-free. And it won't be confined to the occupied Palestinians. For several weeks now, Israeli Palestinians have been subject to vicious attacks, and more and more voices in the media (orchestrated, as always, from above) complain about how they have too many rights. Israel has become the land of apartheid.

=====

(1) Newsweek 17.9.00; 'Haaretz' 18.9.00.

(2) Nahum Barnea "Yediot Aharonot" 30.6.00: "The Arabs

living in the settlement blocks which will be annexed to Israel will have the same rights as the Israelis living in Palestine: They will vote to the Palestinian state and will live by its laws."

Tanya Reinhart Tel Aviv University and the university of Utrecht.

<http://www.tau.ac.il/~reinhart>

=====

Turmoil in Palestine: The Basic Context

By Alex R. Shalom and Stephen R. Shalom

As the occupied Palestinian territories suffer their worst paroxysm of violence in years, with the casualties, as always, overwhelmingly Palestinian, the mainstream media, also as always, focus on peripheral questions, offer misleading answers, and ignore the underlying causes of the conflict. The fundamental, neglected reality is that the Palestinian people have been denied their basic rights for years by the Israeli government, aided and abetted by its Washington ally. More than half a century ago, the United Nations (which at the time had comparatively few Third World members) recommended the partition of Palestine into Palestinian and Jewish states, and an internationalized Jerusalem, with the Jewish minority to receive the majority of the land, as well as most of the fertile land. A civil war and then a regional war ensued and when the armistice agreements were signed there was Israel, the Jewish state, but no Palestinian state and no international Jerusalem, both of these being taken over and divided between Israel and Jordan. The occupying Israelis, however, were not content to block the emergence of a Palestinian state; they wanted as well to expel as many Palestinians as possible. This ethnic cleansing -- forced expulsions facilitated by acts of terror -- drove eight hundred thousand (one third of all) Palestinians from their ancestral lands in 1948 alone, [three times as many people as the Ethnic Albanians driven from Kosovo during the NATO bombing of Serbia]. Hundreds of thousands of Palestinians were thus forced into refugee camps where they lived in squalor, longing to return. In 1967, Israel conquered Jordan's share of Palestine, creating a new wave of Palestinian refugees, and subjecting many more to ruthless Israeli rule in the occupied territories.

Through all the peace plans and negotiations this is the central question: how can Palestinians achieve the right of self-determination that has so long been refused them? To the Israeli government, justice for Palestinians has always been subordinated to the Israeli desire for land, for scarce water resources, and for military supremacy in the region. And the United States government has likewise disregarded Palestinian self-determination and human rights, motivated

by its desire to see a dominant Israel that could help keep radical Arab nationalism in check in a region of great economic and strategic value.

This past week's violence was sparked by the visit of the leader of Israel's right-wing opposition Likud Party, former general Ariel Sharon, to Haram al Sharif, a Muslim holy site in Jerusalem, revered by Jews as the Temple Mount. The media has asked what Sharon intended by his visit, what role Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak played in Sharon's decision to go there, and whether the Palestinian response was spontaneous or orchestrated by the Chairman of the Palestinian Authority, Yasir Arafat. But these limited questions cannot be answered without considering the recent history of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict.

Yasir Arafat was Chairman of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) in 1974 when it was recognized by the U.N. (and by nearly every survey of Palestinian opinion) as the sole, legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. But, by the mid-1980's, Arafat and his lieutenants had been away from Palestine for many years, and their connection with Palestinians living in the occupied West Bank and Gaza Strip began to weaken. In December 1987, after 20 years living under the systematic violence of Israeli rule, Palestinians in the occupied territories began wide-spread resistance known as the intifada. The intifada, often remembered for its vivid images of Palestinian children throwing stones at Israeli soldiers who responded with automatic weapons, included, in fact, highly organized non-violent resistance in addition to the more spontaneous stone throwing. Impressively, the intifada with its remarkable self-discipline and courage was an indigenous uprising - neither initiated nor controlled by the PLO leadership-in-exile -- indicating that Arafat no longer spoke for the Palestinian people.

It thus came as something of a surprise when Arafat joined with then-Israeli Prime Minister Yitzak Rabin to sign the 1993 Oslo Accords. The peace process agreed to by Arafat and Rabin called for the redeployment of Israeli troops from most areas of dense Palestinian concentration to other parts of the West Bank, but not for their full withdrawal from the territory. Israeli settlements -- whose presence even Israel's closest ally, the United States government, had always considered a violation of international law -- were to remain in place. Israel retained authority over most of the land, and all the settlers, roads, water, and borders, while the Palestinians gained civil control -- not sovereignty -- over a tiny portion of the West Bank, which essentially meant that they became responsible only for maintaining order over a population seething in grueling poverty and despair. While Israeli analysts saw this arrangement as more manageable than direct Israeli military

rule over masses of Palestinians, it was clear that a peace process that did not provide justice and self-determination to a long-suffering people was unlikely to provide much peace either.

Why did Arafat accept this raw deal on behalf of his people?

It appears that Arafat was more interested in being the ruler of a Palestinian State, whatever its condition, than in continuing to seek a just solution to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. Since his return to Palestine in the wake of the Oslo process, Arafat has ruled the Palestinian Authority with a brutally authoritarian fist and, despite some public posturing, has made further concessions to the Israeli government -- most notably giving up the refugees' right of return, something demanded by the U.N. since 1949, and the Palestinian claim to any part of Jerusalem. In so doing, Arafat has further alienated himself from the Palestinian people, who no longer see him as a brave freedom fighter but as a corrupt collaborator.

And what of the other players focused upon by the mainstream media? Ariel Sharon, who has received some criticism in the press, is no stranger to being vilified, or more precisely to being a villain. He is best-known for his role in Israel's invasion of Lebanon in 1982, where -- as even the Israeli Kahan commission found -- he bore indirect responsibility for the indiscriminate slaughter of hundreds of Palestinians in the refugee camps of Sabra and Shatila. He has long been an opponent of any negotiations with Palestinians and rejects any Israeli territorial concessions. Perhaps his visit to Haram al Sharif last week was intended as a provocation to thwart any progress in the peace process (though no real progress was in the offing); perhaps he saw an opportunity to bloody some more Palestinians; or perhaps it was all part of a maneuver to secure his leadership of Likud against a challenge from former Prime Minister Benyamin Netanyahu. But the exact mix of motives here doesn't really matter. No one could possibly have doubted that going to Haram al Sharif and proclaiming it eternal Israeli territory would ignite a firestorm.

As for Prime Minister Ehud Barak, also a former general and the leader of the Labor Party, he is portrayed in the press as a pursuer of peace, willing to make concessions on important issues. But his fundamental position allows no compromise. In 1998, Barak declared that Labor has a "set of red lines which it will under no circumstances cross.... A united Jerusalem must remain under full and unequivocal Israeli sovereignty; most of the population of the settlements will remain under Israeli rule in large settlement blocs; under no circumstances will we return to the 1967 lines" (Jerusalem Post, 13 May 1998, p. 1). So whatever other concessions Barak might be willing to entertain, any that might offer the Palestinians real

justice has been automatically excluded.

What role did Barak have in Sharon's decision to go to Haram al Sharif? All indications are that Barak knew of Sharon's visit before it occurred. The extent to which Barak would have been able to prevent the visit had he so desired is not clear, but there is no evidence that Barak had any such desire. In recent weeks, even before the latest outbursts of violence, as Barak's support in the Israeli Knesset (parliament) had been waning, there had been rumors that he was seeking to form a coalition government with Sharon's Likud Party. His inaction did nothing to belie these rumors. In any event, however, the role Barak played in Sharon's visit is less important than Barak's overall role in the latest violence. In addition to his support for a peace process that offers no justice and thus no peace, it is he and his Cabinet who are ultimately responsible for the Israeli military's vicious lack of restraint during this past week: the killing of an unarmed, cowering 12-year-old boy, the killing of an ambulance driver who tried to save the boy, the killings of dozens of others (more than seventy at this writing), the maiming of many hundreds of others, the tank and helicopter gunships blasting apartment buildings.

As for Arafat's role in the latest violence, he can be viewed as the initiator only to the extent that his role in the Oslo process has made conditions in the occupied territories ripe for violence. What has inflamed the Palestinians -- and world opinion, at least outside Washington -- was the provocation of Sharon and the bloody actions of the Israeli military; no orders from Arafat were needed to bring thousands of enraged Palestinians into the streets. On the other hand, while not indicating a causal relationship as many of Israel's supporters have argued, it must be acknowledged that given Israel's savage history with respect to the Palestinians, Arafat might have anticipated this sort of Israeli over-reaction, perhaps allowing him to regain some of his lost credibility and putting some international pressure on the Barak government. But neither Arafat's attempts to keep up with Palestinian popular sentiment nor the occasional mindless excesses by some frustrated Palestinians (such as the trashing of Joseph's tomb, a Jewish holy place) change the basic situation: what has transpired in these past two weeks has been a legitimate, indigenous response to the denial of Palestinian rights, Israel's brutal occupation, and Arafat's capitulation.

What will come of this latest violence is unclear. Certainly the dire poverty in the West Bank and Gaza Strip, the repression by Arafat's police, and the hopelessness of the Oslo process are factors which make another intifada possible. And Barak has made clear how he would answer any

such uprising: the Israeli military would use "all means at their disposal" and they would do so "[e]ven if it is against the whole world." (Karin Laub, Laura King, both AP, 7 Oct. 2000) And indeed Israel is unlikely to concern itself with international pressure as long as the United States continues to flak for Israeli barbarism. U.S. officials may work to quiet outbursts of violence, but they still fail to insist that Israel offer justice to the Palestinians. Peace and justice in the Middle East will never occur until Washington stops giving Israel a blank check. And that will require decisive action by the American people.

Alex R. Shalom spent five months in 1998 studying in Jordan, Israel, and Palestine; Stephen R. Shalom teaches political science at William Paterson University.

=====

MEDIA SPIN REMAINS IN SYNC WITH ISRAELI OCCUPATION

By Norman Solomon

The formula for American media coverage of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is simple: Report on the latest developments in the fragile "peace process." Depict U.S. officials as honest brokers in the negotiations. Emphasize the need for restraint and compromise instead of instability and bloodshed.

In the world according to news media, the U.S. government is situated on high moral ground -- in contrast to some of the intractable adversaries. "The conflict that had been so elaborately dressed in the civilizing cloak of a peace effort has been stripped to its barest essence: Jew against Arab, Arab against Jew," a New York Times dispatch from Jerusalem declared as fierce clashes in occupied territory neared the end of their second week.

Soon afterwards, Secretary of State Madeleine Albright proclaimed: "The cycle of violence has to be stopped." Such pronouncements from Washington get a lot of respectful media play in our country.

Rarely do American journalists explore the ample reasons to believe that the United States is part of the oft-decried cycle of violence. Nor, in the past couple of weeks, has there been much media analysis of the fact that the violence was overwhelmingly inflicted on Palestinian people.

Within days, several dozen Palestinians were killed by heavily armed men in uniform -- often described by CNN and other news outlets as "Israeli security forces." Under the circumstances, it's a notably benign-sounding term for an army that shoots down protesters.

As for the rock-throwing Palestinians, I have never seen or heard a single American news account describing them as "pro-democracy demonstrators." Yet that would be an appropriate way to refer to people who -- after more than three decades of living under occupation -- are in the streets to demand self-determination.

While Israeli soldiers and police, with their vastly superior firepower, do most of the killing, Israel's public-relations engines keep whirling like well-oiled tops. Days ago, tilted by the usual spin, American news stories highlighted the specious ultimatums issued by Prime Minister Ehud Barak as he demanded that Palestinians end the violence -- while uniformed Israelis under his authority continued to kill them.

Beneath the Israeli "peace process" rhetoric echoed by American media, an implicit message isn't hard to discern: If only Palestinians would stop resisting the Israeli occupation of the West Bank, it would no longer be necessary for Israeli forces to shoot them.

"Israel Extends Time For Peace," said the lead headline on the Oct. 10 front page of USA Today. "Israel early today extended a deadline for Palestinians to end rioting," the article began. At this rate, we may someday see a headline that reads: "Israel Demands Palestinians Stop Attacking Bullets With Their Bodies."

Of course, amid all the nifty Orwellian touches, the proper behavior of people whose homeland remains under occupation has never quite been spelled out. But U.S. media coverage has reflexively mimicked the themes coming out of the White House and State Department. It all makes sense -- as long as we set aside basic concepts of human rights -- as long as we refuse to acknowledge that without justice there can be no real peace.

For American journalists on mainstream career ladders, it's prudent to avoid making a big deal about Israel's human rights violations, which persist without letup in tandem with Israel's occupation of land it captured in the 1967 war. Many pundits are fond of cloaking the occupiers in mantles of righteousness. And we hear few questions raised about the fact that the occupiers enjoy the powerful backing of the United States.

The silence is usually deafening, even among journalists who write opinion columns on a regular basis. The U.S. government's economic and military assistance to Israel adds up to a few billion dollars per year. Among media professionals, that aid is widely seen as an untouchable "third rail." To challenge U.S. support for Israel is to invite a torrent of denunciations -- first and foremost, the

accusation of "anti-Semitism."

Occasionally, I've written columns criticizing U.S. media for strong pro-Israel bias in news reporting and spectrums of commentary. Every time, I can count on a flurry of angry letters that accuse me of being anti-Semitic. It's a timeworn, knee-jerk tactic: Whenever someone makes a coherent critique of Israel's policies, immediately go on the attack with charges of anti-Jewish bigotry.

Numerous American supporters of Israel resort to this tactic. Perhaps the difficulties of defending the Israeli occupation on its merits have encouraged substitution of the "anti-Semitic" epithet for reasoned debate.

Like quite a few other Jewish Americans, I'm appalled by what Israel is doing with U.S. tax dollars. Meanwhile, as journalists go along to get along, they diminish the humanity of us all.

"Ask not for whom the bell tolls."

Norman Solomon is a syndicated columnist. His latest book is "The Habits of Highly Deceptive Media."

To: gfred@falcon.cc.ukans.edu
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Alternative language on citizen participatioin
Cc: "Valerie Lemmie" <citymgr@ci.dayton.oh.us>, rutledge@indiana.edu
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Geroge,

Riding home on the metro after the meeting on social equity, I worked out an alternative way to bring citizen participation into the Issue Paper of the NAPA Standing Planning on Social Equity.

Insert the following on page 16 before the concluding paragraph of "III. What Is Social Equity?" As an alternative, place it on page 21 as an unnumbered final paragraph of "IV. Social Equity Issues".

"As public administration engages in policy-making processes on social equity issues, full and equitable citizen participation is essential. Basic fairness requires that persons and groups affected by public policies and programs should be involved in their formulation. Moreover, participation augments the base of knowledge for decision making by obtaining citizen ideas for solutions to pressing problems and by revealing possible effects of proposed policies on various social and economic groups. As persons from different segments of population coming together to consider public issues, they can better understand each other's needs and concerns and together can work out ideas for equitable policy decisions. In this manner citizen participation processes provide an arena for resolving disagreements on public policy issues and settling competing claims. Furthermore, groups fairly represented in decision-making processes are more likely to be supportive of policy decisions as they are implemented."

My main reference is my paper on "Citizen Participation in Local Governmental Decision Making" that I wrote for the May 1996 NAPA-NIRA conference in Japan. In this paper I also present the idea of consent of the governed as a continuous, interactive process. The paper is in the conference report, Future Challenges of Local Autonomy in Japan, Korea, and the United States. If you don't have this handy, I can send you a copy of my paper.

Shalom,
Howard

To: klentner@starburst.cbl.umces.edu
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: e-mail list
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Keith,

Please add my name to the e-mail list to receive notices about softball practices at Aspen Hill, etc. My e-mail address is mupj@igc.org. Is something scheduled for next week?

Thanks,
Howard

Date: Sat, 14 Oct 2000 17:56:22 -0400 (EDT)
From: Keith Lentner <klentner@starburst.cbl.umces.edu>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: e-mail list

Thanks, Howard. As you requested, I have added your name to the MCSSA email distribution list.

On Sat, 14 Oct 2000, Howard W. Hallman wrote:

> Date: Sat, 14 Oct 2000 10:07:13 -0400
> From: Howard W. Hallman <mupj@igc.org>
> To: klentner@starburst.cbl.umces.edu
> Subject: e-mail list
>
> Dear Keith,
>
> Please add my name to the e-mail list to receive notices about softball
> practices at Aspen Hill, etc. My e-mail address is mupj@igc.org. Is
> something scheduled for next week?
>
> Thanks,
> Howard
>
>
>

--

Keith J. Lentner
klentner@starburst.cbl.umces.edu

Date: Sat, 14 Oct 2000 17:58:24 -0400 (EDT)
From: Keith Lentner <klentner@starburst.cbl.umces.edu>
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: Aspen Hill Open Play (fwd)

--

Keith J. Lentner
klentner@starburst.cbl.umces.edu

----- Forwarded message -----

Date: Thu, 12 Oct 2000 17:47:56 -0400 (EDT)
From: Keith Lentner <klentner@starburst.cbl.umces.edu>
To: MCSSA Distribution: ;
Subject: Aspen Hill Open Play

Message from Bill Tait:

Open Play at Aspen Hill will resume at 10:00 am on Tu 17 Oct.

Play will be held every Tu and Thur throughout the fall and winter when it is not raining, the fields are not too muddy, and the temperature is above 50 degree Fahrenheit.

All ages and sexes are welcome!

--

Keith J. Lentner
klentner@starburst.cbl.umces.edu

From: "Rutledge, Philip" <rutledge@indiana.edu>
To: "'Howard W. Hallman '" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: Alternative language on citizen participatioin
Date: Sun, 15 Oct 2000 14:49:59 -0500
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

Howard:

Thanks. Good work. So glad you were with us last Friday. We might get there yet.

Phil

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

From: Howard W. Hallman
To: gfred@falcon.cc.ukans.edu
Cc: Valerie Lemmie; rutledge@indiana.edu
Sent: 10/13/00 4:30 PM
Subject: Alternative language on citizen participatioin

Dear Gerge,

Riding home on the metro after the meeting on social equity, I worked out an alternative way to bring citizen participation into the Issue Paper of the NAPA Standing Planning on Social Equity.

Insert the following on page 16 before the concluding paragraph of "III. What Is Social Equity?" As an alternative, place it on page 21 as an unnumbered final paragraph of "IV. Social Equity Issues".

"As public administration engages in policy-making processes on social equity issues, full and equitable citizen participation is essential. Basic fairness requires that persons and groups affected by public policies and programs should be involved in their formulation. Moreover, participation augments the base of knowledge for decision making by obtaining citizen ideas for solutions to pressing problems and by revealing possible effects of proposed policies on various social and economic groups. As persons from different segments of population coming together to consider public issues, they can better understand each other's needs and concerns and together can work out ideas for equitable policy decisions. In this manner citizen participation processes provide an arena for resolving disagreements on public policy issues and settling competing claims. Furthermore, groups fairly represented in decision-making processes are more likely to be supportive of policy decisions as they are implemented."

My main reference is my paper on "Citizen Participation in Local Governmental Decision Making" that I wrote for the May 1996 NAPA-NIRA conference in Japan. In this paper I also present the idea of consent of the governed as a continuous, interactive process. The paper is in the conference report, Future Challenges of Local Autonomy in Japan, Korea, and the United States. If you don't have this handy, I can send you a copy of my paper.

Shalom,
Howard

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

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

X-Sender: dkimball@[63.106.26.66]
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)
Date: Sun, 15 Oct 2000 17:58:27 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: N-Testing Update: 1 Year After the Senate Vote

<x-rich>October 13, 2000

TO: Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers members and friends

FR: Daryl Kimball, Director

RE: Nuclear Testing Update

One year ago this month, the Senate briefly debated and then voted down the CTBT 51-48.

Despite the vote, international support for the CTBT is still very strong and there will be opportunities to engage the new Senate and the next President on issues related to the CTBT and U.S. nuclear testing/non-proliferation policy. There may also be an opportunity to encourage them to reconsider ratification of the Treaty itself.

As the attached Coalition Issue Brief (below) suggests, such efforts will require a more considered and certainly more bi-partisan discussion in the Senate and in the next administration of the CTBT and other key nuclear weapons policy issues. Among the test ban-related policy questions that must be addressed by the next President are: how the U.S. will maintain the existing U.S. nuclear weapons stockpile; will the U.S. break with the policy (first established by President Bush in 1992 and later reinforced by President Clinton) not to proceed with new nuclear weapons design production (or testing); and how will the U.S. try to turn back nuclear weapons buildups in South and East Asia absent U.S. CTBT ratification.

Developments since the October 1999 votes show that the Department of Energy needs to re-think its approach to its stockpile stewardship program as it faces growing skepticism about claims that some elements of its proposed "stockpile stewardship" program are necessary for stockpile maintenance and that it can complete new R&D projects -- like the National Ignition Facility -- on schedule and on budget. (See below for the latest on the NIF debate.)

And, as the recent Congressional fight about research and development to

"defeat hardened and buried targets" shows, some members of Congress believe that new types of nuclear weapons should be developed, despite the fact that there is no new military "requirement" for such weapons, nor is it in the interest of the United States to resume nuclear test explosions for the sake of any "requirement" that might be manufactured by laboratory scientists or StratCom officers. Last week the House and Senate approved the FY 2001 defense authorization bill which contains a provision added by Sens. Warner (VA) and Allard (CO) to research and report on "defeating hardened and deeply buried targets." They are interested in overturning a 1994 law prohibiting research and development of a new low-yield nuclear weapon that they believe would have the capability to destroy deeply buried targets, such as bunkers.

However, the final language contained in the defense authorization bill was weakened by the Democrats on the House Armed Services Committee. The provision now ends the "limited research and development authority" on mini-nukes on July 1, 2001, when a report on the issue is due to Congress. Because there are no funds earmarked for this project and there is such a short time for the study, it is unlikely to allow extensive activity in this area. But this limited victory may be short-lived as Sens. Warner and Allard can be expected to push again for development of a new small nuclear warhead in next year's defense authorization bill. For further details, see below and see FCNL's web site at <<<http://www.fcnl.org/issues/arm/minnukeindx.htm>>>.

The Congress also has legislated that the next administration conduct reviews that could have a major bearing on U.S. nuclear test ban policy. The FY 2001 defense authorization bill calls for a review of "The active and inactive nuclear weapons stockpile that will be required for implementing the United States national and military strategy, including any plans for replacing or modifying warheads" and a plan for "Appropriate warheads to outfit the strategic nuclear delivery systems ... to satisfy evolving military requirements," among other matters. (See below for further details.)

Meanwhile, international efforts to encourage nuclear restraint in South Asia through the CTBT and other measures have produced few tangible results as India and Pakistan remain at odds and on the verge of nuclear weapon deployment.

On the whole, ten years after the end of the Cold War and eight years after the last U.S. nuclear weapon test explosion, the de facto international test moratorium is in place but is not secure and will not be until and unless the U.S. demonstrates leadership by example by ratifying the CTBT.

- DK

CONTENTS --

* STATUS OF THE CTBT

1. Coalition Issue Brief, October 13, 2000 -- "One Year After the Senate CTBT Vote"
2. CTBTO Press Release: "Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty - Four Years Old," 25 September 2000

* NUCLEAR WEAPONS R, D & T

3. Excerpt from Congressional Record, September 27, 2000, CONFERENCE REPORT ON FY 2001 ENERGY AND WATER

DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001, National Nuclear Security Administration Weapons Activities (NIF)

4. "Superlaser Project To Receive Boost Of \$199 Million," San Francisco Chronicle, Sept. 29, 2000
5. "Steep Budget Rise Saves Nuclear Project," The New York Times, October 5, 2000
6. Letters: Nuclear Testing Debate, The New York Times, October 3, 2000
7. Excerpt from National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001, CONFERENCE REPORT, Subtitle E--Strategic Forces

* SOUTH ASIAN NUCLEAR TEST BAN POLITICS

8. "CTBT: The 'Should' vs. 'Can' Dilemma," The Times of India, 29 September 2000, by *Ejaz Haider*
9. "Gore Meets With India Leader and Prods Senate on Test Ban," The New York Times, September 16, 2000

1. "One Year After Senate CTBT Vote, U.S. Nuclear Testing and Non-Proliferation Policy Still in Limbo"

COALITION TO REDUCE NUCLEAR DANGERS -- ISSUE BRIEF

Volume 4, Number 19, October 13, 2000

ONE YEAR AGO TODAY, the Senate rejected the opinion of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, former Chairman of the JCS, numerous nuclear weapons and verification experts, as well as the vast majority of the American people and it became the first and only legislature to vote down ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). The 51-48 vote also raised doubt among U.S. allies about the United States' global leadership role on nuclear non-proliferation and has given other countries an excuse to withhold support for the CTBT.

By banning all nuclear weapon test explosions, the CTBT can impede the development of advanced, new types of two-stage nuclear warheads, which are more easily deliverable by ballistic missiles. U.S. ratification would strengthen international support for the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and U.S. leadership abroad. Because the United States does not now, nor likely will ever, need to conduct another nuclear explosive test, it remains in America's interest to ratify the treaty to encourage others to do so. The CTBT's far-reaching nuclear test monitoring provisions, including an international monitoring network and short-notice on-site inspections, would greatly enhance the United States' current technical and political capability to ensure that other countries are not conducting nuclear test explosions.

Since the Senate's October 1999 vote, U.S. allies and other states maintained momentum toward CTBT entry into force, with 14 additional ratifications and 6 additional signatories. To date, the Treaty has been signed by 160 states, including 41 of the 44 states required for entry into force, and the Treaty has been ratified by 66 states, including 30 of the 44 states required for entry into force. In addition to the U.S., the other major CTBT hold-outs are China (which has not ratified) and India, Pakistan and North Korea (which have not yet signed).

All NATO member states — except for the U.S. — have ratified the CTBT. In April, the Russian Duma approved ratification of the Treaty. In May, the 180+ states gathered for the Review Conference on the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty expressed unanimous support for "... signatures and ratifications, without delay and without conditions and in accordance with constitutional processes, to achieve the early entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty."

Continuing support for the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty depends, in the long-term, on progress towards the CTBT and other concrete non-proliferation and disarmament measures. The NPT was extended indefinitely in 1995 largely on the basis of the commitment of the United States and the other major nuclear weapons powers to conclude the CTBT. By itself, the CTBT cannot stop proliferation, but America cannot effectively fight the spread of nuclear weapons without the CTBT.

REASONS TO RECONSIDER:

Decisions with a profound and lasting impact on national and international security, like the Senate's CTBT vote, merit thorough, careful, non-partisan consideration. However, as a result of actions of CTBT opponents and proponents, the Senate and the White House, the CTBT was not handled in that fashion.

After refusing to hold hearings on the CTBT for over two years, the Senate leadership allotted two days of hearings in the Senate Armed Services Committee (October 6 and 7), one day in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee (October 7), and a closed briefing in the Select Committee on Intelligence (October 6). The two and one-half days of floor debate began the morning after the hearings ended, and the final floor vote was held just five days after the hearings. There were no committee reports on the Treaty.

In contrast, the Senate held 11 days of SFRC hearings and devoted nearly three weeks of floor debate to the 1963 Limited Test Ban Treaty. The formal floor debate on that Treaty began 6 calendar days after the SFRC issued its final report and the final vote on passage of the LTBT was 18 days later.

For many senators including Richard Lugar (R-IN) and others who voted "no" on the CTBT, the process "...reduced to a few days... a process that normally would take many months..." As Lugar noted, "Many senators know little about this Treaty. Even for those of us on national security committees, this has been an issue floating on the periphery of our concerns." On October 12, 1999, 62 Senators (24 Republicans and 38 Democrats) wrote to Majority Leader Lott and Minority Leader Daschle urging them to "put...off final consideration until the next Congress." The letter would likely have been signed by 67 or more Senators. But there was not time. The Majority Leader pushed forward with the vote the next day.

THE FUTURE OF U.S. NUCLEAR TEST BAN POLICY:

Since the vote, several senators have indicated that they want the Senate to revisit the unfinished question of CTBT ratification. Senators Chuck Hagel (R-NE) and Joseph Lieberman (D-CT) have said that "our constituents and our country's allies have expressed grave concerns about our hasty rejection of the treaty and the impact of that rejection on the treaty's survival. They need to know that we, along with a clear majority of the Senate, have not given up hope of finding common ground in our quest for a sound and secure ban on nuclear testing."

Repairing the damage caused by the Senate vote on the CTBT and averting other imprudent nuclear weapons policy decisions will require a much more balanced and bi-partisan effort to consider the key questions surrounding U.S. nuclear weapons and nuclear testing policy, including:

- * what is the role and purpose of nuclear weapons test explosions?
- * what constitutes an effective stewardship program to maintain the remaining nuclear arsenal?
- * and, in the absence of U.S. CTBT ratification, how can the United States effectively monitor and deter nuclear testing and how can the United States prevent emergence of new nuclear weapons dangers?

Regardless of who is elected, the next president and the next Congress will face issues relating to the CTBT in 2001. The Senate vote has not released the U.S. from its legal obligation as a signatory to the Treaty not to conduct nuclear weapon test explosions, and both of the leading presidential candidates have voiced their support for continuing the nuclear test moratorium that has been in effect since September 1992.

As a consequence, the failure of the Senate to ratify the CTBT puts the U.S. in test ban policy "limbo" that is not beneficial to U.S. security. Until the U.S. ratifies the CTBT, it denies itself the benefits of the Treaty's extensive nuclear test monitoring and on-site inspection provisions, and it denies the U.S. the moral and legal authority to encourage other nations not to conduct nuclear weapon test explosions. America's vital national security interests demand that the new Senate and the new President agree to work together in a bi-partisan fashion to undertake a more thoughtful and balanced review of this widely-supported non-proliferation tool.

The Coalition is a non-partisan alliance of 17 of the nation's leading non-proliferation organizations working for a practical, step-by-step program to reduce the dangers of weapons of mass destruction. The views expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect those of every Coalition member.

2. PREPARATORY COMMISSION FOR THE COMPREHENSIVE NUCLEAR-TEST-BAN TREATY ORGANIZATION (CTBTO PrepCom) PROVISIONAL TECHNICAL SECRETARIAT

Vienna International Centre P.O. BOX 1200, A-1400 Vienna, AUSTRIA
Telephone: +43 1 26030 6200 Facsimile: +43 1 26030 5877

PRESS RELEASE

COMPREHENSIVE NUCLEAR-TEST-BAN TREATY - FOUR YEARS OLD

Vienna, Austria, 25 September 2000

1. "Significant international events, such as the 2000 Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference (New York, 24 April to 19 May 2000), and the United Nations Millennium Summit (New York, 6 to 8 September 2000) have both added momentum to the signature and ratification processes of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT)", remarked Wolfgang Hoffmann, Executive Secretary for the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization (CTBTO Preparatory Commission), on the occasion of the CTBT's fourth anniversary.

"An additional 11 States have ratified the Treaty so far this year, while five more States have joined the list of Signatories. This clearly indicates the high level of political support that the CTBT is receiving, with the number of signatures currently standing at 160 and ratifications at 63. Continued international support will facilitate the fulfilment of the Treaty's goal of universal membership and early entry into force".

2. Over the last year, the CTBTO Preparatory Commission has made good progress on the establishment of the Treaty's global verification regime*, and work on the International Monitoring System (IMS) network is well underway. This network is designed to register vibrations underground, in the seas and in the air as well as to detect radioactive material released into the atmosphere. Many stations are now fully operational.

The first seismological stations that were built in their entirety by the Commission began transmitting data to the International Data Centre (IDC) in Vienna in April 2000. The IDC is currently receiving data from 109 IMS stations around the globe.

3. Three primary seismological stations were certified on 28 July 2000: PS09 (Yellowknife, Canada), PS27 (Hamar, Norway), and PS47 (Mina, Nevada, United States). By the end of 2000, it is anticipated that an additional 15 stations will have been certified. To date, 280 legal arrangements have been undertaken involving work at the sites of stations in over 60 States. Both the seismological and hydroacoustic networks are now about 30 per cent operational, and some 10 per cent of the infrasound and radionuclide networks are now functioning.

4. Over 40 States are currently able to access data and products from the IDC. Data quality and availability will further improve as more IMS stations are established, existing stations upgraded and the satellite communication system for data transmission extended.

5. The Global Communications Infrastructure (GCI) is now functional. Global satellite coverage has been made possible through the installation of five GCI hubs and a frame relay infrastructure to link these hubs to the IDC in Vienna.

6. Preparatory activities for on-site inspections have focused on the drafting of an operational manual and the procurement of basic equipment for testing and training purposes.

7. A third International Cooperation Workshop took place in Beijing in June 2000 for the States of South-East Asia, the Far East and the Pacific Region. A fourth Workshop is scheduled to take place in Lima in November 2000 for the States of the Latin American and Caribbean Region. These Workshops aim, inter alia, to highlight the significance of the CTBT for global peace and security, and to promote signature and ratification. They also explore the possible uses of the verification technologies, IMS data and IDC products, for scientific and civil purposes, and examine the potential for regional or international cooperation in collecting, analysing and using these data.

8. The payment of assessed contributions is an important barometer to gauge the commitment and support of the States Signatories to the Organization's work. Almost 96 per cent of the contributions to the 1999 budget were paid and, to date, some 92 per cent of the contributions for 2000 have been received.

9. As at 19 September, the Provisional Technical Secretariat of the CTBTO Preparatory Commission had a total of 242 staff members from 70 States Signatories.

The [66] States that have deposited their instruments of ratification of the CTBT are: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Czech

Republic, Denmark, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kiribati, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Senegal, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and Uzbekistan.

3. Congressional Record, Wednesday, September 27, 2000, pp. H8316-H8317,

H8378-H8379

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4733 (H. Rept. 106-907), ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

National Nuclear Security Administration

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction

and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other incidental

expenses necessary for atomic energy defense weapons activities in carrying out

the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101

et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property

or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or

expansion; and the purchase of passenger motor vehicles (not to exceed 12 for

replacement only), \$5,015,186,000, to remain available until expended:

Provided: That, \$130,000,000 shall be immediately available for

Project 96-D-111, the National Ignition Facility at Lawrence Livermore National

Laboratory: Provided further, That \$69,100,000 shall be available only upon a certification by the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security

Administration to the Congress after March 31, 2001, that

(a) includes a recommendation on an appropriate path forward for the project;

(b) certifies all established project and scientific milestones have been met on

schedule and on cost;

(c) certifies the first and second quarter project reviews in fiscal year 2001

determined the project to be on schedule and cost;

(d) includes a study of requirements for and alternatives to a 192 beam

ignition facility for maintaining the safety and reliability of the current

nuclear weapons stockpile;

(e) certifies an integrated cost-schedule earned-value

project control system has been fully implemented; and

(f) includes a five-year budget plan for the stockpile stewardship program.

National Ignition Facility.-The conference agreement provides \$199,100,000

for continued construction of the National Ignition Facility (NIF).

The conferees have included a directed reduction of \$25,000,000 in the

Weapons Activities account which is to be applied to programs under the

direction of the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory.

The conferees have included statutory language providing that only

\$130,000,000 shall be made available for NIF at the beginning of fiscal year 2001 and the remaining \$69,100,000 shall be available only upon a certification after March 31, 2001, by the Administrator of the

National Nuclear Security Administration that several requirements have been

met. These requirements include:

A. A recommendation on an appropriate path forward for the project

based on a detailed review of alternative construction options that would (1)

focus on first achieving operation of a 48 or 96 beam laser; (2) allow for

the full demonstration of a such a system in support of the stockpile

stewardship program before proceeding with construction and operation

of a larger laser complex; and (3) include a program and funding plan for

the possible future upgrade to a full NIF configuration. The

recommendation should include identification of available "off-ramps" and decision

points where the project could be scaled to a smaller system.

B. Certification that project and scientific milestones as established

in the revised construction project data sheet for the fourth quarter of

fiscal year 2000 and the first two quarters of fiscal year 2001 have been met

on schedule and on cost.

C. Certification that the first and second quarter project reviews in

fiscal year 2001 determined the project to be on schedule and cost and

have provided further validation to the proposed path forward.

D. Completion of a study that includes conclusions as to whether the full-scale NIF is required in order to maintain the safety and reliability of the current nuclear weapons stockpile, and whether alternatives to the NIF could achieve the objective of maintaining the safety and reliability of the current nuclear weapons stockpile.

E. Certification that the NIF project has implemented an integrated cost-schedule earned-value project control system by March 1, 2001.

F. A five-year budget plan for the stockpile stewardship program that fully describes how the NNSA intends to pay for NIF over the out years and what the potential for other impacts on the stockpile stewardship program will be.

The conferees remain concerned about the Department's proposed budget increase and schedule delay for the NIF at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL). The conferees believe that previously the Department of Energy, and most recently the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), may have failed to examine adequately options for NIF that have fewer than the full 192 beams. For example, a preferred course for NIF may be to complete 48 or 96 beams as soon as possible (although block procurement of infrastructure and glass may be considered), bring the reduced NIF into operation, perform the necessary scientific and technical tests to evaluate whether a full NIF will work and its impact on stockpile stewardship, and then develop a path forward for NIF that balances its

scientific importance within the overall needs of the stockpile

stewardship program. To move on this path in fiscal year 2001, the conferees

recommend that \$199,100,000 be appropriated for NIF as follows: \$74,100,000 as

originally proposed for Project 96-D-111, \$40,000,000 from NIF

operations funding within the budget request for LLNL, \$25,000,000 to be

identified within the budget request at LLNL, plus an additional \$60,000,000 in

new appropriations.

Furthermore, the conferees direct the Administration to prepare a budget

request for fiscal year 2002 that fully reflects a balanced set of programs

and investments within the stockpile stewardship program, and that the

overall budget profile over the next eight years will accommodate a \$3.4

billion NIF along with the other critical aspects of the program.

4. "Superlaser Project To Receive Boost Of \$199 Million," San Francisco Chronicle, 09/29/00

Surviving a year of relentless criticism for cost overruns and mismanagement, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory's superlaser project won a funding boost from Congress yesterday that falls just short of the full lab request.

Livermore officials were jubilant over the \$199 million funding package cobbled together for the National Ignition Facility after months of debate that included calls to scrap the project or severely scale back its budget.

The cost of the stadium-sized superlaser complex under construction at Livermore, which is designed to test the reliability of nuclear weapons

without using bomb tests, is now at least \$1 billion over its original budget and at least six years behind schedule.

Investigators from the General Accounting Office reported this summer that lab officials had misrepresented the cost of the experimental laser system to win initial funding in the mid-1990s.

Critics who see the superlaser as a multibillion-dollar boondoggle that may never succeed in simulating bomb tests said they were disgusted that Congress didn't require an outside review of the project by the National Academy of Sciences before approving its funding.

"It sets a terrible precedent," said Keith Ashdown, a spokesman for the Washington, D.C., group Taxpayers for Common Sense. "If you lie to Congress, mismanage your project and waste taxpayer dollars, Congress will punish you by giving you more money."

Rep. Ellen Tauscher, D-Walnut Creek, a principal advocate for the superlaser project, said Congress has outlined a plan for heightened scrutiny that will continue through budget rounds in the years to come.

"We're not out of the woods yet," Tauscher said.

The compromise appropriation cobbled together by a House-Senate conference committee is \$10 million less than the \$209 million requested this year to keep the project on schedule for completion in 2008. But it far exceeds the \$74 million previously earmarked for the superlaser at the Energy Department laboratory. The funding was part of a bill overwhelmingly approved by the House and expected to be approved by the Senate.

The increase will come partially from \$65 million in funds that must be shifted from other programs at Lawrence Livermore. And Congress will not release \$69 million of the money until the Energy Department demonstrates the project is meeting new cost, schedule and research milestones.

Congress also required DOE officials to consider a modified plan to build the 192-laser array in stages, starting with as few as 48 laser beam lines whose performance could be tested. A DOE report on that option is due in March.

"I think it's trap-door language," said Tauscher. "It's an exit strategy to not go all the way, which I oppose."

Lawrence Livermore lab spokeswoman Susan Houghton said no layoffs will result from the shift of \$25 million to NIF from other lab programs. The money will not come from research projects unrelated to the lab's work on maintaining the nation's nuclear stockpile, she added.

Christopher Paine of the Natural Resources Defense Council was skeptical, saying Livermore's other "stockpile stewardship" programs are too small to absorb the loss.

Marylia Kelley, of the lab watchdog group Tri-Valley Cares, said another shift of \$40 million from NIF's operating costs to its construction budget will starve research programs needed to solve technical problems that still remain with the optical lenses used to focus the laser beams.

Tauscher said other increases in the nuclear weapons program will help Lawrence Livermore cover the cost. The total appropriation for DOE's atomic energy defense programs, which includes the nuclear weapons program, is up \$606 million over fiscal year 2000.

Officials at Los Alamos and other DOE labs had feared that NIF's budget overruns would drain funds from their programs, but Congress apparently augmented budgets for all the labs.

Sen. Tom Harkin, D-Iowa, said Congress is now trusting DOE to do what it has failed to do before -- identify problems and report them honestly.

"I fear we are leaving the fox to watch the hen house," Harkin said. "We need a truly independent review that will not be swept under the rug."

5. "Steep Budget Rise Saves Nuclear Project," The New York Times, 10/05/00

By JAMES GLANZ

A mammoth laser project at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory will apparently not have to be halted, as proponents had feared, after Congress this week nearly tripled its original budget for the 2001 fiscal year to cover large cost overruns and construction delays.

"Frankly, it was nothing short of a miracle," Representative Ellen O. Tauscher, a California Democrat whose district includes the laboratory, said of the sharp increase that she supported.

She said the increase had to overcome opposition from members of Congress who said that project officials had not been forthcoming on the likely costs of the project and that the move would not have been possible without the nation's budget surplus this year.

Called the National Ignition Facility, the project is designed to train 192 converging laser beams on pellets of nuclear fuel like hydrogen, crushing and heating them in order to set off tiny thermonuclear explosions. Officials at the laboratory and the Department of Energy, which runs it, hope that those experiments will help them study nuclear weapons without testing them in much larger explosions.

But the projected cost of the laser has ballooned to \$4 billion, nearly \$1 billion more than originally expected, after laboratory officials greatly underestimated the complexity of the project and then did not report growing problems to the Energy Department and Congress.

The officials have said the overruns grew out of management problems that have been corrected, while critics maintain that the laser still has technical difficulties.

The officials said the Clinton administration's original request for the project in 2001, \$74 million, would have forced it to shut down.

In votes on Thursday and Monday, the House and Senate approved an increase to \$199 million. The money is part of an energy and water bill that still is subject to approval by President Clinton. The bill faces a veto threat because of an unrelated environmental dispute, but Congressional aides say the laser financing will almost certainly remain intact in any agreement.

Clay Sell, a staff member on the energy and water subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, said \$60 million of the increase amounted to new financing, while the rest came from other weapons programs at Livermore.

The increase had strings attached, including heightened oversight of the project and a study to determine whether the project could be replaced by a smaller version with fewer laser beams, or a cheaper alternative based on different technology.

Madelyn Creedon, the deputy administrator for defense programs at the Energy Department's National Nuclear Security Administration, said she believed the full-scale project was "essential for keeping our nuclear weapons reliable and safe."

Ms. Tauscher said that while the management of the project had been "terribly bungled" she believed that those problems had now been fixed and that the science behind the laser was sound.

6. The New York Times, October 3, 2000

Letters: Nuclear Testing Debate

o the Editor:

The article "A Great Hope of Physics Falls on Hard Times" (Sept. 26) quotes a Lawrence Livermore Laboratory associate director as saying that its multibillion-dollar laser facility is needed to maintain our nuclear deterrent without nuclear testing. This might leave the dangerous impression that the failure of this laser project would require restarting underground testing.

In fact, many weapons experts say the nuclear stockpile can be maintained and evaluated using penetrating radiographic hydrotests, without this facility.

We should also be concerned about the risk-taking, optimistic advocacy of the giant Livermore project. It raises doubts that this lab can be entrusted with the maintenance of the existing nuclear stockpile.

STEPHEN E. BODNER Pittsboro, N.C.

•

To the Editor:

I disagree with the contention that a new giant laser at the National Ignition Facility will allow the nation to maintain its nuclear deterrent without nuclear testing (Sept. 26).

The opposite side is that if N.I.F. fails, we will not be able to maintain the stockpile without nuclear testing. I believe neither is true.

Sound arguments can be made that N.I.F. is not required to maintain the stockpile. The best that can be said for the program, besides the economic benefit to the Lawrence Livermore Laboratory, is that the physics of inertially confined fusion is related to weapons physics.

GERALD E. MARSH Chicago

The writer is a consultant on nuclear technology.

7. Excerpt from Enactment of Provisions of H.R. 5408, the Floyd D. Spence National Defense

Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001

CONFERENCE REPORT

to accompany H.R. 4205

Subtitle E--Strategic Forces

SEC. 1041. REVISED NUCLEAR POSTURE REVIEW.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW.--In order to clarify United States nuclear deterrence policy and strategy for the near term, the Secretary of Defense shall conduct a comprehensive review of the nuclear posture of the United States for the next 5 to 10 years. The Secretary shall conduct the review in consultation with the Secretary of Energy.

(b) ELEMENTS OF REVIEW.--The nuclear posture review shall include the following elements:

(1) The role of nuclear forces in United States military strategy, planning, and programming.

(2) The policy requirements and objectives for the United States to maintain a safe, reliable, and credible nuclear deterrence posture.

(3) The relationship among United States nuclear deterrence policy, targeting strategy, and arms control objectives.

(4) The levels and composition of the nuclear delivery systems that will be required for implementing the United States national and military strategy, including any plans for replacing or modifying existing systems.

(5) The nuclear weapons complex that will be required for implementing the United States national and military strategy, including any plans to modernize or modify the complex.

(6) The active and inactive nuclear weapons stockpile that will be required for implementing the United States national and military strategy, including any plans for replacing or modifying warheads.

(c) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**--The Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress,

in unclassified and classified forms as necessary, a report on the results

of the nuclear posture review conducted under this section. The report

shall be submitted concurrently with the Quadrennial Defense Review report

due in December 2001.

(d) SENSE OF CONGRESS.--It is the sense of Congress that the nuclear posture review conducted under this section should be used as the basis for establishing future United States arms control objectives and negotiating positions.

SEC. 1042. PLAN FOR THE LONGTERM SUSTAINMENT AND MODERNIZATION OF UNITED STATES STRATEGIC NUCLEAR FORCES.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR PLAN.--The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, shall develop a longrange plan for the sustainment and modernization of United States strategic nuclear forces to counter emerging threats and satisfy the evolving requirements of deterrence.

(b) ELEMENTS OF PLAN.--The plan specified under subsection (a) shall include the Secretary's plans, if any, for the sustainment and modernization of the following:

(1) Landbased and seabased strategic ballistic missiles, including any plans for developing replacements for the Minuteman III intercontinental ballistic missile and the Trident II sealunched ballistic missile and plans for common ballistic missile technology development.

(2) Strategic nuclear bombers, including any plans for a B 2 followon, a B 52 replacement, and any new airlaunched weapon systems.

(3) Appropriate warheads to outfit the strategic nuclear delivery

systems referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2) to satisfy evolving military

requirements.

(c) SUBMITTAL OF PLAN.--The plan specified under subsection (a) shall be submitted to Congress not later than April 15, 2001. The plan shall be submitted in unclassified and classified forms, as necessary.

SEC. 1044. REPORT ON THE DEFEAT OF HARDENED AND DEEPLY BURIED TARGETS.

(a) STUDY.--The Secretary of Defense shall, in conjunction with the Secretary of Energy, conduct a study relating to the defeat of hardened and deeply buried targets. Under the study, the Secretaries shall

(1) review --

(A) the requirements of the United States to defeat hardened and deeply buried targets and stockpiles of chemical and biological agents and related capabilities; and

(B) current and future plans to meet those requirements;

(2) determine if those plans adequately address all such requirements;

(3) identify potential future hardened and deeply buried targets and other related targets;

(4) determine what resources and research and development efforts are

needed to defeat the targets identified under paragraph (3) as well as other requirements to defeat stockpiles of chemical and biological agents

and related capabilities;

(5) assess both current and future options to defeat hardened and deeply buried targets as well as concepts to defeat stockpiles of chemical

and biological agents and related capabilities; and

(6) determine the capability and cost of each option assessed under paragraph (5).

(b) CONDUCT OF ASSESSMENTS.--In conducting the study under subsection (a),

the Secretaries may, in order to perform the assessments required by paragraph (5) of that subsection, conduct any limited research and development that may be necessary to perform those assessments.

(c) REPORT.--(1) Not later than July 1, 2001, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives a report on the results of the study conducted under subsection (a). The report shall be prepared in conjunction with the Secretary of Energy.

(2) The report under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, together with a classified annex if necessary.

8. The Times of India, 29 September 2000

"CTBT: THE "SHOULD" VS "CAN" DILEMMA"

Ejaz Haider points at the increasing relevance of the CTBT for South Asia and says the treaty must be used to prevent Pakistan and India

from moving up the nuclear ladder

</italic>

Pakistan and India, who had tentatively agreed to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty at the 51st United Nations General Assembly session in September 1998, have since been dithering. The government's belated attempt to build consensus on the issue seems to have failed for various reasons, not least because the exercise was wrongly premised and sloppily executed. What is to be done next? More appropriately, is the issue still relevant, especially in light of the rejection of the treaty by the US Senate?

The answer to that question cannot but be in the affirmative. Here is why.

First, while the US Senate may have refused to ratify the treaty, the treaty is not dead. This is clear from the fact that state parties have continued to come into the treaty fold. To date, 160 states have signed the treaty, with five entering the treaty this year, and 63 have ratified it, with Belarus being the latest, which deposited the instrument of ratification on September 13, 2000. This clearly shows the consensus on the issue has not waned.

Secondly, and this is most significant, the CTBT is the only option left with India and Pakistan in the area of nuclear arms control to (a) engage the international community; (b) use the treaty to arrest the likely movement up the nuclear ladder and (c) use the space thus got to develop confidence- and security-building measures. This CSBMs exercise, first at the military level and involving both conventional and nuclear spheres, could then be used to develop a parallel dialogue on contentious, political issues. Moreover, the exercise could be made more meaningful through verification procedures and guarantees that could be either bilateral or multilateral.

Such a course is important for more reasons than one. Maximalists on both sides seem already to have given the CTBT a burial. Not only that, they are now talking of weaponising (converting weaponisable configurations into weapons), more tests, overt deployment and the rest of it. Since most believe the credible minimum deterrent to be a flexible concept, there is talk of augmenting the arsenals. The proponents of such a course in Pakistan, while realising that an arms race may not be economically feasible, hide the reality by talking about ratios. There is also fanfare over the setting up of the National Command Authority, which is supposed to have resolved the problems of command and control for Pakistan.

All this is a red herring. This is not the place to go into the intricacies of command and control problems, the inevitability of accidents, the organisation theory and its impact on deterrence, various

technological constraints within the South Asian context and the other factors associated with the issue but suffice to say the NCA is no answer to these problems. These problems have only one answer: a clear refusal to go down the nuclear lane.

This is where the CTBT can play its part; this is also how the governments in India and Pakistan must assess the treaty. There is nothing inevitable about the technology-pull argument, as some experts are wont to suggest.

There is no gainsaying that the issue for Pakistan poses a dilemma. Certain international developments have had a negative fallout on nuclear arms control efforts and the international norm they sought to develop and sustain. By emphasising "nationalisms" they have shifted the discourse back to the idea of the survival of the fittest. India, which has always looked at its nuclear capability in expansive terms, desiring to play a larger role commensurate with its size and potential, has not missed out on the signals.

The opponents in that country seem to think stalling the process has become possible because of India's rising stock in the international market and its increasing economic potential. Additionally, they suggest the present CTBT is dead and should be taken back to the CD to be revived as a new treaty purged of its present loopholes. While this stance may correspond with India's earlier rejection of the treaty it seems to overlook certain other factors, not least the international consensus against proliferation of nuclear arms. This view may also tend to underestimate the U.S. commitment to nuclear arms control in light of domestic debate in that country on the issue of the NMD and the Senate's refusal to ratify the CTBT.

Other Delhi strategists who advocate engaging the international community on the issue seem to be looking for a value added for India's nuclear status. This, for them, could translate into a more meaningful strategic dialogue between India and the US, covering a wide range of issues, lifting of export controls on dual-technologies and other sanctions, and accepting India as a State with Nuclear Weapons if not a Nuclear-Weapon State. The idea here seems to be to drive a hard bargain and if that requires signing the CTBT, the treaty should be signed.

Pakistan's situation is more complex. Its stock in the international market has plummeted for various reasons. The Kargil conflict has made the world look askance at its nuclear capability and how it wants to use it. Its Afghanistan policy has come under increasing pressure. The linkage between Afghanistan and Kashmir continues to take a toll on its stand on Kashmir where it has increasingly lost its credibility. The military coup has added to its difficulties. In addition to domestic political uncertainty, its economy is in a shambles and shows no signs of immediate recovery. It is therefore much more dependent on the

international community for bailing it out and to that extent is more amenable to external pressure. In a manner of speaking it cannot afford a "relaxed" debate on the issue of CTBT.

However, the discourse of power and considerations of security also inform Pakistan's response, especially within the given regional situation and on the basis of its present national security paradigm. This also creates a paradox for it. Given its ebbing fortunes, Pakistan requires doing something to enhance its salience, but it fears that its bargaining chip used at this point may not serve any purpose higher than merely bailing it out. It contrasts the situation with India and apprehends that India is likely to get a more generous quid pro quo from the international community. One of the biggest fears Pakistan has is that the US is likely to share with India the advanced technologies to "carry out laboratory sub-critical explosions with no measurable fission yields, computer simulation of atomic explosions and fusion research".

This is not a sustainable position because such sharing could take place with or without Pakistan's signatures to the CTBT. In fact, one could argue that if Pakistan were to sign after India worked out such a quid pro quo with the U.S., there would be nothing left in the bargain for Pakistan. However, a case can be made that if Pakistan had chosen to sign the CTBT after it had tested, the reciprocal reward would likely have been more substantial. But the problem with losing time is that Pakistan could well be losing even more time and opportunity.

Two other factors, doctrine and cost, stand out in regard to a decision. Both are interrelated since the latter cannot be worked out without defining the former. The factor of doctrine is also significant, among other things, for reasons of taking a decision on whether Pakistan needs more tests than it has already conducted.

A third factor, as mentioned earlier, relates to the issue of deployment and its attendant command and control problems. It is here that the real problem arises for the international community. Even if it were to get Pakistan to sign the treaty, it cannot allow India to keep moving up the nuclear ladder. So far the factors of international pressure, the costs involved in the venture, lack of infrastructure and technology and the hope to get something meaningful out of the international community have prevented India from moving ahead. But if India were to move any further down the nuclear route, dragging Pakistan with it, the development is most likely to destabilize the situation, especially in the absence of any movement on the contentious, political issues. It is therefore important that both countries be treated on the basis of parity on the issue of the CTBT.

Therefore, along with signing the CTBT, the present condition of non-deployment can, and should be used as the basic framework for developing confidence- and security-building measures. This would mean an

acceptance of the nuclear status quo and verifiable guarantees, which could either be bilateral or multilateral, that the status quo will not be disturbed. The two countries could then initiate a parallel process of military CSBMs and political dialogue to improve the atmosphere between them.

CTBT affords a good test of what the international community on the one hand, and Pakistan and India on the other hand, can do. It can easily be contrasted with, for instance, the NPT. While Pakistan should de-link from India and sign the treaty, the international community must address its fear that India might ultimately get more out of its signature. Therefore, the international community needs to (a) engage the two countries on the issue of the CTBT on the basis of parity, and (b) explore ways of finding a viable quid pro quo that is acceptable to both countries. In fact, parity in this case can, and should, be used to also allow Pakistan and India to use the opportunity to spurn maximalist options.

For this strategy to work, India and Pakistan must obviously refrain from moving up the nuclear ladder and should in fact turn the factors that presently prevent them from doing so to their mutual advantage. There is no reason why they should build arsenals, big or small, and deploy them before taking to developing CSBMs to address the problem of stabilizing the deterrent a la the US and the Soviet Union.

It is clear that deployment, even on a small scale, is likely to stretch their meagre technological and other resources to the extreme. The maximalists in both countries are trying to "manufacture consent" in this direction. Like before, they hope to raise the stakes and give a fait accompli to the world. The situation must be squarely met and that is where the CTBT must play its part.

*This article is culled from a paper the author read at an arms control conference in Berlin, September 24-26

9. "Gore Meets With India Leader and Prods Senate on Test Ban"

<http://www.nytimes.com/2000/09/16/politics/16PREX.html>

The New York Times, September 16, 2000

By DAVID E. SANGER and KATHARINE Q. SEELYE

WASHINGTON, Sept. 15 Mixing election politics and international diplomacy, Vice President Al Gore told Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee of India today that as president he would make passage of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty his first foreign policy initiative in Congress, and he urged India to adopt the treaty as well.

Mr. Gore, reviving a promise he made last fall, was clearly suggesting that in rejecting the treaty a year ago, the Republican-led Senate had given India an easy excuse to keep its nuclear testing program alive, and had thus contributed to the dangerous standoff between India and Pakistan.

Gov. George W. Bush, the Republican presidential nominee, has said repeatedly that he opposes the treaty, on the ground that it would limit America's nuclear leadership.

Mr. Gore's comments to the visiting Indian prime minister today came at a private meeting between the two men after lunch at the State Department, aides said at a White House briefing.

At other points during the day, President Clinton and a variety of administration officials went out of their way to praise Mr. Vajpayee and signed a raft of agreements, from Export-Import Bank loans to civil aviation pacts. But the administration left in place and left largely undiscussed economic sanctions imposed on both India and Pakistan after they conducted nuclear tests two years ago.

And despite talk between Mr. Clinton and Mr. Vajpayee about closer relations this is the second meeting between the two men in six months India made no commitments beyond a continuation of its current voluntary moratorium on further nuclear testing.

"I think we have worked hard together to move our relationship from one of too little contact and too much suspicion to one of genuine efforts to build a long-term partnership," Mr. Clinton said in the Oval Office this morning, the prime minister at his side.

But their meeting also had an air of farewell about it, much like Mr. Clinton's session last week with President Jiang Zemin of China. Mr. Clinton made clear that he regarded his effort to strengthen ties to India a major accomplishment of his administration.

"We should look at this as a long-term effort that I can speak for myself I hope goes well beyond my presidency," Mr. Clinton said. "I don't think it should be another 20 years before an American president goes to India." Mr. Clinton visited the country earlier this year.

The prime minister described his meetings in Washington as "part of a continuing dialogue between the world's two largest democracies," and he added a "tribute to the Indian-American community, which has been such an effective bridge in strengthening Indo-U.S. ties."

The president and the prime minister talked about everything from trade to the territorial battle over Kashmir, and then the focus

quickly shifted to Mr. Gore's lunch at the State Department for Mr. Vajpayee and to the subsequent private meeting between the two.

Under the glittering glass chandeliers in a State Department dining room, Mr. Gore basked in an incumbent's perk: acting as host of a state luncheon and talking peace with a world leader. Mr. Gore said India, the world's largest democracy, and America, the world's oldest democracy, shared a special bond, and made only glancing reference to India's nuclear weapons capability.

"As the world's two leading democracies, we bear a special responsibility to take the lead in meeting the challenges that all democracies face," Mr. Gore said. "We must work together to ensure that democracy's promises are realized by all our people, that all benefit from freedom. Quality education, public health, a clean environment these are the goals we share and which together we can achieve. Threats that undermine democracy, such as terrorism and the proliferation of dangerous weapons technologies, are concerns we also share and will work together to address."

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-rich>

To: "Schuyler Rhodes" <srhodes@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Amendments to Social Principles
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\mu.114.doc;
In-Reply-To: <001401c034ae\$338b60a0\$06bf1004@default>
References: <3.0.3.32.20001012141510.00692e18@pop2.igc.org>

At 05:40 PM 10/12/00 -0700, you wrote:
>Dear Howard,

.....I understand that at General Conference there was a resolution written by
>Alan Geyer and Phil Wogaman which basically placed the Methodist Church in
>the Augustinian Just War position. Is this so? If so, can you locate the
>info on this for me?

Schuyler,

Unfortunately it happened. The amended language to the Social Principles is contained in an attachment. If you can't download it, let me know and I'll send it by text.

An amendment to paragraph 69C War and Peace adds the word "usual", making it read: "We therefore reject war as a usual instrument of foreign policy." An amendment to paragraph 68G Military Service introduces just war reasoning.

I didn't realize this was happening until the legislation was passed by the Faith and Order legislative committee. Ordinarily this issue is handled by Church and Society committee. I had read through all petitions assigned to Church and Society and didn't see anything like this. However, somebody decided that for the 2000 General Conference Faith and Order should handle all petitions dealing with homosexuality, including language in the Social Principles. Therefore, the entire Social Principles was assigned to Faith and Order, including this matter.

On the first Thursday evening or Friday morning of General Conference Jaydee Hanson told me about these two items coming out of Faith and Order. I helped him mount some opposition, but I left town on Saturday. Opponents got the matter pulled off the consent calendar but were unable to develop sufficient floor opposition to defeat them.

So we have a challenge for the 2004 General Conference. The "incompatible" language remains in paragraph 69C. We should try to remove "usual" because that leaves a loophole large enough for Hitler and other aggressors to send a tank division through. Paragraph 68G may require some new language rather than merely returning to the previous language. Hopefully this issue will return to the Church and Society committee where our viewpoint has more support.

Let's keep it in mind and return to it in 2003 with the petition process starts for the 2004 General Conference.

Shalom,
Howard

To: "Schuyler Rhodes" <srhodes@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <001401c034ae\$338b60a0\$06bf1004@default>
References: <3.0.3.32.20001012141510.00692e18@pop2.igc.org>

Dear Schuyler,

On another matter I am chairing the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. It consists of representatives of denominational offices and a number of peace fellowships affiliated with the FOR. Many are based in Washington but some elsewhere.

I notice that you are the contact for the Methodist Peace Fellowship. Would you be interested in being on the e-mail list to receive a flow of background material, action recommendations, and meeting notices? Do you have somebody in the Washington area who could attend our monthly or bi-monthly meeting? If so, please let me know.

Shalom,
Howard

To: mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Nuclear testing update
Cc:
Bcc: icnd
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

>From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
>Subject: N-Testing Update: 1 Year After the Senate Vote

Dear Colleagues:

I'm forwarding this for your information. Please forgive the duplication if you received it directly from Daryl Kimball.

Howard

>>X-Sender: dkimball@[63.106.26.66]
>>X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)
>>Date: Sun, 15 Oct 2000 17:58:27 -0400
>>To: dkimball@clw.org
>>From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
>>Subject: N-Testing Update: 1 Year After the Senate Vote
>>
>>October 13, 2000
>>
>>TO: Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers members and friends
>>
>>FR: Daryl Kimball, Director
>>
>>RE: Nuclear Testing Update
>>
>>One year ago this month, the Senate briefly debated and then voted down the
>>CTBT 51-48.
>>
>>Despite the vote, international support for the CTBT is still very strong
>>and there will be opportunities to engage the new new Senate and the next
>>President on issues related to the CTBT and U.S. nuclear
>>testing/non-proliferation policy. There may also be an opportunity to
>>encourage them to reconsider ratification of the Treaty itself.
>>
>>As the attached Coalition Issue Brief (below) suggests, such efforts will
>>require a more considered and certainly more bi-partisan discussion in the
>>Senate and in the next administration of the CTBT and other key nuclear
>>weapons policy issues. Among the test ban-related policy questions that
>>must be addressed by the next President are: how the U.S. will maintain the
>>existing U.S. nuclear weapons stockpile; will the U.S. break with the
>>policy (first established by President Bush in 1992 and later reinforced by
>>President Clinton) not to proceed with new nuclear weapons design
>>production (or testing); and how will the U.S. try to turn back nuclear
>>weapons buildups in South and East Asia absent U.S. CTBT ratification.
>>

>>Developments since the October 1999 votes show that the Department of
>>Energy needs to re-think its approach to its stockpile stewardship program
>>as it faces growing skepticism about claims that some elements of its
>>proposed "stockpile stewardship" program are necessary for stockpile
>>maintenance and that it can complete new R&D projects -- like the National
>>Ignition Facility -- on schedule and on budget. (See below for the latest
>>on the NIF debate.)

>>
>>And, as the recent Congressional fight about research and development to
>>"defeat hardened and buried targets" shows, some members of Congress
>>believe that new types of nuclear weapons should be developed, despite the
>>fact that there is no new military "requirement" for such weapons, nor is
>>it in the interest of the United States to resume nuclear test explosions
>>for the sake of any "requirement" that might be manufactured by laboratory
>>scientists or StratCom officers. Last week the House and Senate approved
>>the FY 2001 defense authorization bill which contains a provision added by
>>Sens. Warner (VA) and Allard (CO) to research and report on "defeating
>>hardened and deeply buried targets." They are interested in overturning a
>>1994 law prohibiting research and development of a new low-yield nuclear
>>weapon that they believe would have the capability to destroy deeply buried
>>targets, such as bunkers.

>>
>>However, the final language contained in the defense authorization bill was
>>weakened by the Democrats on the House Armed Services Committee. The
>>provision now ends the "limited research and development authority" on
>>mini-nukes on July 1, 2001, when a report on the issue is due to Congress.
>>Because there are no funds earmarked for this project and there is such a
>>short time for the study, it is unlikely to allow extensive activity in
>>this area. But this limited victory may be short-lived as Sens. Warner and
>>Allard can be expected to push again for development of a new small nuclear
>>warhead in next year's defense authorization bill. For further details, see
>>below and see FCNL's web site at
>><<http://www.fcnl.org/issues/arm/minnukeindx.htm>>.

>>
>>The Congress also has legislated that the next administration conduct
>>reviews that could have a major bearing on U.S. nuclear test ban policy.
>>The FY 2001 defense authorization bill calls for a review of "The active
>>and inactive nuclear weapons stockpile that will be required for
>>implementing the United States national and military strategy, including
>>any plans for replacing or modifying warheads" and a plan for "Appropriate
>>warheads to outfit the strategic nuclear delivery systems ... to satisfy
>>evolving military requirements," among other matters. (See below for
>>further details.)

>>
>>Meanwhile, international efforts to encourage nuclear restraint in South
>>Asia through the CTBT and other measures have produced few tangible results
>>as India and Pakistan remain at odds and on the verge of nuclear weapon
>>deployment.

>>
>>On the whole, ten years after the end of the Cold War and eight years after
>>the last U.S. nuclear weapon test explosion, the de facto international
>>test moratorium is in place but is not secure and will not be until and
>>unless the U.S. demonstrates leadership by example by ratifying the CTBT.

>>

>>- DK
>>
>>*****
>>
>>CONTENTS --
>>
>>* STATUS OF THE CTBT
>>
>>1. Coalition Issue Brief, October 13, 2000 -- "One Year After the Senate
>>CTBT Vote"
>>
>>2. CTBTO Press Release: "Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty - Four Years
>>Old," 25 September 2000
>>
>>* NUCLEAR WEAPONS R, D & T
>>
>>3. Excerpt from Congressional Record, September 27, 2000, CONFERENCE REPORT
>>ON FY 2001 ENERGY AND WATER
>>DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001, National Nuclear Security
>>Administration Weapons Activities (NIF)
>>
>>4. "Superlaser Project To Receive Boost Of \$199 Million," San Francisco
>>Chronicle, Sept. 29, 2000
>>
>>5. "Steep Budget Rise Saves Nuclear Project," The New York Times, October
>>5, 2000
>>
>>6. Letters: Nuclear Testing Debate, The New York Times, October 3, 2000
>>
>>7. Excerpt from National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001,
>>CONFERENCE REPORT, Subtitle E--Strategic Forces
>>
>>* SOUTH ASIAN NUCLEAR TEST BAN POLITICS
>>
>>8. "CTBT: The 'Should' vs. 'Can' Dilemma," The Times of India, 29 September
>>2000, by Ejaz Haider
>>
>>9. "Gore Meets With India Leader and Prods Senate on Test Ban," The New
>>York Times, September 16, 2000
>>
>>*****
>>
>>1. "One Year After Senate CTBT Vote, U.S. Nuclear Testing and
>>Non-Proliferation Policy Still in Limbo"
>>
>>COALITION TO REDUCE NUCLEAR DANGERS -- ISSUE BRIEF
>>
>>Volume 4, Number 19, October 13, 2000
>>
>>
>>ONE YEAR AGO TODAY, the Senate rejected the opinion of the Joint Chiefs of
>>Staff, former Chairman of the JCS, numerous nuclear weapons and
>>verification experts, as well as the vast majority of the American people
>>and it became the first and only legislature to vote down ratification of

>>the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). The 51-48 vote also
>>raised doubt among U.S. allies about the United States' global leadership
>>role on nuclear non-proliferation and has given other countries an excuse
>>to withhold support for the CTBT.

>>
>>By banning all nuclear weapon test explosions, the CTBT can impede the
>>development of advanced, new types of two-stage nuclear warheads, which are
>>more easily deliverable by ballistic missiles U.S. ratification would
>>strengthen international support for the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty
>>(NPT) and U.S. leadership abroad. Because the United States does not now,
>>nor likely will ever, need to conduct another nuclear explosive test, it
>>remains in America's interest to ratify the treaty to encourage others to
>>do so. The CTBT's far-reaching nuclear test monitoring provisions,
>>including an international monitoring network and short-notice on-site
>>inspections, would greatly enhance the United States' current technical and
>>political capability to ensure that other countries are not conducting
>>nuclear test explosions.

>>
>>Since the Senate's October 1999 vote, U.S. allies and other states
>>maintained momentum toward CTBT entry into force, with 14 additional
>>ratifications and 6 additional signatories. To date, the Treaty has been
>>signed by 160 states, including 41 of the 44 states required for entry into
>>force, and the Treaty has been ratified by 66 states, including 30 of the
>>44 states required for entry into force. In addition to the U.S., the other
>>major CTBT hold-outs are China (which has not ratified) and India, Pakistan
>>and North Korea (which have not yet signed).

>>
>>All NATO member states — except for the U.S. — have ratified the CTBT. In
>>April, the Russian Duma approved ratification of the Treaty. In May, the
>>180+ states gathered for the Review Conference on the Nuclear
>>Non-Proliferation Treaty expressed unanimous support for "... signatures
>>and ratifications, without delay and without conditions and in accordance
>>with constitutional processes, to achieve the early entry into force of the
>>Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty."

>>
>>Continuing support for the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty depends, in the
>>long-term, on progress towards the CTBT and other concrete
>>non-proliferation and disarmament measures. The NPT was extended
>>indefinitely in 1995 largely on the basis of the commitment of the United
>>States and the other major nuclear weapons powers to conclude the CTBT. By
>>itself, the CTBT cannot stop proliferation, but America cannot effectively
>>fight the spread of nuclear weapons without the CTBT.

>>
>>REASONS TO RECONSIDER:

>>
>>Decisions with a profound and lasting impact on national and international
>>security, like the Senate's CTBT vote, merit thorough, careful,
>>non-partisan consideration. However, as a result of actions of CTBT
>>opponents and proponents, the Senate and the White House, the CTBT was not
>>handled in that fashion.

>>
>>After refusing to hold hearings on the CTBT for over two years, the Senate
>>leadership allotted two days of hearings in the Senate Armed Services
>>Committee (October 6 and 7), one day in the Senate Foreign Relations

>>Committee (October 7), and a closed briefing in the Select Committee on
>>Intelligence (October 6). The two and one-half days of floor debate began
>>the morning after the hearings ended, and the final floor vote was held
>>just five days after the hearings. There were no committee reports on the
>>Treaty.

>>
>>In contrast, the Senate held 11 days of SFRC hearings and devoted nearly
>>three weeks of floor debate to the 1963 Limited Test Ban Treaty. The formal
>>floor debate on that Treaty began 6 calendar days after the SFRC issued its
>>final report and the final vote on passage of the LTBT was 18 days later.

>>
>>For many senators including Richard Lugar (R-IN) and others who voted "no"
>>on the CTBT, the process "...reduced to a few days... a process that
>>normally would take many months...." As Lugar noted, "Many senators know
>>little about this Treaty. Even for those of us on national security
>>committees, this has been an issue floating on the periphery of our
>>concerns." On October 12, 1999, 62 Senators (24 Republicans and 38
>>Democrats) wrote to Majority Leader Lott and Minority Leader Daschle urging
>>them to "put...off final consideration until the next Congress." The letter
>>would likely have been signed by 67 or more Senators. But there was not
>>time. The Majority Leader pushed forward with the vote the next day.

>>
>>THE FUTURE OF U.S. NUCLEAR TEST BAN POLICY:

>>
>>Since the vote, several senators have indicated that they want the Senate
>>to revisit the unfinished question of CTBT ratification. Senators Chuck
>>Hagel (R-NE) and Joseph Lieberman (D-CT) have said that "our constituents
>>and our country's allies have expressed grave concerns about our hasty
>>rejection of the treaty and the impact of that rejection on the treaty's
>>survival. They need to know that we, along with a clear majority of the
>>Senate, have not given up hope of finding common ground in our quest for a
>>sound and secure ban on nuclear testing."

>>
>>Repairing the damage caused by the Senate vote on the CTBT and averting
>>other imprudent nuclear weapons policy decisions will require a much more
>>balanced and bi-partisan effort to consider the key questions surrounding
>>U.S. nuclear weapons and nuclear testing policy, including:

>>
>>* what is the role and purpose of nuclear weapons test explosions?
>>* what constitutes an effective stewardship program to maintain the
>>remaining nuclear arsenal?
>>* and, in the absence of U.S. CTBT ratification, how can the United States
>>effectively monitor and deter nuclear testing and how can the United
>>States prevent emergence of new nuclear weapons dangers?

>>
>>Regardless of who is elected, the next president and the next Congress will
>>face issues relating to the CTBT in 2001. The Senate vote has not released
>>the U.S. from its legal obligation as a signatory to the Treaty not to
>>conduct nuclear weapon test explosions, and both of the leading
>>presidential candidates have voiced their support for continuing the
>>nuclear test moratorium that has been in effect since September 1992.

>>
>>As a consequence, the failure of the Senate to ratify the CTBT puts the
>>U.S. in test ban policy "limbo" that is not beneficial to U.S. security.

>>>Until the U.S. ratifies the CTBT, it denies itself the benefits of the
>>>Treaty's extensive nuclear test monitoring and on-site inspection
>>>provisions, and it denies the U.S. the moral and legal authority to
>>>encourage other nations not to conduct nuclear weapon test explosions.
>>>America's vital national security interests demand that the new Senate and
>>>the new President agree to work together in a bi-partisan fashion to
>>>undertake a more thoughtful and balanced review of this widely-supported
>>>non-proliferation tool.

>>

>>

>>>The Coalition is a non-partisan alliance of 17 of the nation's leading
>>>non-proliferation organizations working for a practical, step-by-step
>>>program to reduce the dangers of weapons of mass destruction. The views
>>>expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect those of every Coalition
>>>member.

>>

>>*****

>>

>>>2. PREPARATORY COMMISSION FOR THE COMPREHENSIVE NUCLEAR-TEST-BAN TREATY
>>>ORGANIZATION (CTBTO PrepCom) PROVISIONAL TECHNICAL SECRETARIAT

>>

>>>Vienna International Centre P.O. BOX 1200, A-1400 Vienna, AUSTRIA
>>>Telephone: +43 1 26030 6200 Facsimile: +43 1 26030 5877

>>

>>>PRESS RELEASE

>>

>>>COMPREHENSIVE NUCLEAR-TEST-BAN TREATY - FOUR YEARS OLD

>>

>>>Vienna, Austria, 25 September 2000

>>

>>>1. "Significant international events, such as the 2000 Non-Proliferation
>>>Treaty Review Conference (New York, 24 April to 19 May 2000), and the
>>>United Nations Millennium Summit (New York, 6 to 8 September 2000) have
>>>both added momentum to the signature and ratification processes of the
>>>Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT)", remarked Wolfgang Hoffmann,
>>>Executive Secretary for the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive
>>>Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization (CTBTO Preparatory Commission), on the
>>>occasion of the CTBT's fourth anniversary.

>>

>>>"An additional 11 States have ratified the Treaty so far this year, while
>>>five more States have joined the list of Signatories. This clearly
>>>indicates the high level of political support that the CTBT is receiving,
>>>with the number of signatures currently standing at 160 and ratifications
>>>at 63. Continued international support will facilitate the fulfilment of
>>>the Treaty's goal of universal membership and early entry into force".

>>

>>>2. Over the last year, the CTBTO Preparatory Commission has made good
>>>progress on the establishment of the Treaty's global verification regime*,
>>>and work on the International Monitoring System (IMS) network is well
>>>underway. This network is designed to register vibrations underground, in
>>>the seas and in the air as well as to detect radioactive material released
>>>into the atmosphere. Many stations are now fully operational.

>>

>>>The first seismological stations that were built in their entirety by the

>>Commission began transmitting data to the International Data Centre (IDC)
>>in Vienna in April 2000. The IDC is currently receiving data from 109 IMS
>>stations around the globe.

>>
>>3. Three primary seismological stations were certified on 28 July 2000:
>>PS09 (Yellowknife, Canada), PS27 (Hamar, Norway), and PS47 (Mina, Nevada,
>>United States). By the end of 2000, it is anticipated that an additional 15
>>stations will have been certified. To date, 280 legal arrangements have
>>been undertaken involving work at the sites of stations in over 60 States.
>>Both the seismological and hydroacoustic networks are now about 30 per cent
>>operational, and some 10 per cent of the infrasound and radionuclide
>>networks are now functioning.

>>
>>4. Over 40 States are currently able to access data and products from the
>>IDC. Data quality and availability will further improve as more IMS
>>stations are established, existing stations upgraded and the satellite
>>communication system for data transmission extended.

>>
>>5. The Global Communications Infrastructure (GCI) is now functional. Global
>>satellite coverage has been made possible through the installation of five
>>GCI hubs and a frame relay infrastructure to link these hubs to the IDC in
>>Vienna.

>>
>>6. Preparatory activities for on-site inspections have focused on the
>>drafting of an operational manual and the procurement of basic equipment
>>for testing and training purposes.

>>
>>7. A third International Cooperation Workshop took place in Beijing in June
>>2000 for the States of South-East Asia, the Far East and the Pacific
>>Region. A fourth Workshop is scheduled to take place in Lima in November
>>2000 for the States of the Latin American and Caribbean Region. These
>>Workshops aim, inter alia, to highlight the significance of the CTBT for
>>global peace and security, and to promote signature and ratification. They
>>also explore the possible uses of the verification technologies, IMS data
>>and IDC products, for scientific and civil purposes, and examine the
>>potential for regional or international cooperation in collecting,
>>analysing and using these data.

>>
>>8. The payment of assessed contributions is an important barometer to gauge
>>the commitment and support of the States Signatories to the Organization's
>>work. Almost 96 per cent of the contributions to the 1999 budget were paid
>>and, to date, some 92 per cent of the contributions for 2000 have been
>>received.

>>
>>9. As at 19 September, the Provisional Technical Secretariat of the CTBTO
>>Preparatory Commission had a total of 242 staff members from 70 States
>>Signatories.

>>
>>The [66] States that have deposited their instruments of ratification of
>>the CTBT are: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh,
>>Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Czech Republic,
>>Denmark, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece,
>>Grenada, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kiribati,
>>Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Micronesia

>>(Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand,
>>Norway, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania,
>>Russian Federation, Senegal, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain,
>>Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia,
>>Turkey, Turkmenistan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland,
>>and Uzbekistan.

>>
>>*****

>>
>>3. Congressional Record, Wednesday, September 27, 2000, pp. H8316-H8317,
>>H8378-H8379
>>CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4733 (H. Rept. 106-907), ENERGY AND WATER
>>DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

>>
>>National Nuclear Security Administration
>>WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

>>
>>For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction
>>and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other incidental
>>expenses necessary for atomic energy defense weapons activities in carrying out
>>the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101
>>et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property
>>or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or
>>expansion; and the purchase of passenger motor vehicles (not to exceed 12 for
>>replacement only), \$5,015,186,000, to remain available until expended:
>>Provided: That, \$130,000,000 shall be immediately available for
>>Project 96-D-111, the National Ignition Facility at Lawrence Livermore National
>>Laboratory: Provided further, That \$69,100,000 shall be available only
>>upon a certification by the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security
>>Administration to the Congress after March 31, 2001, that

>>
>>(a) includes a recommendation on an appropriate path forward for the project;

>>
>>(b) certifies all established project and scientific milestones have been
>>met on
>>schedule and on cost;

>>
>>(c) certifies the first and second quarter project reviews in fiscal year 2001
>>determined the project to be on schedule and cost;

>>
>>(d) includes a study of requirements for and alternatives to a 192 beam
>>ignition facility for maintaining the safety and reliability of the current
>>nuclear weapons stockpile;

>>
>>(e) certifies an integrated cost-schedule earned-value
>>project control system has been fully implemented; and

>>
>>(f) includes a five-year budget plan for the stockpile stewardship program.

>>
>>National Ignition Facility.-The conference agreement provides \$199,100,000
>>for continued construction of the National Ignition Facility (NIF).
>>The conferees have included a directed reduction of \$25,000,000 in the
>>Weapons Activities account which is to be applied to programs under the
>>direction of the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory.

>>
>>The conferees have included statutory language providing that only
>>\$130,000,000 shall be made available for NIF at the beginning of fiscal
>>year 2001 and the remaining \$69,100,000 shall be available only upon a
>>certification after March 31, 2001, by the Administrator of the
>>National Nuclear Security Administration that several requirements have been
>>met. These requirements include:

>>
>>A. A recommendation on an appropriate path forward for the project
>>based on a detailed review of alternative construction options that would (1)
>>focus on first achieving operation of a 48 or 96 beam laser; (2) allow for
>>the full demonstration of a such a system in support of the stockpile
>>stewardship program before proceeding with construction and operation
>>of a larger laser complex; and (3) include a program and funding plan for
>>the possible future upgrade to a full NIF configuration. The
>>recommendation should include identification of available "off-ramps" and
>>decision
>>points where the project could be scaled to a smaller system.

>>
>>B. Certification that project and scientific milestones as established
>>in the revised construction project data sheet for the fourth quarter of
>>fiscal year 2000 and the first two quarters of fiscal year 2001 have been met
>>on schedule and on cost.

>>
>>C. Certification that the first and second quarter project reviews in
>>fiscal year 2001 determined the project to be on schedule and cost and
>>have provided further validation to the proposed path forward.

>>
>>D. Completion of a study that includes conclusions as to whether the
>>full-scale NIF is required in order to maintain the safety and
>>reliability of the current nuclear weapons stockpile, and whether
>>alternatives to
>>the NIF could achieve the objective of maintaining the safety and
>>reliability of the current nuclear weapons stockpile.

>>
>>E. Certification that the NIF project has implemented an integrated
>>cost-schedule earned-value project control system by March 1, 2001.

>>
>>F. A five-year budget plan for the stockpile stewardship program that
>>fully describes how the NNSA intends to pay for NIF over the out years and
>>what the potential for other impacts on the stockpile stewardship program
>>will be.

>>
>>The conferees remain concerned about the Department's proposed budget
>>increase and schedule delay for the NIF at the Lawrence Livermore
>>National Laboratory (LLNL). The conferees believe that previously the
>>Department of Energy, and most recently the National Nuclear Security
>>Administration

>>(NNSA), may have failed to examine adequately options for NIF that have
>>
>>fewer than the full 192 beams. For example, a preferred course for NIF
>>may be to complete 48 or 96 beams as soon as possible (although block
>>procurement of infrastructure and glass may be considered), bring the
>>reduced NIF into operation, perform the necessary scientific and

>>technical tests to evaluate whether a full NIF will work and its impact on
>>stockpile stewardship, and then develop a path forward for NIF that
>>balances its
>>scientific importance within the overall needs of the stockpile
>>stewardship program. To move on this path in fiscal year 2001, the conferees
>>recommend that \$199,100,000 be appropriated for NIF as follows: \$74,100,000 as
>>originally proposed for Project 96-D-111, \$40,000,000 from NIF
>>operations funding within the budget request for LLNL, \$25,000,000 to be
>>identified within the budget request at LLNL, plus an additional \$60,000,000 in
>>new appropriations.

>>
>>Furthermore, the conferees direct the Administration to prepare a budget
>>request for fiscal year 2002 that fully reflects a balanced set of programs
>>and investments within the stockpile stewardship program, and that the
>>overall budget profile over the next eight years will accommodate a \$3.4
>>billion NIF along with the other critical aspects of the program.

>>
>>*****

>>
>>4. "Superlaser Project To Receive Boost Of \$199 Million," San Francisco
>>Chronicle, 09/29/00

>>
>>Surviving a year of relentless criticism for cost overruns and
>>mismanagement, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory's superlaser project
>>won a funding boost from Congress yesterday that falls just short of the
>>full lab request.

>>
>>Livermore officials were jubilant over the \$199 million funding package
>>cobbled together for the National Ignition Facility after months of debate
>>that included calls to scrap the project or severely scale back its budget.

>>
>>The cost of the stadium-sized superlaser complex under construction at
>>Livermore, which is designed to test the reliability of nuclear weapons
>>without using bomb tests, is now at least \$1 billion over its original
>>budget and at least six years behind schedule.

>>
>>Investigators from the General Accounting Office reported this summer that
>>lab officials had misrepresented the cost of the experimental laser system
>>to win initial funding in the mid-1990s.

>>
>>Critics who see the superlaser as a multibillion-dollar boondoggle that may
>>never succeed in simulating bomb tests said they were disgusted that
>>Congress didn't require an outside review of the project by the National
>>Academy of Sciences before approving its funding.

>>
>>"It sets a terrible precedent," said Keith Ashdown, a spokesman for the
>>Washington, D.C., group Taxpayers for Common Sense. "If you lie to
>>Congress, mismanage your project and waste taxpayer dollars, Congress will
>>punish you by giving you more money."

>>
>>Rep. Ellen Tauscher, D-Walnut Creek, a principal advocate for the
>>superlaser project, said Congress has outlined a plan for heightened
>>scrutiny that will continue through budget rounds in the years to come.

>>

>>"We're not out of the woods yet," Tauscher said.

>>

>>The compromise appropriation cobbled together by a House-Senate conference committee is \$10 million less than the \$209 million requested this year to keep the project on schedule for completion in 2008. But it far exceeds the \$74 million previously earmarked for the superlaser at the Energy Department laboratory. The funding was part of a bill overwhelmingly approved by the House and expected to be approved by the Senate.

>>

>>The increase will come partially from \$65 million in funds that must be shifted from other programs at Lawrence Livermore. And Congress will not release \$69 million of the money until the Energy Department demonstrates the project is meeting new cost, schedule and research milestones.

>>

>>Congress also required DOE officials to consider a modified plan to build the 192-laser array in stages, starting with as few as 48 laser beam lines whose performance could be tested. A DOE report on that option is due in March.

>>

>>"I think it's trap-door language," said Tauscher. "It's an exit strategy to not go all the way, which I oppose."

>>

>>Lawrence Livermore lab spokeswoman Susan Houghton said no layoffs will result from the shift of \$25 million to NIF from other lab programs. The money will not come from research projects unrelated to the lab's work on maintaining the nation's nuclear stockpile, she added.

>>

>>Christopher Paine of the Natural Resources Defense Council was skeptical, saying Livermore's other "stockpile stewardship" programs are too small to absorb the loss.

>>

>>Marylia Kelley, of the lab watchdog group Tri-Valley Cares, said another shift of \$40 million from NIF's operating costs to its construction budget will starve research programs needed to solve technical problems that still remain with the optical lenses used to focus the laser beams.

>>

>>Tauscher said other increases in the nuclear weapons program will help Lawrence Livermore cover the cost. The total appropriation for DOE's atomic energy defense programs, which includes the nuclear weapons program, is up \$606 million over fiscal year 2000.

>>

>>Officials at Los Alamos and other DOE labs had feared that NIF's budget overruns would drain funds from their programs, but Congress apparently augmented budgets for all the labs.

>>

>>Sen. Tom Harkin, D-Iowa, said Congress is now trusting DOE to do what it has failed to do before -- identify problems and report them honestly.

>>

>>"I fear we are leaving the fox to watch the hen house," Harkin said. "We need a truly independent review that will not be swept under the rug."

>>

>>

>>*****

>>

>>5. "Steep Budget Rise Saves Nuclear Project," The New York Times, 10/05/00

>>

>>By JAMES GLANZ

>>

>>A mammoth laser project at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory will
>>apparently not have to be halted, as proponents had feared, after Congress
>>this week nearly tripled its original budget for the 2001 fiscal year to
>>cover large cost overruns and construction delays.

>>

>>"Frankly, it was nothing short of a miracle," Representative Ellen O.
>>Tauscher, a California Democrat whose district includes the laboratory,
>>said of the sharp increase that she supported.

>>

>>She said the increase had to overcome opposition from members of Congress
>>who said that project officials had not been forthcoming on the likely
>>costs of the project and that the move would not have been possible without
>>the nation's budget surplus this year.

>>

>>Called the National Ignition Facility, the project is designed to train 192
>>converging laser beams on pellets of nuclear fuel like hydrogen, crushing
>>and heating them in order to set off tiny thermonuclear explosions.
>>Officials at the laboratory and the Department of Energy, which runs it,
>>hope that those experiments will help them study nuclear weapons without
>>testing them in much larger explosions.

>>

>>But the projected cost of the laser has ballooned to \$4 billion, nearly \$1
>>billion more than originally expected, after laboratory officials greatly
>>underestimated the complexity of the project and then did not report
>>growing problems to the Energy Department and Congress.

>>

>>The officials have said the overruns grew out of management problems that
>>have been corrected, while critics maintain that the laser still has
>>technical difficulties.

>>

>>The officials said the Clinton administration's original request for the
>>project in 2001, \$74 million, would have forced it to shut down.

>>

>>In votes on Thursday and Monday, the House and Senate approved an increase
>>to \$199 million. The money is part of an energy and water bill that still
>>is subject to approval by President Clinton. The bill faces a veto threat
>>because of an unrelated environmental dispute, but Congressional aides say
>>the laser financing will almost certainly remain intact in any agreement.

>>

>>Clay Sell, a staff member on the energy and water subcommittee of the
>>Senate Appropriations Committee, said \$60 million of the increase amounted
>>to new financing, while the rest came from other weapons programs at Livermore.

>>

>>The increase had strings attached, including heightened oversight of the
>>project and a study to determine whether the project could be replaced by a
>>smaller version with fewer laser beams, or a cheaper alternative based on
>>different technology.

>>

>>Madelyn Creedon, the deputy administrator for defense programs at the
>>Energy Department's National Nuclear Security Administration, said she
>>believed the full-scale project was "essential for keeping our nuclear

>>weapons reliable and safe."

>>

>>Ms. Tauscher said that while the management of the project had been
>>"terribly bungled" she believed that those problems had now been fixed and
>>that the science behind the laser was sound.

>>

>>*****

>>

>>6. The New York Times, October 3, 2000

>>

>>Letters: Nuclear Testing Debate

>>

>>o the Editor:

>>

>>The article "A Great Hope of Physics Falls on Hard Times" (Sept. 26) quotes
>>a Lawrence Livermore Laboratory associate director as saying that its
>>multibillion- dollar laser facility is needed to maintain our nuclear
>>deterrent without nuclear testing. This might leave the dangerous
>>impression that the failure of this laser project would require restarting
>>underground testing.

>>

>>In fact, many weapons experts say the nuclear stockpile can be maintained
>>and evaluated using penetrating radiographic hydrotests, without this facility.

>>

>>We should also be concerned about the risk-taking, optimistic advocacy of
>>the giant Livermore project. It raises doubts that this lab can be
>>entrusted with the maintenance of the existing nuclear stockpile.

>>

>>STEPHEN E. BODNER Pittsboro, N.C.

>>

>>•

>>

>>To the Editor:

>>

>>I disagree with the contention that a new giant laser at the National
>>Ignition Facility will allow the nation to maintain its nuclear deterrent
>>without nuclear testing (Sept. 26).

>>

>>The opposite side is that if N.I.F. fails, we will not be able to maintain
>>the stockpile without nuclear testing. I believe neither is true.

>>

>>Sound arguments can be made that N.I.F. is not required to maintain the
>>stockpile. The best that can be said for the program, besides the economic
>>benefit to the Lawrence Livermore Laboratory, is that the physics of
>>inertially confined fusion is related to weapons physics.

>>

>>GERALD E. MARSH Chicago

>>

>>The writer is a consultant on nuclear technology.

>>

>>*****

>>

>>7. Excerpt from Enactment of Provisions of H.R. 5408, the Floyd D. Spence
>>National Defense

>>Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001

>>

>>CONFERENCE REPORT

>>to accompany H.R. 4205

>>

>>Subtitle E--Strategic Forces

>>

>>SEC. 1041. REVISED NUCLEAR POSTURE REVIEW.

>>

>>(a) REQUIREMENT FOR COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW.--In order to clarify United States nuclear deterrence policy and strategy for the near term, the Secretary of Defense shall conduct a comprehensive review of the nuclear posture of the United States for the next 5 to 10 years. The Secretary shall conduct the review in consultation with the Secretary of Energy.

>>

>>(b) ELEMENTS OF REVIEW.--The nuclear posture review shall include the following elements:

>>

>> (1) The role of nuclear forces in United States military strategy, planning, and programming.

>>

>> (2) The policy requirements and objectives for the United States to maintain a safe, reliable, and credible nuclear deterrence posture.

>>

>> (3) The relationship among United States nuclear deterrence policy, targeting strategy, and arms control objectives.

>>

>> (4) The levels and composition of the nuclear delivery systems that will be required for implementing the United States national and military strategy, including any plans for replacing or modifying existing systems.

>>

>> (5) The nuclear weapons complex that will be required for implementing the United States national and military strategy, including any plans to modernize or modify the complex.

>>

>> (6) The active and inactive nuclear weapons stockpile that will be required for implementing the United States national and military strategy, including any plans for replacing or modifying warheads.

>>

>>(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.--The Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress, in unclassified and classified forms as necessary, a report on the results of the nuclear posture review conducted under this section. The report shall be submitted concurrently with the Quadrennial Defense Review report due in December 2001.

>>

>>(d) SENSE OF CONGRESS.--It is the sense of Congress that the nuclear posture review conducted under this section should be used as the basis for establishing future United States arms control objectives and negotiating positions.

>>

>>

>>SEC. 1042. PLAN FOR THE LONGTERM SUSTAINMENT AND MODERNIZATION OF UNITED STATES STRATEGIC NUCLEAR FORCES.

>>

>>(a) REQUIREMENT FOR PLAN.--The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with
>>the Secretary of Energy, shall develop a longrange plan for the sustainment
>>and modernization of United States strategic nuclear forces to counter
>>emerging threats and satisfy the evolving requirements of deterrence.

>>

>>(b) ELEMENTS OF PLAN.--The plan specified under subsection (a) shall
>>include the Secretary's plans, if any, for the sustainment and
>>modernization of the following:

>>

>> (1) Landbased and seabased strategic ballistic missiles, including
>>any plans for developing replacements for the Minuteman III
>>intercontinental ballistic missile and the Trident II sealunched ballistic
>>missile and plans for common ballistic missile technology development.

>>

>> (2) Strategic nuclear bombers, including any plans for a B 2
>>followon, a B 52 replacement, and any new airlaunched weapon systems.

>>

>> (3) Appropriate warheads to outfit the strategic nuclear delivery
>>systems referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2) to satisfy evolving military
>>requirements.

>>

>>(c) SUBMITTAL OF PLAN.--The plan specified under subsection (a) shall be
>>submitted to Congress not later than April 15, 2001. The plan shall be
>>submitted in unclassified and classified forms, as necessary.

>>

>>SEC. 1044. REPORT ON THE DEFEAT OF HARDENED AND DEEPLY BURIED TARGETS.

>>

>>(a) STUDY.--The Secretary of Defense shall, in conjunction with the
>>Secretary of Energy, conduct a study relating to the defeat of hardened and
>>deeply buried targets. Under the study, the Secretaries shall

>>

>> (1) review --

>>

>> (A) the requirements of the United States to defeat hardened and
>>deeply buried targets and stockpiles of chemical and biological agents and
>>related capabilities; and

>>

>> (B) current and future plans to meet those requirements;

>>

>> (2) determine if those plans adequately address all such requirements;

>>

>> (3) identify potential future hardened and deeply buried targets and
>>other related targets;

>>

>> (4) determine what resources and research and development efforts are
>>needed to defeat the targets identified under paragraph (3) as well as
>>other requirements to defeat stockpiles of chemical and biological agents
>>and related capabilities;

>>

>> (5) assess both current and future options to defeat hardened and
>>deeply buried targets as well as concepts to defeat stockpiles of chemical
>>and biological agents and related capabilities; and

>>

>> (6) determine the capability and cost of each option assessed under
>>paragraph (5).

>>
>> (b) CONDUCT OF ASSESSMENTS.--In conducting the study under subsection (a),
>>the Secretaries may, in order to perform the assessments required by
>>paragraph (5) of that subsection, conduct any limited research and
>>development that may be necessary to perform those assessments.

>>
>> (c) REPORT.--(1) Not later than July 1, 2001, the Secretary of Defense
>>shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the
>>Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives a report on the
>>results of the study conducted under subsection (a). The report shall be
>>prepared in conjunction with the Secretary of Energy.

>>
>> (2) The report under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in
>>unclassified form, together with a classified annex if necessary.

>>
>>*****

>>
>>8. The Times of India, 29 September 2000

>>
>>"CTBT: THE "SHOULD" VS "CAN" DILEMMA"

>>
>>Ejaz Haider points at the increasing relevance of the CTBT for South Asia
>>and says the treaty must be used to prevent Pakistan and India from moving
>>up the nuclear ladder

>>
>>Pakistan and India, who had tentatively agreed to sign the Comprehensive
>>Test Ban Treaty at the 51st United Nations General Assembly session in
>>September 1998, have since been dithering. The government's belated attempt
>>to build consensus on the issue seems to have failed for various reasons,
>>not least because the exercise was wrongly premised and sloppily executed.
>>What is to be done next? More appropriately, is the issue still relevant,
>>especially in light of the rejection of the treaty by the US Senate?

>>
>>The answer to that question cannot but be in the affirmative. Here is why.

>>
>>First, while the US Senate may have refused to ratify the treaty, the
>>treaty is not dead. This is clear from the fact that state parties have
>>continued to come into the treaty fold. To date, 160 states have signed the
>>treaty, with five entering the treaty this year, and 63 have ratified it,
>>with Belarus being the latest, which deposited the instrument of
>>ratification on September 13, 2000. This clearly shows the consensus on the
>>issue has not waned.

>>
>>Secondly, and this is most significant, the CTBT is the only option left
>>with India and Pakistan in the area of nuclear arms control to (a) engage
>>the international community; (b) use the treaty to arrest the likely
>>movement up the nuclear ladder and (c) use the space thus got to develop
>>confidence- and security-building measures. This CSBMs exercise, first at
>>the military level and involving both conventional and nuclear spheres,
>>could then be used to develop a parallel dialogue on contentious, political
>>issues. Moreover, the exercise could be made more meaningful through
>>verification procedures and guarantees that could be either bilateral or

>>multilateral.

>>

>>Such a course is important for more reasons than one. Maximalists on both sides seem already to have given the CTBT a burial. Not only that, they are now talking of weaponising (converting weaponisable configurations into weapons), more tests, overt deployment and the rest of it. Since most believe the credible minimum deterrent to be a flexible concept, there is talk of augmenting the arsenals. The proponents of such a course in Pakistan, while realising that an arms race may not be economically feasible, hide the reality by talking about ratios. There is also fanfare over the setting up of the National Command Authority, which is supposed to have resolved the problems of command and control for Pakistan.

>>

>>All this is a red herring. This is not the place to go into the intricacies of command and control problems, the inevitability of accidents, the organisation theory and its impact on deterrence, various technological constraints within the South Asian context and the other factors associated with the issue but suffice to say the NCA is no answer to these problems. These problems have only one answer: a clear refusal to go down the nuclear lane.

>>

>>This is where the CTBT can play its part; this is also how the governments in India and Pakistan must assess the treaty. There is nothing inevitable about the technology-pull argument, as some experts are wont to suggest.

>>

>>There is no gainsaying that the issue for Pakistan poses a dilemma. Certain international developments have had a negative fallout on nuclear arms control efforts and the international norm they sought to develop and sustain. By emphasising "nationalisms" they have shifted the discourse back to the idea of the survival of the fittest. India, which has always looked at its nuclear capability in expansive terms, desiring to play a larger role commensurate with its size and potential, has not missed out on the signals.

>>

>>The opponents in that country seem to think stalling the process has become possible because of India's rising stock in the international market and its increasing economic potential. Additionally, they suggest the present CTBT is dead and should be taken back to the CD to be revived as a new treaty purged of its present loopholes. While this stance may correspond with India's earlier rejection of the treaty it seems to overlook certain other factors, not least the international consensus against proliferation of nuclear arms. This view may also tend to underestimate the U.S. commitment to nuclear arms control in light of domestic debate in that country on the issue of the NMD and the Senate's refusal to ratify the CTBT.

>>

>>Other Delhi strategists who advocate engaging the international community on the issue seem to be looking for a value added for India's nuclear status. This, for them, could translate into a more meaningful strategic dialogue between India and the US, covering a wide range of issues, lifting of export controls on dual-technologies and other sanctions, and accepting India as a State with Nuclear Weapons if not a Nuclear-Weapon State. The idea here seems to be to drive a hard bargain and if that requires signing the CTBT, the treaty should be signed.

>>

>>Pakistan's situation is more complex. Its stock in the international market >>has plummeted for various reasons. The Kargil conflict has made the world >>look askance at its nuclear capability and how it wants to use it. Its >>Afghanistan policy has come under increasing pressure. The linkage between >>Afghanistan and Kashmir continues to take a toll on its stand on Kashmir >>where it has increasingly lost its credibility. The military coup has added >>to its difficulties. In addition to domestic political uncertainty, its >>economy is in a shambles and shows no signs of immediate recovery. It is >>therefore much more dependent on the international community for bailing it >>out and to that extent is more amenable to external pressure. In a manner >>of speaking it cannot afford a "relaxed" debate on the issue of CTBT.

>>>>However, the discourse of power and considerations of security also inform >>Pakistan's response, especially within the given regional situation and on >>the basis of its present national security paradigm. This also creates a >>paradox for it. Given its ebbing fortunes, Pakistan requires doing >>something to enhance its salience, but it fears that its bargaining chip >>used at this point may not serve any purpose higher than merely bailing it >>out. It contrasts the situation with India and apprehends that India is >>likely to get a more generous quid pro quo from the international >>community. One of the biggest fears Pakistan has is that the US is likely >>to share with India the advanced technologies to "carry out laboratory >>sub-critical explosions with no measurable fission yields, computer >>simulation of atomic explosions and fusion research".

>>>>This is not a sustainable position because such sharing could take place >>with or without Pakistan's signatures to the CTBT. In fact, one could argue >>that if Pakistan were to sign after India worked out such a quid pro quo >>with the U.S., there would be nothing left in the bargain for Pakistan. >>However, a case can be made that if Pakistan had chosen to sign the CTBT >>after it had tested, the reciprocal reward would likely have been more >>substantial. But the problem with losing time is that Pakistan could well >>be losing even more time and opportunity.

>>>>Two other factors, doctrine and cost, stand out in regard to a decision. >>Both are interrelated since the latter cannot be worked out without >>defining the former. The factor of doctrine is also significant, among >>other things, for reasons of taking a decision on whether Pakistan needs >>more tests than it has already conducted.

>>>>A third factor, as mentioned earlier, relates to the issue of deployment >>and its attendant command and control problems. It is here that the real >>problem arises for the international community. Even if it were to get >>Pakistan to sign the treaty, it cannot allow India to keep moving up the >>nuclear ladder. So far the factors of international pressure, the costs >>involved in the venture, lack of infrastructure and technology and the hope >>to get something meaningful out of the international community have >>prevented India from moving ahead. But if India were to move any further >>down the nuclear route, dragging Pakistan with it, the development is most >>likely to destabilize the situation, especially in the absence of any >>movement on the contentious, political issues. It is therefore important >>that both countries be treated on the basis of parity on the issue of the CTBT.

>>>>Therefore, along with signing the CTBT, the present condition of

>>non-deployment can, and should be used as the basic framework for
>>developing confidence- and security-building measures. This would mean an
>>acceptance of the nuclear status quo and verifiable guarantees, which could
>>either be bilateral or multilateral, that the status quo will not be
>>disturbed. The two countries could then initiate a parallel process of
>>military CSBMs and political dialogue to improve the atmosphere between them.

>>
>>CTBT affords a good test of what the international community on the one
>>hand, and Pakistan and India on the other hand, can do. It can easily be
>>contrasted with, for instance, the NPT. While Pakistan should de-link from
>>India and sign the treaty, the international community must address its
>>fear that India might ultimately get more out of its signature. Therefore,
>>the international community needs to (a) engage the two countries on the
>>issue of the CTBT on the basis of parity, and (b) explore ways of finding a
>>viable quid pro quo that is acceptable to both countries. In fact, parity
>>in this case can, and should, be used to also allow Pakistan and India to
>>use the opportunity to spurn maximalist options.

>>
>>For this strategy to work, India and Pakistan must obviously refrain from
>>moving up the nuclear ladder and should in fact turn the factors that
>>presently prevent them from doing so to their mutual advantage. There is no
>>reason why they should build arsenals, big or small, and deploy them before
>>taking to developing CSBMs to address the problem of stabilizing the
>>deterrent a la the US and the Soviet Union.

>>
>>It is clear that deployment, even on a small scale, is likely to stretch
>>their meagre technological and other resources to the extreme. The
>>maximalists in both countries are trying to "manufacture consent" in this
>>direction. Like before, they hope to raise the stakes and give a fait
>>accompli to the world. The situation must be squarely met and that is where
>>the CTBT must play its part.

>>
>>*This article is culled from a paper the author read at an arms control
>>conference in Berlin, September 24-26

>>
>>*****

>>
>>9. "Gore Meets With India Leader and Prods Senate on Test Ban"

>>
>><http://www.nytimes.com/2000/09/16/politics/16PREX.html>

>>
>>The New York Times, September 16, 2000

>>
>>By DAVID E. SANGER and KATHARINE Q. SEELYE

>>
>>WASHINGTON, Sept. 15 Mixing election politics and international
>>diplomacy, Vice President Al Gore told Prime Minister Atal Bihari
>>Vajpayee of India today that as president he would make passage of
>>the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty his first foreign policy
>>initiative in Congress, and he urged India to adopt the treaty as
>>well.

>>
>>Mr. Gore, reviving a promise he made last fall, was clearly
>>suggesting that in rejecting the treaty a year ago, the

>>Republican-led Senate had given India an easy excuse to keep its
>>nuclear testing program alive, and had thus contributed to the
>>dangerous standoff between India and Pakistan.

>>
>> Gov. George W. Bush, the Republican presidential nominee, has said
>>repeatedly that he opposes the treaty, on the ground that it would
>>limit America's nuclear leadership.

>>
>> Mr. Gore's comments to the visiting Indian prime minister today
>>came at a private meeting between the two men after lunch at the
>>State Department, aides said at a White House briefing.

>>
>> At other points during the day, President Clinton and a variety of
>>administration officials went out of their way to praise Mr.
>>Vajpayee and signed a raft of agreements, from Export-Import Bank
>>loans to civil aviation pacts. But the administration left in place
>>and left largely undiscussed economic sanctions imposed on both
>>India and Pakistan after they conducted nuclear tests two years
>>ago.

>>
>> And despite talk between Mr. Clinton and Mr. Vajpayee about closer
>>relations this is the second meeting between the two men in six
>>months India made no commitments beyond a continuation of its
>>current voluntary moratorium on further nuclear testing.

>>
>> "I think we have worked hard together to move our relationship
>>from one of too little contact and too much suspicion to one of
>>genuine efforts to build a long-term partnership," Mr. Clinton said
>>in the Oval Office this morning, the prime minister at his side.

>>
>> But their meeting also had an air of farewell about it, much like
>>Mr. Clinton's session last week with President Jiang Zemin of
>>China. Mr. Clinton made clear that he regarded his effort to
>>strengthen ties to India a major accomplishment of his
>>administration.

>>
>> "We should look at this as a long- term effort that I can speak
>>for myself I hope goes well beyond my presidency," Mr. Clinton
>>said. "I don't think it should be another 20 years before an
>>American president goes to India." Mr. Clinton visited the country
>>earlier this year.

>>
>> The prime minister described his meetings in Washington as "part
>>of a continuing dialogue between the world's two largest
>>democracies," and he added a "tribute to the Indian-American
>>community, which has been such an effective bridge in strengthening
>>Indo-U.S. ties."

>>
>> The president and the prime minister talked about everything from
>>trade to the territorial battle over Kashmir, and then the focus
>>quickly shifted to Mr. Gore's lunch at the State Department for Mr.
>>Vajpayee and to the subsequent private meeting between the two.

>>
>> Under the glittering glass chandeliers in a State Department

>>dining room, Mr. Gore basked in an incumbent's perk: acting as host
>>of a state luncheon and talking peace with a world leader. Mr. Gore
>>said India, the world's largest democracy, and America, the world's
>>oldest democracy, shared a special bond, and made only glancing
>>reference to India's nuclear weapons capability.

>>
>> "As the world's two leading democracies, we bear a special
>>responsibility to take the lead in meeting the challenges that all
>>democracies face," Mr. Gore said. "We must work together to ensure
>>that democracy's promises are realized by all our people, that all
>>benefit from freedom. Quality education, public health, a clean
>>environment these are the goals we share and which together we
>>can achieve. Threats that undermine democracy, such as terrorism
>>and the proliferation of dangerous weapons technologies, are
>>concerns we also share and will work together to address."

>>_____

>>
>>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>>

>>_____

Reply-To: "levee" <levee@erols.com>
From: "levee" <levee@erols.com>
To: "Pat Gill" <patkgill@hotmail.com>, "Patricia Juster" <pattytik@yahoo.com>,
"Sharmaine Allen" <sara@jamaicans.com>,
"Peggy Eastman" <Peggyeastman@cs.com>,
"Janet Camp" <janetcardinal@aol.com>,
"Freeman Walker Jr." <freemanw@wh.org>,
"Dottie and Joe Zetts" <mamazet@aol.com>,
"Carlee L. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>,
"Barbara Hemming" <bhemming@osd.pentagon.mil>
Subject: Critique Group
Date: Fri, 13 Oct 2000 10:12:38 -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 Writing Friends,

The next meeting of our critique group will be at 7:30 p.m., Monday, October 16, at my house, 140 New Mark Esplanade, Rockville, Md. Dottie Zetts, Pat Gill, and I have just returned from the Sandy Cove Christian Communicators' Conference and we have lots of impressions to share with you. Hope you can come!

Love in Christ,

Luella LeVee, 301/294-3396

To: "levee" <levee@erols.com>
From: "Carlee L. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Critique Group
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <000f01c0351f\$a5f30780\$36e7a4d8@gbx5v>
References:

Yes, I'll be there this evening.

Carlee

To: newshour@pbs.org
From: "Carlee L. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Questions for presidential candidates
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\mu.107.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Mr. Lehrer:

Previously I wrote to you with suggestions for questions on nuclear weapons to ask the presidential candidates. It occurs to me that since both George W. Bush and Dick Cheney are members of the United Methodist Church, you might be interested in the policy position of that denomination, as adopted by the 2000 General Conference this past May. It is attached.

A key part of the UMC policy resolution on "Nuclear Abolition" is as follows:

"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."

In the resolution this statement is followed by recommendations for specific actions the nuclear weapon states should take to rid the world of nuclear weapons: pledge of no use, de-alerting, de-activating, dismantlement, etc. These are pertinent to the U.S. commitment under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) to join the other nuclear weapon states in an "unequivocal undertaking to eliminate their nuclear arsenals." What the presidential candidates will do about this commitment is a key question to ask them.

With best regards,
Howard W. Hallman

Abolition 2000 Statement

On April 1995, during the first weeks of the Non-Proliferation Treaty Review and Extension Conference, activists from around the world recognized that the issue of nuclear abolition was not on the agenda. Activists met together to write the following statement that has become the founding document of the Abolition 2000 Network. Over 2000 NGOs on six continents have now signed it and are actively working in ten working groups to accomplish the eleven points listed here.

STATEMENT

A secure and livable world for our children and grandchildren and all future generations requires that we achieve a world free of nuclear weapons and redress the environmental degradation and human suffering that is the legacy of fifty years of nuclear weapons testing and production.

Further, the inextricable link between the "peaceful" and warlike uses of nuclear technologies and the threat to future generations inherent in creation and use of long-lived radioactive materials must be recognized. We must move toward reliance on clean, safe, renewable forms of energy production that do not provide the materials for weapons of mass destruction and do not poison the environment for thousands of centuries. The true "inalienable" right is not to nuclear energy, but to life, liberty and security of person in a world free of nuclear weapons.

We recognize that a nuclear weapons free world must be achieved carefully and in a step by step manner. We are convinced of its technological feasibility. Lack of political will, especially on the part of the nuclear weapons states, is the only true barrier. As chemical and biological weapons are prohibited, so must nuclear weapons be prohibited.

We call upon all states particularly the nuclear weapons states, declared and de facto to take the following steps to achieve nuclear weapons abolition. We further urge the states parties to the NPT to demand binding commitments by the declared nuclear weapons states to implement these measures:

1. Initiate immediately [and conclude by the year 2000] negotiations on a nuclear weapons abolition convention that requires the phased elimination of all nuclear weapons within a timebound framework, with provisions for effective verification and enforcement.*
2. Immediately make an unconditional pledge not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons.
3. Rapidly complete a truly comprehensive test ban treaty with a zero threshold and with the stated purpose of precluding nuclear weapons development by all states.
4. Cease to produce and deploy new and additional nuclear weapons systems, and commence to withdraw and disable deployed nuclear weapons systems.
5. Prohibit the military and commercial production and reprocessing of all weapons-usable radioactive materials.
6. Subject all weapons-usable radioactive materials and nuclear facilities in all states to international accounting, monitoring, and safeguards, and establish a public international registry of all weapons-usable radioactive materials.
7. Prohibit nuclear weapons research, design, development, and testing through laboratory experiments including but not limited to non-nuclear hydrodynamic explosions and computer simulations, subject all nuclear weapons laboratories to international monitoring, and close all nuclear test sites.
8. Create additional nuclear weapons free zones such as those established by the treaties of Tlatelolco and Rarotonga.
9. Recognize and declare the illegality of threat or use of nuclear weapons, publicly and before the World Court.
10. Establish an international energy agency to promote and support the development of sustainable and environmentally safe energy sources.
11. Create mechanisms to ensure the participation of citizens and NGOs in planning and monitoring the process of nuclear weapons abolition.

A world free of nuclear weapons is a shared aspiration of humanity. This goal cannot be achieved in a non-proliferation regime that authorizes the possession of nuclear weapons by a small group of states. Our common security requires the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. Our objective is definite and unconditional abolition of nuclear weapons.

* The convention should mandate irreversible disarmament measures, including but not limited to the following: withdraw and disable all deployed nuclear weapons systems; disable and dismantle warheads; place warheads and weapon-usable radioactive materials under international safeguards; destroy ballistic missiles and other delivery systems. The convention could also incorporate the measures listed above which should be implemented independently without delay. When fully implemented, the convention would replace the NPT.

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

Dear Phil,

Please pay me \$1,500 from the Rockefeller grant in the Education Fund in compensation for work performed in September 2000.

My records indicate that this leaves a balance of \$500 for the Rockefeller grant in the Education Fund and \$535.12 for the Rockefeller grant in the General Fund. Is this correct?

Shalom,
Howard

From: "Bob and Elaine Tiller" To: Subject: Good news Date: Tue, 17 Oct 2000 12:13:07 -0400
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2314.1300 X-Mimeole:
Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300

Dear family and friends,

Elaine and I returned on Sunday from our Turkey vacation. It was wonderful in every way: weather, culture, food, historic sights, museums, natural beauty, friendly people, shopping. We had an excellent guide, and everything went smoothly.

I want to share my good news with you. Tomorrow I will start a new job as Director of Government Relations at Bread for the World, one of the leading citizens organizations seeking to end hunger in the U.S. and around the globe.

I am very excited about this opportunity. I had interviews for seven different jobs during August and September, and this was definitely my top choice.

The Government Relations department is one of several departments. Others include: communications, research and education, organizing, church relations, and finance. I will report to the vice president for policy and program, and I will have a staff of about five.

I received the job offer by a fax sent to me in Turkey. I was glad that I gave the fax numbers of our hotels to the vice president of Bread for the World --- it made our vacation more relaxed and enjoyable to receive this news on our third morning there.

Bread for the World has been striving to change U.S. government policies and spending for the hungry for more than 25 years, and has over 40,000 members. It does not collect or distribute food, but rather seeks to change public policy (and public attitudes). It is a 501c4 organization, meaning that contributions are not tax deductible because it devotes a substantial portion of its budget to lobbying. It also has a 501c3 arm (contributions to which are tax deductible) for research and education.

It was founded by Christians committed to ending hunger, but is not in any way restricted to Christians. You can check out our web site at www.bread.org and you can even join!

Thank you for your support, your ideas, your prayers, your references (some of you), and your words of encouragement.

Bob Tiller

From: Vmsmagic@cs.com
Date: Tue, 17 Oct 2000 11:14:04 EDT
Subject: Re: Request for payment
To: mupj@igc.org
X-Mailer: Unknown sub 103

Howard,

I agree with your numbers in the Education Fund and will write the appropriate check.

However, I have a balance in the Rockefeller account in the General Fund of \$580.12. This \$45 difference might be attributable to a Jahn's Printing bill paid on June 15 in the amount of \$45 that I did not assign to Rockefeller.

What do you think?

Phil

To: "Bob and Elaine Tiller" <tiller64@starpower.net>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Good news
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <003801c03855\$26eb3be0\$cefd7ad1@user>
References:

Congratulations, Bob. This sounds like the perfect job for you.

You'll still be welcome at meetings of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament as a representative of the Baptist Peace Fellowship if you have time.

Shalom,
Howard

From: Lydia Milnes <lydia@fcnl.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Monday Lobby Phonebook
Date: Wed, 18 Oct 2000 09:37:24 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

Dear Howard,

Here is an electronic version of the Monday Lobby phonebook. I hope the email makes it to you alright!

Lydia

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\MLphonebook.wpd"

Please inform Friends Committee on National Legislation (547-6000, ex. 121) of any updates/changes.

MONDAY LOBBY PHONEBOOK

October 2000

Alliance for Nuclear Accountability

Kathy Crandall *kathycrandall*
1801 18th Street, NW, #9-2
Washington, DC 20009
Tel: 202-833-4668
Fax: 202-234-9536
E-mail: *(see name listing above)*@earthlink.net
website: www.ananuclear.org

American Baptist Churches USA, Office of Governmental Relations

Curtis W. Ramsey-Lucas
110 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington DC 20002
Tel: 202-544-3400
Fax: 202-544-0277
E-mail: ograbc@aol.com

American Friends Service Committee

Jim Matlack
1822 R Street, NW
Washington DC 20009
Tel: 202-483-3341
Fax: 202-232-3197
E-mail: jmatlack@erols.com
Website: www.afsc.org

Americans for Democratic Action

Darryl Fagin
1625 K Street NW #210
Washington DC 20006
Tel: 202-785-5980
Fax: 202-785-5969
E-mail: adaction@ix.netcom.com
Website: www.adaction.org

Arms Control Association

Wade Boese *wade*
Spurgeon Keeny *smk*
1726 M Street, NW, Suite 201
Washington DC 20036
Tel: 202-463-8270
Fax: 202-463-8273
E-mail: *(see name listing above)*@armscontrol.org
Website: www.armscontrol.org

Arms Trade Resource Center

-See *World Policy Institute*

British American Security Information Council (BASIC)

Dan Plesch
Kathleen Miller *kmiller@basicint.org*
1900 L Street, NW, Suite 401-403
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: 202-785-1266
Fax: 202-387-6298
E-mail: basicus@basicint.org
Website: www.basicint.org

Business Leaders for Sensible Priorities

Duane Peterson
John Fairbanks
1090 Vermont Ave., NW, Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20005
Tel: 202.216.1893
Fax: 202.216.9426
website: www.businessleaders.org

Campaign for U.N. Reform

Don Kraus
420 7th Street, SE, #C
Washington, DC 20003
Tel: 202-546-3956
Fax: 202-546-8703
E-mail: cunr@cunr.org
website: www.cunr.org

Center for Defense Information

Chris Hellman *x103 chellman*
Marcus Corbin *x106 mcorbin*
Rachel Stohl *x105 rstohl*
Dan Smith *x130 dsmith*
1779 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington DC 20036
Tel: 202-332-0600
Fax: 202-462-4559
E-mail: *(see name listing above)*@cdi.org
Website: www.cdi.org

Center for International Policy

Paul Olweny *x8 polwney*
Clarissa Kayosa *mwaampa*
David Lochhead
1755 Massachusetts Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20006
Tel: 202-232-3317
Fax: 202-232-3440
E-mail: *(see name listing above)*@ciponline.org
Website: www.us.net/cip/index.htm

***Center for Strategic and Budgetary
Assessments***

Stacy Shepard *shepard*
Liesl Heeter *heeter*
Steve Kosiak *kosiak*
Alane Kochems *kochems*
1730 Rhode Island Ave. NW, Ste. 912
Washington DC 20036
Tel: 202-331-7990
Fax: 202-331-8019
E-mail: *(see name listing
above)*@csbaonline.org
website: www.csbaonline.org

Church of the Brethren Washington Office

Greg Laszakovits
Cary Jossart
337 North Carolina Ave, SE
Washington, D.C. 20003
Tel: 202-546-3202
Fax: 202-544-5852
E-mail: washofc@aol.com
website: www.brethren.org/genbd/

Church Women United

Ann Delorey
110 Maryland Ave., NE
Washington, DC 20002
Tel: 202-544-8747
Fax: 202-544-9133
E-mail: cwu-dc@churchwomen.org
website: www.churchwomen.org

Citizens for a Responsible Budget

Scott Nathanson
110 Maryland Ave. NE, Suite 201
Washington, DC 20002
Tel: (202) 543-4100 x135
Fax: (202) 546-5142
E-mail: CRB_DC@hotmail.com
website: www.clw.org/crb/

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers

Daryl Kimball x136 *dkimball*

Stephen Young x102 *syoung*
Seth Levin x137 *slevin*
110 Maryland Avenue, NE, #505
Washington, DC 20002
Tel: 202-546-0795
Fax: 202-546-5142
E-mail: *(see name listing above)*@clw.org
website: <http://www.crnd.org>

Committee to Free Lori Berenson

Gail Taylor
110 Maryland Ave. NE, Suite 102
Washington, DC 20002
Tel: (202) 548-8480
Fax: (202) 544-9613
E-mail: gtaylor@freelori.org
website: www.freelori.org

Council for a Livable World

John Isaacs x131 *jdi*
Suzy Kerr x115 *skerr*
Dan Koslofsky x125 *dan*
110 Maryland Avenue, NE, #409
Washington DC 20002
Tel: 202-543-4100
Fax: 202-543-6297
E-mail: clw@clw.org
or (see name listing above)[@clw.org](mailto:clw@clw.org)
Website: www.clw.org

Council for a Livable World Education Fund

Tom Cardamone x126 *cardamone*
Erik Floden x110
efloden
Luke Warren x127 *lwarren*
Steve LaMontagne x119 *slamontagne*
Lynn Erskine x100 *lerskine*
110 Maryland Avenue, NE, #201
Washington, DC 20002
Tel: 202-546-0795
Fax: 202-546-5142
E-mail: (see name listing above)[@clw.org](mailto:clw@clw.org)
Website: www.clw.org

D.C. Green Party

Jenefer Ellingston
641 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20002
Tel: 202-546-0940
Fax: 546-0431
E-mail: jellingston@erols.com
website: www.dcgreenparty.org

Disarmament Clearinghouse

1101 14th Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20005
Tel: 202-898-0150, x232
Fax: 202-898-0172
E-mail: disarmament@igc.org
Web: www.disarmament.org

East Timor Action Network

Lynn Fredriksson *lynn*
Karen Orenstein *karen*
Suite 306, Box 3
110 Maryland Ave, N.E.
Washington, DC 20002
Tel: 202-544-6911
Fax: 202-544-6118
E-mail: (see name listing above)[@etan.org](mailto:clw@clw.org)
Website: www.etan.org

Federation of American Scientists

Tamar Gabelnick x1018 *tamarg*
Pamina Firchow x5220 *firchow*
John Pike x1023 *johnpike*
307 Massachusetts Avenue, NE
Washington DC 20002
Tel: 202-546-3300 or 202-675-(above)
Fax: 202-675-1010
E-mail: (see name listing above)[@fas.org](mailto:clw@clw.org)
Website: www.fas.org

Friends Committee on National Legislation

Joe Volk x119 *joe*
Kathy Guthrie x144 *kathy*
Ned Stowe x117 *ned*
Catherine Stratton x120 *catherine*
Treadway
245 Second Street, NE
Washington DC 20002
Tel: 202-547-6000
Fax: 202-547-6019
E-mail: (see name listing above)[@fcnl.org](mailto:clw@clw.org)
Website: www.fcnl.org

Fund for New Priorities in America

Robert Vandivier
122 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20002
Tel: 202-543-1231
Fax: 202-543-5193
E-mail: bobvan@erols.com

Greenpeace

1436 U Street, NW

Washington DC 20009
Tel: 202-462.1177
Fax: 202-462-4507

Website: www.greenpeaceusa.org

Institute for Policy Studies

Martha Honey
Miriam Pemberton
733 15th Street, NW, Suite 1020
Washington DC 20005
Tel: 202-234-9382
Fax: 202-319-3558
E-mail: nceed@igc.apc.org

Institute for Science and International Security

Kevin O'Neill x5883 *koneill*
Corey Hinderstein x2696 *cgh*
236 Massachusetts Ave NE, Suite 500
Washington, DC 20002
Tel: 202-547-3633 or 547-(*above*)
Fax: 202-547-3634
E-mail: (*see name listing above*)
 @isis-online.org
website: www.ips-dc.org

Jesuit Social Ministries, National Office

1616 P Street, N.W., Suite 400
Washington DC 20036
Tel: 202-462-0400
Fax: 202-462-7009
website: www.jesuit.org

***Lawyers Alliance for World Security
Committee for National Security***

Tom Graham
1901 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Suite 802
Washington DC 20006
Tel: (202) 745-2450
Fax: (202) 667-0444
E-mail: tgraham@lawscns.org
Website: www.lawscns.org

Mennonite Central Committee

Daryl Byler
110 Maryland Avenue, NE, #502
Washington DC 20002

Tel: 202-544-6564
Fax: 202-544-2820
E-mail: jdb@mcc.org
website: www.mcc.org

Website: www.nrdc.org

Methodists United for Peace with Justice

Howard Hallman
1500 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036
Tel/Fax: 202-896-0013
E-mail: mupj@igc.org

National Council of Churches/Church World Service

Heather Nolen *heathern*
Lisa Wright *lisaw*
110 Maryland Ave., NE
Washington, DC 20002
Tel: (202) 543-2350
Fax: (202) 546-6232
E-mail: *(see name listing*
 above)@nccusa.org
website: www.nccusa.org

National Security News Service

Francyne Harrigan x13
 fharrigan@hotmail.com
1100 Connecticut Ave., NW, #1310
Washington DC 20036
Tel: 202-466-4310
Fax: 202-466-4344
website: www.publicedcenter.org/nsns.html

Natural Resources Defense Council

Chris Paine
1535 Dairy Road
Charlottesville, VA 22903
tel: 804.244.5013
fax: 804.245.5099
E-mail: chrispaine@earthlink.net
OR
Matthew McKinzie
1200 New York Avenue, NW #400
Washington DC 20005
Tel: 202-289-6868
Fax: 202-289-1060

National Priorities Project

Greg Speeter
17 New South St., Ste. 301
Northampton, MA 01060
Tel. (413) 584-9556
Fax (413) 586-9647
E-mail: info@natprior.org
Web: www.natprior.org

NETWORK: A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby

Lisa Hixon x13 lhixon
801 Pennsylvania Ave. SE, Suite 460
Washington DC 20003
Tel: 202-547-5556
Fax: 202-547-5510
E-mail: network@networklobby.org
or: (see name listing above)
@networklobby.org
Website: www.networklobby.org

OMB Watch

1742 Connecticut Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20009
Tel: 202-234-8494
Fax: 202-234-8584
Website: ombwatch.org/ombwatch.html

Peace Action/Peace Action Education Fund

Gordon S. Clark x3007 gclark
Jim Bridgman jbridgman
Jennifer Randolph x3004 jrandolph
1819 H Street, NW #420-425
Washington DC 20006-3603
Tel: 202-862-9740
Fax: 202-862-9762
E-mail: (see name listing above)
@peace-action.org
Website: www.peace-action.org

PeaceLinks

Anna Smiles x20
annabananasmls@hotmail.com
666 11th Street, NW Suite 202
Washington, DC 20001
Tel: 202-783-7030

Fax: 202-783-7040
E-mail: peacelinks1@erols.com

Physicians for Social Responsibility

Robert Musil x221 bmusil
Kimberly Roberts x222 kroberts
Martin Butcher mbutcher
1101 14th Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington DC 20005
Tel: 202-898-0150
Fax: 202-898-0172
E-mail: (see name listing above)@psr.org
Website: www.psr.org

Plutonium Challenge

David Culp
245 Second St., NE
Washington, DC 20002
Tel: 202-547-6000
fax: 202-547-6019

Presbyterian Church (USA)

110 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington DC 20002
Tel: 202-543-1126
Fax: 202-543-7755
E-mail: walter_owensby@pcusa.org
website: www.pcusa.org

Project On Government Oversight

Eric Miller
Seth Morris seth@pogo.org
Danielle Brian
666 11th St., N.W., #500
Washington, DC 20001
Tel: 202-347-1122
Fax: 202-347-1116
E-mail: defense@pogo.org
Website: www.pogo.org

Saferworld

Peter J. Davies
711 Ladd Rd.
Bronx, NY 10471
Tel/Fax: (718) 549-1726
E-mail: pjdavies@aol.com

Student Pugwash USA

Sandy Ionno Butcher *sionno*
Susan Veres *sveres*
815 15th Street, NW, #814
Washington, DC 20005
Tel: 202-393-6555
Fax: 202-393-6550
E-mail: (see name listing above)*@spusa.org*
Website: www.spusa.org/pugwash/

Taxpayers for Common Sense

Ralph De Gennaro x102 *ralph*
Alise Frye x104 *alise*
651 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE
Washington, DC 20003
Tel: 202-546-8500
Fax: 202-546-8511
E-mail: (see name listing above)
@taxpayer.net
Website: www.taxpayer.net

20/20 Vision

James Wyerman *jwyerman*
Tim Barner *timb*
1828 Jefferson Place, NW
Washington DC 20036
Tel: 202-833-2020
Fax: 202-833-5307
E-mail: vision@2020vision.org
or: (see name listing above)
@2020vision.org
Website: www.2020vision.org

***Union of American Hebrew Congregations
Religious Action Center***

2027 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington DC 20036
Tel: 202-387-2800
Fax: 202-667-9070
E-mail: rac@uahc.org
website: www.rj.org/rac/

Union of Concerned Scientists

Tom Zamora Collina x109 *tcollina*
1707 H Street, NW #600
Washington DC 20006

Tel: 202-223-6133
Fax: 202-223-6162
E-mail: (see name listing
above)[@ucsusa.org](mailto:)
Website: www.ucsusa.org

2001 S Street, NW, Suite 740
Washington, DC 20009
Tel: 202-483-9222

Unitarian Universalist Association

Meg Riley
2026 P Street, NW, Suite 3
Washington DC 20036
Tel: 202-296-4672
Fax: 202-296-4673
E-mail: uuawo@aol.com

***United Church of Christ Office for Church
in Society***

Charles McCollough *mccolloc*
Jay Lintner *lintnerj*
110 Maryland Avenue, NE, Ste. 207
Washington DC 20002
Tel: 202-543-1517
Fax: 202-543-5994
E-mail: (see name listing above)[@ucc.org](mailto:)
Webpage: www.ucc.org

United Nations Support Pax World Service

Larry Ekin
1111 16th Street, N.W., Suite 120
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: 202-293-7290
Fax: 202-293-7023
E-mail: info@paxworld.org
website: www.paxworld.org

Veterans for Peace, Inc.

Hari Scordo
733 15th St. NW, Ste. 928
Washington, DC 20005
Tel: 202-347-6780
Fax: 202-347-6781
E-mail: vfp@igc.org
Web: www.veteransforpeace.org

***Vietnam Veterans of America Foundation
U.S. Campaign to Ban Landmines***

Marissa Vitagliano

Fax: 202-483-9312
E-mail: marissa@vi.org
Website: www.vvaf.org/htdocs/landmine/
freeworld.htm

Women Strike for Peace

Edith Villastrigo
110 Maryland Avenue, NE, Suite 102
Washington, DC 20002
Tel: 202-543-2660
Fax: 202-544-9613
E-mail: WomenStrikePeace@cs.com

***Women's Action for New Directions,
The Women Legislators' Lobby***

Kimberly Robson (WAND) *wand*
Ann Ober (WILL) *will*
Stephanie Broughton *nuclear*
110 Maryland Avenue, Suite 205
Washington DC 20002
Tel: 202-543-8505
Fax: 202-675-6469
E-mail: (see listing above)@wand.org
Website: www.wand.org

***Women's International League for Peace &
Freedom c/o Women Strike for Peace***

Gillian Gilhool
110 Maryland Avenue, NE, Suite 102
Washington, DC 20002
Tel: 202-546-6727
Fax: 202-544-9613
E-mail: ggilhool@ix.netcom.com
Website: www.wilpf.org

World Federalist Association

Chuck Woolery x 6135 *chuck*
418 7th Street, SE
Washington, DC 20003
Tel: 202-546-(see extension above)
Fax: 202-546-3749
E-mail: (see name listing above)@wfa.org
Website: www.wfa.org

World Policy Institute

Bill Hartung *hartung* x106
Frida Berriga *berrigaf* x112
Michelle Ciarrocca *ciarrm01* x112
66 5th Ave., 9th Floor
New York, NY 10011
Tel: (212) 229-5808
Fax: (212) 229-5579
E-mail: (see name listing above)
@newschool.edu
website: www.worldpolicy.org/projects/arms

To: Lydia Milnes <lydia@fcnl.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Monday Lobby Phonebook
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <E9BA445D76C0D21182F30090273DFAF65519DC@local.fcnl.org>
References:

At 09:37 AM 10/18/00 -0400, you wrote:

>Dear Howard,

>

>Here is an electronic version of the Monday Lobby phonebook. I hope the
>email makes it to you alright!

>

>Lydia

Lydia,

It came through all right. However, when I printed the document, it didn't come out properly with page and column breaks. So would you please mail me a copy to 6508 Wilmet Road, Bethesda, MD 20817.

Thanks,
Howard

X-Mailer: Lyris Web Interface
Date: Wed, 18 Oct 2000 10:54:22 -0700
Subject: GBCS Calls on U.S. to Examine Role in Middle East Violence
To: Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.org>
From: GBCS<actiongbcs@umc-gbcs.org>
List-Unsubscribe: <mailto:leave-gbcs-5112739D@earth.lyris.net>
Reply-To: GBCS<actiongbcs@umc-gbcs.org>

Press Statement
Contact: Jaydee Hanson (202) 488-5650

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Date: October 17, 2000

GBCS Calls on U.S. to Examine Role in Middle East Violence

It is deeply disturbing to witness the death toll climb daily in the current Israeli-Palestinian crisis. We join those who mourning the loss of beloved friends and family as well as those dismayed by the reversal of progress toward peace in the region. We pray for God's healing presence to comfort wounded hearts, bodies, and relationships.

We commend President Clinton for his efforts to mediate this long-standing conflict, especially for his role in the orchestration and proceedings of this week's summit in Sharm El-Sheikh. We likewise commend Prime Minister Barak and Chairman Arafat for attending the summit on behalf of their respective peoples in the face of political opposition and great grievances. Such courageous actions are necessary to resume the journey toward peace.

Many steps are still to be taken on this journey. The General Board of Church and Society of The United Methodist Church calls upon both Israelis and Palestinians to end the use of violence and to seek durable peace, breaking the destructive cycle that lures constructive efforts and energies away from progress. This includes a call upon Israel to end its use of excessive force against Palestinian civilians. We urge Arab and Israeli leaders to take great care to avoid words and actions that provoke or perpetuate hatred or violence.

Recognizing the complex, integral role of the United States in achieving peace in the region, we insist that President Clinton and the U.S. Congress exercise a greater degree of even-handedness in their involvement in the peace and conflict management processes. Playing the role of a third party requires the United States to hear and address Palestinian cries for justice along with Israeli needs for security.

We call upon the United States government to seriously examine its own part in the current crisis in the Middle East, with specific attention to the amount and forms of military aid given to Israel. Israel's use of U.S.-supplied Apache and Cobra helicopters against Palestinians makes the United States a complicit party in the current violence. The United Methodist Church requests "that the U.S. government re-evaluate the entire

structure of aid to the Middle East, one goal being to redistribute the huge amount now given to Israel and Egypt, and a second goal being to consider economic support for the efforts of nongovernmental organizations, including religious institutions, human rights groups, labor unions, and professional groups” (The Book of Resolutions of The United Methodist Church, 1996).

The fact that the current uprising began in Jerusalem, sparked by a political move with religious aspects, underscores the necessity of securing a settlement on Jerusalem that addresses the real need for two peoples - the Palestinians and Israelis - and three religious groups - the Jews, Christians, and Muslims - to share the city. As a place of history and heritage for so many, open access to the holy sites must also be secured for pilgrims and tourists of all faiths and nationalities. Sole sovereignty over the city or its landmarks is unjust for the region’s residents and visitors and is antithetical to peace, as demonstrated by the current violence.

The United Methodist Church reaffirms its commitment “to the objective of a comprehensive Arab-Israeli peace agreement that would bring recognition and security to Israel and national and human rights to the Palestinians” (The Book of Resolutions of The United Methodist Church, 1996). We continue in earnest prayer and hope for this vision to become a reality.

###

Only the General Conference speaks for the entire denomination. The General Board of Church and Society is the international public policy and social action agency of The United Methodist Church.

You are currently subscribed to gbcs as: mupj@igc.org
To unsubscribe send a blank email to leave-gbcs-5112739D@earth.lyris.net

To: "Meg Gage" <info@towncreekfdn.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Background for telephone conversation
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\icnd.042.doc; C:\My Documents\01009.10.doc; C:\My Documents\01011.11.doc;
A:\abolish.306.doc; C:\My Documents\01012.05.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Ms. Gage:

In preparation for our telephone conversation at 12:15 p.m., Thursday, October 19, I would like to bring you up-to-date on what has happened since I submitted the application to the Town Creek Foundation on September 13.

(1) The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament met on September 19. Notes from this meeting are attached. The first paragraph refers to an initiative I undertook with Dave Robinson of Pax Christi USA, separate from the Interfaith Committee, to pose a set of questions on nuclear disarmament to presidential candidates. This was done through use of 501(c)(4) funds, completely distinct from our 501(c)(3) Education Fund, which would be the depository for a Town Creek grant. Other election-related activities are being handled by participating organizations with their own resources. Other topics we discussed at the September 19 meeting were national missile defense and de-alerting. Both illustrate our connections with civil-sector organizations. Our next meeting will be on November 14 to discuss our approach to the incoming presidential administration between the election and inauguration.

(2) A second matter is a consultation I attended in Brussels on October 5-6, consisting of representatives of European, Canadian, and U.S. churches and the World Council of Churches (WCC), mainly to develop a common strategy for dealing with NATO and the review of its nuclear posture. The communiqué of the meeting is attached. I used this occasion to renew my contact with Dwain Epps and Saly Eskidjian, top WCC staff for international affairs, who I first met when I was at the 1998 NPT PrepCom meeting in Geneva. I offered them a suggestion for how the WCC might approach the nuclear-weapon states with a renewed demand for the elimination of nuclear weapons. Copies of this correspondence is attached. This is another illustration of the role I play as a connecting link.

I welcome the opportunity to discuss our work more fully in our upcoming telephone conversation.

Shalom,
Howard Hallman

From: "Bob and Elaine Tiller" <tiller64@starpower.net>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: (abolition-usa) Rehearsing Doomsday to air October 15
Date: Wed, 18 Oct 2000 21:58:48 -0400
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2314.1300
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300

I was unable to watch it on Sunday evening. Please let me know if you get word of a rebroadcast. Thanks.

Bob Tiller

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

From: Howard W. Hallman <mupj@igc.org>
To: <mupj@igc.org>
Sent: Monday, October 02, 2000 2:08 PM
Subject: (abolition-usa) Rehearsing Doomsday to air October 15

> Dear Colleagues:

>
> I call the following information to your attention.

>
> Shalom,
> Howard

>
>>Date: Mon, 02 Oct 2000 12:09:34 -0500
>>From: Kevin Martin <kmartin@fourthfreedom.org>
>>X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win98; U)
>>X-Accept-Language: en
>>To: Kevin Martin <kmartin@fourthfreedom.org>
>>Subject: (abolition-usa) Rehearsing Doomsday to air October 15
>>X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by elk1.elkhart.net
id

> MAA12602
>>Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
>>Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

>>
>>Dear Friends:

>>
>>Less than two weeks remain until the George Crile documentary
>>"Rehearsing Doomsday" will air on CNN Sunday, October 15 at 10:00
>>eastern, 7:00 pacific time, but there's still time to order a watch
>>party organizing kit from Project Abolition. Call us at 219/535-1110 or
>>email me at <kmartin@fourthfreedom.org>. Below is my original notice
>>from last week.

>>
>>Kevin Martin

>>***

>>
>>To: Peace and Disarmament activists
>>Fr: Kevin Martin, Director, Project Abolition

>>September 25, 2000
>>
>>Rehearsing Doomsday documentary to air on CNN October 15
>>
>>Rehearsing Doomsday, a documentary produced by George Crile whose
>>notable documentary "The
>>Missiliers" aired last February on "60 Minutes II," gives an
>>unprecedented look at the nuclear
>>arsenals of both the United States and Russia. Unlike any yet produced,
>>this documentary will
>>take us on a journey to meet the generals and commanders responsible for
>>nuclear weapons, the
>>missiliers charged with firing them, and the politicians who craft our
>>policies.
>>
>>We all know that the Russians are eager to reduce their nuclear
>>stockpile and that a string of
>>former US generals and cabinet secretaries, haunted by their actions,
>>have become
>>abolitionists. This documentary is different. Rehearsing Doomsday will
>>expose the hypocrisy
>>of current nuclear policy with portraits of Senators, frustrated by
>>their lack of access to
>>knowledge, and missiliers, gravely concerned as they watch the American
>>people sleepwalk toward
>>armageddon.
>>
>>Rehearsing Doomsday will be broadcast Sunday, October 15 at 10:00 p.m.
>>eastern, 7:00 pacific
>>time on CNN (The documentary may also air on another date, we'll let you
>>know as soon as we
>>find out). Thanks and kudos are due to the Global Security Institute,
>>headed by former U.S.
>>Sen. Alan Cranston, for working with George Crile and CNN to get this
>>show on the air.
>>
>>Let's put this much-anticipated documentary to good use in the election
>>season. Here are some
>>suggestions for peace and disarmament activists:
>>
>>1. Organize a Rehearsing Doomsday watch party in a private home, church
>>or place of worship,
>>college campus, or other community meeting center. Last spring, Project
>>Abolition, the Global
>>Security Institute, and the Disarmament Clearinghouse organized over 100
>>watch parties around
>>the country for the live CBS television re-make of the anti-nuclear
>>thriller Fail Safe. Please
>>contact Project Abolition at 219/535-1110 or kmartin@fourthfreedom.org
>>for a house party
>>organizing kit. If the broadcast times are inconvenient, you can
>>videotape the show and hold
>>your watch party on another day and time. Be sure to invite your local
>>media to your watch

> >party.
> >
> >2. Bird-dog congressional candidates and demand to know how they will
> >work to reduce the
> >nuclear threat if they are elected or re-elected. Show up at candidate
> >debates, rallies or
> >town meetings prepared to ask tough questions of the candidates. You can
> >also bring your local
> >peace group's literature to hand out attendees.
> >
> >3. Use the broadcast of Rehearsing Doomsday to raise nuclear abolition
> >as an issue with your
> >local media. Project Abolition will provide sample letters to the
> >editor. You can also
> >contact your local newspaper's television critic and encourage her or
> >him to preview or review
> >Rehearsing Doomsday. After the broadcast, you can refer to the show and
> >the concerns it raises
> >in encouraging your local media to cover the nuclear issue and to raise
> >it with candidates in
> >editorial board meetings or candidate debates.
> >
> >-
> > 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.
> >
> > 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: "Bob and Elaine Tiller" <tiller64@starpower.net>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Good news
Date: Wed, 18 Oct 2000 22:21:25 -0400
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2314.1300
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300

Thanks, Howard. I will do my best to participate.

Did you see the recent issue of Baptist Peacemaker? It contains a blurb about the committee.

Bob

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

From: Howard W. Hallman <mupj@igc.org>
To: Bob and Elaine Tiller <tiller64@starpower.net>
Sent: Tuesday, October 17, 2000 5:28 PM
Subject: Re: Good news

> Congratulations, Bob. This sounds like the perfect job for you.
>
> You'll still be welcome at meetings of the Interfaith Committee for
> Nuclear
> Disarmament as a representative of the Baptist Peace Fellowship if you
> have
> time.
>
> 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: sal@wcc-coe.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Sources of information on nuclear disarmament
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Salpy,

In constructing your web page, here are some organizations and sites you might consider for linkage. You can check them out for yourself. Several of them have linkages with other organizations, so you can broaden your review on your own.

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Danger (USA) -- www.clw.org/coalition
Provides linkage with 17 member organizations in U.S. and more than 40 other NGOs

Center for Defense Information (USA) -- www.cdi.org
Has information on world's nuclear arsenal and other data

British American Security Information Council (BASIC) - (UK/USA) -- www.basicint.org
Information about NATO and other issues

Acronym Institute (UK) -- www.acronym.org.uk
Information on arms control negotiations

Women's International League for Peace and Freedom -- www.wilpf.ch
Information on peace and disarmament issues in five languages, especially from viewpoint of women

U.S. State Department, Bureau of Arms Control -- www.state.gov/www/global/arms/bureauc.html
Has text of arms control treaties and other information

I'm hoping to set up a web site that will have linkages with other faith-based organizations in the United States. This is several months away.

Please let me know if I can help further.

Shalom,
Howard

Date: Sun, 22 Oct 2000 20:47:35 -1000
From: Tony Castanha <castanha@hawaii.edu>
Subject: Notes on Delegation
X-Sender: castanha@uhunix1
To: papbullslist@revoke.org

Aloha and Greetings,

The Vatican delegation of indigenous peoples and supporters has completed its trip to Italy. This message will point out a few of the highlights and difficulties of our stay. It's understood that parts of this message should have been presented earlier. An intense schedule and not so easy access to the internet took their toll on us. E kalamai.

Our delegation consisted of nine people, out of the eighteen or so delegates attempting to make the trip. A lack of financial support was the main reason for the reduction of people. Nevertheless, the nine of us were a very spirited group who left a strong impression on those we met along the way. The Italian people were very hospitable, receptive and supportive of the issue and our efforts. Grazie Italianos!

Interestingly, the delegation assumed no distinct leadership roles (we were all leaders in a sense, which seemed to work to our advantage), though Daniela Minerbi of Italy and myself coordinated the effort. A big mahalo to Daniela for everything! Steve Newcomb, director of the Indigenous Law Institute, was at times the primary spokesperson for his legal expertise and long-time research on the issue. Yet, all of the members of the delegation spoke and presented at the numerous panel presentations, press conferences and informal gatherings attended. These events took place in the cities of Torino, Milano and Rome. The delegates were:

Naniki Reyes Ocasio (Taino Elder)
Steve Newcomb (Shawnee/Lenape)
Rev. Kaleo Patterson (Kanaka Maoli)
Dr. Lou Ann Ha`aheo Guanson (Kanaka Maoli)
Daniela Minerbi (Italy)
Eric Po`ohina (Kanaka Maoli)
Dr. Johan Galtung (Norway)
Kame`aloha Smith (Kanaka Maoli)
Tony Castanha (Carib/Taino)

Key Points

*Meeting with "El Papa" - We had requested an audience with the Pope for October 11. However, we were told by phone days before leaving that the audience would basically not occur. This news was not unexpected. By not putting all our "eggs in one basket" by planning a variety of activities, centering on the important task of education and awareness-building, we were fully prepared to move forward with the trip. We still held out a glimmer of

hope in getting an audience while there, but this faded for one when we learned that many of the Pope's closest associates couldn't even meet with him.

*Pontifical Council - Instead, we were "received" at the Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace. This is where we have been sending our "Appeal to the Vatican." We met with a Monsignor under the President of the Council. He assured us we were on the track, and that the Council was an important player along with the Secretariat of State. The issue of the revocation of the Bull "Inter Caetera" has now been submitted to a commission at the Secretariat of State. This is a victory indicating that for the first time the Vatican is seriously considering this issue. Let's hope it's not "studied to death"!

Ancestral Spirit

It was the consensus of most of the delegates that our coming to Rome at this moment in history was very significant. We were motivated by spirit, the ancestors had guided us to be here at this time, or we would NOT have been there. Certainly, the "Jubilee" year provided an important time reference in which to act, a time to take the Vatican up on their pledges. The October 12 date was also an important time to be there. This symbolic date provides the impetus and energy for creative action, and to educate the public on the real meaning and implications of "discovery" for indigenous peoples. It was further the agreement among the delegation that this issue is much larger than any one person or group. The struggle for accountability and the resolution of the issue has gone on now for over 500 years. This is not to take anything away from the groups who have motivated the modern campaign to revoke the bull. A special thanks to the Indigenous Law Institute for their ground-breaking work.

In the end, there was no overall consensus on the formation of a proposed type of "umbrella" group to organize as a collective body in the future. However, it was the basic consensus of delegates that we would return home to elicit support from our communities and indigenous peoples in general. It was also the consensus of the delegation that we would be back again next year, in greater and greater numbers until this issue is resolved! This was articulated numerous times publically. We have already begun to organize for next year. For anyone interested in joining us or getting involved, please email me (castanha@hawaii.edu) or phone (808-737-6097) as soon as possible.

Finally, we would like to thank the following groups and organizations for all their support: Ahupua`a Action Alliance, Associated Students of the University of Hawai`i (ASUH), Graduate Student Organization (University of Hawai`i), Hague Appeal for Peace, Hawai`i Ecumenical Coalition, Indigenous Law Institute, Ka Pakaukau, Matsunaga Institute for Peace, People's Fund, and the Seventh Generation Fund. Mahalo nui loa!

*Here's the address for our website:

<http://bullsburning.itgo.com/papbull.htm>

In peace and solidarity,

Tony Castanha
Matsunaga Institute for Peace

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

Phil,

At Foundry there's a \$200 check from Joy Arthur, which he says is \$100 for membership (General Fund) and \$100 for the Education Fund. Since you can't split it, put it all in the Education Fund.

No, don't assign the Jahn's copying bill to Rockefeller.

Thanks for your diligence,
Howard

X-Sender: jameshipkn@mail.sssnet.com (Unverified)
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.0
Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2000 11:13:40 -0400
To: Hallman <mupj@igc.apc.org>
From: JamesHipkins <jameshipkin@sssnet.com>
Subject: Peace Leaf

Howard:

Do you want aq new issue of the Peace Leaf tyo go out? I have the material you prepared and have several letters from Christian Peace Makers in Hebron which will be helpful background material.

We are finally in place and my computer is going. I do need to get reimbursement for \$78 postage for last issue. I sent several e-mails to Phil but no reply. Not sure why. Can we affor another issue?

Keep in touch.

Jim and Char

To: jameshipkn@sssnet.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Peace Leaf
Cc: vmsmagic@cs.com
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

At 11:13 AM 10/20/00 -0400, you wrote:

>Howard:

> Do you want aq new issue of the Peace Leaf tyo go out? I have the
>material you prepared and have several letters from Christian Peace Makers
>in Hebron which will be helpful background material.

> We are finally in place and my computer is going. I do need to get
>reimbursement for \$78 postage for last issue. I sent several e-mails to
>Phil but no reply. Not sure why. Can we affor another issue?

>

>Keep in touch.

>>Jim and Char

>

>

Jim,

Yes, do an issue of Peace Leaf. We can afford it.

With a copy of this e-mail, I'll query Phil about your reimbursement. He changed his e-mail address a while ago, so maybe that's why you haven't reached him.

Shalom,
Howard

From: Vmsmagic@cs.com
Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2000 15:02:53 EDT
Subject: Re: Peace Leaf
To: mupj@igc.org, jameshipkin@sssnet.com
X-Mailer: Unknown sub 103

I've not changed my email address but Jim has changed his. He has abandoned CompuServe. I haven't received any messages from Jim.

At any rate, I think we ought to get out an issue of Peace Leaf and await Howard's guidance on payments related thereto (how's that for a bureaucratic word?).

Phil

X-Sender: jdi@[63.106.26.66]
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)
Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2000 12:46:36 -0400
To: jdi@clw.org
From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>
Subject: Senate election polling update

RECENT POLLING ON SENATE 2000 CAMPAIGNS
October 20, 2000 update

== Close races (incumbent party in parentheses): Delaware (R), Florida (R), Michigan (R), Minnesota (R), Missouri (R), Montana (R), Nebraska (D), Nevada (D), New Jersey (D), New York (D), Virginia (D), Washington (R)

== Longer-shot races: Georgia (D), Pennsylvania (R) Rhode Island, (R), Vermont (R)

==Endorsements by Council for a Livable World indicated by ***

==New polls since the last polling data was circulated: California, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Montana, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Utah, Vermont

N.B. Where available, independent polls are cited rather than those associated with a candidate or a party.

=====
California

=====
52% - Senator Dianne Feinstein (D)
37% - Rep. Tom Campbell (R)
11% - Undecided, other
Research 2000 poll conducted October 12-15, 2000 - 819 likely voters

=====
Connecticut

=====
60% - Sen. Joseph Lieberman (D)
27% - Philip Giordano (R)
10% - Undecided, other

54% - Richard Blumenthal (D)
23% - Philip Giordano (R)
20% - Undecided, other
University of Connecticut poll conducted September 26-Oct. 1, 2000 - 447 registered voters

=====
Delaware

=====
46% - Sen. Bill Roth (R)
43% - Gov. Tom Carper (D) ***
11% - Undecided

Mason Dixon poll conducted October 4-5, 2000 - 633 likely voters

=====
Florida
=====

44% - Bill Nelson (D)
37% - Bill McCollum (R)
4% - Willie Logan (I)
15% - Undecided, other

Mason-Dixon poll conducted October 5-7, 2000 -
807 likely voters

=====
Georgia
=====

49% - Sen. Zell Miller (D)
30% - Mack Mattingly (R)
21% - Undecided, other

Mason-Dixon poll conducted October 12-14, 2000 -
627 likely voters

=====
Indiana
=====

69% - Sen. Dick Lugar (R)
18% - David Johnson (D)
13% - Undecided, other

Research 2000 poll conducted October 12-14, 2000 for the South Bend Tribune
- 604 likely voters

=====
Maine
=====

73% - Sen. Olympia Snowe (R)
16% - Mark Lawrence (D) ***
10% - Undecided, other

Critical Insights of Portland poll conducted October 15-17, 2000 - 404
registered voters

=====
Maryland
=====

58% - Sen. Paul Sarbanes (D) ***
29% - Delegate Paul Rappaport (R)
13% - Undecided

Mason Dixon poll conducted October 6-8, 2000 - 621 likely voters

=====
Massachusetts
=====

68% - Sen. Edward Kennedy (D) ***
16% - Jack E. Robinson (R)
16% - Undecided

Boston Herald poll conducted August 29 - 31, 2000 - 410 likely voters

=====

Michigan

=====

49% - Sen. Spencer Abraham (R)

39% - Rep. Debbie Stabenow (D) ***

12% - Undecided

Detroit News poll conducted October 11-12, 2000 - 600 likely voters

=====

Minnesota

=====

46% - Mark Dayton (D)

41% - Sen. Rod Grams (R)

4% - James Gibson (I)

9% - Undecided

Mason-Dixon poll conducted September 22-25, 2000 for the St. Paul Pioneer Press and Minnesota Public Radio - 627 regular voters

49% - Mark Dayton (D)

35% - Sen. Rod Grams (R)

3% - James Gibson (I)

13% - Undecided

Minneapolis Star Tribune poll conducted September 23-27, 2000 by Market Solutions Group - 833 adults

=====

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

=====

48% - Sen. Conrad Burns (R)

40% - Brian Schweitzer (D) ***

12% - Undecided, other

Great Falls Tribune poll conducted October 13-15, 2000 by A&A Research - 402 likely voters

=====

Nebraska

=====

53% Ben Nelson (D) ***

33% Don Stenberg (R)

13% Undecided

Omaha World-Herald poll conducted September 12- 14, 2000 by RKM Research and Comm. - 986 registered voters

=====

Nevada

=====

50% - Former Rep. John Ensign (R)

39% - Ed Bernstein (D)***

11% - Undecided

Mason-Dixon poll conducted September 9-12, 2000 - 627 regular voters

=====

New Jersey

=====

45% - Jon Corzine (D) ***

33% - Rep. Bob Franks (R)

22% - Undecided

New York Times poll conducted October 12-15, 2000 - 908 registered voters

=====

New Mexico

=====

59% - Sen. Jeff Bingaman (D) ***

31% - Former Rep. Bill Redmond (R)

10% - Undecided, other

Mason Dixon poll conducted September 28-30, 2000 - 442 likely voters

=====

New York

=====

43% - Hillary Clinton (D) ***

42% - Rep. Rick Lazio (R)

15% - Undecided, other

New York Post poll conducted October 18-19, 2000 by Zogby International -
504 likely voters

50% - Hillary Clinton (D) ***

43% - Rep. Rick Lazio (R)

7% - Undecided, other

Quinnipiac University poll conducted October 12-16, 2000 - 969 likely voters

=====

North Dakota

=====

65% - Sen. Kent Conrad (D) ***

24% - Duane Sand (R)

11% - Undecided

Fargo Forum poll conducted October 2-5, 2000 by Public Affairs Institute -
586 likely voters

=====

Ohio

=====

57% - Sen. Mike DeWine (R)

32% - Ted Celeste (D)

11% - Undecided, other

Columbus Dispatch poll conducted September 22- 29, 2000 - 2,468 likely voters

=====
Pennsylvania

=====
51% - Sen. Rick Santorum (R)
32% - Rep. Ron Klink (D) ***
17% - Undecided

University of Connecticut poll conducted October 3- 10, 2000 - 596
registered voters

=====
Rhode Island

=====
50% - Sen. Lincoln Chafee (R) ***
34% - Rep. Robert Weygand (D)
16% - Undecided, other

Channel 12 poll conducted October 10-13, 2000 - 408 likely voters

=====
Tennessee

=====
62% - Sen. Bill Frist (R)
23% - John Kay Hooker (D)
15% - Undecided, other

Mason-Dixon poll conducted September 25-27, 2000 - 625 likely 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

=====
64% - Sen. Orrin Hatch (R)
24% - Scott Howell (D)
12% - undecided, others

Deseret News poll conducted October 9-12, 2000 by Dan Jones & Assoc. - 914
adults

=====
Vermont

=====
58% - Sen. Jim Jeffords (R) ***
35% - Ed Flanagan (D)
7% - Undecided

Research 2000 poll conducted October 10-11, 2000 for the Rutland Herald -
401 likely voters

=====
Virginia

=====

45% - Ex-Governor George Allen (R)

42% - Sen. Chuck Robb (D)

13% - Undecided

Media General poll conducted September 22-Oct. 2, 2000 for Richmond

Time-Dispatch - 507 likely voters

=====
Washington

=====
Washington

40% - Sen. Slade Gorton (R)

40% - Maria Cantwell (D) ***

20% - Undecided, other candidates

Elway poll conducted August 24-29, 2000 - 445 registered voters

=====
Wisconsin

=====
Wisconsin

64% - Sen. Herbert Kohl (D) ***

23% - John Gillespie (R)

13% - Undecided

Milwaukee Journal Sentinel poll conducted September 18-20, 2000 by Market

Shares Corp. - 500 likely voters

=====
Wyoming

=====
Wyoming

68% - Sen. Craig Thomas (R)

14% - Mel Logan (D)

18% - Undecided, other

Mason-Dixon poll conducted September 16-17, 2000 - 412 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

Reply-To: <BrinkProgram@backfromthebrink.com>
From: "Brink Campaign" <brinkprogram@backfromthebrink.com>
To: "tim barnes" <timb@2020vision>, "steve young" <syoun@clw.org>,
"stephanie broughton" <nuclear@wand.org>,
"martin butcher" <mbutcher@psr.org>,
"kimberly robison" <wand@wand.org>,
"kimberly roberts" <kroberts@psr.org>,
"kathy guthrie" <kathy@fcl.org>,
"kathy crandall" <kathycrandall@earthlink.net>,
"jim bridgman" <jbridgman@peace-action.org>,
"ira shorr" <irashorr@hotmail.com>,
"gillian gilhool" <ggilhool@ix.net.com>,
"ellen barfield" <wilpfdc@wilpf.org>,
"deedie runkel" <deedier@erols.com>, "david culp" <david@fcl.org>,
"daryl kimball" <dkimball@clw.org>,
"anne gallivan" <agallivan@psr.org>,
"anna smiles" <annabananasmls@hotmail.com>,
"alison millar" <amillar@fourthfreedom.org>,
"howard hollman" <mupj@igc.org>

Subject: change of e-mail
Date: Sat, 21 Oct 2000 03:41:28 -0400
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)
Importance: Normal
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6600

Please note the change of my e-mail address. Thanks. Esther

Esther Pank
Back from the Brink Campaign
6856 Eastern Avenue, NW, # 322
Washington DC 20012
202.545.1001 ph
202.545.1004 fax
brinkprogram@backfromthebrink.com

X-eGroups-Return: sentto-1413460-1593-972037661-mupj=igc.apc.org@returns.onelist.com
X-Sender: jbloomfield@gn.apc.org
X-Apparently-To: abolition-caucus@egroups.com
To: "abolition-caucus" <abolition-caucus@egroups.com>
Cc: <abolition@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca>,
"Abolition-Europe" <abolition-europe@vlberlin.comlink.de>,
"abolitionusa" <abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2314.1300
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300
X-eGroups-From: "Janet Bloomfield" <jbloomfield@gn.apc.org>
From: "Janet Bloomfield" <janet@atomicmirror.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: Fri, 20 Oct 2000 10:41:28 +0100
Subject: [abolition-caucus] Minutes of A2000 Coordinating Committee - October 9, 2000

Abolition 2000 Coordinating Committee Conference Call - October 9th, 2000.
Minutes

Present: Janet Bloomfield, Jackie Cabasso, John Burroughs, Carah Ong, David Krieger, Akira Kawasaki, Alyn Ware.

Apologies: Alice Slater.

Facilitator: Jackie Cabasso
Notetaker: Janet Bloomfield

1. Finances and fundraising: Currently \$10,000 in the account. Grant proposals currently lodged with Rachel and Ben Vaughn Foundation, Boehm > Foundation and Environmental Leadership Program. results due in December. John and Alyn to follow up Boehm. Also approaching Threshold Foundation with help of Pamela Meidell. ACC discussed the proposal from David Krieger that Carah should go half-time for A2000 and have the other half working for NAPF. It was agreed that Carah should continue full-time and that we should decide about this after Nagasaki in the light of funding results. This led to a discussion on fundraising:

Have we fully mobilised the potential of our supporting groups? Are there any of are larger groups willing to allocate a substantial amount towards the co-ordinators salary from their core budgets? Are we asking for enough money from foundations backed up with a coherent programme? It was agreed that Carah and David would review the list of A2000 groups and identify those that seem most likely to respond to a fundraising appeal. They will then allocate groups to each ACC member for a fundraising ring round to be completed before Nagasaki. We will not send a letter first.

2. A2000 Petition - after discussion it was agreed to delete "by the year 2000" from the petition as of now and to discuss it's future as an organising tool at the Nagasaki meeting.

3. A2000 Statement - following the consultation with the Global Council it was agreed that a carefully worded message be sent to the listservs

proposing that "2000" be deleted from point 1 of the statement and a footnote added explaining this. Carah to circulate on behalf of the ACC with help in drafting from Alice and Janet.

5. Nagasaki: Akira had circulated a report and updated the ACC on progress so far. The ACC was happy that information about the A2000 meeting had gone out and thanked the Japanese ACC/Global Council members and others their work in preparing this meeting. The main Assembly will have about 800 participants. The A2000 meeting will probably have 20 plus from Japan and 20 plus from elsewhere. The Japanese participants will include representatives of many key groups in the country plus new people from Nagasaki. It was agreed to establish an agenda committee at the meeting to support the Japanese facilitators. It is important to avoid repetitious discussions on the agenda in the meeting! It was also noted that it would be very helpful to have basic background material on the development and work of A2000 available in Japanese. Everyone was asked to send ideas for what should be translated (including the text) to Akira.

6. It was agreed to send three letters on behalf of the ACC:

- * to Citizens Nuclear Information Center, CNIC with condolences on the death of Dr. Jinzaburo Takagi - Jackie
- * to Doug Roche in congratulation on the Pomerance Award from the NGO Disarmament Committee - Carah
- * to Achin Vanik and Praful Bidwai on the IPB Sean McBride Peace Prize - Janet

7. Next calls: two calls were scheduled:

one call re: coordinator position, website, listserv etc on November 1st (one hour earlier)

one call re: general items on November 6th.

Carah to check times.

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

eGroups eLerts

It's Easy. It's Fun. Best of All, it's Free!

http://click.egroups.com/1/9698/3/_/91925/_/972037661/

----- _->

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

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

From: "david rush" <rushd@mediaone.net>
To: <abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>, <abolition-europe@vlberlin.comlink.de>, <abolition-caucus@egroups.com>
Subject: (abolition-usa) Kakwort virus
Date: Sat, 21 Oct 2000 09:03:02 -0400
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4133.2400
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

The kakwort virus was on my machine, and it came from an abolition caucus message .

A fix is available at

<http://www.symantec.com/avcenter/venc/data/wscript.kakworm.fix.html>

David Rush

-

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.

X-eGroups-Return: sentto-1413460-1602-972144607-mupj=igc.apc.org@returns.onelist.com
X-Sender: acc@internetegypt.com
X-Apparently-To: abolition-caucus@egroups.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.72 [en] (Win98; I)
X-Accept-Language: en
To: David Krieger <dkrieger@napf.org>, abolition-caucus@egroups.com
From: acc <acc@internetegypt.com>
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: Sat, 21 Oct 2000 18:05:07 +0200
Reply-To: acc@internetegypt.com
Subject: [abolition-caucus] Remarks on David's report

Dear friends

To identify the main actions needed to abolish nuclear weapons at the beginning of the 21st century clear understanding of the current US nuclear weapons' policies is necessary. In his report dispatched by an E-Mail, October, 10, 2000 on "Nuclear Weapons Abolition at the Beginning of the 21st Century", David Krieger considers "CTBT ratification, commitment to ABM Treaty, de-alerting, de-coupling, no first use, no use against NNWSs and the Nuclear Weapon Convention" the main actions necessary to abolish nuclear weapons. But, are these actions sufficient to counter current US nuclear weapon policies and achieve our target.? The correct answer to this question is necessary for our campaign "Abolition 2000", particularly at a time when suggestions are presented to amend the campaign's basic Statement.
Bahig Nassar.

Remarks on David Kriegers' New Suggestions on Nuclear Abolition

1) Ideas of David Krieger carried by his report on " Nuclear Weapons Abolition at the Beginning of the 21st Century" deserve the attention of NGOs concerned with nuclear weapons due to his role in Abolition 2000 Campaign and Middle Power initiative, and his devotion to the cause of peace.

Correctly, David concentrated in his Report on the positions of US in regard to nuclear disarmament. After all, it has enjoyed the status of the only super power since the collapse of the Soviet Union. However attempts to accurately identify the position of US on questions of nuclear disarmament should be based on a clear understanding of the current US nuclear policies. Without this understanding we may miss important positions endorsed by US and consequently overlook important steps NGOs should take to counter these positions.

2) Concisely speaking , one can say that US nuclear policies had been determined at the time of the cold war by the main contradiction between the former two camps led by US and the Soviet Union. They were focused on consistent nuclear confrontation with Soviet Union. This strategic posture has been the base of US nuclear weapon policies, structures and military build up, and consequently it has determined US position in

regard to nuclear disarmament. In other words US positions on nuclear disarmament had been confined to the relation and balance of power among nuclear weapon states mainly vis a vis the Soviet Union.

This situation had changed after the collapse of the Soviet Union, the increasing influence of US world wide as the only super power, and its continuous attempts to control the growing process of globalisation.

Naturally US is still paying due attention to the balance of power vis a vis other NWSs in particular Russia and China in spite of the fact that the policy of confrontation has receded. But no more the domain of US nuclear weapon policy is confined to its relations with the official and traditional NWSs. Now, it goes far beyond this domain to defend US interests and investments, globally and in all regions in the world.

This is the ground which had prompted US to lay down new nuclear weapon policies to prevent proliferation of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction and their delivery vehicles, mainly ballistic missiles, by states hostile to its interests and investments. These new policies had led to new military nuclear structures and consequently should prompt NGOs to identify new disarmament steps in order to prevent the looming deadly threat to the very existence of many people.

It seems to me that the outlook of David Krieger report is still limited to relations among the traditional NWSs, overlooking the new US policies. All of us agree with the disarmament steps he is suggesting (de-alerting, de-coupling, no first use, etc...) but they are not enough to counter the current dangers.

3) It goes without saying that the only assured way to prevent proliferation of nuclear weapons is to firmly implement article VI of NPT. But US considers maintaining its nuclear weapon arsenal a major asset for its national security. Therefore aggressive nuclear strategy was adopted to prevent proliferation by force combined with nuclear deterrence: the so-called counter Proliferation Policy.

It also goes without saying that US conflicts with the so-called states of concern can be easily settled by endorsing peaceful political options. The cases of US recent relations with Cuba, North Korea and Libya are clear examples. But the abnormal exaggeration of the dangerous policies of these states are leveled to justify its aggressive policies against certain states hostile to the so-called US "vital interests" in many regions.

Moreover US has initiated National Missile defense system (NMD) together with Theater Missile Defense systems (TMD) to defend its investments and interests globally and in various regions. The first will neutralise strategic intercontinental missiles of Russia and China while the second systems will kill medium and short range missiles of its adversaries in any region. At the same time US nuclear capable missiles will be free to act. Even if US agrees to renounce its NMD in order to abide by the ABM Treaty (David's proposal), the deployment of TMDs in various regions will lead to unprecedented arms race in the fields of missiles and missile defense systems while US superiority in arms technology will afford its military more opportunities to kill the missiles of its adversaries.

In addition US nuclear capable naval units are freely moving in

international water to project power on any region. Also NATO nuclear capable forces are allowed to operate outside its traditional region mainly towards the South.

A horrible plan to produce mini nukes is now under discussion in the US senate in order to turn nuclear deterrence into actual use of nuclear weapons in theater military operation in any region.

These new nuclear weapon policies and strategies should be taken in consideration in order to identify the specific disarmament steps which will counter and foil them.

4) In addition to de-alerting, de-coupling, no correctly first use, and other intermediary disarmament steps correctly suggested by David in his report, other intermediary steps should be endorsed by NGOs towards a world free from nuclear weapons. Among them :

- To refrain from deploying NMD and TMD systems, and take measures towards zero ballistic missiles and other vehicles capable of delivering WMD. (now the question of ballistic missile defense deployment is no more confined to the abidance by the 1972 ABM Treaty which is mainly concerned with the strategic balance of NWSs possessing intercontinental missiles. It goes far beyond the limits of this Treaty in order to respond to the US global interests within the process of the current globalisation).
- To repatriate nuclear weapons deployed in NATO – NNWSs and on naval units moving in international waters close to NNWSs (this step limits the capabilities of nuclear forces. It is also a practical exercise - and not only declaratory statement - . of no use against non-nuclear weapon states).
- To establish NWFZs particularly in regions of tension where proliferation of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction together with their delivery vehicles tends to escalate such as the Middle East and North East Asia (this step and the protocols to be endorsed by NWSs to comply with their provisions will totally eliminate US justifications to adopt and implement its policy of “counter proliferation” against the so-called states of concern. It should be noted that all these states are located in the two regions. It should be also noted that US and its allies are the main forces which oppose the establishment of these zones).
- To firmly oppose current planes to produce mini nukes (they will be used in theater operations mainly in regions in the South and East, but never their dangers will be confined to any region once they will be used).

Identification of these disarmament steps is aimed at countering US new policies at the beginning of the 21st century.

(end)

Bahig Nassar

Coordinator, Arab Coordination Center of NGOs.

19-10-200

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

It's Easy. It's Fun. Best of All, it's Free!

http://click.egroups.com/1/9698/3/_/91925/_/972144607/

----->

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

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

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

A year ago I purchased one of your photo albums, style no. MP-300, with capacity of 300 photos up to 3 1/2" by 5 1/4". Now I can't find this style at any retail store. Can I order additional albums by mail. If so what is the cost per album? Is there any discount for two or more? What are the shipping costs? To whom should the order go? I live in Bethesda, Maryland.

Thanks,
Howard W. Hallman

X-Sender: flick@pop.igc.org
Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 16:02:14 -0400
To: updates@reachingcriticalwill.org
From: Felicity Hill <flick@igc.org>
Subject: WEEK 3 UNGA FIRST COMMITTEE REPORT
Cc: wilpf-news@igc.topica.com

<x-rich><center>

REPORT ON THE THIRD WEEK OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE
OF THE UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY

</center>

1. Introduction

2. Disarmament Education Resolution

3. NMD/ABM

4. Nuclear Disarmament/New Agenda Coalition resolution

5. International Court of Justice resolution

6. Small Arms

7. Landmines

8. Nuclear Weapon Free Zones

9. Disarmament as Humanitarian Action, report on event.

1. INTRODUCTION

The following groups are part of the NGO group monitoring the First Committee: WILPF, LCNP, Peace Action, IPPNW/PSR, NGO Committee on Disarmament, World Policy Institute, Quaker UN Office.

Many events occurred this past week: the film "Armed to the Teeth" was launched by DDA and DPI; the 20th anniversary of the UN's Disarmament Research Institute (UNIDIR) was celebrated with an event joining the humanitarian and disarmament communities; the Middle Powers Initiative held some meetings and its chair, Doug Roche was awarded the Pomerance Award. Some reports of these events are intersperced throughout the report below.

NB: In our last report we spoke of a NAM nuclear disarmament resolution, that was an error. There is not such a thing. NAM are producing 5 resolutions this year: SSOD4, Development and Disarmament, Environment, Regional Centers and one about the Geneva Protocols if I can decipher my own handwriting correctly.

The chairman's suggested programme for the cluster list is out and on the website, as are all the draft resolutions which I list today only by the L number. The cluster debate is structured around the issues as follows:

Cluster 1: Nuclear Weapons

L1, L2, L4, L7, L8, L16, L19, L29, L30, L32, L36, L37, L39, L40, L41, L45, L48, L49

Cluster 2: Other Weapons of Mass Destruction

L18, L20, L42

Cluster 3: Outer Space (Disarmament Aspects)

L25

Cluster 4: Conventional Weapons

L11, L28, L38, L44, L50

Cluster 5: Regional Disarmament and Security

L34, L35, L46

Cluster 6: Confidence Building Measures, Including Transparency in Armaments L12, L43

Cluster 7: Disarmament Machinery

L3, L5, L9, L10, L13, L14 Rev 1, L17, L23, L24, L26, L33

Cluster 8: Other Disarmament Measures

L6, L21, L22, L31

Cluster 9: Related Matters of Disarmament and International Security

L15

Cluter 10: International Security

L27, L47

The NGO group are holding another roundtable discussion with governments on Oct 25. One the same day we are holding a Press Conference featuring speakers on the isuses of ABM/NMD, Small Arms and nuclear issues.

Felicity Hill

WILPF

2. UN Study on Disarmament Education

On Wednesday 18 October, Mexico introduced a draft resolution calling for a UN study on disarmament education. The study, which would be conducted by a group of governmental experts, would asses the current situation of disarmament education at primary, secondary, university and post-graduate levels in all regions of the world, and recommend ways to promote and extend such education including the training of educators, parliamentarians, municipal leaders, military officers and government officials.

The expert group would invite disarmament and peace related institutes, university educators and relevant NGOs to contribute to the study.

The resolution is co-sponsored by Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Egypt, Guatemala, Indonesia, Japan, Mozambique, Pakistan, South Africa, Sweden and Thailand.

Alyn Ware, LCNP

3. NMD/ABM

This week, the Russians, together with the delegations from the Republic of Belarus and the People's Republic of China, submitted to

the First Committee a draft resolution entitled "Preservation of and Compliance with the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty." This draft resolution is worded identically to the one adopted by the General Assembly in 1999. Anatoly Antonov, who serves on the Russian delegation to the Conference on Disarmament, said in a statement to the First Committee on October 18 that, "We believe that such an approach would allow to avert [sic] protracted and unnecessary debate." Basically, the Russians hope to receive more support this year than in 1999. The following day, Antonov, who was speaking on a panel at the UN about outer space policy, said that the Russians, by resubmitting the resolution, want to draw more attention to the ABM issue-and particularly want the international community to call on both the US and the Russian Federation to comply with the ABM Treaty. He said that the US wants to change the treaty's substance by implementing a national missile defense (NMD). However, he warned, if the US implements an NMD, then Russia will be forced to withdraw from a number of arms control treaties. Presumably, that means not only the ABM but also START II and negotiations for START III.

Pam Jordan, NGO Committee on Disarmament

<bold>4. Nuclear Disarmament/New Agenda Coalition Resolution

</bold>Nuclear Disarmament/New Agenda

The NEW AGENDA states will likely introduce their draft resolution (L.4) on

Monday. They have more than 60 co-sponsors, exceeding last year's number. The

question now is how far this year's vote will shift in favor of the new

NPT-focused draft. The vast majority of non-nuclear NATO states are leaning

towards a "yes" vote and none of the P5 have flat out said they would vote

against it. It's even possible one or two of the five will vote for the

draft. China has indicated that it will likely support. The US, UK and France have separately presented suggested changes in

the text, but focused negotiations have not taken place yet. The only certain

"no" votes are the three NWS outside of the NPT (India, Israel and Pakistan).

The best case scenario would be five or six "no" votes (down from 13 in 1999), the P5 spread out between "yes" and abstentions, most NATO states switching from abstention to "yes" with the US managing to keep a few states like Poland and Estonia in the abstention column. Such an outcome would cement the NA course as currently the most viable plan for multilateral nuclear disarmament.

The JAPANESE draft on "A Path to the total elimination of nuclear weapons"

(L.39) is essentially a reprint of the NPT's 13 steps, leading several delegates to question its utility at all. A change between this version and

the previous draft (see last week's report) is that the new draft is more

specific in calling for the involvement of all the nuclear weapon states. It

is likely the majority of states will vote for it without enthusiasm, while

those opposing it will do so on the grounds that it is too weak. The resolution adds a paragraph of interest to NGOs, supporting the role of civil society in the disarmament process. However, Japanese groups have complained that in contrast to the sentiment expressed in this paragraph, their government has not been open to consultation on this or other disarmament resolutions or initiatives.

Like the NA draft, the MYANMAR draft on "Nuclear Disarmament" (L.41) has

changed to reflect the successful outcome of the NPT Review Conference, but

retains the stronger language of previous years calling for elimination "with

a specified framework of time." The draft "welcomes" the outcome of the NPT

Conference and then goes further than the NPT consensus and calls on the CD

to establish a committee in 2001 "to commence negotiations on a phased program of nuclear disarmament leading to the eventual elimination of nuclear weapons."

While using some of the same language as NA, it goes several steps further.

For example, it calls for immediate de-alerting and while the NA draft simply

recalls the ICJ Advisory Opinion, this draft also welcomes "the unanimous

reaffirmation... that there exists an obligation for all states to pursue in

good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear

disarmament." It also "calls for the convening of an international conference

on nuclear disarmament in all its aspects at an early date to identify and

deal with concrete measures for nuclear disarmament."

It will be interesting to see how this blend of New Agenda diplomacy and

non-aligned commitments is received. Neither India nor Pakistan are co-

sponsoring this year's draft, yet it contains too many phrases the West finds

objectionable.

The INDIAN-sponsored draft on "Reducing nuclear danger" (L.32) "calls for a

review of nuclear doctrines and... immediate and urgent steps to reduce the

risks of unintentional and accidental use of nuclear weapons" and request the

Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters to look at such measures including the

proposal "for convening an international conference to identify ways of eliminating nuclear dangers."

Jim Wurst, LCNP

5. International Court of Justice/Nuclear Weapons Convention resolution

On Thursday 19 October, Ambassador Hasmy Agam, Permanent Representative of Malaysia to the UN, introduced Draft Resolution L.48 entitled "Follow-up to the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice on the Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons."

The draft resolution underlines "the unanimous conclusion of the ICJ that 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", and calls "upon all States immediately to fulfill that obligation by commencing multilateral negotiations in 2001 leading to an early conclusion of a nuclear weapons convention prohibiting the development, production, testing, deployment, stockpiling, transfer, threat or use of nuclear weapons and providing for their elimination."

The draft resolution is co-sponsored by Bangladesh, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Ghana, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Republic, Lesotho, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, Nigeria, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Thailand, Vietnam, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

Ambassador Hasmy stressed that the resolution called for negotiations leading to a nuclear weapons convention not specifically on a nuclear weapons convention, and that it was thus consistent with the process of incremental steps towards complete nuclear disarmament.

He also noted that the resolution focused primarily on the disarmament

obligation affirmed by the ICJ, as this was an appropriate aspect for the UN General Assembly to implement. However, the other principle conclusion of the ICJ, i.e. on the legality of threat or use, was also relevant for disarmament policy, which is why the resolution requests States "to inform the Secretary General on the efforts and measures they have taken to fulfil their duties as underlined by the conclusions of the Court."

Ambassador Hasmy also clarified the apparent equivocation of the ICJ on the question of the threat or use of nuclear weapons in an extreme circumstance when the very survival of a State is at stake. He noted that "Further it (the ICJ) stressed that "States must never make civilians the object of attack and must consequently never use weapons that are incapable of distinguishing between civilian and military targets" of which nuclear weapons are obviously not."

Alyn Ware, LCNP

<bold>6. Small arms

</bold>Civil Society Panel

On Monday, October 16, the Mission of Brazil and the International

Action Network on Small Arms (IANSA) invited First Committee delegations

to presentations by Ed Laurance, Monterey Institute of International

Studies (and formerly Consultant to the UN Panel of Governmental Experts

on Small Arms) and Peter Batchelor, from "Small Arms Survey," the new

annual publication being produced in Geneva. The event was designed to

highlight new information and research relevant to the 2001 UN

Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms. Twenty delegations and

NGO reps attended.

Ed Laurance began by announcing that he had just been hired to assist

the UN Department of Disarmament Affairs with the preparations for the forthcoming conference in 2001. Under the title "What do we know?" Ed listed ideas under the headings:

Availability & Proliferation; Negative Effects of Small Arms; Links between Availability and the Negative Effects; and Global Impact. In particular, his last section made a strong case for a global approach to small arms. He noted that easily available small arms threaten international peacekeeping operations, derail preventive diplomacy efforts, are used to perpetrate violations of International Humanitarian Law, are distributed through global supply chains, and require international financial support for their collection and destruction.

Peter Batchelor outlined the work of the Small Arms Survey, which was established last year by the Swiss and is also now supported by the governments of the UK, Denmark, Canada, Norway, and Belgium. It is a long term data collection institution which will serve as a primary source of data collection on small arms and will produce an annual year

book. Peter organized his talk around some key research areas: producers, brokers, stockpiles, and transfers. He noted that research confirms an increase in the number of countries producing weapons, in the number of guns produced each year, as well in illegal production

--
mainly in South Asia and Africa. Theft and other leakage from government

inventories has become a prominent source of illegal arms. This is just

one example to show that illicit transfers are strongly tied to licit trade/ transfers since most illicit arms started out legal.

Transparency

is the key to addressing this problem. Currently, 30 governments report

arms transfers to their parliaments but only 3 offer detailed numbers

and reporting internationally.

Regarding issues that are important in the 2001 Conference, Peter

emphasized the need to clarify the phrase "illicit trade and all it's

aspects, " to develop the results of regional & sub-regional initiatives

as building blocks for substantive work at the conference and to

incorporate current practices in a number of technical issues such as:

marking, stockpile management, surplus destruction, disarmament and

demobilization, transparency, confidence building measures, and donor

assistance.

Around the corridors:

There is still no decision as to the venue and date for the 2001

Conference. Japan held consultations again on Thursday evening but

delegations were not positive about the likely results. Without a

breakthrough the site will default to New York, which may mean that

fewer delegations will be able to send their most capable specialists to

the conference and will rely on their staff already in place in New

York. NGO access to the 2001 prepcom and conference process is the topic

of a draft text being circulated in hopes of resolving this issue before

the next prepcom session in January. The text appears to be an "NPT

Lite" solution, and NGOs are still looking for a conference role more

congruent with their involvement in the issue. Algeria still maintains the hardest line on limiting NGO access to the conference.

David Jackman, Quaker UN Office

Armed to the Teeth: This one hour film is full of useful information for those campaigning on the issue of small arms, and is a good tool to engage those who are not. The film reveals that every two minutes someone is injured or killed with small arms, 30,000 casualties per year, there is one gun for every 10 people on earth, 250 million small arms in the USA which boasts 10 times the amount of arms retail outlets as there are McDonalds. 4 million people have died since the fall of the Berlin Wall, 2 million of those were children. 5 million children have been disabled, and 12 million are rendered homeless by wars involving small arms, 300,000 child soldiers are in action, with more than half of the militia under 16. The film gives case studies of South Africa, Albania, Colombia, El Salvador and the USA.

Felicity Hill, WILPF

7. Landmines

The annual Mine Ban Convention resolution, sponsored this year by Norway, Mozambique and Nicaragua, was tabled on 13 October and was introduced by Norway in the First Committee of the United Nations in New York. It currently has about 96 Co-Sponsors.

Any help in contacting the following countries which supported the Resolution last year but are not yet co-sponsoring the Resolution this year would be helpful. Please urge them to co-sponsor and vote for the Resolution both in the UN First Committee and in the General Assembly:

Angola, Bahamas, Burkina Faso, Cape Verde, Comores, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Greece, Guinea Bissau, Jamaica, Kiribati, Lithuania, Nepal, Nigeria, Romania, Rwanda, Seychelles, Solomon Islands, Suriname and Trinidad & Tobago.

Susan Walker, ICBL

8. Nuclear Weapon Free Zones

Most of the drafts on nuclear-weapons-free zones are uncontroversial, except

those dealing with the Southern Hemisphere and Middle East. The Middle East

draft usually passes by consensus, however the language that strongly

reflects the NPT and the current unrest in the region may cause some problems

this year. "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the

Middle East" (L.16) calls for steps leading to the creation of such a zone

including adherence to the NPT and the placement of all "nuclear activities"

under IAEA safeguards. Israel is the only state in the region outside of the

NPT regime.

"Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas" (L.19) calls for

greater cooperation among existing zones "to promote their common objective"

and "...considers that an international conference of states parties and

signatories to [NWFZs] can help promoting these objectives." In the past, the

US, UK and France have objected to the goal, saying it was unclear what the

effect would be on freedom of navigation.

"Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia" (L.45) simply

encourages the five states (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan

and Uzbekistan) to continue their efforts to create the zone.

"Mongolia's international security and nuclear-weapon-free status" (L.40)

calls Mongolia's status as a single-state zone "as a concrete step towards

promoting the aims of nuclear non-proliferation" and welcomes the security

assurances given by the P5 to Mongolia's single-state zone.

Belarus has placed its proposal for a NWF "space" in Central and Eastern

Europe in a draft on "regional disarmament and non-proliferation" (L.46).

This idea has the distinction of being opposed by virtually every state that

would be a part of such a "space."

Jim Wurst, LCNP

9. Disarmament as Humanitarian Action

9. Disarmament as Humanitarian Action

The panel discussion drew together figures from disarmament and humanitarian

communities, comprising USG for Disarmament Affairs, Mr. Dhanapala; Patricia

Lewis of UNIDIR; Martin Griffiths Director, Henry Dunant Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue, Geneva; Randall Forsberg of Director, Institute for Defense and Disarmament Studies, and Soren Jessen-Petersen, Assistant High Commissioner for Refugees, Geneva

The discussion about disarmament and humanitarian action began by noting how

the sheer size of the problem has in the past tended to shift disarmament

off the humanitarian agenda. Patricia Lewis argued that, given the recent

growth in the targeting of civilians and humanitarian workers in war

zones,

questions about disarmament should, on the contrary, be situated in the

mainstream of humanitarian discussion. Elaborating on this sentiment, Soren

Jessen-Petersen spoke of the increasing militarization of refugee zones,

noting that, refugees populations increasingly comprised militias in flight

from battle. The neutrality of humanitarian camps was, in consequence,

coming into question, rendering humanitarian staff vulnerable, and their

work, increasingly difficult. He moreover referred to the UNHCR's "ladder of

options, " which allows for discreet responses according to the level of

risk, as providing means of preventing conflict from worsening into all-out

war.

Martin Griffiths noted that, historically, the disarmament and humanitarian

community need little of each other's constraints, needs, and potential - and

few of each other's acronyms! Pondering how the humanitarian community can

contribute to disarmament efforts, he argued that those who work in crisis

zones are often uniquely positioned to provide morally impeccable evidence

of the consequences of massive flows of small arms into regions of conflict.

He also suggested that the humanitarian and disarmament communities could

inform each other's work in conflict zones and humanitarian crises through

the exchange of informational packets, leading to an interweaving of efforts. Such efforts could help shift discussions of disarmament amid humanitarian crises from the seemingly impossible to the merely very difficult.

Randy Forsberg of IDDS introduced the problem of weapons of mass destruction

into the disarmament / humanitarian action discussion. The acquisition of

nuclear capabilities, she noted, was invariably precipitated by a spiraling

build-up of conventional weapons - so preventing conventional weapons

proliferation in a region should be understood as a strategy for inhibiting

the spread of nuclear weapons. South Asia, East Asia and the Middle East are

cases in point. Stemming the proliferation of conventional weapons, nuclear

weapons, and chemical and biological weapons should therefore be understood

as humanitarian action: the prevention of war should be a humanitarian priority.

Felicity Hill, WILPF

Tyrone Savage, WPI

***** ***** ***** *****

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

***** ***** ***** *****

</x-rich>

To: Felicity Hill <flick@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Request for information
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <v0421010bb618de9122ac@[192.168.0.2]>
References:

Dear Felicity,

I greatly appreciate receiving your reports of the First Committee of the UN General Assembly.

Did Archbishop Martino address the First Committee this year? If so, do you have a copy of his speech that you could send me, or can you tell me where I might get a copy?

Thanks,
Howard

To: rgentzler@gbod.org
From: "Carlee L. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Request for information
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Mr. Gentzler:

At a Christian Education Conference sponsored by the Baltimore-Washington Conference on Saturday, Oct. 21, I spoke with MaryJane Pierce/Norton who mentioned that you were in the process of compiling a devotional for older people. Is it possible to contribute devotions for this? If so, do you have guidelines?

Since my retirement from active UM ministry in 1996, I have been active in my church, and with volunteers put on a worship service each month in a local nursing home. I am also the leader for a UMW circle of which I am the youngest member. During my training at Wesley Theological Seminary, I did my residency at Asbury Methodist Village in Gaithersburg. I was ordained in 1985.

My motivation to serve the aging comes not only from my own participation, but also, from childhood memories of loving grandparents. Since my retirement, I have been pursuing my interest in writing for children, poetry, and devotions.

My husband and I live in Bethesda, MD, near our two daughters and one grandson. I am a member of the Bethesda Writer's Center, Maryland Writers' Assoc., Women's National Book Assn., Washington Chapter, and SCBWI.

I look forward to hearing from you. Sincerely, Carlee

From: "Mytra Jimenez" <pioneer@pioneerphotoalbums.com>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Request for information
Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 13:15:14 -0700
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2919.6600
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6600

Howard,
Thank you for your interest in Pioneer. You may order by calling (888) 229-3020. We will also send a catalog from which you may order. The albums are \$16.99 each. There are no quantity discounts. Shipping for one album is \$4.00 and shipping for two albums would be \$6.00.

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

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: <Pioneer@pioneerphotoalbums.com>
Sent: Monday, October 23, 2000 6:37 AM
Subject: Request for information

> A year ago I purchased one of your photo albums, style no. MP-300, with
> capacity of 300 photos up to 3 1/2" by 5 1/4". Now I can't find this
> style at any retail store. Can I order additional albums by mail. If so
> what is the cost per album? Is there any discount for two or more? What
> are the shipping costs? To whom should the order go? I live in Bethesda,
> Maryland.

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

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

>

X-Lotus-FromDomain: GBOD
From: Rick_Gentzler@GBOD.ORG
To: "Carlee L. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Date: Tue, 24 Oct 2000 06:59:00 -0500
Subject: Re: Request for information

Hi, Carlee,

Thank you for your memo and interest in the workshop and song book idea. I will be meeting with the UM Committee on Older Adult Ministries in February. Since the workshop and song book for use in nursing homes and other long-term health care facilities is their idea, I will need to have a clear idea of what they are proposing. It is very possible that we will be inviting people to provide liturgy and other works for the resource. And your interest is most gratifying. I am sure I will be getting in contact with you after I know more of about the resource. By the way, I am teaching a course on older adult ministries for Wesley Theological Seminary during January, February and March. The course is being held at Asbury Retirement Village. Just thought you might like to know.

Grace and peace,

Rick

(Embedded
image moved "Carlee L. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
to file: 10/23/2000 03:50 PM
pic07222.pcx)

To: Rick Gentzler/DM/GBOD
cc:
Subject: Request for information

Dear Mr. Gentzler:

At a Christian Education Conference sponsored by the Baltimore-Washington Conference on Saturday, Oct. 21, I spoke with MaryJane Pierce/Norton who mentioned that you were in the process of compiling a devotional for older people. Is it possible to contribute devotions for this? If so, do you have guidelines?

Since my retirement from active UM ministry in 1996, I have been active in my church, and with volunteers put on a worship service each month in a local nursing home. I am also the leader for a UMW circle of which I am

the youngest member. During my training at Wesley Theological Seminary, I did my residency at Asbury Methodist Village in Gaithersburg. I was ordained in 1985.

My motivation to serve the aging comes not only from my own participation, but also, from childhood memories of loving grandparents. Since my retirement, I have been pursuing my interest in writing for children, poetry, and devotions.

My husband and I live in Bethesda, MD, near our two daughters and one grandson. I am a member of the Bethesda Writer's Center, Maryland Writers' Assoc., Women's National Book Assn., Washington Chapter, and SCBWI.

I look forward to hearing from you. Sincerely, Carlee

begin 644 pic07222.pcx

M"@4!"~~~~~!H"P~~~~~
M~~~~~!0`!~~~~~
M~~~~~#U\$]L3S1/'
M\$,3PA/U\$]L3S1/'\$,3PA/U\$]L3S1/'\$,3PA/U\$]L3S1/'\$,3PA/U\$]L3
MS1/'\$,3PA/U\$]L3S1/'\$,3PA/U\$]L3S1/'\$,3PA/U\$]L3S1/'\$,3PA/U
M\$]L3S1/'\$,3PA/P\$PS(!@S8\$P3QA/#\$(3[A/.!M<3S!/&\$,3\$^P3P@;"
M!P;"\$@;"\$@;"\$L4&UA/+\$\83PQ,3ZA,,P@8'P@+"`P(2P@?\$L,"PP;5\$L3
MQ1/#\$Q/I\$,&`P<"!P,"PA+#!(2P@(2P@+#!M43RA/%\$,3\$^@3P@("(\(""
M\$PX##@+#\$42PP+"\$,(&U!/*\$43PQ,3YQ,"`P<#`@X3#@ (3P@(2#(2#(2
M!1("\$<("PP;4\$H3Q1/"\$Q/F\$P8"!P,"#@(.P@+#\$Q(3\$A/"\$@&Q@+#!M,,
M#?)\$03PA,3YA,&PP(3!@,"#A+%\$P2\$(2!@(#PA(#L,&!),#QPP'Q1/#
M\$Q/E\$P8`A\$2`@`PA,/PA,/Q!/,Q1(0P@(#`@,"!M,#QP/#`?#\$(3X1,'
MPPS"!@+"\$A,"#Q+(\$,2#,2PP(0`P(#!@?2#,D#P@/"#`?"\$Q/;\$P?&#,(#
M#('\$1(3\$A,2PQ,/PQ/#\$@(#`@,"PP,"!@S1\$P?#8##,(3\$]83!4,
MR`,`&!\("A+#L83\$A,2\$Q(/PA(" @<"P40`@81!@?2\$43!0,P@,,PA,3
MTA,'Q`S+`\,(L(2#Q\$2\$Q(3`PX#Q!,2\$Q(3PQ("P/"`L,##,(&!)(3R1,'
MPPS"\$Q/\$P?##,D#QOP'PA,&IQ(3`A\$"\$P,.`@[#\$Q(3#Q,/PQ(#`@,"!P,"
M#81!@?2\$D3PA/"#, (3\$P3!,,QP/\$#,(QQ,&Q!+#`@X##@(&P@_(\$@(#
MP@(#`@P"\$,(&!)(3R1,'#<,PA,3RA,'P@S&`,`P@?,\$P8'PA+"\$`(`@X"
M#A##`A/(QA(%`@7#`@4"\$08'TA/'\$P?#"#</#,(3\$@3!(\,Q0/##?0\$P;#
M\$A#\$`A`.\$XOP@+&\$@<2!A(&!<,"!<(&!]`3!4,\$P?"#`'#PP'PA,3QA,'
MP@S\$`,,],3!@?"\$A`#\$,("#A`.\$,("\$0(#QQ(&!P;"`@4"\$08'RQ,'Q`P'
MPA,'\$PS"\$P<!P\,!,3\$43!PSS`\,(,]83!L02\$`,`4"\$0(#`@/#\$@<2
M!@?!"@40`A#!"@?&\$P?#`?&\$\(-\$PS"\$P`P@'PQ/"\$03!PS#`\,(,]@3
M!@?\$\$A`"\$,8"\$0(#L02!A+#!L("\$`+!"@?"\$P?##`?*P?"#1,'PA/"#`?\$
M\$(3\$,3!PS""\,(,]H3#!('PQ+##!#\$Q0(#`@/#\$@82!@?!"@('0`A`&#`?"
M\$PS#\$,`R1,'PA/"!Q,Q1/#\$Q/#\$PS""PP'W1,&QQ("\$0/#`@,"`,2!A(&
M!P8,!A`"\$(&#,,3#!/"!83PP?`\$P?&\$,3PA/#\$PP##`?>\$P8'QQ("\$0/#
M`@,"PA(&\$@8!@P&\$`('0`L(&!,3#,83PP?*SPS&\$,3PA/#\$(\,(,]3#!+"
M!42`@,1Q`2!(2!@<#80!A`&\$`8,!,!,!D3PP?`\$PS&\$,3PA/#\$PP/
MP@S?`\$P82!(2!\(2`A\$""P(#\$@<2!P8!@P&\$`80Q@S##('Q1/#!D3!PS&
M\$,3PA/#\$PS##0,W!"!A(&PQ(&`A\$""P('!@<&R`S)#Q,'S1,'PPP'QQ/#
M\$(3PQ,#,8/QPP'U!,&\$@82!A++#,X/PPP3#,<3P@?`\$#?)\$03PA,3Q!,'

MP@S+#]L,TP_&#`?#SPS#SP?#`?+\$\83PQ,3QA,'Q`SM#\@,!\@?(\$\0,!\X3
MQQ/#\$(3RA,'QPS;#L,\$`4,!<(,P@8'U1/*\$\43PQ,3T1,'VPP&\$`80!A`"
M!0P%#`4,!\@P'!\@?6\$\L3Q1/#\$Q/N\$P8,!A`&\$`(&#`8,PP8'UQ/+\$\83PQ,3
M!\/*!\@?8\$P3QA/#\$Q/U\$]L3S1/'\$,3PA/U\$]L3S1/'\$,3PA,,````@````
M(`@(```"@"``"("P,#P-S`ILKP_OPH*"D@("P``^`_`\``#_
M_P#_`/_`_____````@````(`@(```"@"``"("P,#P-S`ILKP_OPH*"D
M@("P``^`_`\``#_P#_`/_`_____````@````(`@(```"@"``"("P
MP,#P-S`ILKP_OPH*"D@("P``^`_`\``#_P#_`/_`_____````@````
M(`@(```"@"``"("P,#P-S`ILKP_OPH*"D@("P``^`_`\``#_
M_P#_`/_`_____````@````(`@(```"@"``"("P,#P-S`ILKP_OPH*"D
M@("P``^`_`\``#_P#_`/_`_____````@````(`@(```"@"``"("P
MP,#P-S`ILKP_OPH*"D@("P``^`_`\``#_P#_`/_`_____````@````
M(`@(```"@"``"("P,#P-S`ILKP_OPH*"D@("P``^`_`\``#_
M_P#_`/_`_____````@````(`@(```"@"``"("P,#P-S`ILKP_OPH*"D
M@("P``^`_`\``#_P#_`/_`_____````@````(`@(```"@"``"("P
MP,#P-S`ILKP_OPH*"D@("P``^`_`\``#_P#_`/_`_____````@````
J(`@(```"@"``"OPH*"D@("P``^`_`\``#_P#_`/_`_____

end

X-eGroups-Return: sentto-1413460-1618-972350836-mupj=igc.apc.org@returns.onelist.com
X-Sender: johnburroughs@earthlink.net
X-Apparently-To: abolition-caucus@egroups.com
X-Sender: johnburroughs@mail.earthlink.net
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0.1
To: abolition-caucus@egroups.com
Cc: jhwurst@aol.com
From: John Burroughs <johnburroughs@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: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 21:26:46 -0400
Subject: [abolition-caucus] The New Agenda in the First Committee: 2nd Report

The New Agenda in the First Committee
Second Report 23 October 2000
by Jim Wurst, UN Coordinator
Middle Powers Initiative and Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy

The New Agenda formally introduced its resolution today. The US and Pakistan made strong, somewhat veiled, attacks on NA and other drafts.

REMINDER

Some of the New York-based NGOs (including LCNP, WILPF, and IPPNW) are pooling our resources to cover the First Committee. We are posting speeches, draft resolutions, our own weekly reports (the report for Week Three is now out) - including the documents cited in this report - on the WILPF website for all to read. The address is: www.reachingcriticalwill.org

Click on the First Committee icon on the homepage for everything we can get our hands on.

NA DRAFT INTRODUCED

Amb. Henrik Salander of Sweden introduced the draft (L.4) on behalf of 60 co-sponsors this morning. He said the NA draft's co-sponsors "have challenged complacency in the fulfillment of the obligation to advance the pursuit of nuclear disarmament. They have insisted that each requisite step in this process be addressed within the perspectives of an unequivocal commitment to the total elimination of nuclear weapons." He also said the draft "sets out a comprehensive program of action... There is an imperative built into this approach that requires results in each of the segments of action. The co-sponsors are determined to monitor the achievement of these results in light of the unequivocal commitment recently made."

In a subtle rebuttal to the charge that the NA goes beyond the NPT consensus, Salander said, "The Final Document is neither as far-reaching nor as detailed as the states parties were entitled to expect. The compromise it represents reinforces the determination of the co-sponsors of this text that the steps agreed at the Review Conference shall indeed be implemented without prevarication or delay."

THE UNITED STATES AND PAKISTAN

Amb. Robert Gray of the US and Amb. Munir Akram of Pakistan both gave quite

detailed critiques of the some the drafts the First Committee is considering. Neither mentioned the NA by name, but the implications were very clear.

Gray said draft resolutions using the language of the NPT's Final Document but which take measures "out of their context or attempt to expand the undertakings could only endanger [the Conference's] hard-won consensus." The US would judge resolutions on "how faithfully they reflect the NPT consensus," he said. Gray was less diplomatic in reference to the Fissile Materials Cut-Off Treaty (FMCT) talks, which he said were a "prisoner of political maneuvering." He blasted "two or three states" in the CD who had "frustrated" efforts to get the negotiations underway. "The excuses have ranged from a need to curb a non-existent arms race in outer space to the United States' initiative for a limited national missile defense," he added. Gray said the draft on the ABM was "unnecessary" in light of Clinton's decision to defer a decision on deployment.

Akram criticized the NPT Conference for criticizing the South Asian nuclear tests of 1998 but not earlier tests by other countries and for calling for the conclusion of a FMCT within five years but not setting similar deadlines for the elimination of nuclear weapons or for the prevention of an arms race in outer space. He said Pakistan will not support "any draft resolution that welcomes the result of the Review Conference or incorporates the discriminatory elements of its decisions."

I do not have the text for either speech; members of their delegations said the ambassador's ad-libbed a great deal from the original printed text. I hope to have the official versions by Tuesday, Wednesday at the latest. Check the "reaching critical will" website for the texts.

NEXT UP

The First Committee begins voting on drafts on Wednesday 25 Oct at 3pm. The tentative list for Wednesday covers the easy drafts - 2000 NPT Review Conference, Mongolia's NWF status. Committee officials say they may end their work before the 3 Nov planned conclusion. They said 1 Nov is possible. I think that's wildly optimistic. But if they are right, the NA draft could be voted on in less than one week.

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

eLerts

It's Easy. It's Fun. Best of All, it's Free!

http://click.egroups.com/1/9699/3/_/91925/_/972350837/

----->

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-eGroups-Return: sentto-1413460-1621-972378326-mupj=igc.apc.org@returns.onelist.com

X-Sender: pamela@atomicmirror.org

X-Apparently-To: abolition-caucus@egroups.com

X-Sender: pmeidell@pop.igc.org

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.5 (32)

To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com, abolition-europe@vlberlin.comlink.de,
abolition-caucus@egroups.com, abolition@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca,
abolition2000@hotmail.com, Ibrahim Ramey <disarm@forusa.org>,
berniemeyer@uswest.net, dcady@gw.hamline.edu, Schroe77@aol.com,
pamela@atomicmirror.org, johndear@forusa.org, dave@paxchristiusa.org,
kathleen@projectedna.org

X-eGroups-From: "Pamela S. Meidell" <pamela@atomicmirror.org>

From: "Pamela S. Meidell" <pmeidell@igc.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, 24 Oct 2000 02:03:00 -0700

Subject: [abolition-caucus] ALERT!Abolition 2000 Report Card

Dear Nuclear Abolition Friends,

We are happy to include with this email, this year's Abolition 2000 Report Card. It is being released today, United Nations Day, in New York, San Francisco, and Stockholm. In New York, it is being distributed to all members of the United Nations' First Committee, whose mandate includes nuclear disarmament. Please feel free to distribute it widely. The text version follows. A formatted version is included as an attachment. A pdf version will be available for the Nagasaki Abolition Summit in November. Please contact us with any comments or suggestions. Thank you to everyone who contributed this year.

In peace,

Janet Bloomfield and Pamela Meidell

Abolition 2000 Report Card
Annual Progress toward a Nuclear-Free World
United Nations Day
October 24, 2000

"We came because of our nightmares...

We stayed because of our dream."

--the women of Greenham Common

Total grade on progress toward nuclear abolition: 20 out of 120 points.
(For comparison, the 1996 report card scored 31/110, the 1997 card: 7/120,
the 1998 card: 16/120, the 1999 card: 12/120. (The discrepancy in total
points is due to the inclusion since 1997 of the Moorea Declaration.) The
five-year review on progress toward nuclear abolition, Must Try Harder,
produced for the NPT Review Conference in 2000, scored 29/120 points.)

Introduction: For the last four years, we have issued an Abolition 2000
report card in October, assessing progress toward a nuclear weapons free

world. Five years after the Abolition Statement was released at the United Nations, we pause again to take stock of the state of the Nuclear World, and of efforts to abolish nuclear weapons. Looking at this year's events in the context of the Abolition 2000 Statement offers a simple way to make such an evaluation. This Report Card offers a brief assessment of progress in the past year in the implementation of the 11 points of the Abolition Statement, and compliance with the letter and spirit of the Moorea Declaration. We offer it on United Nations Day, October 24, to recall the initial promise of the UN Charter: "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war." We keep in mind our future descendants, knowing that the elimination of nuclear weapons will go far in fulfilling our promise to them.

1. Immediately initiate and conclude by the year 2000 negotiations on a nuclear weapons abolition convention that requires the phased elimination of all nuclear weapons within a timebound framework, with provisions for effective verification and enforcement.

Report: The most significant event in relation to this goal in the last year was the Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). From April 24 to May 19, representatives of 187 countries and at least as many representatives of civil society organizations from around the world gathered at the United Nations in New York to review the Nuclear Non Proliferation Treaty (NPT). By May 19, the five senior nuclear weapons countries (China, France, Russia, United Kingdom, United States) committed to an "unequivocal undertaking " to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals," thus clearly accepting their responsibility under Article VI. Although they did not set a deadline for this worthy goal, they did agree to diminish the role of nuclear weapons in world security. The conference also called upon India, Pakistan, Israel and Cuba to join the treaty, thus making it "universal." The increasing concerns of non-nuclear weapons states that the nuclear weapons states are not fulfilling their disarmament agreements led to a much stronger effort and a unified call for action. The US remains the biggest "state of concern:" Department of Energy documents made public at the meeting revealed the US intention to keep its nuclear weapons "forever." 36,000 nuclear weapons and the doctrine of deterrence are still with us. But the world is inching closer to being free of nuclear weapons, thanks to the persistent efforts of citizen groups and courageous non-nuclear weapon states, such as the New Agenda Coalition (Aotearoa/New Zealand, Ireland, Egypt, Mexico, Sweden, Brazil, South Africa.)

The final document of the NPT, if implemented with a sense of urgency, would transform the current situation. But without any deadlines, or at least serious political will behind its goals, it is in danger of going the way of so many documents agreed at the UN that remain as aspirations never achieved. There is still much to be done. The choices that will be made in the next few years will be crucial.

Grade: 3 out of 10.

2. Immediately make an unconditional pledge not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons.

Report: It is hard to reconcile the Final Document of the NPT Review Conference with the continuation of first use policies. The contradiction

between the NPT Final Document and NATO policy is an opportunity to increase pressure on the alliance as it reviews its nuclear policy. NATO is due to receive a report in December 2000 that will consider "options for confidence and security- building measures, verification, non-proliferation and arms control and disarmament." (NATO Communiqué 24 April 1999). The final document of the NPT commits the nuclear weapons states to "Diminish the role of nuclear weapons in security policies." It is hard to see how this commitment can be reconciled with existing policy in NATO nuclear states, as well as current Russian policy. China still remains the only state with a public policy in place of no first use, while India appears to have adopted it as part of its nuclear posture.

Grade: 1 out of 10.

3. Rapidly complete a truly Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) with a zero threshold and with the stated purpose of precluding nuclear weapons development by all states.

Report: The fallout from the failure of the US Senate to ratify the CTBT in 1999 continues. Newly elected President Putin of Russia seized the opportunity of a more sympathetic Duma to get the CTBT ratified by his country in April, thus putting political pressure on the US as the NPT Review Conference opened. But there is little sign of progress in this year of a US Presidential election. Brajesh Mishra, National Security Advisor of India, announced on September 2 that his country had no intention of signing a global treaty banning atomic testing in the near future. Alongside India, Pakistan and North Korea, the US has become the major obstacle to the entry into force of the Treaty. (See also number 7.)

Grade: 0 out of 10.

4. Cease to produce and deploy new and additional nuclear weapons systems, and commence to withdraw and disable deployed nuclear weapons systems.

Report: The world survived unscathed as computers rolled over to the date 01/01/2000. Whether this quiet passage over the threshold occurred through luck or good judgement it is difficult to know. The joint arrangements between Russia and the US may have helped, although in the days following the New Year celebrations stories emerged of a number of incidents that could have led to much greater problems than actually happened. Sadly, the Center for Y2K Strategic Stability, a 'safety catch' on US and Russian nuclear arsenals, was closed soon after the "rollover." The Center, where Americans and Russians sat side by side on the eve of the millennium, monitored both nations' arsenals, which even now are kept ready to fire on a "hair trigger."

Earlier this year it was revealed that the US strategic war plan target list has actually been growing instead of contracting since the last strategic arms reduction treaty, START II, was signed in 1993. The list has grown by 20 percent over the last five years alone, according to top military and former administration officials. The vast bulk of the targets are in Russia. Three other former republics of the Soviet Union -- Belarus, Ukraine and Kazakhstan -- were dropped from the strategic plan in 1997, yet the list of sites the Pentagon says the US must be ready to destroy has

grown from 2,500 in 1995 to 3,000 now. In the United States, modifications or upgrades - including in some instances enhanced military capabilities - are planned for every weapon type in the arsenal. While the United States continues to outspend all the other nuclear weapons states in developing new infrastructure for nuclear weapons development, the others have not been idle. In particular, the United Kingdom is actively colluding with the US and France to maintain and develop their respective nuclear arsenals through an extensive cooperative effort on nuclear weapons research and development. When we consider this and the fact that no nuclear weapons systems have been withdrawn from service this year, the situation looks bleak indeed.

The dominating debate of the year in relation to new weapons systems developed around US plans to deploy a National Missile Defense (NMD) system. This "Son of Star Wars" is designed to shoot down incoming nuclear missiles. Supposed threats from "rogue states," (referred by the US State Department this summer as "states of concern"), were used to justify deploying this system. Technical, economic and political criticism of NMD has grown over the year. Russia and China have made clear their objections and the dangers of unleashing a new nuclear arms race. European criticism has been more muted, although President Chirac of France and Chancellor Schroder of Germany made public and trenchant criticism of it in Berlin in June. To many people's surprise President Clinton announced on September 1 that he would leave to his successor the decision on whether to deploy a National Missile Defense system. In a speech at Georgetown University, Clinton told his audience that "the system as a whole is not yet proven." But the issue of missile defense has not gone away. In the same speech, Clinton mandated a 'robust' program of continued nuclear development and testing, including 16 more tests at US \$100 million each.

Grade: 0 out of 10.

5. Prohibit the military and commercial production and reprocessing of all weapons-usable radioactive materials.

Report: The nuclear industry's troubles continued to pile as high as the mountains of nuclear waste it has produced in the last twelve months. Scandals over falsification of records have dogged British Nuclear Fuels relations with its customers in Japan and Germany. At the OSPAR (Oslo-Paris) talks in Europe in June, Norway and Ireland made clear their determination to stop all discharges into the sea from both Sellafield, England and La Hague, France. But true to form, the nuclear industry is still trying to promote itself. The European Community approved a loan program costing up to US \$1 billion on September 6 to help fund two new nuclear reactors at Khmelnitsky and Rivne to replace the unsafe Chernobyl plant when it closes at the end of the year. The closure of the Chernobyl plant, 14 years after the world's worst environmental disaster, will be hollow indeed if this plan goes ahead.

The Fissile Material Cut Off talks at the Conference in Disarmament (CD) in Geneva are stuck in part because the Chinese wish to link progress on this issue with the negotiation of an agreement on the weaponization of space. They feel that if the NMD system is introduced it will mean that they will need to produce more nuclear warheads (and thus more fissile material) to

maintain their "deterrent." Arguments about whether or not existing stocks of nuclear material should be included with the prohibition of new production have further prevented progress. Once again the CD was unable to agree on a program of work for 2000.

Grade: 1 out of 10.

6. Subject all weapons-usable radioactive materials and nuclear facilities in all states to international accounting, monitoring, and safeguards, and establish a public international registry of all weapons-usable radioactive materials.

Report: In point 10 of the 13 practical steps agreed in the Final Document of the NPT Review Conference this May, nuclear weapons states agreed to place under international verification all fissile material no longer required for military purposes. However we still do not know the details of these stocks worldwide. All nuclear weapons states need to follow the 1998 initiative of the UK when it announced the details of its stocks of weapons-usable radioactive materials.

Grade: 0 out of 10.

7. Prohibit nuclear weapons research, design, development, and testing through laboratory experiments including but not limited to non-nuclear hydrodynamic explosions and computer simulations, subject all nuclear weapons laboratories to international monitoring, and close all nuclear test sites.

Report: The US "subcritical" nuclear test program grinds on with little sign of abatement. In the last twelve months, five sub-critical tests have been conducted deep underground at the Nevada Test Site. It is believed that subcritical tests also are being conducted in steel tanks, above ground, at the Los Alamos National Laboratory in New Mexico. Los Alamos Lab Director, John Browne, recently admitted that unannounced subcritical tests would be impossible to detect. On the island of Novaya Zemlya, Russia carried out three subcritical tests in August and September. It is believed that France also is conducting subcritical tests at one of its nuclear weapons laboratories.

Over the past year, the National Ignition Facility (NIF) at Lawrence Livermore Laboratory, was plagued by huge cost overruns, allegations of gross mismanagement and technical problems, thus raising the hopes of NIF opponents that the project could be halted. Unfortunately, however, a campaign narrowly focussed on budgetary and technical concerns, which for the most part avoided dealing with the NIF's central purpose, backfired badly, and the Congress ultimately responded by actually increasing funding for the project. If the NIF - and indeed the entire Stockpile Stewardship program - is to be stopped, it will have to be challenged directly on the grounds that it is anti-disarmament and proliferation provocative, and is fundamentally incompatible with global security and the nuclear disarmament obligations undertaken in the NPT as reinforced in this year's Review Conference Final Document. (See also number 3)

Grade: 0 out of 10.

8. Create additional nuclear weapons free zones (NWFZs) such as those established by the treaties of Tlatelolco and Rarotonga.

Report: "At a time when over 30,000 nuclear weapons remain in the world, NWFZs offer one of the few activities open to non-nuclear-weapon states, not just to quarantine themselves from the nuclear contagion, but to pool their efforts to resist it." Thus spoke Jayantha Dhanapala, the UN Under-Secretary-General of the Department for Disarmament Affairs in September at an international conference in Sweden on "NWFZs: Crucial Steps towards a Nuclear-Free World." Over 50 scholars, activists, diplomats from six continents called for establishing such zones as a transitional step on the way to nuclear abolition. Meanwhile, the Green Party in Aotearoa/New Zealand has launched an initiative to extend its country's historic nuclear free legislation to include all waters in its 200-mile Exclusive Economic Zone. If taken up by other countries in the Pacific, it would complicate the ability of nuclear powered and armed ships to navigate its waters. Efforts are also underway to link the existing NWFZs, and add to them, to create a true nuclear weapon free zone in the Southern Hemisphere. In the US, Las Vegas declared itself a nuclear free zone, confirming its citizens' commitment not to become the route to the nation's nuclear waste dump. Local groups see this declaration as the first step toward the creation of the Nuclear Free Great Basin (of North America).

Grade: 1 out of 10.

9. Recognize and declare the illegality of threat or use of nuclear weapons, publicly and before the World Court.

Report: Citizens around the globe continue to use the historic 1996 opinion of the International Court of Justice to push for nuclear abolition and the dismantling of the nuclear infrastructure. Groups have been especially emboldened by the breakthrough case in Scotland last year, where three anti-nuclear activists were acquitted after having damaged the research infrastructure for Trident submarines at the UK base in Faslane, Scotland. The judgement of Sheriff Gimplett in the case is currently under review in the Scottish High Court. In the US, five nuns who conducted a plowshares action against the US Space Command in Colorado, faced up to eight years in prison if convicted of a felony. In a surprising turn of events, their case was dismissed before they could even present a defense.

Grade: 6 out of 10.

10. Establish an international energy agency to promote and support the development of sustainable and environmentally safe energy sources.

Report: This summer the North Pole became clear of ice for the first time in over 50 million years, a sobering fact that underlines the need for sustainable energy. Nuclear power cannot supply the answer despite attempts by some governments and the industry to convince the public that it can. Global warming is in itself threatening to many nuclear installations. In February, British Government scientists and experts in the nuclear industry warned that many areas predicted to be underwater by 2025 coincide with key nuclear installations. This problem is not just confined to Britain. On

December 27, while Hurricane Lothar was sweeping France, the nuclear power plant on the Gironde River, Le Blayais, was flooded. Unfortunately the doors opened towards the inside, and so they could not be shut against the outside to let the water out. Nothing terrible happened, but it took some days to evacuate the water. Who knows what may happen in the future as extreme weather events in low lying areas increase?

Fortunately the case for solar, wind and wave energy gets stronger by the month. Companies and government are daily moving in the direction of renewables. Texaco has invested US \$67 million in Energy Conversion Inc. (ECD). BP Amoco has invested US \$100 million in the American green-electricity company, Green Mountain Power, and completed its 100th service-station solar panel installation. The British government's budget this summer included a tax cut of 12.5% (from 17.5% to 5 %) on the installation of solar cell systems. The Japanese will spend US \$266 million on its ongoing program for the Promotion of Photo Voltaic (PV) Systems, which aims to install 70,000 solar PV roofs in Japan by 2004. Japanese solar companies have scaled up their manufacturing significantly in response to the program.

Grade: 2 out of 10.

11. Create mechanisms to ensure the participation of citizens and NGOs in planning and monitoring the process of nuclear weapons abolition.

Report: This year the Abolition 2000 network has grown to over 2040 organizations and municipalities in over 95 countries. At the NPT Review Conference, citizen groups worked in partnership with the New Agenda Coalition delegations (Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, Aotearoa/New Zealand, South Africa, and Sweden) to promote the abolitionist agenda, but were still excluded from many of the sessions. The number of Citizen Weapons Inspection teams attempting to implement the 1996 ICJ opinion at nuclear facilities around the world continues to grow. In August, Pax Christi led an inspection of Yorktown Naval Weapons Station in Virginia. When inspectors were not admitted, a blockade shut down the base for an hour. The possibilities of what concerted action by citizens can achieve were dramatically shown on April 8 at Greenham Common in Britain, when the fence was finally removed at the former US nuclear Cruise Missile base there. In the 1980s Greenham Common was the base for US Cruise Missiles, deployed in Europe as part of NATO's strategy for fighting a "limited nuclear war." Women from all over Britain and farther afield camped outside in non-violent resistance. On some occasions over 30,000 women gathered to "Embrace the Base" and envision a world free of nuclear weapons. The last Cruise Missiles left in 1991 as part of the INF (intermediate-range nuclear forces) Treaty of 1987. Since then local people of all political persuasions have worked to see the Common restored. On April 8, 2000 the dream became reality when the base was finally opened with an invitation to take down the nine-mile fence surrounding it. Greenham Common is once again a place for wildlife, the free grazing of cattle, picnics and play. Plans are going forward to commemorate the Women's Peace Camps with a stone circle and garden outside the Main Gate.

Grade: 5 out of 10

From the Moorea Declaration: "The anger and tears of colonized peoples arise from the fact that there was no consultation, no consent, no involvement in the decision when their lands, air and waters were taken for the nuclear build-up, from the very start of the nuclear era.... Colonized and indigenous peoples have, in the large part, borne the brunt of this nuclear devastation.... We reaffirm... that indigenous and colonized peoples must be central... in decisions relating to the nuclear weapons cycle - and especially in the abolition of nuclear weapons in all aspects. The inalienable right to self-determination, sovereignty and independence is crucial in allowing all peoples of the world to join in the common struggle to rid the planet forever of nuclear weapons."

Report: For those familiar with the exploitation of colonized and indigenous people by the military powers of the world, it will come as no surprise that the main testing grounds for the US planned National Missile Defense system are on the lands of the native American Chumash people at Vandenberg Air Force base in California, and in the Marshall Islands at Kwajalein atoll in the Pacific. If NMD is ever deployed, the system will include bases in Alaska and Greenland, on indigenous lands. Representatives of the world's 152,000 Inuit people condemned US plans for deployment of the NMD system when they met at the Inuit Circumpolar Conference in Nuuk, Greenland, on August 6, 2000. Inuit peoples live in Greenland, Canada, Alaska and Russia, and their homelands will host new military infrastructure in several places across the Arctic under NMD plans.

In Australia, aboriginal people continue to resist the uranium mines at Jabiluka in Kakadu National Park, a UNESCO World Heritage Site. Western Shoshone people and their supporters have issued a call to create a Nuclear Free Great Basin in North America. Their call states in part: "The Great Basin bio-region is a beautiful, diverse and fragile area stretching through five states. Home to strong indigenous people and cultures, high mountainous alpine lakes and forests, as well as many endangered and threatened plants and wildlife. Sadly, this land has experienced the deadly effects of nuclear weapons testing as well as the disposal of radioactive and toxic waste in leaking dumps. Now is the time to create a Nuclear Free Great Basin." Western Shoshone land is home to the US nuclear test site and the proposed high level nuclear waste dump at Yucca Mountain.

Grade: 1 out of 10

Total grade: 20 out of 120

Conclusions: The dangers of continuing reliance on destructive weapons systems for our "security" was brought into sharp relief when 118 Russian submariners were killed in August as the pride of their navy - the Kursk - was wrecked in the Barents Sea. The Cold War mentality of secrecy combined with national pride and the hangover of the old Soviet culture combined to create great anger in Russia, and shock around the world. The Kursk tragedy was an awful reminder of the human cost of militarism. The deaths serve as a warning to us all that we cannot ignore the perils of our nuclear world and the new dangers developing. If President Clinton had decided to go ahead with NMD, he would have opened the way to the destruction of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, the withdrawal of Russia from further nuclear disarmament and an arms race with the Chinese. These possibilities

still exist if a new President decides to give NMD the go-ahead, and should activate increased opposition at both the citizen and governmental levels.

We still need to heed Albert Einstein's prophetic reminder of April 1947: "For there is no secret and there is no defense, there is no possibility of control except through the aroused understanding and insistence of the peoples of the world." Although Abolition 2000 has been insisting on nuclear abolition for five years, our goal of concluding negotiations on a nuclear weapons convention by the end of this year appears remote. The goal is worthy and achievable. But we need the support and clamoring of the world's citizens.

As Helen Clark, Prime Minister of Aotearoa/New Zealand said in a recent speech: "Public opinion worldwide must be mobilized again as it was in the 1980s. Non-governmental organizations must play a vital role, working alongside committed governments. ... The world must not retreat to the days when the doctrine of nuclear armament and deterrence seemed unchangeable. Perhaps our greatest challenge is complacency. We must take the opportunities that are available in this new century of globalization to prevent a renewed nuclear arms race and to work for disarmament. We all have a stake in the security of the 21st century, and we must all work together to eliminate the dangers posed by weapons of mass destruction as we strive to free our world from the fear of the catastrophe of war."

Acknowledgements:

This edition of the Abolition 2000 Report Card is dedicated to Mordechai Vanunu. Its production was made possible with financial support from the EarthWays Foundation and the Lifebridge Foundation.

Copyright c 2000 The Atomic Mirror

Any or all parts of this report may be freely copied and distributed, with proper acknowledgement of the source. As a courtesy, please send copies containing any reprinted material to:

The Atomic Mirror
P.O. Box 220
Port Hueneme, CA 93044-0220 USA
Tel: 1 805 985 5073
Fax: 1 805 985 7563
Email: info@atomicmirror.org

Adobe pdf version designed by Clare Yerbury, c y graphics and training.
Written and compiled by Janet Bloomfield and Pamela S. Meidell
(with thanks to abolition colleagues for contributions, comments, and suggestions)
October 24, 2000.

[Janet Bloomfield <jbloomfield@gn.apc.org> is the British Coordinator of the Atomic Mirror and a consultant to the Oxford Research Group in Oxford, England; Pamela S. Meidell <pmeidell@igc.org> is the founder/director of the Atomic Mirror in Port Hueneme, California. Both have been involved with Abolition 2000 since its conception.]

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

eGroups eLerts

It's Easy. It's Fun. Best of All, it's Free!

http://click.egroups.com/1/9698/3/_/91925/_/972378326/

----->

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\2000 final-PSM.doc"

Pamela S. Meidell=20

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

X-Sender: flick@pop.igc.org
Date: Tue, 24 Oct 2000 07:13:06 -0400
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: Felicity Hill <flick@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Request for information

Howard all speeches are on line, check at <http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org>

under UNGA and then country statements.

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

X-Sender: flick@pop.igc.org
Date: Tue, 24 Oct 2000 07:24:07 -0400
To: updates@reachingcriticalwill.org
From: Felicity Hill <flick@igc.org>
Subject: ANNEX WEEK 3 UNGA 1st Committee
Cc: wilpf-news@igc.topica.com

<x-rich>Dear All,

I neglected to add this to our First Committee report yesterday.

apologies

Felicity

<bold>Panel Discussion: Follow up to the 2000 NPT Review Conference

</bold>On October 18, ambassadors to the First Committee from the US, the UK, France, Sweden and Japan spoke on a panel at the UN about the follow-up to the 2000 NPT Review Conference (RevCon). In addition, journalist Jonathan Schell and Bruce Blair, head of the Center for Defense Information, also participated. The panel was sponsored by the NGO Committee on Disarmament, in cooperation with the Department for Disarmament Affairs and the Department of Public Information. In general, all of the panelists agreed that the final document of the 2000 NPT RevCon strengthened the NPT in principle. However, they differed in terms of how to operationalize the final doc's commitments.

Amb. Robert Grey of the US said that the final document, built on compromise, "charts a realistic course" and purposely contains "ambiguous formulas." He referred to the text on the NPT's operational status and how it must be balanced with the need to keep "strategic stability" (read: deterrence). Grey said that US nuclear weapons policy tends to be incoherent because of the fragmented structure of the US government-including priority differences between the president, members of Congress and governmental departments. Since the 2000 NPT RevCon, he said, Russia and the US have been holding talks about weapons reduction, but the US has not reacted formally to Russia's proposal to go to 1500. Grey hammered on the point that countries should not be looking for a perfect solution to verification, which he termed a "snake pit" issue that could tie up negotiations for years. First, he urged, a clear process must be in place before verification measures can be designed.

Amb. Ian Soutar of the UK noted that the readiness of the New Agenda Coalition to talk with the P-5 was ultimately what got the results at the RevCon. Soutar also said that the general atmosphere in the First Committee this year has been free of recriminations, compared with previous years. On the other hand, he said, since the RevCon, there's been a tendency to downplay-and reinterpret-its results. The UK, he said, does not support an "a la carte" implementation of the NPT final doc ands firmly behind its commitments. Notably, Soutar said that NGOs should continue to write him since their correspondences make a difference and have sometimes changed his instructions.

Amb. Hubert de La Fortelle of France agreed with Soutar that he opposes "a la carte" implementation of the final document. He said that selective quotations of the document, such as paragraph 15.9 (undiminished security for all) can be misleading. While France will continue to take its own security concerns into account, he said, it has worked to disarm: it eliminated all of its tactical nuclear weapons, lowered the number of its nuclear subs to 4 from 5, and lowered its level of alert. "Minimum deterrence," he stressed, is France's policy, and Member States must adopt a pragmatic, step-by-step approach to disarmament.

Amb. Henrik Salander of Sweden, a member of the NAC (NAG), admitted that the final doc of the RevCon is very much a compromise document and represents a commitment by the NAC to a results-oriented dialogue and pragmatic proposals. One noteworthy compromise, he said, was on the issue of operational status; the text does not include a mention of dealerting or demating. However, according to Salander, these NPT commitments must be honored. In its draft resolution submitted to the First Committee, NAC/NAG, according to Salander, has outlined 13 steps that are mutually reinforcing and serve as a basis for progress. Amb. Seiichiro Noboru of Japan warned that NPT RevCon participants can't rest on their laurels. He regrets that some stipulations that he had supported couldn't be included in the final doc because it needed to be adopted by consensus. Japan, he said, intends to play a leadership role in following up on the RevCon. He urged the US and Russia to begin START III negotiations ASAP, the Conference on Disarmament to take seriously with the commitments outlined in the final doc and to support negotiations over a future FMCT. Noboru called on the First Committee to give direction to the NPT final doc and even go beyond its language. For example, he calls on Member States to support Japan's draft resolution calling for the total elimination of nuclear weapons. He urges that a time target for the CTBT be set for 2003 and that the FMCT be concluded by 2005.

Jonathan Schell, whose article, "The Folly of Arms Control," appears in the Sept./Oct. 2000 issue of *Foreign Affairs*, argued that, while the final doc is important to disarmament, policies of nuclear-weapons states-particularly deterrence as practiced by the US-are already contradicting it. He is favorably impressed the

language in the final doc stipulating for an "unequivocal undertaking" of the elimination of nuclear weapons. The document represents a benchmark to hold the nuclear states to, he said. In the meantime, though, NGOs confront obstacles relating to how many governments, on the one hand, tell them that complete abolition is an impractical goal, yet on the other hand, tell NGOs that they're already working to abolish them. The US, for example, is making it clear that nuclear weapons continue to be a foundation of its super power status and its strategic security. Moreover, in US policy circles, what's lacking is a full and open discussion of abolition (its costs and benefits). Schell urged UN Member States to adopt policies strengthening inspection and transparency, two goals which he thinks will eventually be reached.

Bruce Blair stressed that the key to progress on disarmament/arms control is not patience, as Amb. Grey had said, but leadership, a value that the US lacks. Russia and the US are still mired in a cold-war mentality, he noted. The US or any other State needs to take leadership in creating an international taboo against States that have already have launch-ready configurations (India, Pakistan), which he defines as the most serious risk to global security. Instead of our leaders waiting around for someone to act-for good or ill-someone needs to take the initiative in terms of unequivocal elimination of nuclear weapons.

During the questions and answers, several audience members asked how NATO will receive and implement the final doc, given that NATO policy still is dependent on nuclear weapons as a deterrent. Amb. Soutar said that he saw no incompatibility. Amb. Grey said that changing policy and outlooks in NATO will take time. And Amb. La Fortelle mentioned that Russian nuclear policy is also incompatible with the final doc, but that Russia's approach may change for the better in time.

Tracy Moavero, Peace Action

Pam Jordan, NGO Committee on Disarmament

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

***** ***** ***** *****

</x-rich>

From: Robin Ringler <DRingler@UMC-GBCS.ORG>
To: "mupj@igc.org" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Nov. 14
Date: Tue, 24 Oct 2000 12:33:10 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

Howard,

Unfortunately, there are no conference rooms available here Nov. 14. What about the NCC Conf. room? Do you want me to call them and ask? Please let me know.

I've left a voice mail message for Jaydee about the \$500 to help with your travel to Brussels. He's out of town until next Tues. I hope to hear back from him by phone.

I've been gone since Oct. 12. My dad has lung cancer for the 3rd time, had surgery right before our Board meeting, started bleeding internally and almost died. I went down to GA to be with him and my mom. He came home from the hospital yesterday and will begin chemotherapy this week. At 79, he has a tough time ahead, but he has a very positive outlook, and he's a fighter (military man!). My sister who lives in Alaska is arriving next Monday and will stay with them for 3 weeks to help drive my dad to his Dr. appts.

Needless to say, I'm hopelessly behind. The Board approved my staying here until March 31 at the latest. I will be getting info out about the March 2001 PwJ Coords. mtg. soon.

Please let me know if you want me to call the NCC about their conf. room.

Robin

From: Robin Ringler <DRingler@UMC-GBCS.ORG>
To: "mupj@igc.org" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: \$\$\$
Date: Tue, 24 Oct 2000 16:13:41 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

Hi Howard,

I just got a call from Jaydee approving our giving you \$500 toward your trip to Brussels. Are you ready for me to make out a check requisition payable to you?

Robin

To: Robin Ringler <DRingler@UMC-GBCS.ORG>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Nov. 14, etc.
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\01009.10.doc;
In-Reply-To: <619BD1E95646D311B69D0008C79FE32D2E1E61@CHURCH2>
References:

Dear Robin,

I hope that chemotherapy goes well for you dad and that he recuperates successfully. He's lucky to have two devoted daughters.

Regarding November 14, yes, please ask for the NCC conference room. The meeting is for 1:00 to 2:30 p.m.

I appreciate the \$500 grant in support of my trip to Brussels for the consultation of church representatives on NATO nuclear policy and related issues. The communique from this meeting is attached. The check can be made out to Methodists United for Peace with Justice and sent to MUPJ, Attn: Phillip Miller, 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036.

Shalom,
Howard

From: "Schuyler Rhodes" <srhodes@igc.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Fw: which resolution??
Date: Tue, 24 Oct 2000 16:30:05 -0700
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2314.1300
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300

Howard, could you respond to this?

Thanks,
Schuyler

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

From: Brenda B. Hardt <bbhardt@mail.esc4.com>
To: Schuyler Rhodes <srhodes@igc.org>
Sent: Saturday, October 07, 2000 1:29 PM
Subject: which resolution??

> Dear Rev. Rhodes:
> You mentioned to me that the UM General Conf. 2000 adopted a resolution
> that smacked of just war justification. Which one might that be? I
> looked on the umc website but couldn't find it and couldn't find
> anything on the GBCS website where they listed the new resolutions.
> Thank you if you could clarify this or tell me more.
>
> Also, do you know which UM publishing entities might be the first to
> publish
> peace and nonviolence study curriculum in response to the "Decade
> appeal"?(--and which professors or theologians might write such)
>
> Brenda
>

To: Brenda B. Hardt <bbhardt@mail.esc4.com>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: General conference resolution
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\mu.114.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Brenda,

Schuyler Rhodes asked me to respond to your inquiry about a General Conference resolution with a "just war" justification. The General Conference did indeed adopt two amendments to the Social Principles along these lines. They are attached.

We were caught napping. Ordinarily the Social Principles are handled by the Church and Society legislative committee. This year all petitions related to homosexuality were assigned to the Faith and Order committee. Because some of these deal with the Social Principles, all petitions dealing with the Social Principles went to Faith and Order, including matters of war and peace. I didn't realize this until Jaydee Hanson told me on the first Friday of General Conference that these amendments had passed the Faith and Order committee. He and I tried to mount some opposition and succeeded in getting the items removed from the consent calendar. But it wasn't possible to build enough floor opposition to defeat them.

So we've got our work cut out for us for the 2004 General Conference. At a minimum we ought to get "usual" eliminated because that is a loophole wide enough for Hitler and other aggressors to drive a tank division through. The one in the paragraph on military service will require more work. But we should return Methodism to its historic position. After all in 1944 in the midst of World War II the General Conference of the Methodist Church stated: "The methods of Jesus and the methods of war belong to different worlds."

We need to be better prepared for the 2004 General Conference.

Shalom,
Howard

From: "Pastor Schuyler Rhodes" To: "Howard W. Hallman" Subject: Next MUPJ Meeting Date: Tue, 24 Oct 2000 09:44:39 -0700 X-MSMail-Priority: Normal X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2314.1300 X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300
Hey Howard,

Are you scheduling the next time that MUPJ meets? If possible, I'd like to try to pull together some things I need to do on the east coast. Let me know, OK?

Thanks

Schuyler Rhodes

To: "Pastor Schuyler Rhodes" <pastor@templeumc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Next MUPJ Meeting
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <007c01c03dd9\$b57adee0\$a4201004@default>
References:

Schuyler,

I'm about to initiate some correspondence with the MUPJ board about board membership, our National Advisory Committee, other organizational issues, and the possibility of scheduling a conference call. This may lead to scheduling a board meeting for next spring, but we won't be bringing the board together before then.

If in the meantime you plan to come to D.C., let me know so that we can get together.

Shalom,
Howard

From: Robin Ringler <DRingler@UMC-GBCS.ORG>
To: "mupj@igc.org" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: ncc conf. rm.
Date: Wed, 25 Oct 2000 09:48:20 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

Howard,

We have the NCC Conf. room Nov. 14, 1-2:30 p.m. Will you notify people about the mtg. & location? Meanwhile, I will fill out a check requisition for your \$500. Jaydee has to sign it and he will be back in the office next Tues. Then it'll be about a week and a half or so before the check comes back to me. I'll mail it to the address you requested as soon as I get it.

Thanks for everything you do!

Robin

Please inform Friends Committee on National Legislation (547-6000, ex. 121) of any updates/changes.

MONDAY LOBBY PHONEBOOK

October 2000

Alliance for Nuclear Accountability

Kathy Crandall *kathycrandall*
1801 18th Street, NW, #9-2
Washington, DC 20009
Tel: 202-833-4668
Fax: 202-234-9536
E-mail: *(see name listing above)*@earthlink.net
website: www.ananuclear.org

American Baptist Churches USA, Office of Governmental Relations

Curtis W. Ramsey-Lucas
110 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington DC 20002
Tel: 202-544-3400
Fax: 202-544-0277
E-mail: ograbc@aol.com

American Friends Service Committee

Jim Matlack
1822 R Street, NW
Washington DC 20009
Tel: 202-483-3341
Fax: 202-232-3197
E-mail: jmatlack@erols.com
Website: www.afsc.org

Americans for Democratic Action

Darryl Fagin
1625 K Street NW #210
Washington DC 20006
Tel: 202-785-5980
Fax: 202-785-5969
E-mail: adaction@ix.netcom.com
Website: www.adaction.org

Arms Control Association

Wade Boese *wade*
Spurgeon Keeny *smk*
1726 M Street, NW, Suite 201
Washington DC 20036
Tel: 202-463-8270
Fax: 202-463-8273
E-mail: *(see name listing above)*@armscontrol.org
Website: www.armscontrol.org

Arms Trade Resource Center

-See *World Policy Institute*

British American Security Information Council (BASIC)

Dan Plesch
Kathleen Miller *kmiller@basicint.org*
1900 L Street, NW, Suite 401-403
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: 202-785-1266
Fax: 202-387-6298
E-mail: basicus@basicint.org
Website: www.basicint.org

Business Leaders for Sensible Priorities

Duane Peterson
John Fairbanks
1090 Vermont Ave., NW, Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20005
Tel: 202.216.1893
Fax: 202.216.9426
website: www.businessleaders.org

Campaign for U.N. Reform

Don Kraus
420 7th Street, SE, #C
Washington, DC 20003
Tel: 202-546-3956
Fax: 202-546-8703
E-mail: cunr@cunr.org
website: www.cunr.org

Center for Defense Information

Chris Hellman *x103 chellman*
Marcus Corbin *x106 mcorbin*
Rachel Stohl *x105 rstohl*
Dan Smith *x130 dsmith*
1779 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington DC 20036
Tel: 202-332-0600
Fax: 202-462-4559
E-mail: *(see name listing above)*@cdi.org
Website: www.cdi.org

Center for International Policy

Paul Olweny *x8 polwney*
Clarissa Kayosa *mwaampa*
David Lochhead
1755 Massachusetts Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20006
Tel: 202-232-3317
Fax: 202-232-3440
E-mail: *(see name listing above)*@ciponline.org
Website: www.us.net/cip/index.htm

***Center for Strategic and Budgetary
Assessments***

Stacy Shepard *shepard*
Liesl Heeter *heeter*
Steve Kosiak *kosiak*
Alane Kochems *kochems*
1730 Rhode Island Ave. NW, Ste. 912
Washington DC 20036
Tel: 202-331-7990
Fax: 202-331-8019
E-mail: *(see name listing
above)*@csbaonline.org
website: www.csbaonline.org

Church of the Brethren Washington Office

Greg Laszakovits
Cary Jossart
337 North Carolina Ave, SE
Washington, D.C. 20003
Tel: 202-546-3202
Fax: 202-544-5852
E-mail: washofc@aol.com
website: www.brethren.org/genbd/

Church Women United

Ann Delorey
110 Maryland Ave., NE
Washington, DC 20002
Tel: 202-544-8747
Fax: 202-544-9133
E-mail: cwu-dc@churchwomen.org
website: www.churchwomen.org

Citizens for a Responsible Budget

Scott Nathanson
110 Maryland Ave. NE, Suite 201
Washington, DC 20002
Tel: (202) 543-4100 x135
Fax: (202) 546-5142
E-mail: CRB_DC@hotmail.com
website: www.clw.org/crb/

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers

Daryl Kimball x136 *dkimball*

Stephen Young x102 *syoung*
Seth Levin x137 *slevin*
110 Maryland Avenue, NE, #505
Washington, DC 20002
Tel: 202-546-0795
Fax: 202-546-5142
E-mail: *(see name listing above)*@clw.org
website: <http://www.crnd.org>

Committee to Free Lori Berenson

Gail Taylor
110 Maryland Ave. NE, Suite 102
Washington, DC 20002
Tel: (202) 548-8480
Fax: (202) 544-9613
E-mail: gtaylor@freelori.org
website: www.freelori.org

Council for a Livable World

John Isaacs x131 *jdi*
Suzy Kerr x115 *skerr*
Dan Koslofsky x125 *dan*
110 Maryland Avenue, NE, #409
Washington DC 20002
Tel: 202-543-4100
Fax: 202-543-6297
E-mail: clw@clw.org
or (see name listing above)[@clw.org](mailto:clw@clw.org)
Website: www.clw.org

Council for a Livable World Education Fund

Tom Cardamone x126 *cardamone*
Erik Floden x110
efloden
Luke Warren x127 *lwarren*
Steve LaMontagne x119 *slamontagne*
Lynn Erskine x100 *lerskine*
110 Maryland Avenue, NE, #201
Washington, DC 20002
Tel: 202-546-0795
Fax: 202-546-5142
E-mail: (see name listing above)[@clw.org](mailto:clw@clw.org)
Website: www.clw.org

D.C. Green Party

Jenefer Ellingston
641 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20002
Tel: 202-546-0940
Fax: 546-0431
E-mail: jellingston@erols.com
website: www.dcgreenparty.org

Disarmament Clearinghouse

1101 14th Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20005
Tel: 202-898-0150, x232
Fax: 202-898-0172
E-mail: disarmament@igc.org
Web: www.disarmament.org

East Timor Action Network

Lynn Fredriksson *lynn*
Karen Orenstein *karen*
Suite 306, Box 3
110 Maryland Ave, N.E.
Washington, DC 20002
Tel: 202-544-6911
Fax: 202-544-6118
E-mail: (see name listing above)[@etan.org](mailto:clw@clw.org)
Website: www.etan.org

Federation of American Scientists

Tamar Gabelnick x1018 *tamarg*
Pamina Firchow x5220 *firchow*
John Pike x1023 *johnpike*
307 Massachusetts Avenue, NE
Washington DC 20002
Tel: 202-546-3300 or 202-675-(above)
Fax: 202-675-1010
E-mail: (see name listing above)[@fas.org](mailto:clw@clw.org)
Website: www.fas.org

Friends Committee on National Legislation

Joe Volk x119 *joe*
Kathy Guthrie x144 *kathy*
Ned Stowe x117 *ned*
Catherine Stratton x120 *catherine*
Treadway
245 Second Street, NE
Washington DC 20002
Tel: 202-547-6000
Fax: 202-547-6019
E-mail: (see name listing above)[@fcnl.org](mailto:clw@clw.org)
Website: www.fcnl.org

Fund for New Priorities in America

Robert Vandivier
122 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20002
Tel: 202-543-1231
Fax: 202-543-5193
E-mail: bobvan@erols.com

Greenpeace

1436 U Street, NW

Washington DC 20009
Tel: 202-462.1177
Fax: 202-462-4507

Website: www.greenpeaceusa.org

Institute for Policy Studies

Martha Honey
Miriam Pemberton
733 15th Street, NW, Suite 1020
Washington DC 20005
Tel: 202-234-9382
Fax: 202-319-3558
E-mail: nceed@igc.apc.org

Institute for Science and International Security

Kevin O'Neill x5883 *koneill*
Corey Hinderstein x2696 *cgh*
236 Massachusetts Ave NE, Suite 500
Washington, DC 20002
Tel: 202-547-3633 or 547-(*above*)
Fax: 202-547-3634
E-mail: (*see name listing above*)
 @isis-online.org
website: www.ips-dc.org

Jesuit Social Ministries, National Office

1616 P Street, N.W., Suite 400
Washington DC 20036
Tel: 202-462-0400
Fax: 202-462-7009
website: www.jesuit.org

***Lawyers Alliance for World Security
Committee for National Security***

Tom Graham
1901 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Suite 802
Washington DC 20006
Tel: (202) 745-2450
Fax: (202) 667-0444
E-mail: tgraham@lawscns.org
Website: www.lawscns.org

Mennonite Central Committee

Daryl Byler
110 Maryland Avenue, NE, #502
Washington DC 20002

Tel: 202-544-6564
Fax: 202-544-2820
E-mail: jdb@mcc.org
website: www.mcc.org

Website: www.nrdc.org

Methodists United for Peace with Justice

Howard Hallman
1500 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036
Tel/Fax: 202-896-0013
E-mail: mupj@igc.org

National Council of Churches/Church World Service

Heather Nolen *heathern*
Lisa Wright *lisaw*
110 Maryland Ave., NE
Washington, DC 20002
Tel: (202) 543-2350
Fax: (202) 546-6232
E-mail: *(see name listing*
 above)@nccusa.org
website: www.nccusa.org

National Security News Service

Francyne Harrigan x13
 fharrigan@hotmail.com
1100 Connecticut Ave., NW, #1310
Washington DC 20036
Tel: 202-466-4310
Fax: 202-466-4344
website: www.publicedcenter.org/nsns.html

Natural Resources Defense Council

Chris Paine
1535 Dairy Road
Charlottesville, VA 22903
tel: 804.244.5013
fax: 804.245.5099
E-mail: chrispaine@earthlink.net
OR
Matthew McKinzie
1200 New York Avenue, NW #400
Washington DC 20005
Tel: 202-289-6868
Fax: 202-289-1060

National Priorities Project

Greg Speeter
17 New South St., Ste. 301
Northampton, MA 01060
Tel. (413) 584-9556
Fax (413) 586-9647
E-mail: info@natprior.org
Web: www.natprior.org

NETWORK: A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby

Lisa Hixon x13 lhixon
801 Pennsylvania Ave. SE, Suite 460
Washington DC 20003
Tel: 202-547-5556
Fax: 202-547-5510
E-mail: network@networklobby.org
or: (see name listing above)
@networklobby.org
Website: www.networklobby.org

OMB Watch

1742 Connecticut Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20009
Tel: 202-234-8494
Fax: 202-234-8584
Website: ombwatch.org/ombwatch.html

Peace Action/Peace Action Education Fund

Gordon S. Clark x3007 gclark
Jim Bridgman jbridgman
Jennifer Randolph x3004 jrandolph
1819 H Street, NW #420-425
Washington DC 20006-3603
Tel: 202-862-9740
Fax: 202-862-9762
E-mail: (see name listing above)
@peace-action.org
Website: www.peace-action.org

PeaceLinks

Anna Smiles x20
annabananasmls@hotmail.com
666 11th Street, NW Suite 202
Washington, DC 20001
Tel: 202-783-7030

Fax: 202-783-7040
E-mail: peacelinks1@erols.com

Physicians for Social Responsibility

Robert Musil x221 bmusil
Kimberly Roberts x222 kroberts
Martin Butcher mbutcher
1101 14th Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington DC 20005
Tel: 202-898-0150
Fax: 202-898-0172
E-mail: (see name listing above)@psr.org
Website: www.psr.org

Plutonium Challenge

David Culp
245 Second St., NE
Washington, DC 20002
Tel: 202-547-6000
fax: 202-547-6019

Presbyterian Church (USA)

110 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington DC 20002
Tel: 202-543-1126
Fax: 202-543-7755
E-mail: walter_owensby@pcusa.org
website: www.pcusa.org

Project On Government Oversight

Eric Miller
Seth Morris seth@pogo.org
Danielle Brian
666 11th St., N.W., #500
Washington, DC 20001
Tel: 202-347-1122
Fax: 202-347-1116
E-mail: defense@pogo.org
Website: www.pogo.org

Saferworld

Peter J. Davies
711 Ladd Rd.
Bronx, NY 10471
Tel/Fax: (718) 549-1726
E-mail: pjdavies@aol.com

Student Pugwash USA

Sandy Ionno Butcher *sionno*
Susan Veres *sveres*
815 15th Street, NW, #814
Washington, DC 20005
Tel: 202-393-6555
Fax: 202-393-6550
E-mail: (see name listing above)@spusa.org
Website: www.spusa.org/pugwash/

Taxpayers for Common Sense

Ralph De Gennaro x102 *ralph*
Alise Frye x104 *alise*
651 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE
Washington, DC 20003
Tel: 202-546-8500
Fax: 202-546-8511
E-mail: (see name listing above)
@taxpayer.net
Website: www.taxpayer.net

20/20 Vision

James Wyerman *jwyerman*
Tim Barner *timb*
1828 Jefferson Place, NW
Washington DC 20036
Tel: 202-833-2020
Fax: 202-833-5307
E-mail: vision@2020vision.org
or: (see name listing above)
@2020vision.org
Website: www.2020vision.org

Union of American Hebrew Congregations

Religious Action Center

2027 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington DC 20036
Tel: 202-387-2800
Fax: 202-667-9070
E-mail: rac@uahc.org
website: www.rj.org/rac/

Union of Concerned Scientists

Tom Zamora Collina x109 *tcollina*
1707 H Street, NW #600
Washington DC 20006

Tel: 202-223-6133
Fax: 202-223-6162
E-mail: (see name listing
above)[@ucsusa.org](mailto:)
Website: www.ucsusa.org

2001 S Street, NW, Suite 740
Washington, DC 20009
Tel: 202-483-9222

Unitarian Universalist Association

Meg Riley
2026 P Street, NW, Suite 3
Washington DC 20036
Tel: 202-296-4672
Fax: 202-296-4673
E-mail: uuawo@aol.com

***United Church of Christ Office for Church
in Society***

Charles McCollough *mccolloc*
Jay Lintner *lintnerj*
110 Maryland Avenue, NE, Ste. 207
Washington DC 20002
Tel: 202-543-1517
Fax: 202-543-5994
E-mail: (see name listing above)[@ucc.org](mailto:)
Webpage: www.ucc.org

United Nations Support Pax World Service

Larry Ekin
1111 16th Street, N.W., Suite 120
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: 202-293-7290
Fax: 202-293-7023
E-mail: info@paxworld.org
website: www.paxworld.org

Veterans for Peace, Inc.

Hari Scordo
733 15th St. NW, Ste. 928
Washington, DC 20005
Tel: 202-347-6780
Fax: 202-347-6781
E-mail: vfp@igc.org
Web: www.veteransforpeace.org

***Vietnam Veterans of America Foundation
U.S. Campaign to Ban Landmines***

Marissa Vitagliano

Fax: 202-483-9312
E-mail: marissa@vi.org
Website: www.vvaf.org/htdocs/landmine/
freeworld.htm

Women Strike for Peace

Edith Villastrigo
110 Maryland Avenue, NE, Suite 102
Washington, DC 20002
Tel: 202-543-2660
Fax: 202-544-9613
E-mail: WomenStrikePeace@cs.com

***Women's Action for New Directions,
The Women Legislators' Lobby***

Kimberly Robson (WAND) *wand*
Ann Ober (WILL) *will*
Stephanie Broughton *nuclear*
110 Maryland Avenue, Suite 205
Washington DC 20002
Tel: 202-543-8505
Fax: 202-675-6469
E-mail: (see listing above)@wand.org
Website: www.wand.org

***Women's International League for Peace &
Freedom c/o Women Strike for Peace***

Gillian Gilhool
110 Maryland Avenue, NE, Suite 102
Washington, DC 20002
Tel: 202-546-6727
Fax: 202-544-9613
E-mail: ggilhool@ix.netcom.com
Website: www.wilpf.org

World Federalist Association

Chuck Woolery x 6135 *chuck*
418 7th Street, SE
Washington, DC 20003
Tel: 202-546-(see extension above)
Fax: 202-546-3749
E-mail: (see name listing above)@wfa.org
Website: www.wfa.org

World Policy Institute

Bill Hartung *hartung* x106
Frida Berriga *berrigaf* x112
Michelle Ciarrocca *ciarrm01* x112
66 5th Ave., 9th Floor
New York, NY 10011
Tel: (212) 229-5808
Fax: (212) 229-5579
E-mail: (see name listing above)
@newschool.edu
website: www.worldpolicy.org/projects/arms

Abolition 2000 Report Card
Annual Progress toward a Nuclear-Free World
United Nations Day
October 24, 2000

*"We came because of our nightmares...
We stayed because of our dream."*

--the women of Greenham Common

Total grade on progress toward nuclear abolition: 20 out of 120 points.

(For comparison, the 1996 report card scored 31/110, the 1997 card: 7/120, the 1998 card: 16/120, the 1999 card: 12/120. (The discrepancy in total points is due to the inclusion since 1997 of the Moorea Declaration.) The five-year review on progress toward nuclear abolition, **Must Try Harder**, produced for the NPT Review Conference in 2000, scored 29/120 points.)

Introduction: For the last four years, we have issued an Abolition 2000 report card in October, assessing progress toward a nuclear weapons free world. Five years after the Abolition Statement was released at the United Nations, we pause again to take stock of the state of the Nuclear World, and of efforts to abolish nuclear weapons. Looking at this year's events in the context of the Abolition 2000 Statement offers a simple way to make such an evaluation. This Report Card offers a brief assessment of progress in the past year in the implementation of the 11 points of the Abolition Statement, and compliance with the letter and spirit of the Moorea Declaration. We offer it on United Nations Day, October 24, to recall the initial promise of the UN Charter: "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war." We keep in mind our future descendants, knowing that the elimination of nuclear weapons will go far in fulfilling our promise to them.

1. Immediately initiate and conclude by the year 2000 negotiations on a nuclear weapons abolition convention that requires the phased elimination of all nuclear weapons within a timebound framework, with provisions for effective verification and enforcement.

Report: The most significant event in relation to this goal in the last year was the Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). From April 24 to May 19, representatives of 187 countries and at least as many representatives of civil society organizations from around the world gathered at the United Nations in New York to review the Nuclear Non Proliferation Treaty (NPT). By May 19, the five senior nuclear weapons countries (China, France, Russia, United Kingdom, United States) committed to an "unequivocal undertaking " to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals," thus clearly accepting their responsibility under Article VI. Although they did not set a deadline for this worthy goal, they did agree to diminish the role of nuclear weapons in world security. The conference also called upon India, Pakistan, Israel and Cuba to join the treaty, thus making it "universal." The increasing concerns of non-nuclear weapons states that the nuclear weapons states are not fulfilling their disarmament agreements led to a much stronger effort and a unified call for action. The US remains the biggest "state of concern:" Department of Energy documents made public at the meeting

revealed the US intention to keep its nuclear weapons "forever." 36,000 nuclear weapons and the doctrine of deterrence are still with us. But the world is inching closer to being free of nuclear weapons, thanks to the persistent efforts of citizen groups and courageous non-nuclear weapon states, such as the New Agenda Coalition (Aotearoa/New Zealand, Ireland, Egypt, Mexico, Sweden, Brazil, South Africa.)

The final document of the NPT, if implemented with a sense of urgency, would transform the current situation. But without any deadlines, or at least serious political will behind its goals, it is in danger of going the way of so many documents agreed at the UN that remain as aspirations never achieved. There is still much to be done. The choices that will be made in the next few years will be crucial.

Grade: 3 out of 10.

2. Immediately make an unconditional pledge not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons.

Report: It is hard to reconcile the Final Document of the NPT Review Conference with the continuation of first use policies. The contradiction between the NPT Final Document and NATO policy is an opportunity to increase pressure on the alliance as it reviews its nuclear policy. NATO is due to receive a report in December 2000 that will consider "options for confidence and security- building measures, verification, non-proliferation and arms control and disarmament." (NATO Communiqué 24 April 1999). The final document of the NPT commits the nuclear weapons states to "Diminish the role of nuclear weapons in security policies." It is hard to see how this commitment can be reconciled with existing policy in NATO nuclear states, as well as current Russian policy. China still remains the only state with a public policy in place of no first use, while India appears to have adopted it as part of its nuclear posture.

Grade: 1 out of 10.

3. Rapidly complete a truly Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) with a zero threshold and with the stated purpose of precluding nuclear weapons development by all states.

Report: The fallout from the failure of the US Senate to ratify the CTBT in 1999 continues. Newly elected President Putin of Russia seized the opportunity of a more sympathetic Duma to get the CTBT ratified by his country in April, thus putting political pressure on the US as the NPT Review Conference opened. But there is little sign of progress in this year of a US Presidential election. Brajesh Mishra, National Security Advisor of India, announced on September 2 that his country had no intention of signing a global treaty banning atomic testing in the near future. Alongside India, Pakistan and North Korea, the US has become the major obstacle to the entry into force of the Treaty. (See also number 7.)

Grade: 0 out of 10.

4. Cease to produce and deploy new and additional nuclear weapons systems, and commence to withdraw and disable deployed nuclear weapons systems.

Report: The world survived unscathed as computers rolled over to the date 01/01/2000. Whether this quiet passage over the threshold occurred through luck or good judgement it is difficult to know. The joint arrangements between Russia and the US may have helped, although in the days following the New Year celebrations stories emerged of a number of incidents that could have led to much greater problems than actually happened. Sadly, the Center for Y2K Strategic Stability, a 'safety catch' on US and Russian nuclear arsenals, was closed soon after the "rollover." The Center, where Americans and Russians sat side by side on the eve of the millennium, monitored both nations' arsenals, which even now are kept ready to fire on a "hair trigger."

Earlier this year it was revealed that the US strategic war plan target list has actually been growing instead of contracting since the last strategic arms reduction treaty, START II, was signed in 1993. The list has grown by 20 percent over the last five years alone, according to top military and former administration officials. The vast bulk of the targets are in Russia. Three other former republics of the Soviet Union -- Belarus, Ukraine and Kazakhstan -- were dropped from the strategic plan in 1997, yet the list of sites the Pentagon says the US must be ready to destroy has grown from 2,500 in 1995 to 3,000 now. In the United States, modifications or upgrades -- including in some instances enhanced military capabilities -- are planned for every weapon type in the arsenal. While the United States continues to outspend all the other nuclear weapons states in developing new infrastructure for nuclear weapons development, the others have not been idle. In particular, the United Kingdom is actively colluding with the US and France to maintain and develop their respective nuclear arsenals through an extensive cooperative effort on nuclear weapons research and development. When we consider this and the fact that no nuclear weapons systems have been withdrawn from service this year, the situation looks bleak indeed.

The dominating debate of the year in relation to new weapons systems developed around US plans to deploy a National Missile Defense (NMD) system. This "Son of Star Wars" is designed to shoot down incoming nuclear missiles. Supposed threats from "rogue states," (referred by the US State Department this summer as "states of concern"), were used to justify deploying this system. Technical, economic and political criticism of NMD has grown over the year. Russia and China have made clear their objections and the dangers of unleashing a new nuclear arms race. European criticism has been more muted, although President Chirac of France and Chancellor Schroder of Germany made public and trenchant criticism of it in Berlin in June. To many people's surprise President Clinton announced on September 1 that he would leave to his successor the decision on whether to deploy a National Missile Defense system. In a speech at Georgetown University, Clinton told his audience that "the system as a whole is not yet proven." But the issue of missile defense has not gone away. In the same speech, Clinton mandated a 'robust' program of continued nuclear development and testing, including 16 more tests at US \$100 million each.

Grade: 0 out of 10.

5. Prohibit the military and commercial production and reprocessing of all weapons-usable radioactive materials.

Report: The nuclear industry's troubles continued to pile as high as the mountains of nuclear waste it has produced in the last twelve months. Scandals over falsification of records have dogged British Nuclear Fuels relations with its customers in Japan and Germany. At the OSPAR (Oslo-Paris) talks in Europe in June, Norway and Ireland made clear their determination to stop all discharges into the sea from both Sellafield, England and La Hague, France. But true to form, the nuclear industry is still trying to promote itself. The European Community approved a loan program costing up to US \$1 billion on September 6 to help fund two new nuclear reactors at Khmelnitsky and Rivne to replace the unsafe Chernobyl plant when it closes at the end of the year. The closure of the Chernobyl plant, 14 years after the world's worst environmental disaster, will be hollow indeed if this plan goes ahead.

The Fissile Material Cut Off talks at the Conference in Disarmament (CD) in Geneva are stuck in part because the Chinese wish to link progress on this issue with the negotiation of an agreement on the weaponization of space. They feel that if the NMD system is introduced it will mean that they will need to produce more nuclear warheads (and thus more fissile material) to maintain their "deterrent." Arguments about whether or not existing stocks of nuclear material should be included with the prohibition of new production have further prevented progress. Once again the CD was unable to agree on a program of work for 2000.

Grade: 1 out of 10.

6. Subject all weapons-usable radioactive materials and nuclear facilities in all states to international accounting, monitoring, and safeguards, and establish a public international registry of all weapons-usable radioactive materials.

Report: In point 10 of the 13 practical steps agreed in the Final Document of the NPT Review Conference this May, nuclear weapons states agreed to place under international verification all fissile material no longer required for military purposes. However we still do not know the details of these stocks worldwide. All nuclear weapons states need to follow the 1998 initiative of the UK when it announced the details of its stocks of weapons-usable radioactive materials.

Grade: 0 out of 10.

7. Prohibit nuclear weapons research, design, development, and testing through laboratory experiments including but not limited to non-nuclear hydrodynamic explosions and computer simulations, subject all nuclear weapons laboratories to international monitoring, and close all nuclear test sites.

Report: The US "subcritical" nuclear test program grinds on with little sign of abatement. In the last twelve months, five sub-critical tests have been conducted deep underground at the Nevada Test Site. It is believed that subcritical tests also are being conducted in steel tanks, above ground, at the Los Alamos National Laboratory in New Mexico. Los Alamos Lab Director, John Browne, recently admitted that unannounced subcritical tests would be impossible to detect. On

the island of Novaya Zemlya, Russia carried out three subcritical tests in August and September. It is believed that France also is conducting subcritical tests at one of its nuclear weapons laboratories.

Over the past year, the National Ignition Facility (NIF) at Lawrence Livermore Laboratory, was plagued by huge cost overruns, allegations of gross mismanagement and technical problems, thus raising the hopes of NIF opponents that the project could be halted. Unfortunately, however, a campaign narrowly focussed on budgetary and technical concerns, which for the most part avoided dealing with the NIF's central purpose, backfired badly, and the Congress ultimately responded by actually increasing funding for the project. If the NIF – and indeed the entire Stockpile Stewardship program – is to be stopped, it will have to be challenged directly on the grounds that it is anti-disarmament and proliferation provocative, and is fundamentally incompatible with global security and the nuclear disarmament obligations undertaken in the NPT as reinforced in this year's Review Conference Final Document. (See also number 3)

Grade: 0 out of 10.

8. Create additional nuclear weapons free zones (NWFZs) such as those established by the treaties of Tlatelolco and Rarotonga.

Report: "At a time when over 30,000 nuclear weapons remain in the world, NWFZs offer one of the few activities open to non-nuclear-weapon states, not just to quarantine themselves from the nuclear contagion, but to pool their efforts to resist it." Thus spoke Jayantha Dhanapala, the UN Under-Secretary-General of the Department for Disarmament Affairs in September at an international conference in Sweden on "NWFZs: Crucial Steps towards a Nuclear-Free World." Over 50 scholars, activists, diplomats from six continents called for establishing such zones as a transitional step on the way to nuclear abolition. Meanwhile, the Green Party in Aotearoa/New Zealand has launched an initiative to extend its country's historic nuclear free legislation to include all waters in its 200-mile Exclusive Economic Zone. If taken up by other countries in the Pacific, it would complicate the ability of nuclear powered and armed ships to navigate its waters. Efforts are also underway to link the existing NWFZs, and add to them, to create a true nuclear weapon free zone in the Southern Hemisphere. In the US, Las Vegas declared itself a nuclear free zone, confirming its citizens' commitment not to become the route to the nation's nuclear waste dump. Local groups see this declaration as the first step toward the creation of the Nuclear Free Great Basin (of North America).

Grade: 1 out of 10.

9. Recognize and declare the illegality of threat or use of nuclear weapons, publicly and before the World Court.

Report: Citizens around the globe continue to use the historic 1996 opinion of the International Court of Justice to push for nuclear abolition and the dismantling of the nuclear infrastructure. Groups have been especially emboldened by the breakthrough case in Scotland last year, where three anti-nuclear activists were acquitted after having damaged the research infrastructure for Trident submarines at the UK base in Faslane, Scotland. The judgement of Sheriff Gimblett in

the case is currently under review in the Scottish High Court. In the US, five nuns who conducted a plowshares action against the US Space Command in Colorado, faced up to eight years in prison if convicted of a felony. In a surprising turn of events, their case was dismissed before they could even present a defense.

Grade: 6 out of 10.

10. Establish an international energy agency to promote and support the development of sustainable and environmentally safe energy sources.

Report: This summer the North Pole became clear of ice for the first time in over 50 million years, a sobering fact that underlines the need for sustainable energy. Nuclear power cannot supply the answer despite attempts by some governments and the industry to convince the public that it can. Global warming is in itself threatening to many nuclear installations. In February, British Government scientists and experts in the nuclear industry warned that many areas predicted to be underwater by 2025 coincide with key nuclear installations. This problem is not just confined to Britain. On December 27, while Hurricane Lothar was sweeping France, the nuclear power plant on the Gironde River, Le Blayais, was flooded. Unfortunately the doors opened towards the inside, and so they could not be shut against the outside to let the water out. Nothing terrible happened, but it took some days to evacuate the water. Who knows what may happen in the future as extreme weather events in low lying areas increase?

Fortunately the case for solar, wind and wave energy gets stronger by the month. Companies and government are daily moving in the direction of renewables. Texaco has invested US \$67 million in Energy Conversion Inc. (ECD). BP Amoco has invested US \$100 million in the American green-electricity company, Green Mountain Power, and completed its 100th service-station solar panel installation. The British government's budget this summer included a tax cut of 12.5% (from 17.5% to 5 %) on the installation of solar cell systems. The Japanese will spend US \$266 million on its ongoing program for the Promotion of Photo Voltaic (PV) Systems, which aims to install 70,000 solar PV roofs in Japan by 2004. Japanese solar companies have scaled up their manufacturing significantly in response to the program.

Grade: 2 out of 10.

11. Create mechanisms to ensure the participation of citizens and NGOs in planning and monitoring the process of nuclear weapons abolition.

Report: This year the Abolition 2000 network has grown to over 2040 organizations and municipalities in over 95 countries. At the NPT Review Conference, citizen groups worked in partnership with the New Agenda Coalition delegations (Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, Aotearoa/New Zealand, South Africa, and Sweden) to promote the abolitionist agenda, but were still excluded from many of the sessions. The number of Citizen Weapons Inspection teams attempting to implement the 1996 ICJ opinion at nuclear facilities around the world continues to grow. In August, Pax Christi led an inspection of Yorktown Naval Weapons Station in Virginia. When inspectors were not admitted, a blockade shut down the base for an hour. The possibilities of what concerted action by citizens can achieve were dramatically shown on April 8 at

Greenham Common in Britain, when the fence was finally removed at the former US nuclear Cruise Missile base there. In the 1980s Greenham Common was the base for US Cruise Missiles, deployed in Europe as part of NATO's strategy for fighting a "limited nuclear war." Women from all over Britain and farther afield camped outside in non-violent resistance. On some occasions over 30,000 women gathered to "Embrace the Base" and envision a world free of nuclear weapons. The last Cruise Missiles left in 1991 as part of the INF (intermediate-range nuclear forces) Treaty of 1987. Since then local people of all political persuasions have worked to see the Common restored. On April 8, 2000 the dream became reality when the base was finally opened with an invitation to take down the nine-mile fence surrounding it. Greenham Common is once again a place for wildlife, the free grazing of cattle, picnics and play. Plans are going forward to commemorate the Women's Peace Camps with a stone circle and garden outside the Main Gate.

Grade: 5 out of 10

***From the Moorea Declaration:** "The anger and tears of colonized peoples arise from the fact that there was no consultation, no consent, no involvement in the decision when their lands, air and waters were taken for the nuclear build-up, from the very start of the nuclear era.... Colonized and indigenous peoples have, in the large part, borne the brunt of this nuclear devastation.... We reaffirm... that indigenous and colonized peoples must be central... in decisions relating to the nuclear weapons cycle - and especially in the abolition of nuclear weapons in all aspects. The inalienable right to self-determination, sovereignty and independence is crucial in allowing all peoples of the world to join in the common struggle to rid the planet forever of nuclear weapons."*

Report: For those familiar with the exploitation of colonized and indigenous people by the military powers of the world, it will come as no surprise that the main testing grounds for the US planned National Missile Defense system are on the lands of the native American Chumash people at Vandenberg Air Force base in California, and in the Marshall Islands at Kwajalein atoll in the Pacific. If NMD is ever deployed, the system will include bases in Alaska and Greenland, on indigenous lands. Representatives of the world's 152,000 Inuit people condemned US plans for deployment of the NMD system when they met at the Inuit Circumpolar Conference in Nuuk, Greenland, on August 6, 2000. Inuit peoples live in Greenland, Canada, Alaska and Russia, and their homelands will host new military infrastructure in several places across the Arctic under NMD plans.

In Australia, aboriginal people continue to resist the uranium mines at Jabiluka in Kakadu National Park, a UNESCO World Heritage Site. Western Shoshone people and their supporters have issued a call to create a Nuclear Free Great Basin in North America. Their call states in part: "The Great Basin bio-region is a beautiful, diverse and fragile area stretching through five states. Home to strong indigenous people and cultures, high mountainous alpine lakes and forests, as well as many endangered and threatened plants and wildlife. Sadly, this land has experienced the deadly effects of nuclear weapons testing as well as the disposal of radioactive and toxic waste in leaking dumps. Now is the time to create a Nuclear Free Great Basin." Western Shoshone land is home to the US nuclear test site and the proposed high level nuclear waste dump at Yucca Mountain.

Grade: 1 out of 10

Total grade: 20 out of 120

Conclusions: The dangers of continuing reliance on destructive weapons systems for our "security" was brought into sharp relief when 118 Russian submariners were killed in August as the pride of their navy - the Kursk - was wrecked in the Barents Sea. The Cold War mentality of secrecy combined with national pride and the hangover of the old Soviet culture combined to create great anger in Russia, and shock around the world. The Kursk tragedy was an awful reminder of the human cost of militarism. The deaths serve as a warning to us all that we cannot ignore the perils of our nuclear world and the new dangers developing. If President Clinton had decided to go ahead with NMD, he would have opened the way to the destruction of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, the withdrawal of Russia from further nuclear disarmament and an arms race with the Chinese. These possibilities still exist if a new President decides to give NMD the go-ahead, and should activate increased opposition at both the citizen and governmental levels.

We still need to heed Albert Einstein's prophetic reminder of April 1947: "For there is no secret and there is no defense, there is no possibility of control except through the aroused understanding and insistence of the peoples of the world." Although Abolition 2000 has been insisting on nuclear abolition for five years, our goal of concluding negotiations on a nuclear weapons convention by the end of this year appears remote. The goal is worthy and achievable. But we need the support and clamoring of the world's citizens.

As Helen Clark, Prime Minister of Aotearoa/New Zealand said in a recent speech: *"Public opinion worldwide must be mobilized again as it was in the 1980s. Non-governmental organizations must play a vital role, working alongside committed governments. ... The world must not retreat to the days when the doctrine of nuclear armament and deterrence seemed unchangeable. Perhaps our greatest challenge is complacency. We must take the opportunities that are available in this new century of globalization to prevent a renewed nuclear arms race and to work for disarmament. We all have a stake in the security of the 21st century, and we must all work together to eliminate the dangers posed by weapons of mass destruction as we strive to free our world from the fear of the catastrophe of war."*

Acknowledgements:

This edition of the Abolition 2000 Report Card is dedicated to Mordechai Vanunu. Its production was made possible with financial support from the EarthWays Foundation and the Lifebridge Foundation.

Copyright c 2000 The Atomic Mirror

Any or all parts of this report may be freely copied and distributed, with proper acknowledgement of the source. As a courtesy, please send copies containing any reprinted material to:

The Atomic Mirror

P.O. Box 220
Port Hueneme, CA 93044-0220 USA
Tel: 1 805 985 5073
Fax: 1 805 985 7563
Email: info@atomicmirror.org

Adobe pdf version designed by Clare Yerbury, c y graphics and training.
Written and compiled by Janet Bloomfield and Pamela S. Meidell
(with thanks to abolition colleagues for contributions, comments, and suggestions)
October 24, 2000.

[Janet Bloomfield <jbloomfield@gn.apc.org> is the British Coordinator of the Atomic Mirror and a consultant to the Oxford Research Group in Oxford, England; Pamela S. Meidell <pmeidell@igc.org> is the founder/director of the Atomic Mirror in Port Hueneme, California. Both have been involved with Abolition 2000 since its conception.]

Reply-To: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
From: "Brink Campaign" <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
To: "alison millar" <amillar@fourthfreedom.org>,
"anna smiles" <annabananasmls@hotmail.com>,
"anne gallivan" <agallivan@psr.org>,
"daryl kimball" <dkimball@clw.org>, "david culp" <david@fcn.org>,
"deedie runkel" <deedier@erols.com>,
"ellen barfield" <wilpfdc@wilpf.org>,
"esther pank" <brinkprogram@backfromthebrink.net>,
"howard hollman" <mupj@igc.org>, "ira shorr" <irashorr@hotmail.com>,
"jim bridgman" <jbridgman@peace-action.org>,
"kathy crandall" <kathycrandall@earthlink.net>,
"kathy guthrie" <kathy@fcn.org>,
"kimberly roberts" <kroberts@psr.org>,
"kimberly robison" <>wand@wand.org>,
"martin butcher" <mbutcher@psr.org>,
"stephanie broughton" <nuclear@wand.org>,
"steve young" <syoun@clw.org>

Subject: Presidential Call In Days date revision
Date: Sat, 28 Oct 2000 01:40:39 -0400
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)
Importance: Normal
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6600

Please note that the proposed dates for the presidential call in days are now scheduled for February 5-6. If anyone can establish a really good tie in to those dates, let us know.

Esther Pank
Back from the Brink Campaign
6856 Eastern Avenue, NW, # 322
Washington DC 20012
202.545.1001 ph
202.545.1004 fax
prgrm@backfromthebrink.net

X-Sender: skerr@[63.106.26.66]
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)
Date: Fri, 27 Oct 2000 14:29:25 -0400
To: skerr@clw.org
From: Suzy Kerr <skerr@clw.org>
Subject: Coolfont Registration Form

A request has been made for me to post the Coolfont registration form and send it to the Monday Lobby Group. Please note the date your checks are due and the amount. Let me know what night or nights you will be attending. Thanks, Suzy

Monday Lobby Retreat

Where: Coolfont Resort, Berkeley Springs, West Virginia

Depart: Tuesday, January 9, 2001

Return: Thursday, January 11, 2001

Cost: Double occupancy with meals, \$134.36 per night = \$268.72
Single occupancy with meals, \$159.36 per night = \$318.72

Check to: Council for a Livable World Education Fund, 110 Maryland Ave., N.E., Suite 409, Washington, D.C. 20002. Attention: Suzy Kerr

Deadline: Deposit must be in to Coolfont by November 21st. Please have your check in by November 17, 2000.

Organization:

Payment: \$

Name of staff person(s) attending

Single or Double

1* or 2 nights

Driving?
Y or N

* If only one night, specify whether Tuesday or Wednesday

Call Suzy Kerr at (202) 543-4100 x115 if you have a roommate preference or write it on the form.

X-Sender: jdi@[63.106.26.66]
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)
Date: Fri, 27 Oct 2000 15:30:58 -0400
To: jdi@clw.org
From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>
Subject: Senate election polling update

RECENT POLLING ON SENATE 2000 CAMPAIGNS
October 27, 2000 update

== Close races (incumbent party in parentheses): Delaware (R), Florida (R), Michigan (R), Minnesota (R), Missouri (R), Montana (R), Nebraska (D), Nevada (D), New Jersey (D), New York (D), Pennsylvania (R), Virginia (D), Washington (R)

== Longer-shot races: Georgia (D), Rhode Island, (R), Vermont (R)

==Endorsements by Council for a Livable World indicated by ***

==New polls since the last polling data was circulated: California, Florida, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin

N.B. Where available, independent polls are cited rather than those associated with a candidate or a party.

=====
California

=====
60% - Senator Dianne Feinstein (D)
35% - Rep. Tom Campbell (R)
5% - Undecided, other
L.A. Times poll conducted October 19-23, 2000 - 852 likely voters

=====
Connecticut

=====
60% - Sen. Joseph Lieberman (D)
27% - Philip Giordano (R)
10% - Undecided, other

54% - Richard Blumenthal (D)
23% - Philip Giordano (R)
20% - Undecided, other
University of Connecticut poll conducted September 26-Oct. 1, 2000 - 447 registered voters

=====
Delaware

=====
46% - Sen. Bill Roth (R)
43% - Gov. Tom Carper (D) ***
11% - Undecided

Mason Dixon poll conducted October 4-5, 2000 - 633 likely voters

=====
Florida
=====

42% - Bill Nelson (D)
34% - Bill McCollum (R)
7% - Willie Logan (I)
20% - Undecided, other

New York Times poll conducted October 22-24, 2000 - 637 registered voters

43% - Bill Nelson (D)
40% - Bill McCollum (R)
4% - Willie Logan (I)
13% - Undecided, other

Florida Voter poll conducted October 17-23, 2000 - 606 likely voters

=====
Georgia
=====

49% - Sen. Zell Miller (D)
30% - Mack Mattingly (R)
21% - Undecided, other

Mason-Dixon poll conducted October 12-14, 2000 -
627 likely voters

=====
Indiana
=====

69% - Sen. Dick Lugar (R)
18% - David Johnson (D)
13% - Undecided, other

Research 2000 poll conducted October 12-14, 2000 for the South Bend Tribune
- 604 likely voters

=====
Maine
=====

73% - Sen. Olympia Snowe (R)
16% - Mark Lawrence (D) ***
10% - Undecided, other

Critical Insights of Portland poll conducted October 15-17, 2000 - 404
registered voters

=====
Maryland
=====

58% - Sen. Paul Sarbanes (D) ***
29% - Delegate Paul Rappaport (R)
13% - Undecided

Mason-Dixon poll conducted October 6-8, 2000 - 621 likely voters

=====
Massachusetts

=====

68% - Sen. Edward Kennedy (D) ***

16% - Jack E. Robinson (R)

16% - Undecided

Boston Herald poll conducted August 29 - 31, 2000 - 410 likely voters

=====

Michigan

=====

41% - Sen. Spencer Abraham (R)

41% - Rep. Debbie Stabenow (D) ***

17% - Undecided

EPIC-MRA poll conducted October 23-25, 2000 for Detroit Free press - 600

likely voters

39% - Sen. Spencer Abraham (R)

36% - Rep. Debbie Stabenow (D) ***

25% - Undecided

Detroit News poll conducted October 23-25, 2000 by Mitchell Research - 600

likely voters

=====

Minnesota

=====

49% - Mark Dayton (D)

37% - Sen. Rod Grams (R)

14% - Undecided, other

Minneapolis Star Tribune poll conducted October 14- 18, 2000 by Market

Solutions Group - 814 likely voters

=====

Missouri

=====

46% - Sen. John Ashcroft (R)

46% - Gov. Mel Carnahan (D) *** (Died in plane crash)

8% - Undecided, other

Mason-Dixon poll conducted October 24-25, 2000 for the Kansas City Star -

625 likely voters

=====

Montana

=====

43% - Brian Schweitzer (D) ***

41% - Sen. Conrad Burns (R)

10% - Undecided, other

Montana State University-Billings poll conducted October 19-23, 2000 - 401

likely voters

45% - Sen. Conrad Burns (R)

44% - Brian Schweitzer (D) ***

11% - Undecided, other

Mason-Dixon poll conducted October 23-24, 2000 for Lee Newspapers - 628

likely voters

=====

Nebraska

=====

53% Ben Nelson (D) ***
33% Don Stenberg (R)
13% Undecided

Omaha World-Herald poll conducted September 12- 14, 2000 by RKM Research
and Comm. - 986 registered voters

=====

Nevada

=====

50% - Former Rep. John Ensign (R)
39% - Ed Bernstein (D)***
11% - Undecided

Mason-Dixon poll conducted September 9-12, 2000 - 627 regular voters

=====

New Jersey

=====

46% - Jon Corzine (D) ***
41% - Rep. Bob Franks (R)
13% - Undecided, other

Quinnipiac University poll conducted October 18-23, 2000 - 909 registered
voters

=====

New Mexico

=====

59% - Sen. Jeff Bingaman (D) ***
31% - Former Rep. Bill Redmond (R)
10% - Undecided, other

Mason Dixon poll conducted September 28-30, 2000 - 442 likely voters

=====

New York

=====

50% - Hillary Clinton (D) ***
43% - Rep. Rick Lazio (R)
7% - Undecided, other

NY1 News poll conducted October 23-25, 2000 by Blum and Weprin - 844 likely
voters

=====

North Dakota

=====

65% - Sen. Kent Conrad (D) ***
24% - Duane Sand (R)
11% - Undecided

Fargo Forum poll conducted October 2-5, 2000 by Public Affairs Institute -
586 likely voters

=====

Ohio

=====

54% - Sen. Mike DeWine (R)

31% - Ted Celeste (D)

15% - Undecided, other

Mason-Dixon poll conducted October 18-19, 2000 - 625 likely voters

=====

Pennsylvania

=====

43% - Sen. Rick Santorum (R)

35% - Rep. Ron Klink (D) ***

22% - Undecided

West Chester University poll conducted October 19- 22, 2000 for two t.v. stations - 625 registered voters

=====

Rhode Island

=====

50% - Sen. Lincoln Chafee (R) ***

34% - Rep. Robert Weygand (D)

16% - Undecided, other

Channel 12 poll conducted October 10-13, 2000 - 408 likely voters

=====

Tennessee

=====

62% - Sen. Bill Frist (R)

23% - John Kay Hooker (D)

15% - Undecided, other

Mason-Dixon poll conducted September 25-27, 2000 - 625 likely 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

=====

64% - Sen. Orrin Hatch (R)

24% - Scott Howell (D)

12% - undecided, others

Deseret News poll conducted October 9-12, 2000 by Dan Jones & Assoc. - 914 adults

=====

Vermont

=====

61% - Sen. Jim Jeffords (R) ***

33% - Ed Flanagan (D)

6% - Undecided

Research 2000 poll conducted October 23-25, 2000 for the Rutland Herald -
400 likely voters

=====
Virginia

=====
47% - Ex-Governor George Allen (R)
44% - Sen. Chuck Robb (D)
9% - Undecided

Mason-Dixon poll conducted Ocxtober 24-25, 2000 - 627 likely voters

54% - Ex-Governor George Allen (R)
39% - Sen. Chuck Robb (D)
7% - Undecided

Virginia Commonwealth Univ. poll conducted October 18-24, 2000 - 596 likely
voters

=====
Washington

=====
46% - Sen. Slade Gorton (R)
43% - Maria Cantwell (D) ***
11% - Undecided, other candidates

Elway poll conducted October 18-20, 2000 - 400 registered voters

=====
Wisconsin

=====
64% - Sen. Herbert Kohl (D) ***
27% - John Gillespie (R)
9% - Undecided

Wisconsin Policy Research Institute poll conducted October 18-21, 2000 by
Harris Interactive - 587 likely voters

=====
Wyoming

=====
68% - Sen. Craig Thomas (R)
14% - Mel Logan (D)
18% - Undecided, other

Mason-Dixon poll conducted September 16-17, 2000 - 412 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

X-Sender: jameshipkn@mail.sssnet.com (Unverified)
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.0
Date: Sat, 28 Oct 2000 23:11:42 -0400
To: Hallman <mupj@igc.apc.org>
From: JamesHipkins <jameshipkin@sssnet.com>
Subject:

Howard:

Got your letter. This issue will be on the proposal you wrote on the International Peace Force proposal. I have three letters from Hebron from a friend who was with the Christian Peace Making Team there. It gives a vivid example of what can be done. Your idea for the January issue sounds good.

Charlotte is having surgery this next Thursday. She has Cancer in her left breast. She is in good spirits and hope it is localized. We will know more after the surgery. I have to find some ones financing permit to use and hope that can be done. I have a good lead, so will see what can be done. I will have the issue printed in Sevierville. I don't think we can get it cheaper. Keep in touch and I will let you know how surgery goes in Thurs. Hope to have the Peace Leaf in the mail before Thanksgiving. Hopefully in a couple of weeks.

Jim

X-eGroups-Return: sentto-1413460-1656-972933290-mupj=igc.apc.org@returns.onelist.com
X-Sender: johnburroughs@earthlink.net
X-Apparently-To: abolition-caucus@egroups.com
X-Sender: johnburroughs@mail.earthlink.net
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0.1
To: abolition-caucus@egroups.com
Cc: mpi@ippnw.org, Jhwurst@aol.com
From: John Burroughs <johnburroughs@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: Mon, 30 Oct 2000 14:14:22 -0500
Subject: [abolition-caucus] URGENT: New Agenda revisions

The new version of the New Agenda draft is out (L.4/Rev. 1). My first, quick read is that most of the changes are in the preambular paras. Only Op. Para 16 is changed- an addition to the NSA para that legally-binding assurances would "strengthen the nuclear non-proliferation regime." Op. Para 18 (instrument or framework of instruments) is unchanged.

In the preambular paras, some of the obvious changes are: "underlining the fundamental significance of the unequivocal undertaking" is now "taking into consideration..."; the word "urgent" is dropped from the line "underlining the need for action to achieve a world free from nuclear weapons;" and concerned that negotiations are "not actively under way" rather than "stalled."

It is likely the revised text will be formally introduced this afternoon in the First Committee and voted on Tuesday morning. It's 1pm NY time now.

The full text will soon be posted on www.reachingcriticalwill.org

Again this is a quick read, more later today.

Jim Wurst, UN Coordinator, Middle Powers Initiative and
Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy

----- eGroups Sponsor ----->
eGroups eLerts
It's Easy. It's Fun. Best of All, it's Free!
http://click.egroups.com/1/9698/3/_/91925/_/972933290/
----- _->

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

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

From: "Bob and Elaine Tiller" <tiller64@starpower.net>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: (abolition-usa) Rehearsing Doomsday to air October 15
Date: Sat, 28 Oct 2000 18:30:53 -0400
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2314.1300
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300

Howard,

Have you heard anything about a rebroadcast of this? I missed it, and would like to see it.

Bob Tiller

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

From: Howard W. Hallman <mupj@igc.org>
To: <mupj@igc.org>
Sent: Monday, October 02, 2000 2:08 PM
Subject: (abolition-usa) Rehearsing Doomsday to air October 15

> Dear Colleagues:

>
> I call the following information to your attention.

>
> Shalom,
> Howard

>
>>Date: Mon, 02 Oct 2000 12:09:34 -0500
>>From: Kevin Martin <kmartin@fourthfreedom.org>
>>X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win98; U)
>>X-Accept-Language: en
>>To: Kevin Martin <kmartin@fourthfreedom.org>
>>Subject: (abolition-usa) Rehearsing Doomsday to air October 15
>>X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by elk1.elkhart.net

id
> MAA12602
>>Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
>>Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

>>
>>Dear Friends:

>>
>>Less than two weeks remain until the George Crile documentary
>>"Rehearsing Doomsday" will air on CNN Sunday, October 15 at 10:00
>>eastern, 7:00 pacific time, but there's still time to order a watch
>>party organizing kit from Project Abolition. Call us at 219/535-1110 or
>>email me at <kmartin@fourthfreedom.org>. Below is my original notice
>>from last week.

>>
>>
>>Kevin Martin
>>***

>>
>>To: Peace and Disarmament activists
>>Fr: Kevin Martin, Director, Project Abolition
>>September 25, 2000
>>
>>Rehearsing Doomsday documentary to air on CNN October 15
>>
>>Rehearsing Doomsday, a documentary produced by George Crile whose
>>notable documentary "The
>>Missiliers" aired last February on "60 Minutes II," gives an
>>unprecedented look at the nuclear
>>arsenals of both the United States and Russia. Unlike any yet produced,
>>this documentary will
>>take us on a journey to meet the generals and commanders responsible for
>>nuclear weapons, the
>>missiliers charged with firing them, and the politicians who craft our
>>policies.
>>
>>We all know that the Russians are eager to reduce their nuclear
>>stockpile and that a string of
>>former US generals and cabinet secretaries, haunted by their actions,
>>have become
>>abolitionists. This documentary is different. Rehearsing Doomsday will
>>expose the hypocrisy
>>of current nuclear policy with portraits of Senators, frustrated by
>>their lack of access to
>>knowledge, and missiliers, gravely concerned as they watch the American
>>people sleepwalk toward
>>armageddon.
>>
>>Rehearsing Doomsday will be broadcast Sunday, October 15 at 10:00 p.m.
>>eastern, 7:00 pacific
>>time on CNN (The documentary may also air on another date, we'll let you
>>know as soon as we
>>find out). Thanks and kudos are due to the Global Security Institute,
>>headed by former U.S.
>>Sen. Alan Cranston, for working with George Crile and CNN to get this
>>show on the air.
>>
>>Let's put this much-anticipated documentary to good use in the election
>>season. Here are some
>>suggestions for peace and disarmament activists:
>>
>>1. Organize a Rehearsing Doomsday watch party in a private home, church
>>or place of worship,
>>college campus, or other community meeting center. Last spring, Project
>>Abolition, the Global
>>Security Institute, and the Disarmament Clearinghouse organized over 100
>>watch parties around
>>the country for the live CBS television re-make of the anti-nuclear
>>thriller Fail Safe. Please
>>contact Project Abolition at 219/535-1110 or kmartin@fourthfreedom.org
>>for a house party
>>organizing kit. If the broadcast times are inconvenient, you can

>>videotape the show and hold
>>your watch party on another day and time. Be sure to invite your local
>>media to your watch
>>party.
>>
>>2. Bird-dog congressional candidates and demand to know how they will
>>work to reduce the
>>nuclear threat if they are elected or re-elected. Show up at candidate
>>debates, rallies or
>>town meetings prepared to ask tough questions of the candidates. You can
>>also bring your local
>>peace group's literature to hand out attendees.
>>
>>3. Use the broadcast of Rehearsing Doomsday to raise nuclear abolition
>>as an issue with your
>>local media. Project Abolition will provide sample letters to the
>>editor. You can also
>>contact your local newspaper's television critic and encourage her or
>>him to preview or review
>>Rehearsing Doomsday. After the broadcast, you can refer to the show and
>>the concerns it raises
>>in encouraging your local media to cover the nuclear issue and to raise
>>it with candidates in
>>editorial board meetings or candidate debates.
>>
>>-
>> 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.
>>
> Howard W. Hallman, Chair
> Methodists United for Peace with Justice
> 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036
> Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail: mupj@igc.org
>
> Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a membership association of
> laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any Methodist denomination.
>

Date: Mon, 30 Oct 2000 14:46:23 -0600 (CST)
From: MCI WorldCom Online Account Manager <iot-internet@wcom.com>
Subject: Welcome to Online Account Manager
To: mupj@igc.org
Reply-to: for.home.services@wcom.com
X-Authentication-warning: omzolcs2.mcit.com: wwwsvr set sender to
iot-internet@wcom.com using -f

Dear METHODISTS UNITED FOR PEACE,

Thank you for enrolling in Online Account Manager from MCI WorldCom(sm). To service and manage your account, simply visit Online Account Manager at <http://www.mci.com/service> and enter the Username and Password that you selected:

Username mupj
Password *****

Please note: Your Password is not displayed above for security reasons.

Use Online Account Manager to:

- * View your current and past MCI WorldCom(sm) statements
- * Update your name and address
- * Review your current MCI WorldCom services
- * Add new products to your account
- * E-mail questions to customer service
- * And much more!

MCI WorldCom is pleased to provide you with Online Account Manager, the most convenient way to manage your MCI WorldCom account.

Sincerely,
MCI WorldCom Online Customer Service

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

Phil,

I'm mailing you the latest phone bill for MUPJ. It totals \$132.31. This includes \$98.97 due from the previous month and the balance for this month. I have no recollection of receiving the previous phone bill and have nothing in my file, such as the return envelope. I've checked the MCI charges on-line for the previous month, and they are okay. So go ahead and pay the full amount.

Thanks,
Howard

P.S. I am getting \$500 from the UM General Board of Church and Society to help pay the expenses of my trip to Brussels. The remaining \$300 will come from the Rockefeller grant. I'll bill after the GBCS payment arrives.

Date: Mon, 30 Oct 2000 22:26:52 -0500 (EST)
To: mupj@igc.org
From: orders@www.hallmark.com
Subject: Your Hallmark E-Card has been viewed

Hi Howard W. Hallman,

vhall110@southwind.net just read the e-card you sent from Hallmark.com. Our thanks again for sending it. We hope you'll be back to send more e-cards and to shop our gifts, gift certificates, fresh flowers, cookies, Keepsake Ornaments - all kinds of things we sell online. Want a shortcut?

<http://gifts.hallmark.com>
<http://flowers.hallmark.com>
http://www.hallmark.com/hmk/Website/pass_gifts.jsp

About that e-card. If you want to see it again yourself, you still can. Just click this link or copy and paste it into the address line of your Web browser:

<http://ecardview.hallmark.com/hmk/Website/greeting.jsp?id=EG4048-542066-9245268>

Jan Scott
Hallmark.com

X-eGroups-Return: sentto-1413460-1661-972955875-mupj=igc.apc.org@returns.onelist.com
X-Sender: johnburroughs@earthlink.net
X-Apparently-To: abolition-caucus@egroups.com
X-Sender: johnburroughs@mail.earthlink.net
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0.1
To: abolition-caucus@egroups.com
Cc: jhwurst@aol.com
From: John Burroughs <johnburroughs@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: Mon, 30 Oct 2000 20:31:44 -0500
Subject: [abolition-caucus] More on revisions to New Agenda res.

October 30, 2000 8:30 pm

The new version of the New Agenda draft is out (L.4/Rev. 1). Most of the changes are in the preambular paras. Only Op. Para 16 is changed - an addition to the NSA para that legally-binding assurances would "strengthen the nuclear non-proliferation regime." Op. Para 18 (instrument or framework of instruments) is unchanged.

In the preambular paras, the changes are: "underlining the fundamental significance of the unequivocal undertaking" is now "taking into consideration...."; the word "urgent" is dropped from the line "underlining the need for [urgent] action to achieve a world free from nuclear weapons" and this phrase has been decoupled from the para "welcoming" the NPT Conference Final Document (thus separating abolition from the NPT); concerned that negotiations are "not actively under way" rather than "stalled;" instead of "recalling" the ICJ Opinion, it now is "noting;" and "concerned" about the three states without safeguarded nuclear facilities is now "noting."

Clearly the subtle softening of the language is meant to appeal to the NNWS of NATO. It does look better than ever that they will vote for the draft. Of the P5, China is a likely yes and Russia is a likely abstention. The three Western NWS are "in a grey zone," according to one delegate.

The draft will not be voted on Tuesday. Negotiations are continuing in light of the revisions so Wednesday is now the earliest date, with a real possibility of a delay until Thursday.

Jim Wurst, UN Coordinator, Middle Powers Initiative and
Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy

----- eGroups Sponsor ----->
eLerts
It's Easy. It's Fun. Best of All, it's Free!
http://click.egroups.com/1/9699/3/_/91925/_/972955875/
----- _->

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: flick@pop.igc.org (Unverified)
Date: Tue, 31 Oct 2000 10:28:49 -0400
To: updates@reachingcriticalwill.org
From: Felicity Hill <flick@igc.org>
Subject: WEEK 4 FIRST COMMITTEE REPORT
Cc: wilpf-news@igc.topica.com

<x-rich><center><bold>REPORT ON THE FOURTH WEEK OF THE
FIRST COMMITTEE OF THE UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY
</bold></center><bold>

</bold>Dear First Committee watchers,

Voting on resolutions began on Wednesday, October 25 in the First Committee.

While these resolutions are not legally binding, they set norms, raising the

bar for disarmament, and provide an indicator of the level of political will

by governments to carry out their disarmament obligations. These votes act

as recommendations to the General Assembly, which will take them up in

November or December.

A listing of the remaining resolutions which are to be voted on the week of

30 October can be found at the end of this report. Texts are on-line at

www.reachingcriticalwill.org:. This is the final week of the First

Committee, which is scheduled to go through Friday but may wrap up earlier.

In terms of NGO work, we held our third successful roundtable with

governments which will be followed by a fourth and final one on Thursday,

November 2. We also held a press conference on key First Committee issues

(see reports below).

Contained in this week's report:

Actions by the First Committee (Disarmament), Friday October 27

1. Disarmament Education
2. Environmental Norms
3. Disarmament and Development
4. Role of Science and Technology
5. Other resolutions
6. ICJ Resolution
7. Nuclear Disarmament/New Agenda
8. NPT
9. Other Drafts
10. US and Pakistan - statements
11. Nuclear Weapon Free Zones
12. Other Conventional Disarmament Issues
13. Special Session on Disarmament IV
14. Government/NGO roundtable
15. News conference
16. UN Disarmament Display Opened
17. Remaining resolutions to be voted on by the First Committee as of Oct. 28

We will vary from our once-weekly reports during these final days of the

First Committee to send you timely updates on the voting.

Felicity Hill - WILPF, Merav Datan - IPPNW/PSR, Pam Jordan - NGO Committee

on Disarmament, Jim Wurst - LCNP, David Jackman - QUNO, Tyrone Savage

-

World Policy Institute, Tracy Moavero - Peace Action Education Fund,

Alyn Ware - Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy

Actions by the First Committee (Disarmament), Friday October 27

1. Disarmament Education

Resolution A/C.1/55/L.10, entitled United Nations study on disarmament and

non-proliferation education was adopted without a vote (ie by consensus).

Prior to the vote, the Secretary of the First Committee explained the

financial implications of the resolution and the proposed work program for

the group of qualified governmental experts that would be established to

undertake the study. The study would take two years at a cost of \$130,000

per year and report to the UN General Assembly in 2002. Algeria, Egypt and

New Zealand were added to the list of cosponsors.

2. Environmental Norms

Resolution A/C.1/55/L.21 entitled Observance of environmental norms in the

drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control

was adopted by a vote of 149 in favour, 4 abstentions (US, France, UK and

Israel). Iraq charged that the UK and US violated these norms in their use

of depleted uranium munitions in Iraq and Serbia, noting that such weapons

can continue releasing ionizing radiation for thousands of years. The US, in

explaining their abstention, stated that they see no connection between

environmental standards and disarmament and arms control agreements, which

are complex enough as it is. However, they argued that the US adopts stringent domestic regulations for environmental protection.

3. Disarmament and Development

Resolution A/C.1/55/L.22 entitled Relationship between disarmament and

development, was adopted without a vote. It urges the international

community to devote part of the resources made available by disarmament to

economic and social development, and urges the Steering Committee on

Disarmament and Development to enhance its program of activities. However

the US did not participate in the vote and argued that disarmament and

development are two distinct issues. The US said that they were not bound by

the decisions of the International Conference on Disarmament and Development

as they did not participate in the conference.

4. Role of Science and Technology

Resolution A/C.1/55/L.31 entitled Role of science and technology in the

context of international security and disarmament, was adopted by a vote of

91 in favour, 44 against and 17 abstentions. The resolution urges

member

States to undertake multilateral negotiations on non-discriminatory

guidelines for transfer of dual-use goods and technologies. The high number

of no votes indicates concerns of many countries about the proliferation

risks of international transfers of dual-use goods and technologies.

5. Other resolutions

The First Committee also adopted the following resolutions without a vote:

A/C.1/55/L.6 Developments in the field of information and telecommunications

in the context of international security

A/C.1/55/L.15 Consolidation of peace through practical disarmament measures

A/C.1/55/L.27 Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean

region

Alyn Ware, Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy

6 ICJ Resolution

Resolution A/C.1/55/L.48, entitled Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the

International Court of Justice on the Legality of the Threat or Use of

Nuclear Weapons, was deferred until Monday for action. Canada, as it did

last year, has reportedly requested a separate vote on paragraph 1, which

underlines the ICJ's unanimous conclusion that there is an obligation to

complete nuclear disarmament negotiations. However, no request has been

made

so far for a separate vote on paragraph 2, which calls for implementation of

that obligation by the commencement of negotiations leading to the conclusion of a nuclear weapons convention.

Alyn Ware, Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy

7. Nuclear Disarmament/New Agenda

NEW AGENDA

The New Agenda (NA) resolution is scheduled to be voted on Tuesday morning,

31 October.

Amb. Henrik Salander of Sweden introduced the NA draft (L.4) on behalf of 60

co-sponsors on 23 October. He said the NA draft's co-sponsors "have challenged complacency in the fulfillment of the obligation to advance the

pursuit of nuclear disarmament. They have insisted that each requisite step

in this process be addressed within the perspectives of an unequivocal

commitment to the total elimination of nuclear weapons." He also said the

draft "sets out a comprehensive program of action . . . There is an imperative

built into this approach that requires results in each of the segments of

action. The co-sponsors are determined to monitor the achievement of these

results in light of the unequivocal commitment recently made."

In a subtle rebuttal to the charge that the NA goes beyond the NPT consensus,

Salander said, "The Final Document is neither as far-reaching nor as detailed

as the states parties were entitled to expect. The compromise it represents

reinforces the determination of the co-sponsors of this text that the steps

agreed at the Review Conference shall indeed be implemented without prevarication or delay."

As of Friday, 27 October, it appears likely that the NA draft will be

revised, with the new text changing some of the preambular language to make

it more acceptable to the West. In particular, the preambular para on

"unequivocal undertaking" would change from "underlining the fundamental

significance of..." to something softer like "taking note of..." It would

remain a preambular para. The important Operative Paragraph 18 (instruments

or framework of instruments) remains.

While it is still not clear how the Western NWS will vote (China is likely

to

vote yes; Russia is very noncommittal), it is looking better that the NNWS

members of NATO will find the new draft easy to accept (many were leaning

towards a yes vote with the original draft).

<bold>8. THE NPT RESOLUTION

</bold>The brief (four paragraph) draft welcoming the results of the 2000 NPT

Review

Conference (L.7) was adopted on 25 October with only the four states outside

the NPT not supporting the draft. The vote was 142 to one (India) with three

abstentions (Cuba, Israel and Pakistan). India was outspoken in its

criticism

of the draft and the NPT Final Document, calling the NPT "discriminatory and

ineffective" and saying the Final Document contained "unwarranted" criticism

of India. [For those with access to the official computerized voting chart,

you will see the vote as 141 to two instead of 142 to one. Cape Verde pushed

the wrong bottom and did not change it before the voting machine was locked.]

<bold>9. OTHER DRAFTS OF NOTE

</bold>The other key nuclear disarmament drafts - by JAPAN and MYANMAR - were not

dealt with this week, nor was INDIA's resolution on "Reducing nuclear danger."

The Iranian draft on MISSILES has been revised (L.1/Rev. 1) and issued on

Friday. The request for a UN expert study on missiles has been dropped, and

replaced with a request that the Secretary-General "further... seek the view

of member states on the issue of missiles in all its aspects and submit
a

report to the General Assembly" next year. This is a repeat of last
year's

pattern where the request for a study was dropped in favor of a simple

request for information. Iran didn't formally introduce the draft on
Friday

or explain the change, but it's clear that the Western powers are not
happy

with the UN dealing with this subject.

<bold>10. THE UNITED STATES AND PAKISTAN

</bold>Amb. Robert Grey of the US and Amb. Munir Akram of Pakistan both
gave quite

detailed critiques of the some the nuclear weapons drafts the First

Committee

is considering (both texts are on the "reachingcriticalwill" website)
in

speeches on Monday, 23 October. Neither mentioned the NA by name, but
the

implications were very clear.

Grey said draft resolutions using the language of the NPT's Final
Document

but which take "individual disarmament measures out of their context...
or

[attempt] to expand the undertakings given in the Review Conference's

results, can only endanger the Conference's hard-won consensus." The
US

"will

evaluate proposals to follow up on the NPT Review Conference results by
how

faithfully they reflect the Review Conference consensus," he said. Grey
was

less diplomatic in reference to the Fissile Materials Cut-Off Treaty (FMCT)

talks, which he said were a "prisoner of political maneuvering." He blasted

"two or perhaps three states" in the CD who "continue to frustrate" efforts

to get the negotiations underway. "One excuse after another has been offered

for not permitting FMCT to go forward, from the need to curb a non-existent

arms race in outer space to the United States' initiative for a limited

national missile defense," he added. Grey said the draft on the ABM was

"unnecessary" in light of Clinton's decision to defer a decision on deployment.

Akram criticized the NPT Conference for criticizing the South Asian nuclear

tests of 1998 but not earlier tests by other countries and for calling for

the conclusion of a FMCT within five years but not setting a similar deadline

for the elimination of nuclear weapons. He said Pakistan supports FMCT negotiations, "but we will not accept any obligations which are in advance

of

the conclusion of these negotiations, specially those which are arbitrary

and

inequitable." Akram also said his government "will not find it possible to

support any draft resolution... which welcomes the results of the NPT Review

Conference or incorporates the discriminatory and unacceptable elements of its decisions."

Jim Wurst, LCNP

11. Nuclear Weapons Free Zones

Four NWFZs drafts were adopted by consensus this week: The Treaty of

Tlatelolco (L.8); "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region

of the Middle East" (L.16); Mongolia's nuclear-weapon-free status (L.40/Rev.

1); and "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia (L.45/Rev. 1).

The Middle East draft was the only one to draw any comment. This resolution

passes by consensus every year regardless of how well or poorly overall

relations are among the peoples of the Middle East since all states in the

region officially support the principle of a NWFZ. However, as Israel pointed

out when the draft was adopted on 26 October, its position is that "such a

zone can only be established through direct negotiations" among the states

of

the region after all states are recognized each other. The draft is silent

on

this point.

This leaves only the contentious draft on the southern hemisphere zone

(L.19)

and Belarus' Central and Eastern European nuclear free "space" (L.46)
to be

considered.

Jim Wurst, LCNP

12. Other Conventional Disarmament Issues

Among the resolutions relating to conventional disarmament are those

pertaining to certain conventional weapons, L.50, ("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" (CCW)); landmines, L.44, ("Implementation of the Convention on
the

Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of

Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction" (Ottawa Convention));
and the

UN Register of Conventional Arms, L.43, ("Transparency in Armaments").

The resolution on certain conventional weapons, introduced on October
19 by

Sweden on behalf of almost 60 co-sponsoring delegations, passed by
consensus

on October 25. The resolution seeks greater adherence to the 1980 CCW
and

its protocols. The CCW is a framework convention restricting the use
of

certain weapons in armed conflict. The four protocols deal with

fragmentation weapons (Protocol I), landmines, booby traps and other devices

(Protocol II), incendiary weapons (Protocol III), and blinding laser weapons

(Protocol IV). The resolution recommends that the next review conference be

held in December 2001 and also sets two preparatory committee meetings for

April and September.

Amb. Petocz of Slovakia, president-designate of the second annual conference

and acting president of the first annual conference of the states parties to

the Amended Protocol II, reported on the first annual conference on 20

October. The conference considered matters relating to greater adherence to

Amended Protocol II, avoiding duplication of existing activities with regard

to antipersonnel landmines covered by the Ottawa Convention, NGO

participation in the work of the subsidiary bodies of the conference, and

national annual reports.

The resolution on landmines passed on October 26, with a vote of 127 in

favor, no opposing, and 22 abstentions (Azerbaijan, China, Cuba, Congo,

Egypt, India, Iran, Israel, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Libya,

Micronesia, Morocco, Myanmar, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Russia, Syria,

US, Uzbekistan, and Viet Nam). The resolution, introduced by Norway on

October 19, invites additional accession to the Ottawa Convention, urges

ratification by those who have signed and not yet ratified, and supports

improved implementation and compliance.

It also calls on all states and relevant parties "to work together to promote, support and advance the care, rehabilitation and social and economic integration of mine victims, mine awareness programmes, and the removal of anti-personnel mines placed throughout the world and the assurance of their destruction." The resolution further invites state and NGO participation in inter-sessional work and requests the necessary preparations for the Third Meeting of States Parties, to be held in Nicaragua in September 2001.

The resolution on "Transparency in armaments" introduced by the Netherlands

on October 18 on behalf of 97 states, calls on UN member states to submit

the requested data for the UN Register of Conventional Arms by May 31

annually, "with a view to achieving universal participation." The resolution

also reaffirms the GA decision to keep the scope of and participation in the

Register under review. The resolution has not yet come to a vote in the

First Committee.

Colombia, on behalf of the countries members of the Rio Group, expressed

support for the further development of and wider participation in the UN

Register of Conventional Arms, in the context of promoting transparency in

defence policies. In June 1999, the Inter-American Convention on

Transparency in Conventional Weapons Acquisitions was opened for signature.

In addition to imports and exports, States Parties would also provide

information on procurements through national production.

Speaking for the Rio Group Colombia noted further that "it is necessary to

involve arms producing countries so that they would discourage investments

in the development of and research into new types of arms, promote the

conversion of military industries and adequately monitor trading circuits

and arms transfers to prevent diversion into illicit channels.

Arms-importing countries should therefore exercise moderation in their

demand and thus avoid promoting arms races."

(See also report of the Group of Experts on the UN Register of Conventional

Arms, covered in Week 2 UNGA First Committee Report.)

Merav Datan

PSR/IPPNW

13. Special Session on Disarmament IV

A broadly-worded resolution sponsored by South Africa was adopted by

consensus: " . . . Decides, subject to the emergence of a consensus on its

objectives and agenda, to convene the fourth special session of the General

Assembly devoted to disarmament". The Secretary-General is asked to seek

the views of member states on the timing, agenda and objectives of such a

session for a report to next year's General Assembly. As member states have

been unable to reach consensus on SSOD IV after years of discussion, such a

session appears to remain a ways off. Post-First Committee our NGO group

plans to investigate the benefits and drawbacks of SSOD-IV the international

conference to reduce nuclear dangers which was proposed by Kofi Annan in his

Millenium report. We want to get a sense of which option seems most useful

and viable so we can work to support whichever option(s) seem best.

Tracy Moavero

Peace Action Education Fund

14. Government/NGO Roundtable

The third roundtable of governments and NGOs took place on October 25. Among

the topics discussed were the Mexican Resolution on a Disarmament Study [to

be completed by Alyn].

The subject of national missile defense (NMD) and space was also discussed.

Preserving the ABM treaty is a priority for a number of states, and it is

hoped that the resolution on this issue will send a strong message from the

international community to the US and assist US leadership in "taking the

right step". It was stated that a US amendment of the ABM treaty would change the main content of the treaty, making it irrelevant. The Iranian resolution calling for a study on missile proliferation was called a "positive idea".

The UN conference on small arms was discussed primarily with regard to the

question of NGO access. There was disagreement over the best "realistic"

model that NGOs might expect and whether we can reasonably hope for better

than the NPT model. Supportive governments would like to see transparency

and NGO participation (with the understanding that this is a government

conference). It was stated that the issue affects entire societies,

therefore NGO participation is important for implementing outcomes. In

addition, NGO expertise would offer valuable input. No delegations (or NGOs)

would like to see this issue hijack the agenda or delay consideration of

important and substantive issues. The question is when and how it can be

resolved quickly and without taking up First Committee or PrepCom time.

A delegate from Mexico explained that their resolution calling for a study

group on nuclear disarmament education had been challenged on two fronts: a)

that disarmament education was the responsibility of UNESCO, not the General

Assembly, and that it would require additional resources. Mexico was

preparing responses to these including details on costs (see Actions by

First Committee: Disarmament Education above).

A delegate from South Africa commented on the relationship between the calls

for the Fourth UN Special Session on Disarmament (South Africa introduces a

resolution on this on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM)), the NPT

Review Process and the call for an international conference to reduce

nuclear dangers (which has been made by the UN Secretary-General and in a

resolution introduced by India and noted in the Millennium Summit

statement). He noted that the Special Session on Disarmament had a wide

agenda including conventional disarmament and weapons of mass destruction,

while the international conference proposal was focused on nuclear dangers.

The South African delegate also spoke on the NAM resolution on disarmament

and development, which calls on the international community to use resources

released from disarmament for social and economic development particularly

of the developing countries. He noted that there were no international

mechanisms to assist this. It was suggested by an NGO that a first step may

be for the UN to maintain an account of military expenditures and of

resources which had been transferred to social and economic development.

Merav Datan

Physicians for Social Responsibility & International Physicians for
the

Prevention of Nuclear War

Alyn Ware, Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy

15. News Conference

The NGO network organized a news conference on 25 October (the
first day of

voting in the First Committee) to highlight for journalists some of the
key

issues before the Committee: nuclear disarmament (especially the New
Agenda

resolution), small arms and the continuing debate over the ABM Treaty
and

ballistic missile defenses (BMD). The UN Department for Disarmament
Affairs

sponsored the briefing.

Darach MacFhionnbhairr of Ireland spoke about the New Agenda draft and
Jean

Du Preez of South Africa focused on small arms, especially the
conference to

be held in 2001. William Hartung of the World Policy Institute wove
together

the issues of the ABM Treaty, the US proposal for a BMD, and the
Iranian

draft resolution on missiles. Merav Datan of IPPNW/PSR addressed other

nuclear disarmament issues and facilitated the briefing.

MacFhionnbhairr said the NA draft "captures the language" of the 2000
NPT

Review Conference and is thus part of "a continuous process" towards a
new

orientation towards reducing nuclear weapons and their strategic importance.

Du Preez said a key issue that will be dealt with by the Small Arms

Conference next year will be how to use national and regional experiences in

the control and reduction of small arms in developing international

strategies. He said the conference could realistically only set political

goals, with the implementation up to the nations themselves. Hartung said

there is "a significant gulf" between the ABM draft resolution and the US

position. He said he hoped the US could be brought around to working to

limit missile threats through diplomacy rather than through developing a

BMD.

Jim Wurst, LCNP

16. UN Disarmament Display Opened

On October 23, the UN opened a new display on disarmament. UN Messenger of

Peace Michael Douglas opened the exhibit, which is on the third floor of the

UN General Assembly building. Under-Secretary-General for Communications and

Public Information, Kensaku Hogen, and the Under-Secretary-General for

Disarmament Affairs, Jayantha Dhanapala, also participated in the opening

ceremony.

The exhibit presents historical and current aspects of the nuclear arms race

as well as the threat posed by other weapons of mass destruction, such as

chemical and biological weapons, and the continuing proliferation of small

arms, landmines and other conventional weapons. It provides comparisons of

military expenditures with expenditures on social services, such as health

and education. Finally, it portrays the role of the United Nations and

others in this key area, citing the treaties, conventions and other

international agreements which have been negotiated and adopted over the

years.

The exhibit was produced by the Department of Public Information and the

Department for Disarmament Affairs (DDA). For more information, please

contact Mr. Michael Cassandra at DDA, tel. (212) 963- 7714; e-mail:

cassandra@un.org website <http://www.un.org/Depts/dda/index.html>

Alyn Ware, LCNP

17. Remaining resolutions to be voted on by the First Committee as of Oct. 28

L. 1 Islamic Republic of Iran Draft Resolution Re: Missiles

L. 2 ABM Draft Resolution

L.4 Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: the need for a new agenda

(Note: another revised draft expected for Monday, 30 October)

L.11 Assistance to States for Curbing illicit traffic in small arms and

collecting them

L19. Draft Resolution Re: Nuclear Weapon free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas

L.19/Rev.1 Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas

L.25 Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space

L.28 Small Arms: draft decision on the 2001 Conference

L29. Egypt Resolution Re: The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle

East

L30. Draft Resolution Re: Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons

L.32.Rev 1 Reducing Nuclear Danger

L.34 Regional Disarmament

L37. Draft Resolution Re: Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty

L.38/Rev.1 Illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons

L39. Japan Draft Resolution Re: A path to the total elimination of nuclear

weapons

L.41 Nuclear Disarmament - Myanmar draft

L42. Draft Resolution Re: Convention on the Prohibition of the Development,

Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons

and on Their Destruction

L43. Draft Resolution Re: Transparency in armaments

L46. Belarus Draft Resolution Re: Regional disarmament

L47. Draft Resolution Re: Maintenance of international

security-good-neighbourliness, stability and development of South-Eastern

Europe

L48. Draft Resolution Re: Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the

International Court of Justice on the Legality of the Threat or Use of
Nuclear Weapons

L49. Canada Draft Resolution on FMCT

L.51 Regional confidence-building measures: activities of the United
Nations

Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa

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

</x-rich>

X-Sender: flick@pop.igc.org (Unverified)
Date: Tue, 31 Oct 2000 10:36:01 -0400
To: updates@reachingcriticalwill.org
From: Felicity Hill <flick@igc.org>
Subject: daily update
Cc: wilpf-news@igc.topica.com

<x-rich><bold>Daily NGO report on Comm I: October 30

</bold>This is the first of daily reports we will be sending out for the duration

of the First Committee now that many of the most important resolutions are

coming up for consideration. Five nuclear disarmament drafts were voted on

and several (including the New Agenda and the Japanese drafts) have been

revised. There was a vote on the outer space resolution. The draft decision

on the dates and venue for the 2001 Small Arms Conference was issued today.

The New Agenda resolution will NOT be voted on Tuesday, it now looks like

Wednesday at the earliest.

Comm I officers still say the committee can end by Wednesday, Nov. 1, a full

two days ahead of schedule. Our guess is that it will have to go into

Thursday.

In this report:

1. Nuclear Disarmament Resolution Votes
2. New Agenda Update
3. Other Nuclear Disarmament Revisions
4. Outer Space

5. Small Arms

6. ICJ Resolution

Check out www.reachingcriticalwill.org for the revised texts and computerized voting tables for today's votes. A more comprehensive overview of the week will be produced after the Committee ends.

1. Votes on Nuclear Disarmament Resolutions Today (30 Oct.)

L. 30: "Convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons." 101 to

42 with 14 abstentions. Always a contentious resolution, many states find it

too extreme. The US (which voted no) said the proposal "is not the type of

convention the US would approve, negotiate or sign."

L.32/ Rev. 1: "Reducing nuclear danger." 101 to 42 with 14 abstentions. The

Indian-sponsored draft calls for "a review of nuclear doctrines and...

immediate and urgent steps to reduce the risks of unintentional and

accidental use of nuclear weapons." The US (a no vote) said it was

"unrealistic" and pretended the NPT Review Conference never happened.

(The

revision added co-sponsored, the text is unchanged.)

L.37: "CTBT". 149 to zero with seven abstentions (Bhutan, India, Lebanon,

Libya, Mauritius, Syria, and Tanzania).

L.41 "Nuclear Disarmament" (the Myanmar draft): 99 to 39 with 17

abstentions.

There's a lot in this that most NWS and some of their allies don't like

-

"specified framework of time," de-alerting, an international conference on

nuclear disarmament - but by welcoming the NPT Conference outcome and

ignoring some non-aligned proposals, some non-aligned had problems with it.

As a result, the voting is spread all over the board. There was a separate

para vote on Op. Para 9 welcoming the "positive outcome" of the NPT

Conference and referred to the pledge "to accomplish the total elimination

of... nuclear arsenals leading to nuclear disarmament." The vote was 139 to

two (India and Israel) with 16 abstentions. China voted yes; the US, UK,

France, Russia and Pakistan abstained.

(See separate heading for the ICJ vote.)

2. New Agenda Update

The new version of the New Agenda draft is out (L.4/Rev. 1). Most of the

changes are in the preambular paras. Only Op. Para 16 is changed - an

addition to the NSA para that legally-binding assurances would "strengthen

the nuclear non-proliferation regime." Op. Para 18 (instrument or framework

of instruments) is unchanged.

In the preambular paras, the changes are: "underlining the fundamental

significance of the unequivocal undertaking" is now "taking into

consideration..."; the word "urgent" is dropped from the line
"underlining

the need for [urgent] action to achieve a world free from nuclear
weapons"

and this phrase has been decoupled from the para "welcoming" the NPT

Conference Final Document (thus separating abolition from the NPT);

concerned that negotiations are "not actively under way" rather than
"stalled;"

instead of "recalling" the ICJ Opinion, it now is "noting;" and
"concerned" about the three states without safeguarded nuclear
facilities is now "noting."

Clearly the subtle softening of the language is meant to appeal to the
NNWS

of NATO. It does look better than ever that they will vote for the
draft. Of

the P5, China is a likely yes and Russia is a likely abstention. The
three

Western NWS are "in a grey zone," according to one delegate.

The draft will not be voted on Tuesday. Negotiations are continuing in
light

of the revisions so Wednesday is now the earliest date, with a real
possibility of a delay until Thursday.

3. Other Nuclear Disarmament Revisions

The JAPANESE draft (L.39/Rev. 1) on "A path to the total
elimination of

nuclear weapons" has been slightly revised. Op Para 9 still deals with
the

threat of the proliferation of mass destruction weapons, but the
reference

to "non-state actors" has been dropped. In addition, Australia has

joined as

the only co-sponsor.

The ABM draft (L.2/Rev. 1) adds a paragraph that "welcomes" the US decision

not to authorize deployment of a BMD and "considers that it constitutes a

positive step for the preservation of strategic stability and security."

Russia said the additions shows the draft is not confrontational.

The Canadian draft on the Fissile Materials Cut Off Treaty talks (L.49/Rev.

1) has dropped the call for a five year time-frame for concluding a FMCT in

the Conference on Disarmament. Canada said this was done to avoid amendments

and make consensus more likely. The apparent strategy here is to preserve

the

CD consensus by having the draft stick strictly to the CD agreement, even

though the NPT Conference Final Document calls for that time-frame. In its

original form, Pakistan, at least, would oppose it (see the Week Four

Report:

The United States and Pakistan).

Jim Wurst, LCNP

4. Outer Space

The one resolution dealing with the prevention of an arms race in outer

space

(L.25) was voted on today. It was adopted 154 to zero with two abstentions

(the US and Israel). Neither abstainer explained their votes. The draft

"invites" the CD to establish an ad hoc committee on this issue "as early as

possible during the 2001 session."

Jim Wurst, LCNP

5. Small Arms at the GA First Committee

October 30, 2000

2001 Conference site and dates proposed:

On Friday, October 27 the draft decision on small arms was made available as UN document A/C.1/55/L.28/Rev. 1. This is likely to be passed as introduced. The text has just three main points: the Third Preparatory Committee (prepcom) session will be in New York (Kenya having removed its offer to host), the conference itself also will be held in New York (Switzerland having withdrawn its offer to host) from July 9 to 20, 2001. Japan, which traditionally chairs the drafting group, thanked the Swiss and Kenyans for their "flexibility." In a separate document South Africa gave formal notice from the Non-Aligned Movement that their candidate for the Chairman of the 2001 Conference is Ambassador Camilo Reyes of Colombia. The other candidates are Sir Michael Weston (UK), nominated by the EU, and Ambassador Mitsuro Donowaki, nominated by Japan.

First Committee is addressing four draft resolutions focused specifically on small arms:

A/C.1/L.11/Rev.1 on "Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and collecting them." This is traditionally led by

Mali and focuses on the provision of support to West African countries that have joined in the 1998 Moratorium on the Importation, Exportation and Manufacture of Small Arms and Light Weapons in West Africa. This year the continuing resolution has added an operative paragraph that encourages states in the sub-region to create national commissions against the proliferation of small arms.

A/C.1/L.15 [passed without a vote, October 27] on "consolidation of peace through practical disarmament measures." Germany traditionally leads on this continuing resolution which promotes the guidelines established on practical disarmament by the Disarmament Commission and invites the relevant group of interested states to study lessons learned and to promote new projects within affected states.

A/C.1/L.28/Rev.1 on "Small Arms." This is the draft decision, mentioned above, on the site and dates of the 2001 Conference and its Third Prepcom session.

A/C.1/L.38 on "Illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons." South Africa has led the drafting of this continuing resolution which serves to encourage states to engage in measures that will reduce the illicit trade, to assist other states to provide needed assistance through

appropriate channels and, finally, mandates the UN Secretariat to monitor the issue and to provide practical assistance in response to requests from states.

David Jackman

6. ICJ Resolution

TENTATIVE - AWAITING CONFIRMATION OF VOTING RECORD - More details on

individual votes in the next update

The United Nations First Committee today adopted resolution A/C.1/55/L.48,

entitled Follow-up to the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of

Justice on the Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons, and which

calls for States to implement their disarmament obligation by commencing

negotiations leading to the conclusion of a nuclear weapons convention. The

vote was 109 in favour, 27 against and 21 abstaining. A separate vote was

held on operative paragraph 1, which underlines the International Court of

Justice's unanimous conclusion that there exists an obligation to conclude

negotiations on nuclear disarmament in all its aspects. France, US, Russia

and Israel opposed this paragraph, the UK abstained and all other countries

present voted in favour.

On the resolution as a whole, China, Pakistan and India supported as

did New

Agenda countries New Zealand, Sweden, Ireland, Brazil and South Africa.
The

other New Agenda countries, ie Egypt and Mexico, were among the
resolution's

cosponsors. On the down side, Norway which abstained on this
resolution in

1999, voted against this year leaving Canada, which abstained, as the
only

NATO state not to oppose. On the upside, Canada did not call for a
separate

vote on operative paragraph 2 this year as they have in the past. Op 2
calls

for negotiations leading to a nuclear weapons convention and Canada has
in

the past opposed this paragraph. The other European States which
abstained

last year - Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia and
Herzegovina,

Croatia, Finland, Georgia, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Moldova and Macedonia

-

also abstained this year.

Explanations of vote were given by the Democratic People's Republic of

Korea, Chile, Japan, Luxembourg (on behalf of Belgium, Netherlands,
Germany,

Italy, Norway, Denmark, Spain, Greece, Italy and Portugal), and the
US.

Japan, which abstained, noted that nuclear weapons should never be used
and

should be eliminated but the way forward was through practical steps
as

outlined in their resolution L.39.

Luxembourg also said that the step-by-step process was the way forward

and

called for the international community to focus on the steps agreed in the NPT Review Conference.

Chile commended the ICJ for highlighting the link between humanitarian law

and nuclear disarmament. They noted that the possession of nuclear weapons

in a conflict situation would constitute a threat that they may be used and

would increase tension in such a situation. They believe that this resolution is thus an important preventive diplomacy action.

The US stated that the step-by-step process is yielding significant results

and is the only realistic option. They also stated that the ICJ opinion is

only advisory and not binding and does not alter the obligations the US has

agreed to under the Non Proliferation Treaty.

***** ***** ***** *****

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

***** ***** ***** *****

</x-rich>

X-Sender: flick@pop.igc.org
Date: Wed, 1 Nov 2000 11:53:40 -0400
To: updates@reachingcriticalwill.org
From: Felicity Hill <flick@igc.org>
Subject: First Committee Daily Update
Cc: wilpf-news@igc.topica.com

<x-rich>Daily NGO report on Comm I: October 31

Voting continues in the First Committee. The New Agenda, Japanese draft on

nuclear disarmament, the ABM draft resolution and the Register of Conventional Arms are on the list for November 1. The officers of the Committee hope to wrap it all up by the end

of the day.

1. Missiles
2. Nuclear Weapon Free Southern Hemisphere
3. Correction to previous report on ICJ resolution
4. Small Arms
5. Other Weapons of Mass Destruction
6. Security Council special session on women in armed conflict

<bold>1. Missiles

</bold>The controversial draft on Missiles (L.1/Rev. 1), sponsored by Iran, was

adopted 90 to zero with 60 abstentions. China, India, Pakistan, and Russia

voted in favor; France, Israel, the UK and US were among the abstainers. The

draft calls for a panel of governmental experts to prepare a report on

missiles "in all its aspects" and submit it to the General Assembly in two

years and asks the Secretary-General to seek the views of states on this

issue for submission to next year's GA (sorry, last week's report mistakenly

said the panel proposal had been dropped).

Iran introduced a revision to the original

resolution which added a request to States to submit their views on the

question to the Secretary-General for a report to the General Assembly in

2001. Iran acknowledged that it was difficult to find common ground on this

issue - "It is difficult to compare this to any other field of disarmament due to its sensitivity to the security of states."

The vote and explanation of votes showed how this was an understatement. In what was largely a developed nations versus developing nations fault line, Northern countries said the draft should have focused on halting ballistic missile proliferation and praised the efforts of the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR) while Southern countries blasted "discriminatory regimes" (meaning MTCR) and said the draft should have said something about self-defense and peaceful uses of the technology.

Australia, France, Japan and the US explained their abstention on the

resolution arguing that it fails to focus on the proliferation of missiles

or to support the approach or progress made by the Missile Technology

Control Regime.

The US said it was "unnecessary and counterproductive to bring this into the

UN," arguing instead that the issue is best left to regional negotiations.

Pakistan said states that have "thousands of missiles" seek to "deny

[others] the means of self-defense;" without a "multilateral dialogue" there is

"likely to be a proliferation of discrimination."

China, Pakistan and Egypt argued that the resolution was necessary in order to develop a comprehensive and non-discriminatory approach to missiles. Pakistan noted that there are thousands of deployed missiles armed with nuclear weapons which are threatening security and this threat needs to be addressed. The current missile technology control regime does not do this, but is a discriminatory regime whereby those with missiles seek to prevent those without from acquiring them. Pakistan added that some States have the power to reach outer space while others are not even allowed to use firecrackers.

Composing the panel will be a delicate operation. Finally Pakistan noted

that some States were trying to get on the study group which would be created if the resolution is adopted while at the same time not being supportive of the resolution, and noted that this was not general UN practice. But it's a little difficult to imagine a UN panel dealing with a issue as sensitive as missiles where China, India and Pakistan have seats but the US, UK and France do not.

Jim Wurst & Alyn Ware, LCNP

2. Nuclear Weapon Free Southern Hemisphere

Resolution A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1 entitled Nuclear Weapon Free Southern

Hemisphere and Adjacent Areas was adopted by a vote of 146 in favour,
4

against (France, Monaco, UK and US) and 6 abstentions (Andorra, India,

Israel, Micronesia, Russia and Spain). Separate votes were also held
on

operative paragraph 3 (130 in favour, 9 abstentions and 1 opposed) and
the

last three words of operative paragraph 3 referring to a nuclear weapon
free

zone in South Asia (134 in favour, 10 abstentions and 1 opposed).

India, in opposing operative paragraph 3, noted that nuclear weapon free

zones needed to be established on the basis of agreement by all states in

the region, and that there was not such agreement in the case of South Asia.

The UK, speaking on behalf of themselves, France and the US argued that the

resolution aimed to restrict freedom of the high seas, and this was

indicated recently by the Foreign Minister of one of the cosponsoring countries. Thus they would oppose it.

The Philippines argued that the resolution actually did the opposite and

specifically allowed for freedom of passage. Philippines was originally a

cosponsor of the resolution but could not cosponsor now that it supposedly

allows for freedom of navigation. It is the Philippines' belief that, in

light of the International Court of Justice advisory opinion, the deployment

of nuclear weapons is illegal in all circumstances including on the high

seas. Philippines themselves has adopted legislation prohibiting nuclear

weapons in their territory and maritime space, and proposed that the threat

or use of nuclear weapons be included in the jurisdiction of the

International Criminal Court. The current resolution could now not achieve

what it originally set out to do which was create a Southern Hemisphere

completely free from nuclear weapons.

3. CORRECTION ON ICJ RESOLUTION REPORT FROM 31 OCT

Belarus, which I had listed as abstaining on the ICJ resolution,
moved to a

yes vote this year.

Alyn Ware, LCNP

4. Small Arms

Draft decision on 2001 Conference adopted without a vote. (More
details in

the next report.)

5. Other Weapons of Mass Destruction

The draft on the Biological Weapons Convention (BWC) (L.42) was
adopted

without a vote. It welcomes the progress made so far on negotiating a

verification protocol to the Convention and asks states to "accelerate
the

negotiations."

- Jim Wurst, LCNP

6. Breakthrough in the Security Council

The following text is an excerpt of the NGO statement for last
week's

unprecedented Security Council session on women in armed conflict.
While

this is not directly related to the First Committee, our group would like to

share the news of this momentous peace event with you. The Council has been

increasingly looking at overarching issues which had previously been

ignored - protection of civilians in armed conflict, AIDS, women . . .
Some

NGOs are looking at the possibility of pushing the Council to start dealing

with disarmament, which is generally seen as the province of the First

Committee. Some of us are asking how can the Security Council address

threats to peace and security without dealing with the continuing dangers

posed by huge nuclear weapons arsenals, the flood of small arms, etc?

-- Tracy Moavero, Peace Action Education Fund

"We welcome today's debate as an opportunity to look at some of the concrete

ways in which this can be achieved. The political and economic empowerment

of women, however and the full advancement of their rights and the rights

of all people, will never be achieved until war the scourge of war is

eradicated. Women around the world look to and support the United Nations

as the world's peace organisation founded on this aim.

The fear and trauma caused by war are pervasive and long lasting.
Reminders

of war come with every helicopter that flies by, every crack of thunder,

every car that backfires. At the individual level alone, men and women who

have participated in war know that it is neither glorious nor heroic work.

It has been found that the trauma of war is a significant contributor to

the increased incidence of domestic and social violence, as well as

depression and mental health disorders that we see around us.

The prevention of war and the restoration of peace depends on ensuring

respect for all human rights and fundamental freedoms. The lessons of the

20th century have repeatedly demonstrated that a durable peace and lasting

reconciliation can only be built on a solid foundation of justice and

truth, where individual criminal accountability is ensured.

The regulation of armament is central to the prevention of war. In most

arms exporting countries there is insufficient parliamentary scrutiny of

the trade, let alone public transparency. Those responsible for gross

systematic violations of human rights know all too well that very often the

arms supplies will continue. The founders of the UN saw a particular role

for the Security Council in establishing a system for the regulation of

armament under Article 26. We feel that the Council needs to fulfil this

role now more than ever, in order to address the root causes of war, which

include the actual preparation for war.

The prevention of war also depends on diverting resources from preparation

for war to the sustainability of peace. It is well documented that the human family needs just one quarter of global military spending to provide food, health care, housing, education, clean renewable energy, and environmental restoration, including the removal of all landmines and nuclear weapons. We could start this if we reduced global military spending by 5% each year for 5 years, to free up half a billion dollars a day."

(excerpt provided by Felicity Hill, WILPF)

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

</x-rich>

X-Sender: flick@pop.igc.org
Date: Wed, 1 Nov 2000 12:36:45 -0400
To: updates@reachingcriticalwill.org
From: Felicity Hill <flick@igc.org>
Subject: Hot Press: NAG RESOLUTION
Cc: wilpf-news@igc.topica.com

Dear All,

A quick note to say that the New Agenda resolution L4 just passed

146 YES

3 NO (India, Israel, Pakistan)

8 ABSTAIN (Russia, France, Bhutan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan,
Uzbekistan, Mauritius + one country that will be identified when the
voting record is available.)

best wishes and

YAAAAAAAAAY

Felicity Hill & Merav Datan

***** ***** ***** *****

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

***** ***** ***** *****

X-eGroups-Return: sentto-1413460-1672-973103902-mupj=igc.apc.org@returns.onelist.com
X-Sender: johnburroughs@earthlink.net
X-Apparently-To: abolition-caucus@egroups.com
X-Sender: johnburroughs@mail.earthlink.net
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0.1
To: abolition-caucus@egroups.com
Cc: jhwurst@aol.com
From: John Burroughs <johnburroughs@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: Wed, 01 Nov 2000 13:38:42 -0500
Subject: [abolition-caucus] OVERWHELMING SUPPORT FOR "NEW AGENDA"

12:45 PM (NY Time), November 1, 2000

The New Agenda resolution was overwhelmingly adopted today by a vote of 146 to three with eight abstentions. All of NATO (except France) voted yes. The US, UK and China are in the "yes" column; Russia and France abstained.

The three "no" votes are from the non-NPT NWSs - India, Israel and Pakistan.

The eight abstainers are: Bhutan, France, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Mauritius, Monaco, Russia, Uzbekistan. Note most are countries closely tied to Russia, France or India.

----- eGroups Sponsor ----->
eGroups eLerts
It's Easy. It's Fun. Best of All, it's Free!
http://click.egroups.com/1/9698/3/_/91925/_/973103902/
----- _->

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

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

From: "Surratt, Doris" To: zz Social Equity Panel Subject: Social Equity Panel Meeting Date: Wed, 1 Nov 2000 15:34:42 -0500 X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

This notice is to remind you that the first full meeting of the Standing Panel on Social Equity is scheduled to be held in conjunction with the Academy Fall Meeting in Washington, DC. The Panel meeting will take place in the Scott Room, Westin Hotel, 24th and M Streets, NW, on Thursday, November 16th, 9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. At this meeting, a working paper on social equity issues will be deliberated and a work plan for the year decided. An agenda and pertinent materials will follow.

Please let me know if you plan to attend.

Doris Surratt
dsurratt@napawash.org
PH: 202-347-3190

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

From: Rachel Labush <rlabush@rac.org>
To: "mupj@igc.org" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Urgent - Revised and Refreshed Garza Letter
Date: Tue, 31 Oct 2000 17:06:51 -0500
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

Dear Howard,

In addition to being the arms control LA, I also cover death penalty issues. Josh Noble, a legislative assistant here at the Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism, was in touch with you a few months ago when you signed on to our letter to President Clinton asking him to grant clemency to Juan Raul Garza. Mr. Garza was slated to be the first person executed under federal law since 1963.

That letter never went out because the President granted him a reprieve until December 12. Then David Paul Hammer was scheduled to be executed on November 15 after he waived his rights to appeals, asking to be executed. Last week, he unexpectedly filed for clemency, so his execution date is up in the air.

I am writing to ask for your signature for a new version of the Garza letter, one which addresses both his case and Mr. Hammer's, and which also asks for an executive moratorium. The letter is attached, and also pasted below this e-mail. If you have any comments or suggestions for edits, I would love to accept them through Friday. Please let me know if you can sign the letter as soon as you can - November 8th at the latest.

Many 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>

<<Federal Moratorium letter.doc>>
The Honorable William Jefferson Clinton
President of the United States
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear President Clinton:

As you are on the eve of your departure from office, the nation is on the eve of the first federal executions in nearly forty years. We write to urge that you declare an executive moratorium on federal executions and grant clemency to David Paul Hammer and Juan Raul Garza to ensure that the United States does not carry out these death sentences at a time when the nation questions the reliability and fairness of capital punishment.

The overwhelming majority of communities of faith are united in their

opposition to the death penalty. We address you as members of religious organizations that minister daily to the profound suffering that is caused when a life is taken by an act of violence. However, we are called upon to promote life, even the lives of those who have taken a life. We also have the mission of giving comfort to the children and other loved ones of the condemned when the government carries out an execution. Options to capital punishment, including life in prison without the possibility of release, are available that will both protect society and ensure that justice is done.

In the past year, religious communities have been joined by a diverse chorus of American voices, including those of respected members of all three branches of government, public figures across the political spectrum, local and state governing bodies, civil rights leaders, professional associations and grass roots organizations. At no time since the death penalty was reinstated in 1976, have Americans, individually and collectively, expressed such grave reservations about capital punishment.

Doubts about the continued imposition of the death penalty concern not only issues of wrongful convictions, incompetent counsel and prosecutorial misconduct, but also the inadequacy of judicial review, the unequal treatment of the poor and people of color, and geographic disparities. The public and policymakers are facing the unpleasant reality that capital punishment is most often reserved for those at the margins of society. Until recently, the focus of criticism was largely on state capital punishment systems. Now, however, serious questions regarding the fairness of the administration of the federal death penalty are squarely before you.

We commend your forthright decision in August to grant Mr. Garza a reprieve until December 12, 2000, so that he would have the opportunity to seek clemency under new federal guidelines. Shortly before you ordered the reprieve, you spoke of your concern about the "disturbing racial composition" of federal death row and about evidence that a handful of federal districts have accounted for more than half of the cases in which federal capital prosecution has been sought. When the Department of Justice survey of the federal death penalty was released in September, White House spokesperson Jake Siewart confirmed your view that "these numbers are troubling," and that more information must be gathered to determine "more about how the system works and what's behind those numbers," including "why minorities in some geographic districts are disproportionately represented." We believe that even Americans who support capital punishment will agree that no federal execution should proceed until these questions are answered and the nation is assured that the federal death penalty is neither biased nor arbitrary in its application.

In Mr. Hammer's case, the execution an individual without at least one completed appeal of his conviction and death sentence - irrespective of his apparent, present desire to forgo such review - is incompatible with the interests of the United States in preserving the integrity and the reliability of its justice system.

During your remarks at the Democratic National Convention, you spoke with admiration and appreciation of President Carter's enduring contribution to advancing human rights around the globe. Our Ambassador to France, Felix Rohatyn, has written that the continued imposition of the death penalty

"casts a shadow" on our country's image as the flagship of freedom and democracy. And, President Carter has now expressed his support for a moratorium on state and federal executions. We are confident that your decision to declare a moratorium - an act of courage and leadership -- would be respected by the nation and by our allies.

In closing, there is strong evidence that Americans are troubled that capital punishment is not administered equitably, impartially, or rationally and there is now growing support for a moratorium on executions. To execute Mr. Hammer and Mr. Garza at a time of such ferment and debate is to act hastily and precipitously. A declaration of an executive moratorium and grants of clemency will acknowledge the legitimacy of the reservations that are on the minds and in the hearts of so many and assure the country that an investigation into questions surrounding the federal death penalty will continue until satisfactory answers are found.

We urge you to embrace this legacy.

Sincerely,

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\Federal Moratorium letter.doc"

The Honorable William Jefferson Clinton
President of the United States
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear President Clinton:

As you are on the eve of your departure from office, the nation is on the eve of the first federal executions in nearly forty years. We write to urge that you declare an executive moratorium on federal executions and grant clemency to David Paul Hammer and Juan Raul Garza to ensure that the United States does not carry out these death sentences at a time when the nation questions the reliability and fairness of capital punishment.

The overwhelming majority of communities of faith are united in their opposition to the death penalty. We address you as members of religious organizations that minister daily to the profound suffering that is caused when a life is taken by an act of violence. However, we are called upon to promote life, even the lives of those who have taken a life. We also have the mission of giving comfort to the children and other loved ones of the condemned when the government carries out an execution. Options to capital punishment, including life in prison without the possibility of release, are available that will both protect society and ensure that justice is done.

In the past year, religious communities have been joined by a diverse chorus of American voices, including those of respected members of all three branches of government, public figures across the political spectrum, local and state governing bodies, civil rights leaders, professional associations and grass roots organizations. At no time since the death penalty was reinstated in 1976, have Americans, individually and collectively, expressed such grave reservations about capital punishment.

Doubts about the continued imposition of the death penalty concern not only issues of wrongful convictions, incompetent counsel and prosecutorial misconduct, but also the inadequacy of judicial review, the unequal treatment of the poor and people of color, and geographic disparities. The public and policymakers are facing the unpleasant reality that capital punishment is most often reserved for those at the margins of society. Until recently, the focus of criticism was largely on state capital punishment systems. Now, however, serious questions regarding the fairness of the administration of the federal death penalty are squarely before you.

We commend your forthright decision in August to grant Mr. Garza a reprieve until December 12, 2000, so that he would have the opportunity to seek clemency under new federal guidelines. Shortly before you ordered the reprieve, you spoke of your concern about the "disturbing racial composition" of federal death row and about evidence that a handful of federal districts have accounted for more than half of the cases in which federal capital prosecution has been sought. When the Department of Justice survey of the federal death penalty was released in September, White House spokesperson Jake

Siewart confirmed your view that “these numbers are troubling,” and that more information must be gathered to determine “more about how the system works and what’s behind those numbers,” including “why minorities in some geographic districts are disproportionately represented.” We believe that even Americans who support capital punishment will agree that no federal execution should proceed until these questions are answered and the nation is assured that the federal death penalty is neither biased nor arbitrary in its application.

In Mr. Hammer’s case, the execution an individual without at least one completed appeal of his conviction and death sentence – irrespective of his apparent, present desire to forgo such review – is incompatible with the interests of the United States in preserving the integrity and the reliability of its justice system.

During your remarks at the Democratic National Convention, you spoke with admiration and appreciation of President Carter’s enduring contribution to advancing human rights around the globe. Our Ambassador to France, Felix Rohatyn, has written that the continued imposition of the death penalty “casts a shadow” on our country’s image as the flagship of freedom and democracy. And, President Carter has now expressed his support for a moratorium on state and federal executions. We are confident that your decision to declare a moratorium – an act of courage and leadership -- would be respected by the nation and by our allies.

In closing, there is strong evidence that Americans are troubled that capital punishment is not administered equitably, impartially, or rationally and there is now growing support for a moratorium on executions. To execute Mr. Hammer and Mr. Garza at a time of such ferment and debate is to act hastily and precipitously. A declaration of an executive moratorium and grants of clemency will acknowledge the legitimacy of the reservations that are on the minds and in the hearts of so many and assure the country that an investigation into questions surrounding the federal death penalty will continue until satisfactory answers are found.

We urge you to embrace this legacy.

Sincerely,

To: Rachel Labush <rlabush@rac.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Urgent - Revised and Refreshed Garza Letter
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <23B701418684D21182F600A0C9D60D0544B3B2@RACSRV>
References:

At 05:06 PM 10/31/00 -0500, you wrote:

>Dear Howard,

>

>I am writing to ask for your signature for a new version of the
>Garza letter, one which addresses both his case and Mr. Hammer's, and which
>also asks for an executive moratorium.....

Rachel,

Yes, I'll sign the letter.

Howard W. Hallman

X-Sender: skerr@[63.106.26.66]
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)
Date: Wed, 01 Nov 2000 16:52:24 -0500
To: dan@clw.org
From: Suzy Kerr <skerr@clw.org>
Subject: Election Briefing Invite

You are cordially invited to an election briefing:

Thursday, November 9
1:00 - 2:30 P.M.
UCS office - 1707 H Street, NW - Suite 600

Jerome Grossman, chairman of Council for a Livable World, and John Isaacs, president of Council for a Livable World, will discuss the results for the Presidential and congressional elections and the implications for our agenda in 2001. They will highlight a few of the races and discuss the shape of the new Congress.

As space is limited, please RSVP to Dan Koskofsky (dan@clw.org, 543-4100 x.125)

To: dan@clw.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Post-election briefing
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dan,

Please reserve a place for me at the post-election briefing on November 9.

Howard Hallman

**STATEMENT BY H.E. ARCHBISHOP RENATO R. MARTINO
APOSTOLIC NUNCIO, PERMANENT OBSERVER OF THE HOLY SEE
TO THE UNITED NATIONS
BEFORE THE FIRST COMMITTEE
OF THE 55TH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY
ON ITEM 74
GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT**

6 OCTOBER 2000

Check against delivery

STATEMENT BY H.E. ARCHBISHOP RENATO R. MARTINO
APOSTOLIC NUNCIO, PERMANENT OBSERVER OF THE HOLY SEE TO THE UNITED NATIONS
BEFORE THE FIRST COMMITTEE
OF THE 55TH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY
ON ITEM 74
GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT
6 OCTOBER 2000

Mr. Chairman,

At this first meeting of the Disarmament Committee in the new century, let us resolve at the outset to develop the concept of a culture of peace as an integral approach to preventing violence and armed conflicts. That is indeed the goal of the International Year for the Culture of Peace.

At the basis of a culture of peace is respect for life and for all human rights. Constructing such a culture requires comprehensive educational, social and civic action. This will lead to the "civilization of love," as described by Pope John Paul II, and it is this aspiration at the dawn of the Third Millennium that the peoples of the world so ardently long for.

Since the first duty of the United Nations is to preserve and promote peace throughout the world, this Committee has a vital role to play in establishing political norms for peace. The nations of the world pledged at the recent Millennium Summit to "spare no effort to free our peoples from the scourge of war, whether within or between States, which has claimed more than five million lives in the past decade." To carry out this pledge, nations must build respect for the rule of law, and ensure compliance with the U.N. Charter and the decisions of the International Court of Justice.

How easy it is to say these words; yet how difficult to practice them. After three years of steady decline, the number of wars fought world-wide increased significantly in 1999, when there were no less than forty armed conflicts being fought on the territories of 36 countries. Sixteen of these conflicts took place in Africa, 14 in Asia, 6 in the Middle East, 2 in Europe and 2 in the Americas. These conflicts, fed by arms dealers with a rapacious appetite for money, are a scandal of modern civilization.

The widespread availability of small arms and light weapons contributes towards intensifying conflicts by increasing the lethality and duration of violence; they generate a vicious circle of a greater sense of insecurity, which in turn leads to a greater demand for the use of these weapons. It is an even greater shame that many small arms are

readily obtainable by children who are enslaved into being combatants and porters by warring factions.

It is no accident that the vast majority of states experiencing war are among the most poverty-stricken. These conflicts, which consume large amounts of resources needed for economic and social development, are responsible for the displacement of people, the vast majority civilian, mostly women and children. The easy availability of small arms and light weapons has led to the targeting of U.N. peacekeeping and humanitarian field staff. The U.N.'s development projects and those of donor countries are often destroyed when groups carrying these weapons ransack towns and villages.

All this has been the study of a number of expert groups, preparing the way for the 2001 Conference on "Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in all Its Aspects." The Holy See gives its full support to this Conference in the hope that it will develop and strengthen international efforts to prevent, combat and eradicate the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons.

While norms and international measures need to be advanced, most of all it is political will throughout the world that must be developed to stop the trafficking in weapons, licit and illicit. States must exercise their responsibility with regard to the export, import, transit and re-transfer of small arms and light weapons. Let the international community at least implement the Millennium Declaration pledge "to take concerted action to end illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons, especially by making arms transfers more transparent and supporting regional disarmament measures."

Despite the immense suffering still caused by wars, we should not lose sight of the gains that are being made in reducing weaponry. Since the Anti-Personnel Landmines Treaty went into effect in 1999, 10 million stockpiled anti-personnel mines have been destroyed, bringing the total, so far, to 22 million. It is true that an estimated 250 million mines remain stockpiled in 105 nations, but at least the trade in such evil instruments has almost completely halted. The treaty that has brought this about has been signed by 139 governments and ratified by 105. Some major countries are still outside the treaty, and the Holy See appeals to them to join this important movement in the world community to avert even more human suffering by so many innocent victims of warfare.

This past year has also seen the *Sixth Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (April 27, 2000)*, in which 187 States made "an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals." The Conference also agreed on 13 practical steps for the systematic and progressive efforts to implement Article VI of the Treaty.

In his intervention to this Conference, Archbishop Tauran, Secretary for the Holy Sees's Relations with States, noted that: "The actual stage of nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament indicates that at the dawn of a new century many still believe in the use of force and count on nuclear weapons. This means that the rule of law, confidence in others and the will to dialogue are not yet priorities. It also indicates the relative value of a concept like "nuclear deterrence", a distressing solution for a world overwhelmed with weapons, which should be turning instead toward progressive and effective disarmament".

Why should it be so difficult for the Nuclear Weapons States to take leadership in implementing these progressive steps to nuclear disarmament? Such a question bring us face to face with a searing question for modern humanity: "Do we really want peace? If we reply yes, then we are bound to verify it: there will be no peace in a world which continues to produce more and more sophisticated arms, which prepares itself for their use or where peace is only maintained by a balance of terror. The time has come to get rid of the inherited mind-sets of the Cold War and to resolve the problems connected with the establishment of mutual security" (ibid.).

The Holy See welcomes the U.N. Millennium Summit Declaration, which resolved "to strive for the elimination of weapons of mass destruction, particularly nuclear weapons..." The Secretary-General's proposal for a global conference to identify ways of eliminating nuclear dangers should be taken into consideration.

The United Nations must play a leading role in advancing measures for nuclear disarmament because the Organization has the ability to gather together the world community and express its collective will for peace and human security.

My Delegation would like to repeat here the words of Angelo Cardinal Sodano, Secretary of State, at the Millennium Summit: "...the U.N. needs to develop its capacities in the area of preventive diplomacy. For its part, the Holy See will always support initiatives in favour of peace, including those aimed to strengthening respect for international law and controlling arms proliferation."

Moreover, at the Millennium Summit, the leaders of the world have solemnly renewed their commitment to promote the building of a new century based on a culture of peace. We really believe the peoples of the world want a culture of peace. To achieve this lofty goal States must work to develop and extend policies that promote human security, new coalitions and negotiations, the rule of law, initiatives at peacemaking, democratic decision-making and humanitarian intervention mandated by the Security Council. In such a culture, there would be a reversal of present policies in which billions of dollars are spent on arms and militarization while worthwhile development initiatives and programs for peace and human security are starved for lack of funds.

A culture of peace is possible, but first we must develop the moral and political will.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

X-eGroups-Return: sentto-1413460-1685-973217993-mupj=igc.apc.org@returns.onelist.com
X-Sender: johnburroughs@earthlink.net
X-Apparently-To: abolition-caucus@egroups.com
X-Sender: johnburroughs@mail.earthlink.net
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0.1
To: abolition-caucus@egroups.com
Cc: jhwurst@aol.com
From: John Burroughs <johnburroughs@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: Thu, 02 Nov 2000 21:19:11 -0500
Subject: [abolition-caucus] "New Agenda" Sets the Disarmament Agenda

"New Agenda" Sets the Disarmament Agenda

2 November 2000

Jim Wurst, UN Coordinator

Middle Powers Initiative and Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy

The New Agenda resolution was overwhelmingly adopted on 1 November by a vote of 146 to three with eight abstentions: an obvious and unequivocal endorsement. All of NATO (except France) voted yes. The US, UK and China are in the "yes" column; Russia and France abstained.

The three "no" votes are from the non-NPT NWSs - India, Israel and Pakistan.

The eight abstainers are: Bhutan, France, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Mauritius, Monaco, Russia, Uzbekistan. Most are countries closely tied to Russia, France or India.

This overwhelming vote serves the dual goals of bringing the NPT consensus onto the broader international stage and solidifying the New Agenda's role in nuclear disarmament deliberations. In short, this is the new agenda.

Several delegations, including the US and UK, said they were judging First Committee resolutions this year by the light of the 2000 NPT Review Conference Final Document. In explaining their votes, the US said the NPT Document "is our guiding light for nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament efforts" and the UK said First Committee drafts "should faithfully reflect the letter and spirit" of the NPT agreement.

Amb. Robert Grey of the US said the draft "recognizes that nuclear disarmament is a process that requires pragmatic proposals in a step-like process, not political calls for impossible goals. We view the resolution in this context, including the rather unclear and ambiguous operative paragraph 18, which should not be construed as in any way limiting the ways and means available to pursue our shared goals."

Paragraph 18 is the one that calls for "the underpinnings of a universal and multilaterally negotiated legally binding instrument or a framework encompassing a mutually reinforcing set of instruments."

Amb. Ian Souter of the UK said, "We considered it particularly important that resolutions emerging from this committee should faithfully reflect the letter and spirit [of the NPT Conference]... With that in mind, we are pleased to have been able to vote in favor of this resolution. As we made clear in May, the United Kingdom is unequivocally committed to the global elimination of nuclear weapons. We welcome the fact that the 2000 NPT Review Conference endorsed the package of measures that are reflected in this resolution - many of which the United Kingdom has undertaken nationally."

In explaining their abstentions, China said the draft should have been "more explicit" on issues including preserving the ABM Treaty, no-first-use, and the lead role that should be taken by the major nuclear powers in disarmament; France said the text "does not fully satisfy the need for fidelity" to the NPT consensus.

There were two separate votes on paragraphs. PP 15, welcoming the Final Document of the NPT Conference, passed 151 to three (India, Israel, Pakistan), with one abstention (Cuba). OP 16, also on the NPT, passed 151 to zero with four abstentions (Cuba, India, Israel, Pakistan).

OTHER DRAFTS

The Japanese/Australian draft on "A path to the total elimination of nuclear weapons" (L.39/Rev. 1) was adopted 144 to one (India) with 12 abstentions (including China, France, Russia and Pakistan). The abstainers complained had multiple complaints, largely stemming either from the way the draft interprets the NPT Final Document or that it does not go far enough: the draft "departs markedly from the [NPT] consensus" (France); it "selectively cites provisions from the Final Document which violate the fragile balance of interests" in the Document (Russia); the text "have certain inadequacies" such as the failure to reject deterrence (China); and it places "inordinate emphasis on non-proliferation and not on nuclear disarmament" (Pakistan).

The ABM resolution (L.2/Rev. 1) was adopted 78 to three (US, Israel and Micronesia), with 65 abstentions. Abstainers pretty much split the difference on the issue: yes, we think the ABM Treaty should be preserved (in other words, we don't like BMD), but no, it's not the business of non-states parties to tell states parties what to do with their treaty. Since the US allies could easily have joined the US in voting no, we can look at this vote as a ringing lack of endorsement for the US missile defense plans.

The US has always opposed this resolution. Amb. Grey said the draft has "basic flaws" and that it "remains based on the premise that preserving and strengthening the ABM Treaty is incompatible with amending it." He added, "Questions about the ABM Treaty are for the Treaty parties to resolve. That process will only be hindered by having the General Assembly take sides."

Germany, speaking on behalf of 30 abstaining countries (NATO plus), said such an issue "should have the support of the parties to the Treaty... We have underlined the need for consensus on this resolution. We regret that it was not possible for the parties to reach an agreement, and we encourage them to continue their discussions on the issue. We attach great importance to the ABM Treaty as a cornerstone of strategic stability, contributing to the broader disarmament and arms control process."

Sweden gave an interesting addendum to this debate. Originally it had signed up on the German statement, but withdrew in favor of a separate statement. While aligning itself with that group of states, Sweden said it "does not share the overriding preoccupation with 'strategic stability' expressed in the resolution. The concept of strategic stability is closely linked with cold war doctrines which... should in Sweden's view not be the sole basis for disarmament and non-proliferation in the post-cold war era." This was the only time in the five weeks of the First Committee that any state challenged this new catchphrase.

The resolution on the Fissile Materials Cut-Off Treaty talks (L.49/ Rev. 1) was adopted by consensus. The revised text dropped the idea of completing negotiations within five years, thus aligning the draft with the language of the CD consensus.

Go to www.reachingcriticalwill.org for the revised texts, voting charts, other resolutions and full texts of some of the explanation of votes.

----- eGroups Sponsor ----->
eLerts
It's Easy. It's Fun. Best of All, it's Free!
http://click.egroups.com/1/9699/3/_/91925/_/973217993/
-----_->

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: flick@pop.igc.org
Date: Thu, 2 Nov 2000 20:29:10 -0400
To: updates@reachingcriticalwill.org
From: Felicity Hill <flick@igc.org>
Subject: Final Voting

Dear All,

A full report is coming from the New York NGO group tomorrow, but until then, the resolutions and the voting charts are all up on line at

<http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org/1stcommittee/draftres/drindex.html>

best wishes

Felicity

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

X-eGroups-Return: sentto-1413460-1685-973217993-mupj=igc.apc.org@returns.onelist.com
X-Sender: johnburroughs@earthlink.net
X-Apparently-To: abolition-caucus@egroups.com
X-Sender: johnburroughs@mail.earthlink.net
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0.1
To: abolition-caucus@egroups.com
Cc: jhwurst@aol.com
From: John Burroughs <johnburroughs@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: Thu, 02 Nov 2000 21:19:11 -0500
Subject: [abolition-caucus] "New Agenda" Sets the Disarmament Agenda

"New Agenda" Sets the Disarmament Agenda

2 November 2000

Jim Wurst, UN Coordinator

Middle Powers Initiative and Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy

The New Agenda resolution was overwhelmingly adopted on 1 November by a vote of 146 to three with eight abstentions: an obvious and unequivocal endorsement. All of NATO (except France) voted yes. The US, UK and China are in the "yes" column; Russia and France abstained.

The three "no" votes are from the non-NPT NWSs - India, Israel and Pakistan.

The eight abstainers are: Bhutan, France, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Mauritius, Monaco, Russia, Uzbekistan. Most are countries closely tied to Russia, France or India.

This overwhelming vote serves the dual goals of bringing the NPT consensus onto the broader international stage and solidifying the New Agenda's role in nuclear disarmament deliberations. In short, this is the new agenda.

Several delegations, including the US and UK, said they were judging First Committee resolutions this year by the light of the 2000 NPT Review Conference Final Document. In explaining their votes, the US said the NPT Document "is our guiding light for nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament efforts" and the UK said First Committee drafts "should faithfully reflect the letter and spirit" of the NPT agreement.

Amb. Robert Grey of the US said the draft "recognizes that nuclear disarmament is a process that requires pragmatic proposals in a step-like process, not political calls for impossible goals. We view the resolution in this context, including the rather unclear and ambiguous operative paragraph 18, which should not be construed as in any way limiting the ways and means available to pursue our shared goals."

Paragraph 18 is the one that calls for "the underpinnings of a universal and multilaterally negotiated legally binding instrument or a framework encompassing a mutually reinforcing set of instruments."

Amb. Ian Souter of the UK said, "We considered it particularly important that resolutions emerging from this committee should faithfully reflect the letter and spirit [of the NPT Conference]... With that in mind, we are pleased to have been able to vote in favor of this resolution. As we made clear in May, the United Kingdom is unequivocally committed to the global elimination of nuclear weapons. We welcome the fact that the 2000 NPT Review Conference endorsed the package of measures that are reflected in this resolution - many of which the United Kingdom has undertaken nationally."

In explaining their abstentions, China said the draft should have been "more explicit" on issues including preserving the ABM Treaty, no-first-use, and the lead role that should be taken by the major nuclear powers in disarmament; France said the text "does not fully satisfy the need for fidelity" to the NPT consensus.

There were two separate votes on paragraphs. PP 15, welcoming the Final Document of the NPT Conference, passed 151 to three (India, Israel, Pakistan), with one abstention (Cuba). OP 16, also on the NPT, passed 151 to zero with four abstentions (Cuba, India, Israel, Pakistan).

OTHER DRAFTS

The Japanese/Australian draft on "A path to the total elimination of nuclear weapons" (L.39/Rev. 1) was adopted 144 to one (India) with 12 abstentions (including China, France, Russia and Pakistan). The abstainers complained had multiple complaints, largely stemming either from the way the draft interprets the NPT Final Document or that it does not go far enough: the draft "departs markedly from the [NPT] consensus" (France); it "selectively cites provisions from the Final Document which violate the fragile balance of interests" in the Document (Russia); the text "have certain inadequacies" such as the failure to reject deterrence (China); and it places "inordinate emphasis on non-proliferation and not on nuclear disarmament" (Pakistan).

The ABM resolution (L.2/Rev. 1) was adopted 78 to three (US, Israel and Micronesia), with 65 abstentions. Abstainers pretty much split the difference on the issue: yes, we think the ABM Treaty should be preserved (in other words, we don't like BMD), but no, it's not the business of non-states parties to tell states parties what to do with their treaty. Since the US allies could easily have joined the US in voting no, we can look at this vote as a ringing lack of endorsement for the US missile defense plans.

The US has always opposed this resolution. Amb. Grey said the draft has "basic flaws" and that it "remains based on the premise that preserving and strengthening the ABM Treaty is incompatible with amending it." He added, "Questions about the ABM Treaty are for the Treaty parties to resolve. That process will only be hindered by having the General Assembly take sides."

Germany, speaking on behalf of 30 abstaining countries (NATO plus), said such an issue "should have the support of the parties to the Treaty... We have underlined the need for consensus on this resolution. We regret that it was not possible for the parties to reach an agreement, and we encourage them to continue their discussions on the issue. We attach great importance to the ABM Treaty as a cornerstone of strategic stability, contributing to the broader disarmament and arms control process."

Sweden gave an interesting addendum to this debate. Originally it had signed up on the German statement, but withdrew in favor of a separate statement. While aligning itself with that group of states, Sweden said it "does not share the overriding preoccupation with 'strategic stability' expressed in the resolution. The concept of strategic stability is closely linked with cold war doctrines which... should in Sweden's view not be the sole basis for disarmament and non-proliferation in the post-cold war era." This was the only time in the five weeks of the First Committee that any state challenged this new catchphrase.

The resolution on the Fissile Materials Cut-Off Treaty talks (L.49/ Rev. 1) was adopted by consensus. The revised text dropped the idea of completing negotiations within five years, thus aligning the draft with the language of the CD consensus.

Go to www.reachingcriticalwill.org for the revised texts, voting charts, other resolutions and full texts of some of the explanation of votes.

----- eGroups Sponsor -----~>
eLerts
It's Easy. It's Fun. Best of All, it's Free!
http://click.egroups.com/1/9699/3/_/91925/_/973217993/
-----_->

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: dkimball@[63.106.26.66]
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)
Date: Fri, 03 Nov 2000 08:51:32 -0500
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: N-Testing Update: New "Deadline" for Action on CTBT

November 3, 2000

TO: Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers members and friends

FR: Daryl Kimball, Director

RE: Nuclear Testing Update

As reported in the last Coalition Nuclear Testing Update (October 16), the international community continues to press the remaining CTBT hold-out states to sign and or ratify the CTBT. This week, the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly approved a measure that calls for all states to ratify the CTBT by 2003. The resolution was co-sponsored by Japan and Australia. (See Reuters report below.) Japan's ambassador said the effort was an attempt to provide further momentum and specificity to the call for action on the CTBT in the May 2000 NPT Review Conference final document. Japan is also spearheading a working group of CTBT states parties that is pressing the 14 key states -- including the United States, China, Iran, North Korea, Pakistan, India, Egypt, Algeria, and Israel -- to sign and/or ratify.

To help encourage action on the Treaty, the CTBT states parties are expected to request that the UN Secretary General convene a second conference on the entry into force of the Treaty next year. The first such conference, which is allowed for under Article XIV of the Treaty, was convened in Vienna in October 1999. For further details on this mechanism see the Coalition's 1999 report on the subject at <>

Earlier this week, an expert scientific panel on CTBT verification issued its final report from London. The Independent Commission on the Verification of the CTBT was convened by the Verification Research, Training and Information Centre (VERTIC). Addressing several of the concerns raised by Senators in the October 1999 CTBT debate, it concludes that:

the overall resources available for verifying compliance with the CTBT comprise the IMS, NTM and other scientific instruments and networks;

when fully in place, these resources will be capable of meeting the international community's expectation that relevant events will be detected, located and identified with high probability;

overall verification resources will improve as more monitoring stations are installed, more research is carried out and global communications systems continue to expand; these global capabilities constitute a complex and constantly evolving

verification gauntlet, which any potential violator will have to confront—together they will serve as a powerful deterrent.

A Reuters report on the Commission's findings and the text of the Commission's report is attached below. Further details on the Commission members, as well as supporting documents are available from <http://www.ctbtcommission.org>

- DK

CONTENTS --

* STATUS OF THE CTBT

1. "UN panel sets dates on steps to ban nuclear arms," Reuters, 11/02/2000

* CTBT VERIFICATION

2. "SCIENCE PANEL SAYS NUCLEAR TEST BAN IS VERIFIABLE," Reuters, October 30, 2000

3. Final Report of the Independent Commission on the Verifiability of the CTBT, October 2000

* CTBT POLITICS

4. "Vietnam Era Shaped Two Different Worldviews," The Washington Post, October 26, 2000 (Part of a series of articles on the respective positions of the two major presidential candidates. This one outlines their current position on nuclear testing and the CTBT.)

1. "UN panel sets dates on steps to ban nuclear arms"

Reuters, 11/02 0144

By Evelyn Leopold

UNITED NATIONS - Japan was successful in getting a key U.N. panel to approve a timetable for a global nuclear test ban and move towards a treaty banning the production of fissile materials.

The resolution, co-sponsored by Australia, was adopted by a vote of 144-1 with 12 abstentions on Wednesday by the General Assembly's disarmament committee, which includes all U.N. members, thereby ensuring final formal passage by the assembly later this year.

The sole "no" vote was from India, which exploded its own nuclear device and objects to any document that allows the five nuclear power to continue

maintaining atomic arms.

Among those voting in favour were the United States and Britain. The other three recognised nuclear weapon states, Russia, France and China, abstained on the resolution along with Bhutan, Cuba, North Korea, Egypt, Israel, Mauritius, Monaco, Myanmar and Pakistan.

Specifically, the resolution calls for ratification by 2003 of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, which the U.S. Senate rejected last year. More than 150 nations have signed the CTBT but it can only come into force when 44 nuclear-capable states ratify it, including India, Pakistan, Iraq and North Korea.

The measure is non-binding but reflects the will of the world community.

Japanese Ambassador Seiichiro Noboru, who led lobbying efforts on the resolution, said Tokyo had sent delegations to the 14 countries that haven't signed the CTBT, including the United States and China, to get some movement toward ratification of the treaty.

The resolution also says the Geneva-based Conference on Disarmament is to start negotiations immediately on a treaty to ban the production of fissile materials used in nuclear weapons. And it reconfirms the treaty should be concluded within five years but says states should voluntarily impose a moratorium on such production in the interim.

On longer-term disarmament, Wednesday's resolution says the nuclear powers should look beyond the START III talks and "unilaterally or through their negotiations" among the five work seriously towards cutting their arsenals.

Noboru, in an interview, said the purpose of the measure was to move forward the May conference on the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) rather than merely repeat its main tenets. "If you stick to the common denominator you won't have any progress," he said.

At the May treaty review conference, the five nuclear powers agreed to "an unequivocal undertaking" to eliminate their nuclear arsenals entirely. But they gave no timetable.

That conference also agreed on a moratorium on nuclear weapon test explosions pending the entry into force of CTBT. And it urged a speedy conclusion to the START III treaty, which would further reduce long-range U.S. and Russian warheads.

Under the 30-year-old NPT, the five powers are obligated to move toward disarmament while all other signatories vow to give up atomic warheads for good.

Japan is active each year in promoting nuclear disarmament resolutions in the General Assembly "because we are the only victim of this weapon," Noboru said. The United States dropped atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki at the end of World War II.

2. "SCIENCE PANEL SAYS NUCLEAR TEST BAN IS VERIFIABLE"

Reuters, Monday, October 30, 11:44 AM ET

By Paul Taylor, Diplomatic Editor

LONDON (Reuters) - A global nuclear test ban can be reliably verified with existing technology, creating a powerful deterrent against any attempt to cheat, an international panel of scientists said in a report issued Monday.

The commission was established by VERTIC, an independent arms control pressure group, after the U.S. Senate last year refused to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, partly due to concerns over possible cheating.

The multinational panel, including experts from the United States, Russia, Britain, France, Japan, Germany and Israel, found that a combination of international and national, public and non-governmental resources made it virtually impossible to evade detection of an underground nuclear test.

"When fully in place, these resources will be capable of meeting the international community's expectation that relevant events will be detected, located and identified with high probability," the report concluded.

VERTIC director Trevor Findlay, who chaired the panel, said he hoped the study would contribute to a better-informed, less polemical, new debate on ratifying the treaty after next week's U.S. presidential and congressional elections.

More than 150 countries have signed the CTBT but it can only come into force when 44 potentially nuclear-capable countries ratify it, including India, Pakistan, Iraq, Iran and North Korea.

Democratic Vice President Al Gore is committed to working for ratification while Republican candidate George W. Bush backs a continued U.S. national moratorium on nuclear testing but opposes ratifying the CTBT.

"Verification Gauntlet"

The panel said a dense global network of verification assets, including seismography, hydroacoustic and infrasound monitoring, satellite imaging and radionuclide detectors created a "verification gauntlet" which any potential violator would be reluctant to run.

"Together they will serve as a powerful deterrent," the Independent Commission on the Verifiability of the CTBT said.

Findlay said critics of the treaty had failed to take into account the wealth of national intelligence and scientific resources available to detect nuclear explosions in addition to an international monitoring system being established by the CTBT and based in Vienna.

“Together, these resources in total provide a very good basis for verifying the treaty,” he said.

“There is no 100 percent guarantee, but the treaty provides a high level of confidence, that acts as a powerful deterrent against any attempt to violate,” Findlay said.

Commission secretary Oliver Meier said that while the panel had not included irreconcilable U.S. opponents of the treaty, it had involved two respected American scientists familiar with both classified and public evidence on verification techniques -- Gregory van der Vink and Terry Wallace.

Several other studies are under way aimed at reopening the U.S. ratification debate on a more scientific and less partisan basis.

Among them is one by former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General John Shalikashvili, commissioned by outgoing President Clinton, aimed at taking account of concerns raised during the Senate debate in October 1999.

[The adobe acrobat version of the report along with appendices is at <<http://www.ctbtcommission.org>>.]

"Independent Commission on the Verifiability of the CTBT" -- FINAL REPORT, October 2000

Introduction

The Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) bans all nuclear test explosions in the atmosphere, underwater and underground. It provides for the establishment of a verification regime capable of meeting the treaty's verification requirements at entry into force. Opened for signature in 1996, the treaty has not yet entered into force, but the establishment of the verification regime is proceeding.

This report assesses the verifiability of the CTBT—the extent to which compliance with the treaty can be verified. It examines not only the current and future capabilities of the treaty verification regime, but also the additional monitoring capabilities that states parties and others may draw on to assure themselves that the CTBT is being complied with.

The treaty verification regime

The treaty verification regime combines a global monitoring network with modern communications and data management techniques. It also includes consultation and clarification measures, the possibility of on-site inspections, and confidence-building measures. The regime will be managed by a CTBT Organization (CTBTO) in Vienna, Austria. The organisation will comprise a Conference of

States Parties, an Executive Council, and a Technical Secretariat headed by a Director-General. A Preparatory Commission (PrepCom) and Provisional Technical Secretariat (PTS) are currently working to establish the regime.

Like all verification regimes, the design of the CTBT regime reflects considerations of political acceptability, technical capability and cost. Also like other regimes, it cannot provide 100 percent certainty that all treaty violations will be detected. Rather, the aim is that there will be a high probability of detecting violations, thereby deterring potential violators.

The International Monitoring System

An International Monitoring System (IMS), comprising 321 certified monitoring stations and 16 radionuclide laboratories located in some 90 countries, is being established. Four types of stations are involved:

- seismological;
- infrasound;
- hydroacoustic; and
- radionuclide.

A primary network of 201 stations will provide continuous data to the system. The other 120 are auxiliary seismic stations, which will supply data only on request. Some of the 321 stations already exist and can be incorporated into the system as they are, while others need to be improved or specially constructed. All stations need to be authenticated and certified by the PTS.

Cooperating National Facilities, employing IMS technologies and built by a state party at its own expense, may be used to supplement the IMS and must be certified in the same way as IMS stations.

The PTS reports that, as of October 2000, 62 percent of the site surveys for the 201 primary stations are complete, 16 percent of the stations are installed and are sending data to the International Data Centre (IDC) in Vienna, and three primary seismic stations have been certified. Of the 120 auxiliary seismic stations, 60 percent essentially meet PTS specifications; the remaining 40 percent will require some significant upgrades.

Now that the PTS has experience in establishing them, the number of operational and certified stations will increase substantially over the next couple of years, as long as there is continuing financial support.

Data will be transmitted via a dedicated Global Communications Infrastructure (GCI) to the IDC at the CTBTO. The data will be collected, stored, analysed and transmitted to treaty parties. The PTS has already

demonstrated that the IDC can receive and process data and distribute it in a timely manner to states parties.

Global satellite coverage for the GCI was established in 1999 with the commissioning of four communications hubs with terrestrial links to Vienna. The IDC headquarters' facilities were completed in 1999 and are being progressively commissioned. Approximately 100 IMS stations are currently contributing data to the IDC. In February 2000, the IDC began distributing test products. At present, 44 states signatories are receiving IMS data and IDC products.

The system is expected to detect with a very high level of confidence—and hence deterrence—a non-evasively conducted explosion of at least one kiloton (kt). Because of the real possibility of detection significantly below this yield, there is also a considerable deterrent effect against clandestine testing below one kt. The IMS is expected to be able to determine the location of such events within 1,000 square kilometres, the maximum area permitted for an on-site inspection.

Seismic network

The global seismic network, which is designed to detect underground nuclear tests, is a key component of the IMS. Although the partially completed system has varying detection and location capabilities at the local, regional and global levels, in some regions the capability is already quite good. In the northern hemisphere, for example, explosions of 100 tons and below have been readily detected and located. Single array stations in central Eurasia are capable of detecting and providing an approximate location for explosions of around 10–25 tons with sufficient signal amplitude either to identify the source or arouse concerns as to the nature of the source. Three 100-ton seismic calibration explosions conducted in Kazakhstan in recent years were detected and located, as was a small explosion of around five tons in the Dead Sea. While it is not expected that the global detection threshold for the completed system will be this low, these examples demonstrate the capabilities of even a partially completed system.

To locate an event with an uncertainty of less than 1,000 square kilometres, it is essential to have the source region calibrated in order to map variations in seismic wave velocity. International co-operative calibration efforts are now taking place under PrepCom auspices. Once a region is calibrated, it has been shown, through simulation and the observation of events with a known location, that it is possible to achieve a location accuracy of better than 1,000 square kilometres for all continents and a good portion of the world's oceans.

Hydroacoustic network

Explosions in the sea or on small islands are readily detectable by hydrophones tethered in oceans, and by high frequency seismometers (T-phase stations) located near steeply shelving coasts. Establishment of a network of six hydrophone stations and five T-phase stations, which will cover the oceans, has begun. At present three stations are contributing data to the IDC, providing a detection capability for the North Pacific, most of the Indian Ocean and parts of the North Atlantic.

Determining the location of underwater explosions is currently only possible in association with data from the IMS seismic network. When all 11 stations are on line, nuclear explosions will be detectable in all oceans. These stations will facilitate discrimination between small sub-oceanic earthquakes and explosions, and, in conjunction with seismic data, enable accurate location of any nuclear explosion in the sea.

Infrasound network

The infrasound monitoring network of 60 land-based stations aims to detect and locate atmospheric nuclear explosions through the sound waves that they generate. The planned network is not yet complete. Nine stations, 15 percent of the future network, are likely to be operational by the end of 2000, while 29 are expected to be functioning by the end of 2001. The sensitivity and large dynamic range of the sensors allow detection of explosions a few thousand kilometres away. Using such technology, space shuttle launches in Florida have been detected as far away as Canada, and Concorde flights over the Atlantic have been detected in Germany.

Station locations have been selected to give as uniform coverage as possible. The detection and location capabilities of the network have been determined by modelling, based on data derived from past nuclear tests and atmospheric models. The network's detection capability when complete, defined as the minimum detectable explosion yield, is estimated at about one kt overall and less in some areas. The location precision is estimated to be within a radius of 100 km or less. The addition of more sensors to an array will increase the detection range of isolated stations and improve detection at windy sites where background noise is high.

Radionuclide network and laboratories

Eighty radionuclide stations will measure radioactive particulates and noble gases in the atmosphere from atmospheric nuclear tests or underground explosions that vent. Laboratories will analyse samples from these stations. Six particulate stations are installed and sending data to the

IDC. Four recently developed noble gas detection systems are being tested alongside each other prior to deployment in 2001. The 16 radionuclide laboratories included in the system already exist, but need to be certified. Once the system is complete, there should be a high probability of detecting globally a one kt nuclear explosion within 14 days. The combination of particulate and noble gas detection will provide a very high probability of identifying an event as nuclear. The sensitivity limit for particulate detection systems is unlikely to improve significantly in the near future. The sensitivity limit for noble gases, however, could be improved by a factor of 10 using enhanced measurement

and gas purification techniques. The system will locate an event within a radius of 750 kilometres by determining the origin of the radioactive cloud. This will improve with research into atmospheric transport modelling—in collaboration with the World Meteorological Organization.

Synergies between IMS technologies

To improve verifiability and ensure a cost-effective IMS, treaty negotiators took full account of the potential for synergies between the four IMS technologies. The three waveform technologies—seismic, hydroacoustic and infrasound—operate synergistically to improve the detection and location of nuclear explosions. These technologies also operate synergistically with the radionuclide network. The detection of radionuclides may be vital in proving that an identified explosion was nuclear.

Consultation and clarification

States parties are encouraged by the treaty to try to resolve compliance issues among themselves or with the assistance of the Technical Secretariat or Executive Council, particularly before requesting an on-site inspection. Parties are obliged to respond to requests for clarification within a specified period, whether direct from a state party or via the Executive Council. The CTBTO Director-General is obliged to provide, on request, the appropriate information held by the Technical Secretariat to assist in resolving a compliance matter.

On-site inspections When a state party to the CTBT, on the basis of information from the IMS or its own national technical means of verification (NTM), suspects that a nuclear explosion may have been carried out in violation of the treaty, that state may request an on-site inspection (OSI). Before proceeding, such an inspection must be approved by at least 30 of the 51 members of the Executive Council. The state party to be inspected is obliged to accept the OSI.

A well-prepared OSI regime should serve as a deterrent, discouraging any potential violator because of the high probability of exposure. Three elements for the conduct of OSIs are

currently in preparation: the Operational Manual; equipment; and training. The purpose of conducting an OSI is to clarify whether a nuclear explosion in violation of the treaty has been carried out. A team of up to 40 inspectors is permitted to inspect an area as large as 1,000 square kilometres. The treaty provides for a balance of rights and responsibilities between the inspection team and the inspected state party. Different techniques are permitted during successive periods of the inspection, including position finding, radioactive measurements, and passive seismic and geophysical techniques. The final step may be the use of specialised drilling equipment to obtain radioactive samples, which may be the equivalent of a 'smoking gun'.

It is envisaged that OSIs will be used only on rare occasions, after other measures in the treaty, such as consultation and clarification, have been tried. A successful OSI is expected to provide significantly better knowledge about the event that triggered the OSI request. The main challenges confronting an OSI are the diverse environments that may be encountered and a lack of co-operation from the inspected state party.

Confidence-building measures

The purpose of confidence-building measures (CBMs) is to help reduce ambiguities and enhance confidence in treaty compliance through an exchange of data and information. While CBMs are not mandatory, states parties are invited to provide details of any activities that could give rise to potentially ambiguous signals detected by the IMS. For example, conventional explosions of 300 tons or greater, such as for mining operations, should be announced in advance, together with details like yield, location and purpose. In some circumstances the Technical Secretariat could be invited to visit the area of an explosion.

States parties are free to institute bilateral or multilateral CBMs outside the treaty framework in order to enhance their confidence in verifiability. Such measures might include: mutual visits to sites of potentially ambiguous conventional explosions; mutual monitoring of closed nuclear test sites; and mutual notification of sub-critical experiments and close-in monitoring of the area in which they are conducted.

Additional verification means

In addition to the verification means established by the treaty, there are many additional resources available to the international community to verify compliance with the CTBT. These may be owned and operated by governments, research institutes, universities, commercial companies and non-governmental organisations.

Some of the data from these sources are classified, while the rest are openly available.

Today, tens of thousands of openly accessible scientific and environmental monitoring resources may record evidence of a clandestine nuclear explosion. Rapid advances in data processing technology should permit the integration of these vast and continually evolving sources of global information. Together, these resources provide a strong additional deterrent to any country considering a clandestine nuclear test.

National technical means

The CTBT provides that data obtained by NTM, consistent with international law, may be submitted by any state party during consultation and clarification procedures and (in conjunction with IMS data or alone) as the basis of an OSI request. States also use such systems unilaterally to monitor compliance with the CTBT. National technical means may include the same types of technologies used by the IMS, as well as other information-gathering techniques. The United States operates the most sophisticated NTM, including satellite sensors (optical, infrared, visible, imagery, gamma ray and x-ray detectors) and an extensive seismic system, the Atomic Energy Detection System (AEDS). Several of the AEDS stations have been selected as IMS stations and are being upgraded to PTS specifications. Russia also operates a Special Monitoring System. Some Russian, French and British NTM stations, along with those of other countries, have already been incorporated into the IMS.

The main limitation of NTM is that, since states mostly wish to keep their capabilities secret, it is difficult to assess independently their reliability and accuracy. Moreover, because governments operate them, they may serve national interests rather than those of the international community. However, technologically sophisticated states should be able to make a compelling case, using data from their NTM, in the event of a significant violation of the treaty. The capabilities and prevalence of NTM will continue to grow and spread to more countries, further building confidence in the verifiability of the CTBT.

Satellite imagery

Satellites are non-intrusive and can monitor a large area of the earth's surface in a short time. There is considerable potential for detecting surface changes resulting from nuclear tests using the wide range of spectral sensors on satellites and differencing techniques for enhancing

images. Such images can provide 'ground truth' for calibration experiments and for locating mining activity and earthquakes. They can also be used to locate a suspect site after a nuclear test has been conducted or, in some cases, pre-test activities. Satellites may also detect the flash of atmospheric explosions.

Although the CTBT does not currently provide for satellite monitoring, it does commit states parties to examine the verification potential of such technology (along with others such as electromagnetic pulse monitoring) in the future.

Commercial remote sensing satellites with high-resolution sensors are being launched and operated by an increasing number of states—currently Canada, France, India, Russia and the US. Civil radar satellites now have day and night and all-weather capabilities. The quality of data from civilian satellites has improved some 100-fold since 1972 when the US launched the first such satellite. Information acquired by them is available for purchase and the cost is declining. Any state or non-state actor now has access to such information to assist in monitoring compliance with the CTBT.

Scientific networks

While the IMS seismic system consists of 170 stations, by the end of the decade there will be thousands of digital seismic stations worldwide collecting data in real or near-real time. In many areas, seismic stations installed for scientific purposes, such as studying earthquakes, already provide a capability that far exceeds that of the IMS. In Central Asia, for example, regional seismic networks have a detection threshold that, on average, is about 20 times better over large areas, including the nuclear test sites at Lop Nor and Semipalatinsk, than that expected for the IMS. Recent instances that have demonstrated the value of open data for nuclear monitoring include: determination of the source of a magnitude 3.5 seismic event on 16 August 1997 near the test site at Novaya Zemlya; and detection of the nuclear explosions conducted by India and Pakistan in May 1998.

Total verification resources and synergies

The total monitoring resources available to the international community—including the IMS, NTM and scientific instruments and networks—must be considered when evaluating the verifiability of the CTBT. There will be considerable synergies between IMS and non-IMS data from a variety of sources, which will increasingly enhance confidence in the verifiability of the treaty.

Evasion scenarios

The three most credible evasion scenarios that have been proposed to foil monitoring networks are decoupling,

hiding a nuclear explosion in another event, and evading attribution. There are no credible examples of the latter two scenarios, and thus the focus has been on decoupling.

In theory, decoupling would work by conducting a test in a large underground cavity in an attempt to attenuate greatly the seismic waves. A large enough cavity at a sufficient depth would have to be found or constructed to permit such an attempt. Successful decoupling would require substantial financial, technical and human resources and would need to be conducted in complete secrecy.

Any state contemplating a decoupled test would face a verification gauntlet. A potential evader would not only need to attenuate significantly the seismic signal to avoid detection by the IMS and other seismic networks, but it would also have to ensure that all the radioactive particulate and noble gas debris produced by the explosion was completely contained within the cavity. Furthermore, the potential evader would need to avoid creating any surface evidence of the test. Only a few low-yield decoupling experiments have ever been conducted, by the Soviet Union and the United States. It is unlikely that an emergent nuclear weapon state would have sufficient experience or resources to conduct successfully a fully decoupled, completely contained clandestine nuclear test explosion. The most sophisticated nuclear weapon states would themselves have difficulty in carrying out such an explosion, even at low yield.

Conclusions and recommendations

The Commission concludes that:

- the overall resources available for verifying compliance with the CTBT comprise the IMS, NTM and other scientific instruments and networks;

- when fully in place, these resources will be capable of meeting the international community's expectation that relevant events will be detected, located and identified with high probability;

- overall verification resources will improve as more monitoring stations are installed, more research is carried out and global communications systems continue to expand;

- these global capabilities constitute a complex and constantly evolving verification gauntlet, which any potential violator will have to confront—together they will serve as a powerful deterrent.

The Commission recommends that:

- states should provide the necessary political, financial and technical support to permit the CTBT verification regime to be established as soon as possible;

the international community should encourage the open exchange of data between the IMS and the global scientific community;

states should support research to improve the scientific and technical underpinnings of global verification capabilities: as these are strengthened verifiability will increase.

Members of the Independent Commission on the Verifiability of the CTBT:

H.E. Ambassador Nobuyasu Abe, Permanent Mission of Japan to the United Nations, Vienna

Peter Basham, Provisional Technical Secretariat of the CTBT Organization, Vienna

Dr Elisabeth Blanc, Commissariat à l'Energie Atomique (CEA), France

Dr Ola Dahlman, Adviser to the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Sweden

Dr Trevor Findlay, Verification Research, Training and Information Centre (VERTIC), UK, (Chairman)

Dr Lindsay H. Hall, Defence Operational Technology Support Establishment, New Zealand

Professor Herbert Huppert, Cambridge University, Institute of Theoretical Physics and Fellow of the Royal Society, UK

Professor Bhupendra Jasani, Department of War Studies, King's College London, UK

Dr Yury Khokhlov, Research Institute for Pulse Technique, MINATOM, Russia

Peter Marshall, UK Atomic Weapons Establishment at Aldermaston, UK

Dr Mordechai Melamud, Israel Atomic Energy Commission, Israel

Dr Joachim Schulze, Provisional Technical Secretariat of the CTBT Organization, Vienna

Dr Gregory van der Vink, Incorporated Research Institutions for Seismology (IRIS), US

Professor Terry Wallace, Department of Geosciences, University of Arizona, US

** For further information contact the Commission Secretary, Dr Oliver Meier, at the address below.

COMMISSION SECRETARIAT: The Verification Research, Training and Information Centre (VERTIC), 15-17 St. Cross Street, Baird House, London, EC1N 8UW, UK
Phone +44 (0)20 7440 6960 Fax +44 (0)20 7242 3266 E-mail: <info@vertic.org>
Web: <<http://www.ctbtcommission.org>>

To view the entire article, go to
<http://washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A23211-2000Oct26.html>

"Vietnam Era Shaped Two Different Worldviews"

The Washington Post, October 26, 2000

It has taken two Vietnam-era presidential candidates to scramble the positions of their parties on the issue of foreign intervention. Vice President Gore, who served in Vietnam as an Army journalist, has buried his party's anti-war McGovernism and become the election's leading advocate of humanitarian intervention and "forward engagement" in places central to America's values and interests.

Texas Gov. George W. Bush, who stayed in the United States as a National Guard pilot during Vietnam, has tried to split the difference between his party's isolationist and interventionist wings. He criticizes Gore and President Clinton for overextending U.S. forces abroad and calls instead for a vaguely defined "distinctly American internationalism."

Does any of that matter in the presidential race? The conventional wisdom says not much.

The political gurus who run the Gore campaign have done their best to keep their candidate away from these issues, even though he is deeply steeped in them. For Gore to hold forth on foreign policy, they fear, would only reinforce his wonkish image. Bush, with little experience in international affairs, is understandably more comfortable talking about the domestic policy issues he has dealt with as Texas governor.

"It's a general rule of politics: Unless we're in a war, or on the brink of war, voters don't vote on foreign policy issues," a former top adviser to President Clinton said disconsolately.

Suddenly, however, foreign affairs are once again in the news. Peace and prosperity have given way to rocks, bullets and anxiety in the Middle East, with uncertain implications for the United States. Having jolted oil and stock markets, the unfolding crisis also could deliver a shock to the presidential campaign.

Bush says that Clinton and Gore have overextended U.S. military forces by intervening in places that are not linked to U.S. strategic interests. He opposes intervening with U.S. troops for humanitarian reasons alone ! and repeatedly has rapped Gore for getting involved in what he calls "nation building."

Bush says he would not have sent U.S. troops to Haiti, as Clinton did, and he wants to end American involvement in NATO peacekeeping missions in the Balkans. Gore argues that the strength of the United States comes from its values, not just its military and economy. He says there are instances in which the United States should intervene for humanitarian reasons, although

he did not favor intervention in Rwanda or Sierra Leone and backed a regional peacekeeping mission in East Timor.

Gore advisers have sharply criticized Bush's plan for pulling out of the Balkans, saying it would undercut NATO and seriously strain relations with key European allies. On Russia, Bush has attacked Gore for cozying up to a "corrupt and favored elite," citing the vice president's efforts to reform the Russian economy in partnership with former prime minister Viktor Chernomyrdin.

These efforts, Bush says, wound up lining the pockets of government officials as the country slid into ruin. The Republican nominee says the West should focus on institution-building and helping businesses and entrepreneurs.

Gore argues that the United States cannot afford to turn its back on the Russian leadership, whatever its shortcomings. He cites, in particular, a U.S.-Russian program that has led to the deactivation of thousands of Soviet-era nuclear warheads. Gore advisers also contend that expanding NATO--a goal both candidates share--will be much easier if Washington remains "engaged" with Russian leaders.

Bush sides with Senate Republicans who rejected the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty last year. He says the treaty might not be verifiable, would not stop potential enemies from testing and would restrict America's ability to ensure the safety of its nuclear arsenal. However, he has promised to preserve the testing moratorium begun by his father in 1992.

Gore says he would resubmit the treaty to the Senate for ratification. He contends that failure to ratify the test-ban accord has undercut U.S. efforts to curb the spread of nuclear weapons to countries such as India and Pakistan, both of which exploded nuclear devices in May 1998.

Bush and his advisers also have criticized the Clinton administration for describing China as a "strategic partner." They say China is a "strategic competitor," a phrase that seems to imply a more muscular posture.

In practice, however, the two candidates do not appear to be far apart on relations with Beijing. Both support free trade and have welcomed China's entry into the World Trade Organization. Both support the longstanding "one China" policy while promising to defend democracy in Taiwan.

Although he recently intimated that the Clinton administration may have rushed the Camp David summit in July, possibly contributing to the recent eruption of Palestinian-Israeli violence, Bush has not drawn any major distinctions with Gore on Middle East peacemaking.

He has generally backed the administration's effort to act as an "honest broker" between Israelis and Arabs, and he praised Clinton's recent effort to broker a truce in Egypt. Both candidates pledge their undying fidelity to Israel and its security.

Bush has been more critical of the Clinton administration's approach to Iraq. During Gore's watch, he says, Saddam Hussein has grown stronger as

the international coalition against him has weakened and the weapons inspection regime in Iraq has fallen apart. Evidence that Iraq has reconstituted its weapons programs, Bush suggests, would be answered by his administration with military force.

But there could be fewer differences on Iraq than meet the eye. Although both candidates say they would back Iraqi opposition groups seeking to overthrow the Baghdad regime, neither has said he would commit U.S. military forces in support of such an operation.

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: jdi@[63.106.26.66]
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)
Date: Fri, 03 Nov 2000 12:54:06 -0500
To: jdi@clw.org
From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>
Subject: Senate election polling update + fundraising totals

RECENT POLLING ON SENATE 2000 CAMPAIGNS

November 3, 2000 update

== Close races (incumbent party in parentheses): Delaware (R), Florida (R), Michigan (R), Minnesota (R), Missouri (R), Montana (R), Nebraska (D), New Jersey (D), New York (D), Virginia (D), Washington (R)

== Longer-shot races: Georgia (D), Nevada (D), Pennsylvania (R), Rhode Island, (R), Vermont (R)

==Endorsements by Council for a Livable World indicated by ***

==New polls since the last polling data was circulated: California, Delaware, Florida, Indiana, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin

N.B. Where available, independent polls are cited rather than those associated with a candidate or a party.

=====
California

=====
54% - Senator Dianne Feinstein (D)
39% - Rep. Tom Campbell (R)
7% - Undecided, other

Research 2000 poll conducted October 30-Nov. 1, 2000 for KCRA-TV - 820 likely voters

=====
Connecticut

=====
60% - Sen. Joseph Lieberman (D)
27% - Philip Giordano (R)
10% - Undecided, other

54% - Richard Blumenthal (D)
23% - Philip Giordano (R)
20% - Undecided, other

University of Connecticut poll conducted September 26-Oct. 1, 2000 - 447 registered voters

=====
Delaware

=====
44% - Sen. Bill Roth (R)

44% - Gov. Tom Carper (D) ***

12% - Undecided, other

Mason Dixon poll conducted October 31-Nov. 1, 2000 - 625 likely voters

=====

Florida

=====

42% - Bill Nelson (D)

36% - Bill McCollum (R)

7% - Willie Logan (I)

15% - Undecided, other

Zogby tracking poll conducted October 31-Nov. 2, 2000 for Reuters/MSNBC -

659 likely voters

45% - Bill Nelson (D)

40% - Bill McCollum (R)

5% - Willie Logan (I)

10% - Undecided, other

Mason-Dixon poll conducted October 30-31, 2000 for Reuters/MSNBC - 812

likely voters

=====

Georgia

=====

49% - Sen. Zell Miller (D)

30% - Mack Mattingly (R)

21% - Undecided, other

Mason-Dixon poll conducted October 12-14, 2000 -

627 likely voters

=====

Indiana

=====

68% - Sen. Dick Lugar (R)

20% - David Johnson (D)

12% - Undecided, other

Research 2000 poll conducted October 28-30, 2000 for South Bend Tribune -

600 likely voters

=====

Maine

=====

60% - Sen. Olympia Snowe (R)

15% - Mark Lawrence (D) ***

25% - Undecided, other

Portland Pree Herald poll conducted October 22-25, 2000 by Market Decisions

of S. Portland - 824 likely voters

=====

Maryland

=====

59% - Sen. Paul Sarbanes (D) ***

30% - Delegate Paul Rappaport (R)

11% - Undecided

Mason-Dixon poll conducted October 25-26, 2000 - 625 likely voters

=====
Massachusetts
=====

68% - Sen. Edward Kennedy (D) ***
16% - Jack E. Robinson (R)
16% - Undecided

Boston Herald poll conducted August 29 - 31, 2000 - 410 likely voters

=====
Michigan
=====

47% - Rep. Debbie Stabenow (D) ***
41% - Sen. Spencer Abraham (R)
12% - Undecided

Zoby tracking poll conducted October 31-Nov. 2, 2000 for Toledo Blade and Pittsburgh Post-Gazette - 607 likely voters

40% - Sen. Spencer Abraham (R)
39% - Rep. Debbie Stabenow (D) ***
21% - Undecided

Detroit News tracking poll conducted October 30- Nov. 1, 2000 - 600 likely voters

=====
Minnesota
=====

47% - Mark Dayton (D)
42% - Sen. Rod Grams (R)
12% - Undecided, other

Mason-Dixon poll conducted October 26-27, 2000 for St. Paul Pioneer Press - 625 likely voters

=====
Missouri
=====

46% - Gov. Mel Carnahan (D) *** (Died in plane crash)
46% - Sen. John Ashcroft (R)
8% - Undecided, other

Zogby tracking poll conducted October 31-Nov. 2, 2000 for the St. Louis Post-Dispatch - 593 likely voters

47% - Gov. Mel Carnahan (D) *** (Died in plane crash)
42% - Sen. John Ashcroft (R)
11% - Undecided, other

Research 2000 poll conducted October 31-Nov. 1, 2000 for KOMU-TV - 600 likely voters

=====
Montana
=====

43% - Brian Schweitzer (D) ***
41% - Sen. Conrad Burns (R)

10% - Undecided, other
Montana State University-Billings poll conducted October 19-23, 2000 - 401
likely voters

45% - Sen. Conrad Burns (R)
44% - Brian Schweitzer (D) ***
11% - Undecided, other
Mason-Dixon poll conducted October 23-24, 2000 for Lee Newspapers - 628
likely voters

=====
Nebraska
=====

49% Ben Nelson (D) ***
37% Don Stenberg (R)
14% Undecided
Omaha World-Herald poll conducted October 25-27, 2000 by RKM Research and
Comm. - 1,007 registered voters

=====
Nevada
=====

54% - Former Rep. John Ensign (R)
37% - Ed Bernstein (D)***
9% - Undecided, other
Mason-Dixon poll conducted September 9-12, 2000 - 627 regular voters

=====
New Jersey
=====

47% - Jon Corzine (D) ***
39% - Rep. Bob Franks (R)
14% - Undecided, other
Quinnipiac University poll conducted October 24-30, 2000 - 793 likely voters

39% - Jon Corzine (D) ***
35% - Rep. Bob Franks (R)
22% - Undecided, other
Gannett NJ poll conducted October 26-28, 2000 - 575 likely voters

=====
New Mexico
=====

59% - Sen. Jeff Bingaman (D) ***
31% - Former Rep. Bill Redmond (R)
10% - Undecided, other
Mason Dixon poll conducted September 28-30, 2000 - 442 likely voters

=====
New York
=====

48% - Hillary Clinton (D) ***
47% - Rep. Rick Lazio (R)
7% - Undecided, other

Newsday poll conducted October 28-31, 2000 - 1,103 registered voters

47% - Hillary Clinton (D) ***

46% - Rep. Rick Lazio (R)

7% - Undecided, other

Zogby tracking poll conducted October 31-Nov. 2, 2000 for New York Post - 704 likely voters

=====
North Dakota

=====
66% - Sen. Kent Conrad (D) ***

27% - Duane Sand (R)

7% - Undecided

Fargo Forum poll conducted October 23-25, 2000 by Minnesota State University-Moorhead - 626 likely voters

=====
Ohio

=====
60% - Sen. Mike DeWine (R)

30% - Ted Celeste (D)

10% - Undecided, other

Zogby tracking poll conducted October 31-Nov. 2, 2000 for Toledo Blade and Pittsburgh Post-Gazette - 600 likely voters

=====
Pennsylvania

=====
51% - Sen. Rick Santorum (R)

33% - Rep. Ron Klink (D) ***

16% - Undecided, other

Zogby tracking poll conducted October 31-Nov. 2, 2000 for Toledo Blade and Pittsburgh Post-Gazette - 603 likely voters

48% - Sen. Rick Santorum (R)

27% - Rep. Ron Klink (D) ***

25% - Undecided, other

Keystone/Millersville Univ. Poll conducted October 26-29, 2000 for Philadelphia Daily News - 550 likely voters

=====
Rhode Island

=====
52% - Sen. Lincoln Chafee (R) ***

28% - Rep. Robert Weygand (D)

20% - Undecided, other

Brown University poll conducted October 21-22, 2000 for Providence Journal - 412 registered voters

=====
Tennessee

=====
59% - Sen. Bill Frist (R)

27% - Jeff Clark (D)
14% - Undecided, other
Zogby tracking poll conducted October 31-Nov. 2, 2000 for Reuters/MSNBC -
499 likely 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

=====
64% - Sen. Orrin Hatch (R)
24% - Scott Howell (D)
12% - undecided, others
Deseret News poll conducted October 9-12, 2000 by Dan Jones & Assoc. - 914
adults

=====
Vermont

=====
61% - Sen. Jim Jeffords (R) ***
33% - Ed Flanagan (D)
6% - Undecided
Research 2000 poll conducted October 23-25, 2000 for the Rutland Herald -
400 likely voters

=====
Virginia

=====
49% - Ex-Governor George Allen (R)
44% - Sen. Chuck Robb (D)
7% - Undecided
Mason-Dixon poll conducted October 30-31, 2000 - 625 likely voters

=====
Washington

=====
49% - Sen. Slade Gorton (R)
43% - Maria Cantwell (D) ***
8% - Undecided, other
Zogby tracking poll conducted October 31-Nov. 2, 2000 for Reuters/MSNBC -
511 likely voters

=====
Wisconsin

=====
58% - Sen. Herbert Kohl (D) ***
34% - John Gillespie (R)
8% - Undecided

Zogby tracking poll conducted October 31-Nov. 2, 2000 for Reuters/MSNBC -
506 likely voters

=====
Wyoming

=====
68% - Sen. Craig Thomas (R)
14% - Mel Logan (D)
18% - Undecided, other

Mason-Dixon poll conducted September 16-17, 2000 - 412 likely voters

Total campaign fundraising in selected Senate races as of October 18, 2000

California

\$9,584,195 - Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D)
\$4,341,559 - Rep. Tom Campbell (R)

Delaware

\$3,812,80 - Sen. William Roth (R)
\$2,269,524- Gov. Thomas Carper (D)

Florida

\$7,138,900 - Rep. Bill McCollum (R)
\$5,711,144 - Bill Nelson (D)

Georgia

\$2,141,441 - Zell Miller (D)
\$ 870,142 - Mack Mattingly (R)

Indiana

\$3,434,290 - Sen. Dick Lugar (R)
\$1,424,745 - David Johnson (D)

Maine

\$2,138,448 - Sen. Olympia Snowe (R)
\$ 695,976 - Mark Lawrence (D)

Michigan

\$10,789,31 - Sen. Spencer Abraham (R)
\$ 7,190,755- Rep. Debbie Stabenow (D)

Minnesota

\$8,778,643 - Mark Dayton (D)
\$5,882,499 - Sen. Rod Grams (R)

Missouri

\$8,178,786 - Sen. John Ashcroft (R)
\$7,395,367 - Gov. Mel Carnahan (D)

Montana

\$3,577,350 - Sen. Conrad Burns (R)
\$1,720,491 - Brian Schweitzer (D)

Nebraska

\$2,432,845 - Ben Nelson (D)

\$1,514,417 - Don Stenberg (R)

New Jersey

\$55,697,247 - Jon Corzine (D)

\$ 4,991,101- Rep. Bob Franks (R)

Nevada

\$4,479,449 - John Ensign (R)

\$2,353,873 - Ed Bernstein (D)

New Mexico

\$2,615,612 - Sen. Jeff Bingaman (D)

\$ 657,588 - William Redmond (R)

New York

\$32,969,013 - Rick Lazio (R)

\$26,711,579 - Hillary Clinton (D)

Pennsylvania

\$8,368,302 - Sen. Rick Santorum (R)

\$3,671,833 - Rep. Ron Klink (D)

Rhode Island

\$2,314,459 - Sen. Lincoln Chafee (R)

\$2,243,166 - Rep. Bob Weygand (D)

Vermont

\$1,964,757 - Sen. Jim Jeffords (R)

\$ 957,779 - Ed Flanagan (D)

Virginia

\$9,218,874 - George Allen (R)

\$5,624,134 - Sen. Charles Robb (D)

Washington

\$8,366,060 - Maria Cantwell (D)

\$5,678,401 - Sen. Slade Gorton (R)

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: Fri, 3 Nov 2000 17:59:52 -0500
To: updates@reachingcriticalwill.org
From: Felicity Hill <flick@pop.igc.org>
Subject: WEEK 5 REPORT UNGA FIRST COMMITTEE
Cc: wilpf-news@igc.topica.com

<x-rich><center>

<bold>REPORT ON THE FIFTH AND FINAL WEEK
OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE OF THE UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY

</bold></center><bold>

</bold>1. Introduction & Thanks

2. New Agenda Resolution, L.4 Rev 1

3. Japanese-Australian Resolution L.39 Rev 1

4. Fissile Material L.49 Rev 1

5. ABM Treaty Resolution L.2 Rev 1

6. Small Arms L.28 Rev 1

7. Regional Disarmament Resolution L. 34

8. Risk of Nuclear Proliferation in the Middle East L.29 Rev 2

9. Under Secretary General's Press Briefing

10. Disarmament Fellows Denied Visas <smaller>L.13

</smaller><bold>1. Introduction & Thanks

</bold>The First Committee finished its work early, completing the first round of voting on Wednesday evening, November 1. Predictably, the Middle East drama preoccupied the final moments and threatened to hold participants over until the next day. The Chair suspended the 24 hour rule whereby delegations are given 24 hours to examine amended texts in the case of Egypt's resolution on "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East" (more on this below).

The tentative date for final voting in the General Assembly on these resolutions is set for 20 November 2000.

Overall, this First Committee session went smoothly with some special highlights. Discussions on 2001 Conference on the Illicit Traffic in Small Arms developed into overdue but welcome decisions on the venue and date which were set for New York, July 9-20, 2001. The world's nations were given an opportunity to register concern over US plans for a national missile defence with the abstainers affirming the importance of the ABM treaty in explanations of vote.

On nuclear matters, the successful NPT Review Conference boosted spirits with Ambassador Grey of the United States saying it better than anyone could have, "[the] NPT Review Conference Final Document [which] is our guiding light for nuclear nonproliferation and disarmament efforts." Shine on New Agenda - specifically shine some guiding light on the path to 2005 for the radioactive states, maintaining our raised expectations that the achievable and reasonable plan devised at the NPT in 2000 will indeed be acted upon. For our part, NGOs will keep up the pressure, and look forward to next years New Agenda text.

The NGOs in New York monitoring and reporting on the First Committee want to thank many people. We have been greatly assisted by all the staff of the Department for Disarmament Affairs, especially the NGO Liaison, **Ayuush Bat-Erdene**. Many delegations came to our weekly roundtable events and provided ideas, information, analysis and documents - thanks to all of you. We would also like to thank NGO colleagues in capitals and at the grass roots level for engagement in this years First Committee in your country. We are pleased the reports and the provision of texts via the webpage was so useful. We are also surprised that some of your governments refused to provide you with the texts, even ones they were sponsoring that spoke of encouraging NGO activity! Thanks you for your encouragement, sympathy notes, rap poems of praise and punk rock tapes that lightened the sometimes tedious work. Lets maintain the synergy between NGOs, UN departments and governments which is being called the "New Democratic Diplomacy". It is a formula for evolution through partnerships that enable each group to benefit from the strengths and insights of the other.

Merav Datan Int'l Physicans for the Prevention of Nuclear War,
Physicans for Social Responsibility

Felicity Hill Women's International League for Peace and Freedom

David Jackman Quaker United Nations Office,

Pam Jordan NGO Committee on Disarmament,

Tracy Moavero Peace Action Education Fund,

Alyn Ware, Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy

Jim Wurst Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy,

2. New Agenda Resolution, L.4 Rev 1

The New Agenda resolution was overwhelmingly adopted on 1 November by a vote

of 146 to three with eight abstentions: an obvious and unequivocal

endorsement. All of NATO (except France) voted yes. The US, UK and China are

in the "yes" column; Russia and France abstained. The three "no" votes are

from the non-NPT NWSs - India, Israel and Pakistan. The eight abstainers are:

Bhutan, France, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Mauritius, Monaco, Russia,

Uzbekistan. Most are countries closely tied to Russia, France or India.

This overwhelming vote serves the dual goals of bringing the NPT consensus

onto the broader international stage and solidifying the New Agenda's role in

nuclear disarmament deliberations. In short, this is the new agenda.

In 1999, seven of the eight nuclear weapon states voted against the New

Agenda draft (China abstained). The vote was 90 to 13, with 37 abstentions

(including the non-nuclear NATO states).

Several delegations, including the US and UK, said they were judging First

Committee resolutions this year by the light of the 2000 NPT Review

Conference Final Document. In explaining their votes, the US said the NPT

Document "is our guiding light for nuclear

non-proliferation and disarmament efforts" and the UK said First Committee

drafts "should faithfully reflect the letter and spirit" of the NPT agreement.

Amb. Robert Grey of the US said the draft "recognizes that nuclear

disarmament is a process that requires pragmatic proposals in a step-like

process, not political calls for impossible goals. We view the resolution in

this context, including the rather unclear and ambiguous operative

paragraph 18, which should not be construed as in any way limiting the ways

and means available to pursue our shared goals." Paragraph 18 is the one that

calls for "the underpinnings of a universal and multilaterally negotiated

legally binding instrument or a framework encompassing a mutually reinforcing

set of instruments."

Amb. Ian Souter of the UK said, "We considered it particularly important that

resolutions emerging from this committee should faithfully reflect the letter

and spirit [of the NPT Conference]... With that in mind, we are pleased to

have been able to vote in favor of this resolution. As we made clear in May,

the United Kingdom is unequivocally committed to the

global elimination of nuclear weapons. We welcome the fact that the 2000 NPT

Review Conference endorsed the package of measures that are reflected in this

resolution - many of which the United Kingdom has undertaken nationally."

In explaining their abstentions, China said the draft should have been "more

explicit" on issues including preserving the ABM Treaty, no-first-use, and

the lead role that should be taken by the major nuclear powers in

disarmament; France said the text "does not fully satisfy the need for

fidelity" to the NPT consensus.

There were two separate votes on paragraphs. PP 15, welcoming the Final

Document of the NPT Conference, passed 151 to three (India, Israel,

Pakistan), with one abstention (Cuba). OP 16, also on the NPT, passed 151 to

zero with four abstentions (Cuba, India, Israel, Pakistan).

Jim Wurst, LCNP

**3. Japanese-Australian Resolution on Nuclear Disarmament, L.39
Rev 1**

The Japanese/Australian draft on "A path to the total
elimination of nuclear

weapons" (L.39/Rev. 1) was adopted 144 to one (India) with 12
abstentions

(including China, France, Russia and Pakistan). The abstainers
complained had

multiple complaints, largely stemming either from the way the draft

interprets the NPT Final Document or that it does not go far enough:
the

draft "departs markedly from the [NPT] consensus" (France); it
"selectively

cites provisions from the Final Document which violate the fragile
balance of

interests" in the Document (Russia); the text "have certain inadequacies"

such as the failure to reject deterrence (China); and it places "inordinate

emphasis on non-proliferation and not on nuclear disarmament" (Pakistan).

Jim Wurst, LCNP

Japan, left out of the P5 - NAC negotiating during the NPT, put forward a resolution that in many ways mirrored the New Agenda resolution. Australia, also largely sidelined during the 2000 Review, later joined as a co-sponsor. It was adopted by a vote of 144, one no (India) and 12 abstentions (includes Israel, France, Pakistan, China, DPRK, Russia and Egypt).

The revised text changed operative paragraph 9 from "Calls for unilateral and cooperative efforts to prevent weapons of mass destruction, inter alia, nuclear weapons from falling into the hands of non-state actors" to " Calls upon all States to maintain the highest possible standards of security, safe custody, effective control and physical protection of all materials that could contribute to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction." Pakistan and Egypt commended this change.

Operative paragraph eight caused problems for some delegations. ("Calls upon all States to re-double their efforts to prevent the proliferation of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction, including their means for delivery, confirming and strengthening, if necessary, their policies not to transfer equipment, materials or technology that could contribute to the proliferation of those weapons") Egypt voted no on OP8, and said that made it impossible to vote yes on the whole resolution. While Iran voted yes on the whole, it abstained on OP8 saying that it doesn't reflect the NPT RevCon outcome language on transfers. Indonesia voted yes on the whole, saying the resolution contains important points, but abstained on OP8.

Results of the separate vote on OP8: yes 137, no 2 - Pakistan, Egypt, 11 abstentions including India, Indonesia several Arab and African states. France didn't vote on this paragraph.

Egypt called the resolution discriminatory, while Pakistan disagreed with what was seen as an emphasis of non-proliferation over disarmament and took issue with OP3 (implementation of NPT Art. VI and the 1995 Principles and Objectives). China abstained because important principles and measures were missing, such as no first use, nuclear sharing and (their ever common theme) the need for the nations with the largest arsenals to take the lead in disarmament. China criticized the resolution's inclusion of 2005 as a deadline for the completion of FMCT negotiations because such a date was not included in the NPT RevCon consensus document and unrealistically and unreasonably disregards the larger security environment.

While the UK expressed support and voted yes, France changed what in previous years was a yes vote to an abstention. Calling this a pragmatic and moderate resolution in previous years, France complained that this year it did not faithfully reflect the outcomes of the '95 and '00 NPT reviews, not including language on general and complete disarmament. Russia abstained, calling for all states to implement the NPT'00 outcome document.

Tracy Moavero

Peace Action Education Fund

4. Fissile Material

The resolution on the Fissile Materials Cut-Off Treaty talks (L.49/ Rev. 1)

was adopted by consensus. The revised text dropped the idea of completing

negotiations within five years, thus aligning the draft with the language of

the CD consensus.

Go to www.reachingcriticalwill.org for the revised texts, voting charts,

other resolutions and full texts of some of the explanation of votes.

5. ABM Treaty Resolution L.2 Rev 1

The resolution "Preservation of and compliance with the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems" (L.2/Rev.1), in its revised form, passed with a vote of 78 to 3 (Israel, Micronesia, and United States) and 65 abstentions.

Germany spoke on behalf of 30 abstaining countries (NATO and other European states), explaining that "[w]e attach great importance to the ABM Treaty as a cornerstone of strategic stability, contributing to the broader disarmament and arms control process" but asserting that the way the treaty is dealt with in the First Committee should have support of the parties to the treaty. Other states who took the floor to explain their abstention along the same lines, noting the bilateral nature of the treaty but affirming support for the ABM Treaty, included Brazil, Nigeria, the Philippines, New Zealand, and Peru.

Sweden aligned itself with the comments by Germany but stated that it does not share the "overriding preoccupation with 'strategic stability' expressed in the resolution" adding that "strategic stability is closely linked with cold war doctrines which... should in Sweden's view not be the sole basis for disarmament and non-proliferation in the post-cold war era." This was the first such direct challenge in this setting to "strategic stability", ie, deterrence.

The revised resolution included an operative paragraph that "welcomes the decision taken by the United States of America on 1 September 2000) not to authorize deployment of a national missile defence at this time, and considers that it constitutes a positive step for the preservation of strategic stability and security." This was an apparent effort to make the resolution appear more balanced. The United States, which never supported this resolution, claimed it was made worse with this revision and that "the sponsors have essentially ignored the President's decision by failing to make any other changes to the resolution to take into account how the President's decision has changed the landscape on ABM issues." The US further stated that the basic flaw remains the resolution's premise that preserving and strengthening the ABM Treaty is incompatible with amending it. However, Russia continues to indicate that amendment is unacceptable.

According to sources the large number of abstentions by states who actually support the ABM Treaty and do not support NMD was "payback" at the resolution sponsors for not incorporating suggested language in last year's resolution.

6. Small Arms

On October 31, (as reported earlier) the Small Arms decision (A/C.1/55/L.28/Rev.1) passed without a vote. There was no change from the details released last week on the site (New York) and date (July 9-20) of the 2001 conference nor of the site (New York) of the Third Prepcom session. The UN Secretariat's estimate of additional costs for using Geneva as a site for the conference were more than the Swiss were willing to cover. So it's New York all the way for the next two prepcom sessions and for the conference itself. While the site is not crucial to a positive outcome for the conference process, the negotiations leading to the decision have left a feeling of resentment and some suspicion in their wake. There is also a general sense that delegations interested in the conference have lowered their expectations for how much it can achieve. More positively, this means there may be a greater hope of reaching consensus on the substantive content of the conference as views on possible outcomes will be less divergent.

David Jackman QUNO

7. Regional Disarmament L.34

Originally introduced by Pakistan, this resolution called for greater progress on the full range of disarmament issues in the UN and

the CD, focusing on regional and sub-regional processes. Cameroon had put forward three new paras that would foster a greater role for the Secretary-General, but withdrew them. Adopted by consensus.

L.46 Regional Disarmament and Non-Proliferation

Belarus, after a long and somewhat cantankerous intervention, withdrew this resolution calling for a NWF "space" in Central and Eastern Europe. Belarus said that they would either put this forward to be adopted without a vote or not at all. As noted by Jim Wurst of LCNP in a previous report, this resolution "has the distinction of being opposed by virtually every state that would be a part of such a "space."

Tracy Moavero

Peace Action Education Fund

8. Risk of Nuclear Proliferation in the Middle East

As mentioned in the introduction, Rev 2 of this resolution was introduced on November 1 and was passed with 140 votes in favour, three against and 7 abstentions. A separate vote was called on preambular paragraph 6 which called on those states not party to the NPT to accede - which India and Israel voted against, 138 countries voted for, and 5 abstained: Cuba, Bhutan, Pakistan, Tonga and the Marshall Islands. During the debate, Israel objected to the First Committee being used and abused in the sending of political insults and assaults. Iraq took the floor to indicate that all countries except the "Zionist entity" are parties to the NPT and to object to the way in which the United States is assisting the beforementioned entity in the development of nuclear weapons which is more obvious since the agreement made in February of 2000. The US objected to the one sided attack on one country in the region, which gives an inaccurate picture of the While the US indicated it fully supported the NPT and welcomed the recording of its importance in the region, Ambassador Grey said that this resolution does not improve the situation one iota. He went on to say that some delegations that declare their support of the NPT Final Document appear to be jettisoning its outcomes and that the resolution in fact worked against the objective of states outside the NPT acceding. Israel took the floor to indicate that it is a country that has never threatened its neighbors and has never violated a treaty signed. Israel objected to the process and the fact that the text had become harsher over time.

Felicity Hill, WILPF

9 Under Secretary General's Press Briefing

Under-Secretary General for Disarmament Affairs Jayantha Dhanapala held a

press briefing on 2 November in order to draw attention to the key issues

before the First Committee and put them in the broader international context.

He described a "vastly better atmosphere this year... than last year" in the

Committee, which he attributed to "an afterglow" from the successful NPT

Conference. The US decision to postpone a final decision on deploying a ballistic missile defense added to "a general expectation of changes to come."

He added, "There was certainly a burgeoning of support for a number of resolutions" due to the "increasing role of civil society in various countries, the improved atmosphere in Northeast Asia... and in the Balkans."

On the nuclear disarmament issues, Dhanapala said the New Agenda resolution

"was the most important of them all." Since the draft based much of its

language on the NPT Final Document, "it was therefore acceptable to the three

nuclear-weapon states that voted for it and also attracted a lot of support

from NATO countries which had abstained earlier.... Clearly they have a

larger following... We must now see what next steps they will adopt in order

to implement what was in the NPT Final Document," he noted.

Dhanapala pointed out that the Japanese draft on nuclear disarmament had also

garnered "a large measure of support" and that the support for the ABM resolution increased over last year.

The focus on small arms was the decision on the dates and venue of the 2001

Conference. "It is an important step forward... preparations [for the Conference] can now go ahead," he said.

Dhanapala also noted that the Committee has requested two studies to be conducted on missiles and disarmament education.

Jim Wurst, LCNP

Newsday article resulting from this briefing

<http://www.newsday.com/ap/international/ap365.htm>

10. Disarmament Fellows Denied U.S. Visas L.13

UN Disarmament, Training and Advisory Services

Adopted without a vote, this continues a long standing program for training fellows in many aspects of disarmament in a program that includes the CD, CTBTO, OPCW, IAEA and much more. Cuba and Syria took the floor to protest the U.S. denying visas to Syrian and Cuban participants for the U.S. leg of the program.

Tracy Moavero

Peace Action Education Fund

</x-rich>

From: "Shocket, Phyllis" <PShocket@NAPAWASH.ORG>
To: "mupj@igc.org" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Sample Tributes to Fellows
Date: Thu, 2 Nov 2000 09:31:44 -0500
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

Attached are tributes that we have received. Again, they vary in length and style.

Thank you so much for your willingness to do this on such short notice.

Phyllis

<<EULOG-95.DOC>>

Phyllis Gail Shocket
Director of Academy Affairs
National Academy of Public Affairs
General Number: 202-347-31190 / 800-883-3190
Direct Dial: 202-383-7769

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\EULOG-95.doc"

From: "Shocket, Phyllis" <PShocket@NAPAWASH.ORG>
To: "'mupj@igc.org'" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Contact Information
Date: Mon, 6 Nov 2000 09:29:19 -0500
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

Direct dial: 202-383-7769
pshocket@napawash.org

"Renewing HUD: A Long-Term Agenda for Effective Performance," 1994

Quoting from the title page: "Required by the Congress of the United States
for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development"

Many thanks,
Phyllis

Phyllis Gail Shocket
Director of Academy Affairs
National Academy of Public Affairs
General Number: 202-347-3190 / 800-883-3190
Direct Dial: 202-383-7769

To: "Shocket, Phyllis" <PShocket@NAPAWASH.ORG>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Tribute to Mike Sviridoff
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\hwh.399.doc;
In-Reply-To: <043191BD8403D411A2760090279CBFA92DDCC3@NAPA-NT1>
References:

Phyllis,

I am attaching the tribute to Mike Sviridoff that you requested. In following the previous format, I put in the date of November 18, 2000 under the assumption that you use the date of the Saturday session. You, of course, can change it if necessary.

I greatly appreciate this opportunity to pay my tribute to Mike.

Howard

From: "Paul Lansu" <paul@paxchristi.net>
To: <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: nuclear disarmament
Date: Mon, 6 Nov 2000 13:55:55 +0100
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook CWS, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300
Importance: Normal
X-MDAemon-Deliver-To: mupj@igc.org
X-Return-Path: paul@paxchristi.net

Dear Howard,

Many thanks for your kind message of 2 November 2000. Pax Christi International is in a process to work out a new statement on nuclear disarmament. The draft/statement is now in a process of debate within all our national sections and affiliated organisations, and their feedback is expected before the end of this year. The aim of it is to stimulate again the debate on nuclear disarmament within the Roman Catholic Church and all the other Churches as well. The aim is to invite all bishops/members of Pax Christi International to sign. See the draft in attachment. Please do not distribute this draft. I think to have this statement ready at the beginning of 2001. Once we have the bishops/members behind the text, we also want to invite Dr Konrad Raiser to join in order to give it an ecumenical dimension as well. This does not stop you to continue to get a specific message from the WCC as well and in trying to get the Holy See behind it. In fact, that should not be too difficult, since the Holy See has already a good position on this issue. On Friday 10 November, I will be at the WCC and see whether I can discuss your proposal and our draft/statement already with Dwain Epps and with Salpy.

With kind regards,

Paul Lansu

Pax Christi International
Rue du Vieux Marché aux Grains 21
1000 Brussels
Belgium

phone: +32 (-2) 502.55.50
fax: +32 (-2) 502.46.26
mobile: +32 (0475) -382170
e-mail: paul@paxchristi.net
url: <http://www.paxchristi.net>

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\SD04E00.doc"

Ref.: SD.04.E.00

Draft/Statement on Nuclear Disarmament: version of 26 October 2000

When will the danger of nuclear disaster be removed?

Pax Christi International stresses the need of the International Community and the Churches to refocus its attention to the continuing threat of nuclear weapons. We are at a very critical moment of new challenges to the international disarmament agenda. Statements alone will not be enough. Pax Christi International appeals to the public opinion to raise its voice in the debate.

Like Pax Christi International, numerous religious bodies have a long history of addressing nuclear weapons issues. They condemned nuclear weapons and have called for their abolition.¹ In their joint statement of April 1998, Cardinal Danneels, President of Pax Christi International, and Dr Konrad Raiser, General Secretary of the World Council of Churches, stated, "Nuclear weapons, whether used or threatened, are grossly evil and therefore morally wrong. As an instrument of mass destruction, nuclear weapons slaughter the innocent and ravage the environment. (Therefore) we ask the delegates (of the NPT Review Conference PrepCom) to call resolutely upon the nuclear weapons states to embark upon a series of steps along the road leading to nuclear abolition."

In May 2000 at the conclusion of the Review Conference of the 1968 Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), the major nuclear powers made an important new commitment. They promised to make “an unequivocal undertaking ... to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals”. A commitment to nuclear abolition was and is one of the obligations of the NPT itself (Art. VI), but the nuclear weapon states never took it serious. Time and again the Holy See asked for an “unequivocal commitment” during interventions in United Nations. The review conference made progress on other points and the States parties promised to work on many practical steps to be taken in the next years. The window of opportunity for moves towards the elimination of nuclear weapons seems to be open again. However there is still no concrete timeframe for the total abolition of nuclear weapons. The need for abolition exists because of a real possibility that nuclear weapons may be used in anger for the first time since Hiroshima and Nagasaki, with disastrous results for the whole of humanity. In recent years, we have witnessed policies by several states to extend the role for nuclear weapons in their security policies. India and Pakistan are the most prominent examples, and the USA and the Russian Federation are modernising and extending the role of nuclear weapons.

Public opinion takes little notice of the problem. This is due in part to the mistaken belief that with the end of the cold war nuclear weapons no longer pose serious dangers. However, the window of opportunity may be closed again if political leaders are not pressed by public opinion “to accomplish the total elimination” soon. Notwithstanding their proclaimed commitment to the nuclear disarmament required of them by the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Nuclear-Weapon States still insist that their own security depends on retaining nuclear weapons while at the same insisting that the security of other states depends on their renunciation of exactly the same weapons. The incoherence of this position is obvious and must be rectified before it is too late.

We welcome the decision by President Clinton to postpone the deployment of ‘National Missile Defence’. This highly provocative and destabilising plan has been rightly condemned by many, including America’s allies, the world over. We hope that the new US President will finally decide to consign it to the dustbin of history.

Some special dangers

The Churches and other religious organisations can play an important role in forming public opinion of some of the dangers that confront our common security:

The likely further proliferation of nuclear weapons following the example of India and Pakistan, where there is the danger of nuclear weapons being used inadvertently or by miscalculation over the Kashmir dispute, and indeed elsewhere.

The danger of a nuclear strike by chance or accident.

The refusal of Israel, India and Pakistan to accede to the NPT and to place their nuclear facilities under comprehensive IAEA safeguards (International Atomic Energy Agency).

The refusal of the North Korea to preserve and make available to the IAEA all information on its nuclear material, as it is obliged to do as party to the NPT and its safeguard agreement with IAEA.

The refusal of Cuba to accede to the NPT.

The presence, especially in Europe, of many tactical nuclear weapons.

The failure of the USA to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban, and to rule out the extension of the role of nuclear weapons to deter attacks by other weapons of mass-destruction and attacks by terrorist groups and so-called 'rogue states'.

The announcement by Russia of its intention to increase its reliance on nuclear weapons. This is partly a response to its conventional military weakness and its sense of encirclement due to the expansion of NATO; and by China to the threat of Theatre Missile Defences in South-East Asia.

Acceptance of nuclear weapons provides the strongest rationale for development and proliferation of all kinds of weaponry, especially biological and chemical weapons, the mass destruction weapons "of the poor and weak".

Steps to be taken

The Holy See summarised the measures that need to be pursued at the present time, measures largely agreed by the expert opinion-makers.

"It should be an immediate objective of the international community to eliminate non-strategic nuclear weapons, de-alert weapons by removing warheads from delivery vehicles, establish a legally binding negative security assurance regime, and secure from the Nuclear Weapons States a pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons."

Negotiations do not have to start from scratch. A detailed scheme for nuclear abolition has been prepared and is lodged with the United Nations.

We call upon all the Nuclear Weapons States to accept the broad thrust of the ‘New Agenda Resolution’ at the United Nations and to put negotiation of a nuclear disarmament convention at the top of the international agenda. We note here the strength of the support given to this resolution by the Holy See in the last two sessions of the UNGA (United Nations General Assembly), and wish to support its plea to get this resolution accepted by the Nuclear Weapons States.

These are some of the immediate steps to be taken which would move us closer to nuclear abolition. We urge:

The USA and Russia to encourage rapid progress towards START III with lower limits than originally envisaged at Helsinki.

The smaller Nuclear Weapons States to promote multilateral disarmament negotiations for the purpose of reducing nuclear arsenals in order to make progress towards the global elimination of nuclear weapons. The UK and France should take a lead here. We wish to encourage the UK to continue working with the ‘New Agenda’ states on their resolution, in order to preserve its essential thrust while enabling the UK government to support it. The UK should abandon its talk of relying on nuclear weapons for its own security, promote a no-first use treaty among the Nuclear Weapon States and announce that it has no need and no intention to replace Trident at any time in the future.

That the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty be enforced and that an immediate moratorium of all nuclear weapons be established.

Non-nuclear European States to remove nuclear weapons from their territory and to reject the role for nuclear weapons in their security policies, which they promised to do at the NPT-review conference.

That nuclear weapons everywhere be taken off alert.

That National Governments stop budgeting for development of new nuclear weapons of any kind.

A no first use pledge by all nuclear power states.

India, Pakistan, Israel and Cuba to accede to the NPT as non-nuclear states, and to ratify the CTBT (Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty).

Both Korean states to implement rapidly their Joint Declaration on the Denuclearisation of the Korean Peninsula.

To encourage the establishment of nuclear weapon free zones where they do not yet exist, such as in the Middle East and South Asia, and to encourage at the same time the development of zones free of all weapons of mass destruction.

We see nuclear weapons abolition as a major component in the process of re-examining our traditional ideas about security and war. Our ultimate vision is of a peace built as common security based on justice and reconciliation. It is for us all to work for the elimination of war, the priority of non-violence and the establishment of a global culture of peace.

Signed by: (steps to be taken)

1. President of Pax Christi International.
2. All former Presidents of Pax Christi International
3. All Bishop Presidents of National Sections
4. All Bishops – Members of Pax Christi International
5. Dr Konrad Raiser, Secretary General of World Council of Churches

ⁱ See for instance Cardinal Godfried Danneels, International President of Pax Christi, and Dr Konrad Raiser, Secretary General of the World Council of Churches, in a joint statement “ACT NOW FOR NUCLEAR ABOLITION. A Statement Addressed to the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee”, March 1998.

X-Sender: jameshipkn@mail.sssnet.com
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.0
Date: Mon, 06 Nov 2000 10:42:50 -0500
To: Hallman <mupj@igc.apc.org>
From: JamesHipkins <jameshipkin@sssnet.com>
Subject:

Howard:

Am ready to send the copy to the printer. I have contacted a mailing service here it would cost \$70 plus postage and use their franking privilege. I have not been able to establish a relationship here to utilize a franking for bulk mailing. Would this be o.k. to go ahead. We will have 8 pages, the proposal takes 3 1/4 and Dough Wingeir's letters just over 3 pages, have filled in the remainder. I had hope to get his on 2 but to no avail. Let me know.

Char is having strtess test today and an echo cardiogram. tomorrow we meet with cardiologist to see if she can go forward with surgery. Hopefully that can get sceduled so we can relax a bit. I think I told you her surgery was canceled just before she was wheeled out by the antethesiologist. She saw something on the EKG that looked suspicious so she said no. This the follow up to that. Thanks for your prayers keep them coming.

Let me know.

Jim

To: JamesHipkins <jameshipkn@sssnet.com>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re:
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <5.0.0.25.0.20001106103738.009e1680@mail.sssnet.com>
References:

At 10:42 AM 11/6/00 -0500, you wrote:

>Howard:

>Am ready to send the copy to the printer. I have contacted a mailing
>service here it would cost \$70 plus postage and use their franking
>privilege. I have not been able to establish a relationship here to
>utilize a franking for bulk mailing. Would this be o.k. to go ahead. We
>will have 8 pages, the proposal takes 3 1/4 and Dough Wingeir's letters
>just over 3 pages, have filled in the remainder. I had hope to get his on
>2 but to no avail. Let me know.
>

Jim,

Sure, go ahead. I have revised our membership list to weed out those who haven't contributed within the past 18 months. Would you like it by e-mail or by regular mail?
I also have a fairly recent list of UM conference peace with justice coordinators if you want it.

We'll continue to keep Char in our thoughts and prayers.

Shalom,
Howard

To: mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Reminder of November 14 meeting
Cc:
Bcc: icnd
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Colleagues,

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament will meet on Tuesday, November 14, 2000 from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. The meeting will take place in the conference room of the Washington office of the National Council of Churches, 110 Maryland Avenue, NE, Room 108. To get in the building dial 108.

The purpose of the meeting will be to consider how we should approach the new president and the new Congress. I'll send out some background material later in the week.

I hope to see you on the 14th. If you can't attend and want to offer some suggestions, please contact me via e-mail or phone at 301 896-0013.

Shalom,
Howard

To: JamesHipkins <jameshipkn@sssnet.com>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re:
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\MUMEM009.ZLT.doc;
In-Reply-To: <5.0.0.25.0.20001106175935.009e13b0@mail.sssnet.com>
References: <3.0.3.32.20001106114356.00699e14@pop2.igc.org>
<5.0.0.25.0.20001106103738.009e1680@mail.sssnet.com>

Jim,

I'm sending as an attachment our current membership list in zip code order. If you have trouble downloading, please let me know, and I'll send it by text.

On your e-mail address an extra "i" appears before the final "n" when I click reply to sender. You may need to eliminate in the personal information file.

Shalom,
Howard

X-Sender: jameshipkn@mail.sssnet.com (Unverified)
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.0
Date: Tue, 07 Nov 2000 09:43:25 -0500
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: JamesHipkins <jameshipkin@sssnet.com>
Subject: Re:

At 09:21 AM 11/7/00 -0500, you wrote:

>Jim,
>
>I'm sending as an attachment our current membership list in zip code order.
> If you have trouble downloading, please let me know, and I'll send it by
>text.
>
>On your e-mail address an extra "i" appears before the final "n" when I
>click reply to sender. You may need to eliminate in the personal
>information file.
>
>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.

Howard:

Got it. It just takes me a minutte for me to understand. It is o.k.

Jim

X-eGroups-Return: sentto-1413460-1713-973617925-mupj=igc.apc.org@returns.onelist.com
X-Sender: delong@nucleus.com
X-Apparently-To: abolition-caucus@egroups.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.01 [en] (Win95; I)
To: abolition-caucus@egroups.com, abolition@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca,
cnanw@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca
X-Corel-MessageType: EMail
From: DeLong <delong@nucleus.com>
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, 07 Nov 2000 10:25:05 -0700
Subject: [abolition-caucus] Re: MPI Executive Director

Friends,
It is my pleasure to share this notice with you on behalf of Senator
Douglas Roche, Chairperson of the Middle Powers Initiative.

Congratulations Suzy! It will be a great pleasure to continue working
with you!

Bev DeLong, Chairperson, Canadian Network to Abolish Nuclear Weapons

PRESS RELEASE

MPI Executive Director

The appointment of Suzanne Pearce as Executive Director of the
Middle
Powers Initiative (MPI) was announced today by Senator Douglas Roche,
MPI
Chairman.

Ms. Pearce, Coordinator of the MPI since 1998, has
worked in the nuclear disarmament movement since 1984, and in various
organizations based in Cambridge, Massachusetts, including Business
Executives for National Security and the Council for a Nuclear Weapons
Freeze. From 1988-98 she co-ordinated the Massachusetts Lawyers
Alliance
for World Security. She serves as President of the Cambridge-Yerevan
Sister
City Association; Board Member of the Boston-based Coalition for a
Strong
United Nations and member of the American Friends Service Committee New
England Region Committee for Peace and Economic Security.

She received a BA from Radcliffe College and an MA from Columbia
Teachers
College. She is married with two grown daughters and lives in
Cambridge,
Massachusetts.

As Executive Director, Ms. Pearce will take responsibility for the day-to-day operations of the MPI, whose programs include seminars, publications, and consultations with governments and citizen organizations.

The Middle Powers Initiative was started in 1998 by a network of international citizen organizations to mobilize influential middle-power nations to press the Nuclear Weapons States to commit themselves to negotiations for the total elimination of nuclear weapons and a series of practical steps towards this goal.

The MPI office is located in the Cambridge headquarters of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War.

Doug Roche

----- eGroups Sponsor ----->
eLerts
It's Easy. It's Fun. Best of All, it's Free!
http://click.egroups.com/1/9699/1/_/91925/_/973617925/
----- _->

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-Lotus-FromDomain: UCC
From: stiefr@ucc.org
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Date: Tue, 7 Nov 2000 06:15:37 -0500
Subject: Re: Reminder of November 14 meeting

Howard,

I will be in staff meeting all day on the 14th so cannot attend.

Ron Stief, UCC

From: "Rutledge, Philip" <rutledge@indiana.edu>
To: "Surratt, Doris" <DSurratt@NAPAWASH.ORG>, "zz Social Equity Panel" <SocEqPanel@NAPAWASH.ORG>
Subject: RE: Social Equity Panel Meeting
Date: Wed, 8 Nov 2000 10:08:59 -0500
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

Colleagues:

I look forward to seeing most of you at the kick-off meeting of the Standing Panel on Social Equity at the Academy Fall meeting November 16-18. As Doris Surratt indicated in an earlier e-mail, the principal business at the November 16, 9:00 AM-11:00 AM Panel session will be discussion of the paper on social equity issues, prepared by the Working Group chaired by Valerie Lemmie. Each Chair of the four Working Groups that have been laying the ground-work for our October, 2000 to September, 2001 program year will also give a brief report. Although the social equity issues paper is still a "Work in Progress", aptly labeled "DRAFT", it is intended to point the way for us during the coming year. Given the widely ranging views of Social Equity, I anticipate a spirited debate on its contents. Doris will distribute the paper to you both electronically and via hard copy. Be sure to read it in advance of the meeting. Limited copies will also be available at the meeting.

Valerie Lemmie will also chair the breakout session on Friday, November 17, at which advice to the in-coming Bush or Gore Administration will be discussed. Please give advanced thought to areas related to Social Equity in Governance that you would like to propose. I will ask certain ones of you on Thursday to be prepared to take leadership generating ideas for the discussion.

Do not hesitate to send me ideas prior to the meeting.

Phil

X-Sender: jdi@[63.106.26.66]
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)
Date: Wed, 08 Nov 2000 11:24:27 -0500
To: jdi@clw.org
From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>
Subject: Senate election results

Council for a Livable World Fundraising for Senate Candidates
1999 - 2000
14 Victories, 3 Defeats, 1 uncertain (Washington)

Challengers

Maria Cantwell (D) - Washington (Gorton ahead) - \$19,645
Tom Carper (D) - Delaware- Won 56%-44% \$74,537
Mel Carnahan (D) - Missouri* - Won 51%-48%- \$100,441
Ron Klink (D) - Pennsylvania - Lost 45%-52% - \$27,644
Mark Lawrence (D) - Maine- Lost 31%-69%- \$24,222
Brian Schweitzer (D) - Montana - Lost 47%-51%- \$97,645
Debbie Stabenow (D) - Michigan - Won 50%-48% - \$111,484

Open seats

Hillary Clinton (D) - New York - Won 55%-43%- \$55,921
Jon Corzine (D) - New Jersey - Won 50%-47% - \$427
Ben Nelson (D)- Nebraska - Won 51%-49% - \$39,506

Incumbents

Daniel Akaka (D) - Hawaii - Won 73% - 24% - \$153
Jeff Bingaman (D) - New Mexico - Won 63%-37% - \$19,371
Lincoln Chafee (R) - Rhode Island - Won 57%-41% - \$1,397
Ken Conrad (D) - North Dakota - Won 62%-38% - \$163
Jim Jeffords (R) - Vermont - Won 66%-26% - \$13,171
Edward Kennedy (D) - Massachusetts - Won 72%-13% - \$117
Herbert Kohl (D) - Wisconsin - Won 62%-37% - \$187
Paul Sarbanes (D) - Maryland - Won 63%-37% - \$142

Total for all Senate candidates - \$770,786
Total for all House candidates - \$314,716
Grand Total 1999 - 2000 - \$1,085,502

* Died in October 16 airplane crash

Overall Senate: Republicans retain control, with either 51 Republicans, 49 Democrats, or 50 - 50. If case of a tie, if Bush is elected, Cheney breaks the tie; if Gore is elected, Lieberman resigns his seat and the Republican Governor appoints a Republican replacement.

Other races of interest:

Florida - Nelson (D) over McCollum (R) 51%-46%
Georgia - Miller (D) over Mattingly (R) 57%-39%
Nevada - Ensign (R) over Bernstein (D) 55%-40%
Virginia - Allen (R) over Robb (D) 52%-48%

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

From: "Surratt, Doris" To: zz Social Equity Panel Subject: Social Equity Issue Paper Date: Wed, 8 Nov 2000 16:13:58 -0500 X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

As Phil Rutledge mentioned in an earlier e-mail message, attached is a copy of the paper on social equity issues prepared by the Working Group on Social Equity Issues Definition. A hard copy of the paper is being mailed to you today.

Doris Surratt
dsurratt@napawash.org
PH: 202-347-3190

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\NAPA-Standing Panel on Social Equality-Issue paper Work Plan.doc" Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\NAPA_graph.doc"

D R A F T
for Discussion
Purposes Only

National Academy of Public Administration

Standing Panel on Social Equity

ISSUE PAPER AND WORK PLAN

November, 2000

STANDING PANEL ON SOCIAL EQUITY

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The preparation of an Issue Paper and a Work Plan were among the first charges to the Standing Panel on Social Equity by the Academy's Board of Trustees. The Fellows of the National Academy of Public Administration associated with the newly established Panel hereby transmit to the Board and to the full membership the Panel's Issue Paper and Work Plan. These documents set out the importance of social equity in public administration and in the work of the Academy. The history of social equity is traced from the constitutional period to today. Because the Academy is Congressionally chartered, the Issue Paper and Work Plan address the connections between the language of the charter and the work of the Standing Panel on Social Equity.

Like efficiency and economy, social equity is central to public administration. And, like efficiency and economy, social equity is complex. The Issue Paper and Work Plan describe in detail several different social equity perspectives as well as the challenges of reconciliation between them. Several contemporary social equity issues are described, including issues of: managerial and organizational equity, service distribution equity, equity between jurisdictions and agencies, equity and the market, equity between nations, and equity between generations. Several projects and product items are suggested for consideration in each of these issue categories. It is the opinion of the Standing Panel that the Academy can contribute importantly to greater social equity in all of these issue areas. Because social equity is a generalized concept, it connects to the work of the operating centers and the other standing panels of the Academy. Some of those connections are described in the Issue Paper and Work Plan. The Issue Paper and Work Plan concludes with a three-year schedule of activities.

The Standing Panel is composed of several functioning working groups, a coordinating group, and a steering committee. Over 70 Fellows of the Academy as well as several other non-Fellows have contributed to the work of the Panel and will be available to accomplish its work.

ISSUE PAPER AND WORK PLAN

I. THE STANDING PANEL ON SOCIAL EQUITY

The Board of Trustees of the National Academy of Public Administration approved the creation of the Standing Panel on Social Equity at their February 2000 meeting. Philip Rutledge was appointed as its Chair. Following the Board's mandate, the Panel is to:

- A. review and evaluate developments in public administration that have to do with critical matters in social equity and governance and provide guidance to the Academy on those issues,
- B. initiate or sponsor educational meetings to communicate with the public administration community and the fellows of the Academy on social equity issues in public administration,
- C. prepare papers for public release on social equity and governance,
- D. serve as a forum where Fellows interact on issues of social equity and governance,
- E. serve as a means for identifying ideas, issues, and projects in social equity and governance,
- F. provide or recommend witnesses, and/or draft or review testimony, for congressional hearings related to social equity and governance.

The initial meeting of the standing Panel on Social Equity was held at the spring 2000 meeting of the Fellows of the Academy. At that meeting, the Panel established a Coordinating Committee and working groups on Social Equity Issues Definition, Development of Forums and Meetings, Resource Development and Inter-Panel Relations, and International Social Equity Opportunities. The Panel then detailed the tasks and works schedules for each working group.

This combined document, the Issue Paper and Work Plan for the Standing Panel on Social Equity, is the product of the Working Group on Issue Definition. Having been reviewed by that group, it is hereby sent forward to the Fellows of the Standing Panel for their consideration. The Issue Paper and Work Plan are both purposely broad, written with the assumption that through time the work of the Standing Panel will move from these broad considerations to more specific projects and activities.

II. INTRODUCTION

The ideal of equality is one of the great themes in the culture of American public life. From the Declaration of Independence to the Pledge of Allegiance, the rhetoric of equality permeates our symbols of nationhood. Over and over in our history, from the earliest colonial beginnings, equality has been a rallying cry, a promise, and an article of national faith. So it is that the ideal of equality touches our emotions. All these aspects of equality—protest, hope, and faith, infused with emotion—came together in an August afternoon over a third of a century ago when Martin Luther King, Jr., spoke to a multitude at the Lincoln Memorial, repeatedly returning to the phrase: “I have a dream.” That dream was concerned with a final reconciliation between the ideal of equality and the reality of the on-going struggle to achieve equality of at least opportunity for all of our nation’s citizens.

Even before the founding of the United States of America, the people of this continent faced issues of fairness, justice and equality. As the new settlers struggled to collectively govern themselves they experienced unfair treatment at the hands of their colonial masters and rallied to the appeal of a fairness argument, “no taxation without representation.” It may be said that our revolution and its war were fights over fairness and equality. The sacred founding documents were a coda for a new country built on the bedrock of justice, fairness and equality in a system of democratic self-government:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

And yet, at independence and in the constitutional period, there were vexing problems of fairness and equality—the treatment of our indigenous people, the enslavement of black men and women, the franchise for women and others.

Many people had come to the New World to escape injustice and intolerance. Upon coming, however, they had sought to establish justice and equality among themselves, but not between themselves and those who were already here. One consequence of those imbalances was that less than a century after our founding we fought a great war among ourselves over slavery—a profound issue of justice and fairness. Nevertheless, the broadly based values of equality were so evident among our people that de Tocqueville would write of us in 1831:

Among the novel objects that attracted my attention during my stay in the United States, nothing struck me more forcibly than the general equality of conditions. I readily discovered the prodigious influence which this primary fact exercises on the whole course of society, by giving a certain direction to public opinion, and a certain tenor to the laws; by imparting new maxims to the governing powers, and peculiar habits to the governed.

I speedily perceived that the influence of this fact extends far beyond the political character and the laws of the country, and that it has no less empire over civil society than over the government; it creates opinions, engenders sentiments, suggests the ordinary practices of life, and modifies whatever it does not produce. The more I advanced in the study of American society, the more I perceived that the equality of conditions is the fundamental fact from which all others seem to be derived, and the central point at which all my observations constantly terminated.

Despite our national commitment to the “equality of conditions” among our citizens, in the years that followed our Civil War issues of racial injustice did not recede. In *The Souls of Black Folk* (1903), W.E.B. Du Bois stated with seeming prescience that the “problem of the 20th

century is the problem of the color line.” Indeed, over 40 years later scholar Gunnar Myrdal would write *An American Dilemma*, a sobering empirical description of continuing racial injustice and a prescient prediction of its consequences. After the urban riots of the 1960s, the Kerner Commission would issue its report detailing the persistent problems of racial injustice. Finally, in the 1990s, President Clinton assembled a Dialog on Race in America, a forthright recognition of our continuing struggle with equality, particularly in the context of rapidly changing American demographics. Among the issues considered were the growth of Hispanic and Asian American populations, the aging of America, the increasing presence of women in the workforce, and tapping into the potentials of those with disabilities. Today, almost one hundred years after Du Bois made his pronouncement, we continue to struggle with issues of racial justice, fairness and equality, but we also continue as a nation to strive for the goal of “equality of conditions” for all of our citizens.

It might be fairly asked then: What does all this have to do with American public administration? What is the problem?

Justice, fairness and equality have everything to do with public administration.* First, laws do not carry out themselves; implementation is our work. As one of the early leaders of our field wrote, “public administration is the law in action.” Second, if public administrators implement the law, cannot we bring the law simply and precisely to life as it is written? No, we cannot. The law is seldom so clear, so precise, so evident that it uniformly can be applied from case to case to case. Third, in the early years of our field it was written that public administration should be the neutral implementation of law and policy. We now know that is not strictly possible. Public administration is the law in action and involves, indeed requires

* Throughout this document the phrase “public administration” is used broadly to include not only the policies and management of governmental and jurisdictional agencies, but the work of nonprofit, voluntary, nongovernmental and contract organizations with public purposes and engaged in public work.

interpretation of that law and discretion in its application. Fourth, our public institutions are the settings in which our elected leaders, working in our system of democratic self-government, struggle with issues of fairness, justice, and equality. But, because public administrators are responsible for carrying out the laws and policies, we too have important struggles with fairness, justice, and equality. As a nation, we are not as fair, as just or as equal as we should be. Public administrators cannot say that these problems belong only to lawmakers. Over the years, public administrators have contributed much in helping to create to a more equitable, a more fair and a more just America. And yet, we have much more to contribute. In sum, public administration and those who are charged with its implementation have much to do with fairness, justice, and equality in American life. By establishing the Standing Panel on Social Equity, the National Academy of Public Administration helps to address those public policy issues and strengthens its attention to the Congressional Charter upon which the Academy is based.

The objectives and purposes of the Academy's Congressional charter include: evaluating the structure, administration, operation, and program performance of Federal and other governments and government agencies; anticipating, identifying and analyzing significant problems; and suggesting timely corrective action. These objectives and purposes will now also be evaluated in terms of social equity. The charter asks the Academy to foresee and examine critical emerging issues in governance, formulating practical approaches in their resolution. The charter asks the Academy to assess the effectiveness, structure, administration and implications for governance of present or proposed public programs, policies, and processes, recommending specific changes. These assessments will now also include attention to the issues of social equity as described herein. The Academy's charter calls for providing advice on: the relationships between Federal, State, regional, and local governments; increasing public officials', citizens', and scholars' understanding of requirements and opportunities for sound governance, and how these can be met effectively. Finally, the charter asks that the Academy, in

its conduct of its own affairs, demonstrate a commitment to the highest levels of professional ethics and scholarship.

With this document the Standing Panel on Social Equity sets out its initial approaches to achieving these objectives, thereby contributing to the overall work of the Academy.

III. WHAT IS SOCIAL EQUITY?

Efficient and economical management of government agencies characterizes the ethics that guided much of the early reasoning in American public administration. The logic of those ethics allowed public administrators to assume that the effects of good management, efficiency and economy would be evenly and fairly distributed among our citizens. Gradually, however, beginning in the 1960s, public administrators began to acknowledge that many public programs were implemented much more efficiently and effectively for some citizens than for other citizens. Indeed, public administrators could not logically claim to be without responsibility for some practices that resulted in obvious unfairness or injustice. Armed with this understanding, an argument emerged for social equity as an added ethic in public administration. Social equity took its place along with efficiency and economy as the “third pillar” of public administration.

Indeed, by the late 1990s a standard text writes:

The ethical and equitable treatment of citizens by administrators is at the forefront of concerns in public agencies. Reinforced by changing public attitudes, the reinventing government movement and civil rights laws, the new public administration has triumphed after a quarter century. Now it is unthinkable (as well as illegal), for example, to deny someone welfare benefits because of their race or a job opportunity because of their sex. Social equity today does not have to be so much fought for by young radicals as administered by managers of all ages. (Jay M. Shafritz and E.W. Russell, *Introducing Public Administration*, 2nd Ed. New York: Longman, 2000)

Over the years the phrase “social equality” has come to encompass the many complex issues associated with fairness, justice and equality in public administration. A textbook description of social equality in public administration says:

Fairness in the delivery of public services; it is egalitarianism in action—the principle that each citizen, regardless of economic resources or personal traits, deserves and has a right to be given equal treatment by the political system.

The text then lists three qualities of social equity:

All public administrators have an obvious obligation to advance social equity. However, this obligation can be legitimately and honorably interpreted in several ways. First is the obligation to administer the laws they work under in a fair manner. It is hard to believe today that this first obligation was once controversial.

The second way of interpreting obligations to advance social equity is to feel bound to proactively further the cause—to seek to hire and advance a varied workforce. The attitude requires a specific approach: It is not enough to go out and find qualified minorities. You must go out, find them, and then qualify them. This is why the U.S. armed forces have been so much more successful in their affirmative action efforts than the society as a whole. They bring minorities into their organizations as young recruits and nurture them as they grow—just the same as they have been doing with white males for 200 years.

The third aspect to advancing social equity is best illustrated by a story. In 1963 George C. Wallace, then governor of Alabama, dramatically stood in the doorway of the University of Alabama to prevent the entry of black students and the desegregation of the university. It was a major media event. Wallace, backed up by the Alabama National Guard, stood waiting at his designated chalk mark on the pavement wearing his TV network microphone. As was arranged, the deputy U.S. attorney general, Nicholas Katzenbach, backed up by 3,000 federal troops, ordered Wallace to allow a black student, Vivian Malone, to enter. After a longwinded speech about federal encroachment on states' rights, Wallace stepped aside and Katzenbach escorted Malone to the university cafeteria.

This incident is a famous aspect of the civil rights movement. Journalist Jacob Weisberg in his *In Defense of Government* adds an element to this well known story that shows government at its best. After Malone entered the cafeteria, she got her tray of food and sat alone. Almost immediately some white female students joined her. They sought to befriend her, as they would any new student. 'According to Weisberg, "That's the most powerful part of the story because it is about a change that good government inspired but could not force.'" Then, as now, government can go only so far in forcing social equity. But there is no limit to the amount of inspiration it can provide to encourage people to do the right, decent, and honorable thing. This encouragement has a name. It is called moral leadership.

Over the years both the subject of social equity and its language have changed.

Equity is now more broadly defined to include not just race and gender but ethnicity, sexual preference, certain mental and physical conditions, language, and variations in

economic circumstances. The words “multiculturalism” and “diversity” are now often used to suggest this broader definition of social equity.

Based on all of the above, the standing panel on social equity defines social equity in public administration as: “The fair, just and equitable management of all institutions serving the public directly or by contract, and the fair, just and equitable distribution of public services, and implementation of public policy.”

The Panel recognizes that social equity takes several forms:

A. Simple Individual Equality

The most rudimentary logic of equality assumes that we are all absolutely equal. Such logic flies in the face of reason, however, because we are all different in a number of ways, including in size, age, gender, race, talent and energy. We may be equal in the sense of being treated equally or having equal chances, but being equal in this way does not mean that we are all the same and should, therefore, be somehow entirely equal. These are only a few examples of simple individual equality, such as the one-person, one-vote principle or the standard price of products. Lincoln recognized this in his consideration of the meaning of equality in the

Declaration of Independence:

[T]he authors...did not intend to declare all men equal *in all respects*. They did not mean to say all were equal in color, size, intellect, moral development, or social capacity. They defined tolerable distinctness in what respects they did consider man created equal—equal in “certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness”. (Philip Van Doren Stern, ed., *The Life and Writings of Abraham Lincoln*. The Modern Library, 1940. p. 422.)

B. Segmented Equality

In fact, our most common form of social equity is understood to be segmented equality. Principles of segmented equality take into account our differences, setting up the logic of equality within a segment but not between segments. For example, farmers have a system of Federal taxation that is different from that of wage earners. Among farmers tax rates differ in

terms of crops, income, and the like. Among wage earners there are tax differences based on income, number of dependents, home mortgage payments, and so forth. These are segments and we expect to be treated equally within our segment but generally recognize why our segment is not equal or the same as another segment. These segments are built on the basis of the political process and depend on the extent to which the political process reflects dominant political values. There is almost always a lag between previously established segments and changed public values. For this reason segments often seem to unfairly advantage some and disadvantage others.

Segments also reflect the power of majority rule. It is sometimes the case that segments reflect majority interests better than they reflect minority interests. Virtually all of the institutions in which we work are organized hierarchically. Hierarchy is segmented equality. Five star generals with comparable seniority, for example, are approximately equal to each other but hardly equal to privates first class. Merit systems are very elaborate forms of reconciliation of the principles of competence, qualifications and experiences that presume to determine which of us has the greatest merit as well as principles of equal pay, benefits, and working conditions within each segment.

Equal pay for equal work is segmented equality. There are endless such examples. The point is that social equity is a socially constructed set of agreements as to what things are to be equal within a segment and what things are allowed to be unequal between segments. These social agreements change over time as we sort through issues of fairness. There have been big and dramatic redefinitions of segments, such as the discontinuation of slavery, the granting of the franchise to women, and affirmative action programs. A careful examination of the logic of segmented equality reveals an elaborate social system in which we are equally unequal, but able to participate in determining what things are to be equal and unequal, and for each of us to have individual opportunities to find our fair place.

C. Block Equity

The principles of block equality call for equality between blocks – a block being, for example, all women or all retired persons. Under conditions of block equality, all women, as a block, would be approximately equal to all men, as a block. Affirmative action and compatible worth are both block equality arguments. Many contemporary conflicts and debates are between the logic of segmented equality and the logic of block equality. Affirmative action policies, contract set aside policies, comparable work policies, and many other similar policies are designed to make one block – all persons of color, all women – more nearly equal to another block. Much of the present social security and Medicare debate has to do with issues of fairness between the presently employed workforce and the retired or those about-to-retire.

D. Equality of Opportunity

Much of the logic of social equity assumes fair and open processes by which persons compete for grades, admissions, jobs, promotions, and so forth. This is process equality. If the processes are fair and based on social agreements as to process rules and criteria they should produce what we have come to understand as merit. The procedural due-process logic in the American judicial system is a good example of process equality. Many of the issues in social equality have to do with making the processes fair, particularly when the results of the processes tend, obviously, to favor one block over another. The disproportionate share of poor and minority Americans in our penal system is often pointed to as illustrative of problems of fairness in procedural due process. The contemporary test bias debate would also be illustrative of a social equity process that assumes to promote fairness. Equality of opportunity logic is at the core of merit systems and other aspects of human resources administration. Despite the seemingly straightforward nature of that logic, certain equality of opportunity rules consistently produce decidedly unfair outcomes when applied. Equality of opportunity has especially to do, for example, with public schooling, which shoulders 90% of the education load. Jurisdictional

arrangements, which result in inner city and suburban schools with widely differential resources bases as well as high variation in student needs, are a persistent social equity problem. School accountability measures now make it clear in the aggregate especially that schooling impacts life chances. Therefore, when educational resources are seriously maldistributed, which they can be from state to state and across various local jurisdictions within states, there can be a profound lack of social equity. This equity issue is a downward signifier for equity issues in other parts of a citizen's life.

E. Unequal Distribution of Resources so as to Achieve Equality

There are many public policy programs that operate on the basis of a differential allocation of resources for the purpose of achieving a more equitable result. Special education programs and the Americans with Disabilities Act are illustrative of that intent. Compensatory equality is, in fact, another form of block equality. The public sector often ends up with economic and other social problems because of "market failure." It is, therefore, sometimes necessary to distribute services or public resources disproportionately so as to compensate for that market failure.

F. The Values of Equality

Social equity is a reflection of social values. Those values shift and change. The recent resurgence of principles of merit, for example, are based on assumptions of equal opportunity, coupled with political and judicial challenges to affirmative action programs which were originally designed to make blocks more equal. The values of equality are usually debated and settled in the context of majority rule, which is a particular challenge to minority groups in our form of democratic government. It is for this reason that the judicial system is often the final arbiter of conflicts between majority role and minority right.

Social equity in public administration is the logic and language of seeking fairness, equality and justice in the context of competing conceptions of equality. Just as we have learned

over time that the principles of efficiency and economy in public administration are not simple, we also have learned that social equity is not simple. Equality is not one thing upon which we all agree. And yet, there is no disagreement regarding the centrality of equality in American public life and the transcendent importance attached to it by the American people. The actual day-to-day work of public administration often involves patterns of reconciliation between social equity concepts. These varying concepts of social equity suggest the distinction between equality and equity. As Lincoln said, we are not all equal in all respects. The task of public administration is to organize, manage, and lead in such a way as to make the processes and the results of those processes as equitable as possible. Social equity is, then, the balancing of various forms of equality.

The Standing Panel on Social Equity begins its work in full recognition of the complexity of the subject and the necessity for an informed approach to it.

IV. SOCIAL EQUITY ISSUES

Because of the pervasiveness of social equity issues in American public life, an enumeration of them here must necessarily be limited to those which are at present most salient to public administration and to which the National Academy of Public Administration can contribute. It is understood that over time the centrality of these issues will wax and wane depending on social, economic and political circumstances. Based on present circumstances, the following is the Panel's list of social equity issues relevant to the mission of the Academy and about which the Academy can contribute.

A. Managerial and Organizational Equity.

1. There continue to be issues of equity within many public agencies. Recent examples include allegations of unfair and unequal treatment by managers in the U.S. Secret Service, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of

Energy, the Defense Department, and several local police and fire departments. The Academy can study these allegations, determine their validity and, if valid, suggest corrective steps.

2. The Academy can study effects of contracting-out or organizational fairness.

For example, some have charged that the savings attributed to contracting-out can be traced to issues of worker inequity, including lower wages, fewer benefits, the creation of more part-time and temporary work, and reduced job security in the public work force. It also has been suggested that increased levels of contracting-out are particularly disadvantaging women and racial and ethnic minorities. Selected studies of contracting-out from the perspective of social equity could test these questions and contribute to our common understanding of this currently popular organizational tool.

3. Many Academy projects deal with equity as an issue of agency and jurisdictional performance. The Social Equity Standing Panel can add value to these projects by developing indices of fairness which would, like other measures of performance, tell agencies how they are doing. In particular, the Standing Panel can develop a generalized equity “self assessment tool” that could be adapted to apply to specific agencies and, when applied, give those agencies a clearer picture of their equity performances. Such a tool would be based on the logic of the application of indices that measure program results and outcomes in terms of social equity.
4. It has been suggested that even as some public agencies and jurisdictions reduce their work forces, worker productivity expectations stay the same or even increase, i.e. fewer and fewer workers are expected to produce more and

more. The Academy could test this question and develop guidelines for reasonable and fair public workplace performance.

B. Service Distribution and Social Equity

1. In the conduct of their work, some law enforcement agencies have used “profiles” of people “likely” or “suspected” to be criminals or to commit criminal acts. This practice has come to be known as racial profiling and is an appropriate subject for Academy study and action.
2. Studies indicate that the distribution of U.S. Department of Agriculture benefits has unfairly favored certain farmers while neglecting others, particularly African-American farmers in the South and Hispanic farmers in the Southwest and California. That discrepancy, and similar federal subsidy distribution issues, is an appropriate subject for Academy study and action.
3. University and college admissions and implementation policies are in the midst of radical reformation. As a result of Proposition 309, the University of California dropped race-based segmented admissions, which kept the student profile an approximate mirror of state demographics. In its place, a strictly merit-based policy was adopted. As predicted Asian-Americans now constitute over 65% of new University of California admissions while the percentage of African-American, Hispanic and white students has plummeted. Texas also dropped somewhat race-driven segmented admissions in favor of admissions to the top graduates of each high school. This appears to distribute admissions more equitably by race than in the California example. This subject is also suited to Academy study.

4. Modern local government economic development policies usually involve one or more forms of public subsidy to businesses. The distribution of costs and benefits associated with these policies deserve Academy study and action.
5. In American public schools performance and accountability are increasingly defined by individual and aggregate student test scores. Some states have set performance criteria and deny accreditation to school districts that do not meet those criteria. Virtually all of the districts either denied accreditation or threatened with accreditation denial are metropolitan inner city or poor rural and heavily minority districts.

C C. Interjurisdictional Ethics.

1. The high jurisdictional fragmentation of American metropolitan areas has resulted in wide disparities in public costs and benefits, disparities that unfairly discriminate against those living in inner cities. The research of Rusk and others indicates that greater jurisdictional consolidation in metropolitan areas results in stronger economic and more equitable distribution of public costs and benefits. This subject is well suited to Academy attention.
2. Disparities in per student school spending rates are the subject of legal action in over half the states. State school distribution formulas and related equity issues are appropriate topics for Academy consideration.
3. In American federalism most modern housing, transportation and welfare programs are highly interjurisdictional. The experiences of urban renewal, freeway construction, high-rise public housing, and the like are all examples

of the distributive issues associated with federalism. These subjects are highly suited to Academy study and action.

D. International Ethics

1. In the era of global trade, on one hand, there are growing issues of fairness to American workers; on the other hand, providing safe, fair and responsible income opportunities for workers abroad, particularly in developing countries, are important issues. The Academy can assist in developing strategies and programs to achieve both objectives.
2. Many of the issues associated with global North/South inequality have to do with the absence of effective institutions, the rule of law, and an effective civil infrastructure in some countries in the southern hemisphere and among the newly independent states in Eastern Europe. The Academy has already contributed much to programs and projects designed to ameliorate these problems and the Standing Panel on Social Equity now will join with the International Affairs Panel to further contribute to solutions to these problems of international inequality.

E. Equity and the Market

1. Over the past century the functioning of our market economy has resulted in serious environmental pollution for everyone but especially the poor and disproportionately racial minorities. Issues of environmental justice are suited to Academy study and action.
2. In the information age there are those who are being left behind, usually because of poverty and/or under-funded schools. The Academy can study and recommend policies and programs to ameliorate this problem.

3. Evolution in the American health care financing system has left millions of citizens underinsured or uninsured, even among those who are employed. The Academy can contribute to the development of state and federal level approaches to a more equitable health care financing system. The same point could be made in other fields of public policy.
4. Many environmental issues can be traced to market function. The field of environmental justice is now well developed and the connection between industrial and even governmental pollution and the poor is now evident. Issues of environmental equity are ideal subjects for the Standing Panel on Social Equity.

F. Intergenerational Equity

1. Perhaps the most obvious issues related to intergenerational equity have to do with the Federal Social Security and Medicare programs. Intergenerational fairness issues as well as the long-term financial visibility of both programs are provoking high political interest. The Social Security Administration receives high marks for productivity and performance. The complexity and attenuated delivery format of Medicare invites evaluation and suggestions for improving both performance and equity.
2. Few American social problems are more vexing than the persistent deprivation of children being raised in poverty. Many of these children regularly experience deficits in housing, nutrition, schooling and health care. At this point, the acuity of this problem is particularly at issue, given the implementation of welfare reform. The Academy has a role to play in exploring and identifying more equitable programs and alternatives.

G. Participation Ethics

Full and equitable participation in policy-making processes are important. Persons and groups affected by public policies and programs should have a voice in their formulation. Participation augments the base of knowledge for decision-making and helps to build the civic capacities of the people. Citizen participation from a full range of social, economic and political circumstances lends credibility to public policy and builds program legitimacy. Groups fairly represented in decision-making processes are more likely to be supportive of policy decisions as they are implemented. Developing techniques and strategies for participative equity can provide the Academy with a unique opportunity to contribute to well-functioning government.

V. THE WORK OF THE STANDING PANEL ON SOCIAL EQUITY AND THE WORK OF ACADEMY CENTERS AND OTHER ACADEMY PANELS

In the Academy the word “centers” is used to distinguish organizational units that manage grants and contracts. The following is a brief overview of the work of each center and standing panel:

The Center for the Economy and the Environment has as its mission to help public and private institutions build their capacity to produce stronger economies, healthier ecosystems, and safer living and working environments. Part of the work of the Center has to do with “civil environmentalism” and with environmental equity. The Standing Panel on Social Equity can link to the Center for the Economy and the Environment to work on these issues as well as issues of economic justice.

The Performance Consortium was established to assist federal agencies in the successful implementation of the Government Results and Performance Act (GPRA), and related performance-based management activities. Because the results or performance of

public programs are generalized on the assumption that all benefit equally, it is sometimes the case that program outcomes are better for some than for others. Sometimes this is part of program design, to make things more equitable. But sometimes the results of program performance are unbalanced because of unanticipated side-effects. It is in such circumstances that the Standing Panel on Social Equity can contribute to the work of the Performance Consortium.

The Center for Human Resources Management provides public-sector managers and human resources professionals with a source of practical expertise, best practices, and innovative solutions for improving the management of human resources. Balancing merit and fairness has always been a central issue in human resources administration. The Standing Panel on Social Equity can link with the Center on Human Resources Management to contribute, where possible, to its work.

The Management Studies Program undertakes projects to analyze and evaluate broad structural, managerial, and performance capacity issues in public institutions. The program emphases are on organizational missions, values, and leadership; structure; service delivery systems; technology and business processes; program funding strategies; performance capacity and measures; and administrative support systems. Insofar as there are equity issues in management and service delivery systems, the Standing Panel on Social Equity may link with the Management Studies Program.

The Alliance for Redesigning Government was established to improve systems of governance by connecting and supporting public sector innovators. As in all areas of public administration, there are innovative and creative ways to improve the equitable performance of public agencies, and such efforts may serve as links between the Standing Panel on Social Equity and the Alliance for Redesigning Government.

Standing panels are the deliberative arms of the Academy, the places where Academy fellows gather, literally and virtually, to review Academy projects, to suggest projects, to review issues and to discuss generally their collective interests. All standing panels meet at each of the semi-annual meetings of the full Academy and often monthly or quarterly as well. Fellows may participate freely in one or more of the standing panels.

The Standing Panel on Executive Organization and Management, chaired by Thomas Stanton, is dedicated to improving the structure, capacity, and management and functioning of public agencies and organizations. The Panel has special responsibility for pursuing initiatives designed to make government work better so as to fulfill the Academy congressional charter. The Panel receives reports from the Academy centers and provides guidance on center project activities. Insofar as there are linkages between executive organization and management and issues of social equity, the new Standing Panel on Social Equity would seek to contribute to the work of the Standing Panel on Executive Organization and Management.

The Standing Panel on International Affairs, chaired by Frank Reeder, takes globalization as its subject and engages in learning about and understanding developments in public management in other parts of the world that might provide models for governments at all levels in the United States. This panel also provides assistance to emerging democracies, helping them to build capacities for governance. The Panel works particularly on training and institution building, building legislative capacity, improving public expenditure management, improving human resources development, and dealing with public ethics and corruption. Much of the work of the Standing Panel on International Affairs has to do with problems associated with unequal resources and limited management, justice and civic capacities. There are, then, rather obvious linkages between the work of this panel and the Standing Panel on Social Equity.

The Standing Panel on the Public Service takes improving the delivery of services by public institutions as its mission. Chaired by Ralph Bledsoe, this Panel deals with service distribution, agency performance and effectiveness and especially human resources issues. There is an evident link with the Standing Panel on Social Equity and the Standing Panel on Public Service both are concerned with issues related to fairness and equity.

The Standing Panel on Federal Systems, chaired by Beth Keller, takes as its mission an understanding of governmental federation, including the roles of cities, counties, special districts, regional governments, states and the federal government. The Panel deliberates on matters of devolution, unfunded mandates, interjurisdictional coordination and cooperation, and other aspects of federalism. Again, there are common issues having to do with matters of fairness and equity between the work of these two standing panels.

The Plan of Work

Two features characterize the work of the Standing Panel on Social Equity. The first is working groups. The second is projects. The working groups were established in the spring of 2000 and are discussed in Section I. As would be expected, during calendar year 2000 each group is holding meetings and planning their work.

Steering Committee

Charge: Guide the activities of the Panel during its initial program year, October 2000 to September 2001, while Panel membership is being confirmed and long-term leadership identified. Working Groups, composed of Steering Committee members appointed by the NAPA Board Chair, other Fellows who have self-selected the Panel, and some Associate Panel Members, have been appointed to assist in developing a work plan and in arranging interim program sessions. Meetings of the Steering Committee and its Working Groups will be held via teleconference, e-mail, or fax, unless the respective Chair determines otherwise.

Coordinating Committee

Charge: Coordinate Working Group Activities and Plans and consult regularly with NAPA leadership and management to assure alignment with academy policies and procedures.

Members: Phil Rutledge, Chair; Bill Hansell, Vice Chair; Gail Christopher, George Frederickson, Valerie Lemmie, Sy Murray, Costis Toregas, Charles Washington

Working Group on Panel Forums/Meetings

Charge: Plan three to five forums/meetings to be held at NAPA and/or via teleconference on the second Friday of the month, between October 2000 and July 2001. A Retreat, with outside experts, to scope out issues in social equity and governance that the Panel may address, should be considered, if outside funding is available.

Members: Bill Hansell, Chair; Walter Broadnax, Bill Davis*, Manny Deese, Dave Garrison, Wilson Goode, Pat Florestano, Mary Hamilton, Robert Knox*, Bruce McDowell, Richard Monteilh, Dave Rusk, Carl Stenberg, Susan Tolchin, Eddie Williams

Working Group on Resources Development & Inter Panel Cooperation

Charge: Develop resources for Panel activities, analyze areas of overlap and opportunities for cooperation with other NAPA Standing Panels, and produce a newsletter on Panel activities.

Members: Gail Christopher, Chair; Charles Washington, Vice-Chair; Charles Bingman, Glen Cope, Adam Herbert, Herb Jasper, Tobe Johnson, Jim Kunde, Gilda Lambert, Jim Murley, Rosemary O’Leary, Elaine Orr*, Mark Pisano, Barbara Sabol, Alvin Schexnider, John Shannon, Dan Skoler, Larry Terry, Ralph Widner, Regina Williams, Deil Wright

Working Group on Social Equity Issue Definition

Charge: Define, synthesize, and articulate social equity issues in governance, based on Forums, expert experience and commentaries, commissioned papers, and other sources that help to identify possible Panel contributions to the profession.

Members: Valerie Lemmie, Chair; Yvonne Braithwaite Burke, George Carvalho, Jim Carroll, Timothy Clark, George Frederickson, Howard Hallman, Royce Hanson, Grantland Johnson, Norman Johnson, Norman King, David Mora, Jim Svara, Charles Washington, Harvey White*, Joe Wholey

Working Group on International Social Equity Opportunities

Charge: Examine ideas and opportunities for NAPA initiatives in enhancing social equity in governance internationally, with particular emphasis on Africa. Charge includes seeking opportunities for projects that may be conducted by the Academy.

Members: Sy Murray, Chair; Chuck Bingman, Mort Downey, George Goodman, Dale Krane*, Emerson Markham*, Ed Perkins, Mitch Rice, Terence Todman, Costis Toregas

Unassigned Fellows who have self-selected for the panel: Steve Carter, Beth Kellar, Dolph Norton, Fred Riggs, Neil Kerwin, Emmett Carson, Jim Barnes, Jonathan Howes, Enid Beaumont, Jane Pisano, Robert Agranoff, Diane Henshel, Mark Rosentraub, Charles Bonser, Astrid Merget, Nancy Tate*

Staff Support: Doris Surratt, NAPA Senior Staff

Tel: 800-993-3190 or 202-347-3190

E-mail: dsurratt@napawash.org

Fax: 202-393-0993

Panel Officers: Philip Rutledge, Chair
Gail Christopher, Co-Vice Chair
William Hansell, Co-Vice Chair
Valerie Lemmie, Rapporteur

*Indicates an Associate Member of the Panel who is not a Fellow.

VII. The Schedule of Work

<p>People -Seek Joint Projects & International Panel -Explore Africa project -Develop & fund Africa project Implement Africa project</p>			
<p>5. Coordination -Coordinate Working Groups -Prepare for General NAPA Meetings -Liaison with NAPA Leadership</p>	<p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>	<p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>	<p>_____</p>

From: "Bob and Elaine Tiller" <tiller64@starpower.net>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Reminder of November 14 meeting
Date: Wed, 8 Nov 2000 20:08:20 -0500
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2314.1300
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300

Unfortunately, I can not attend. As I may have told you, I have begun a new job as Director of Government Relations for Bread for the World. The semi-annual meeting of our board of directors will occur on the 14th, and I need to be at it. Sorry to miss the ICND meeting. Let me know what transpires, and I will see how the Baptist Peace Fellowship can connect to it.

Bob

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

From: Howard W. Hallman <mupj@igc.org>
To: <mupj@igc.org>
Sent: Monday, November 06, 2000 11:41 AM
Subject: Reminder of November 14 meeting

> Dear Colleagues,
>
> The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament will meet on Tuesday,
> November 14, 2000 from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. The meeting will take place in
> the conference room of the Washington office of the National Council of
> Churches, 110 Maryland Avenue, NE, Room 108. To get in the building dial
> 108.
>
> The purpose of the meeting will be to consider how we should approach the
> new president and the new Congress. I'll send out some background
> material
> later in the week.
>
> I hope to see you on the 14th. If you can't attend and want to offer some
> suggestions, please contact me via e-mail or phone at 301 896-0013.
>
> 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: dce@wcc-coe.org, sal@wcc-coe.org, paul@paxchristi.net
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: U.S. election results, etc.
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Dwain, Salpy, and Paul,

I understand from Paul that you three will be talking in Geneva on November 10 about common initiatives related to nuclear disarmament. I hope you work something out. We in the United States need you to exert pressure from the global faith community on our policy makers.

In case it might be helpful, let me offer some observations about our election. As I write, I don't know the results of the recount in Florida. Whoever wins the presidency will lack a strong mandate from the voters. Congress will be closely divided. At its worst this will set the stage for partisan bickering. At its best it will call for a reduction of partisanship and a search for bipartisan cooperation on issues affecting the common good.

I am going to suggest to our Interfaith Committee on Nuclear Disarmament that we pursue the latter and try to make nuclear disarmament a bipartisan issue. We can cite bipartisan support for the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) in 1969 and for ever arms control treaty since until the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) was defeated in 1999. The agenda for a bipartisan approach is laid out in the Final Document of the 2000 NPT Review Conference in thirteen practical steps presented in paragraph 15. They were reaffirmed in the New Agenda Coalition resolution approved recently by First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly. The U.S. representative supported the NPT Final Document and the First Committee resolution.

You might want to look at these documents as you draw up your statements. (If you don't have them, let me know, and I'll send them.) Your appeal to the nuclear-weapon states can stress the needs of humanity that go beyond national advantage and political partisanship.

As regards our presidential candidates, we tried unsuccessfully to get them to discuss nuclear weapons during the campaign. They both refused to answer questions we posed about the morality of nuclear weapons, their military utility, and the U.S. NPT obligation. In one major speech George W. Bush spoke in favor of unilateral initiatives on de-alerting and cuts in the strategic arsenal, but he also advocated a robust, global missile defense. He is on record as favoring continuation of the moratorium on nuclear testing, but he opposes ratification of the CTBT. In contrast Al Gore favors CTBT ratification. He seems more oriented toward traditional bilateral negotiations for reductions of strategic weapons than reciprocal unilateral initiatives. So whoever is elected, we have a challenge to get them to think bigger and to act decisively for nuclear disarmament.

Therefore, strong international appeals from the faith community would be very helpful. If the Holy See can be officially involved, it would help get the National Council of Catholic Bishops to speak out stronger on this issue. At the moment they are in a conservative mode on disarmament issues, except for Pax Christi bishops, who amount to about one-third of their numbers.

Let's keep in touch.

Howard

To: johnburroughs@mail.earthlink.net
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: New Agenda resolution
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear John,

Will you please send me a copy of the New Agenda resolution as adopted by the UNGA First Committee? I haven't been able to download it from the WILPF website.

Thanks,
Howard

To: mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Agenda and draft statement for November 14 meeting
Cc:
Bcc: icnd
X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\icnd.047.doc; A:\abolish.308.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Colleague:

For the meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, scheduled to take place from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m., Tuesday, November 14 in the conference room of the National Council of Churches, Room 108, 110 Maryland Avenue, NE (around the corner from the Methodist Building entrance), I propose the following agenda:

1. Introductions
2. Reflections on the election
3. Bipartisan approach to nuclear disarmament
 - a. Draft statement
 - b. Priorities for 2001
4. Contacting transition team of president-elect
5. Contacting members of 107th Congress
 - a. In Washington
 - b. Grassroots
6. Next meeting

As a point of departure for item 3, I have drafted the attached statement on a bipartisan approach to nuclear disarmament. As this statement is further developed and refined, it can provide us a set of goals to seek with the new presidential administration during the next four years. It can provide an agenda for discussion with the transition team and designated appointees and with members of Congress. Our grassroots contacts can use this statement as they make contact with senators and representatives who will serve in the next Congress.

The draft statement deals with more issues than we are likely to encompass in 2001. Therefore, we will want to determine our priorities for next year.

My guess is that we will not have time on November 14 to go very far into discussion of grassroots outreach. This can be taken up at a subsequent meeting.

Along with the draft statement, I am attaching an excerpt from the Final Document of the NPT 2000 Review Conference that lists 13 practical steps toward nuclear disarmament.

If you cannot attend the November 14 meeting, I would welcome your comments in advance on the draft statement and other agenda items. Call me at 301 896-0013 or respond by e-mail to mupj@igc.org.

Shalom,
Howard

To: brinkprogram@backfromthebrink.net, dkimball@clw.org, dculp@fcnl.org, timb@2020vision.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Agenda and draft statement for November 14 meeting
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\icnd.047.doc; A:\abolish.308.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Advisor:

I hope that you can participate in the meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, scheduled to take place from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m., Tuesday, November 14 in the conference room of the National Council of Churches, Room 108, 110 Maryland Avenue, NE (around the corner from the Methodist Building entrance), At the door the entrance code is 108. I propose the following agenda:

1. Introductions
2. Reflections on the election
3. Bipartisan approach to nuclear disarmament
 - a. Draft statement
 - b. Priorities for 2001
4. Contacting transition team of president-elect
5. Contacting members of 107th Congress
 - a. In Washington
 - b. Grassroots
6. Next meeting

As a point of departure for item 3, I have drafted the attached statement on a bipartisan approach to nuclear disarmament. As this statement is further developed and refined, it can provide us a set of goals to seek with the new presidential administration during the next four years. It can provide an agenda for discussion with the transition team and designated appointees and with members of Congress. Our grassroots contacts can use this statement as they make contact with senators and representatives who will serve in the next Congress.

The draft statement deals with more issues than we are likely to encompass in 2001. Therefore, we will want to determine our priorities for next year.

My guess is that we will not have time on November 14 to go very far into discussion of grassroots outreach. This can be taken up at a subsequent meeting.

Along with the draft statement, I am attaching an excerpt from the Final Document of the NPT 2000 Review Conference that lists 13 practical steps toward nuclear disarmament.

If you cannot attend the November 14 meeting, I would welcome your comments in advance on the draft statement and other agenda items. Call me at 301 896-0013 or respond by e-mail to mupj@igc.org.

Shalom,
Howard

To: Gail Williams <gwilliams@TrammellCrow.com>, Amee Fansler <fansfam@aol.com>, Andrea Butler <andreabutler@mindspring.com>, David_N_Welch@ETNET.Com, "Eliza Toomey @ Home" <polenaroom@aol.com>, Janet Tyson - Home <jmtyson@dellnet.com>, "Jimbo @ Home" <Spragins53@aol.com>, "Jimbo @ Work" <jlong@abramsonconstruction.com>, "Jodie Paustian @ mlirs" <Jodie.L.Paustian@m1.irs.gov>, "John Euler @ Home" <eulers@erols.com>, "John Euler @ Work" <john.euler@usdoj.gov>, Michael Moran <mmoran@cbstevens.com>, "Nancy Smith @ Work" <smithn@cder.fda.gov>, Ron Foster <HolRonFost@aol.com>, "Sandy Long @ Home" <MingoMae@aol.com>, "Sandy Long @ Work" <slong@4thpres.org>

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

Subject: A song for November 19

Cc:

Bcc:

X-Attachments:

In-Reply-To: <A1BE0BD0BE8BD311844800508B44F4D56FCDDE@MD0102>

References:

I would like to add "What Does the Lord Require" to the November 19 list. It is in the form of a round that gives the congregation an opportunity to participate.

Howard

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

Dear Phil,

I'm ready to close out the Rockefeller grant. Therefore, I request payments as follows:

1. Please pay me \$500 for my time spent in October from the balance remaining in the Rockefeller grant in the Education Fund.
2. I am submitting my expenses for the trip I took to Brussels to participate in the consultation of church representatives, as follows:

Air faire	\$401.49
Transportation to and from airport	34.00
Hotel	281.00
Meals	116.30
Metro	5.75
Total	\$838.54
Pay from Rockefeller in General Fund	\$338.54
Pay later from a UMGBCS grant	500.00

I am expecting \$500 from the UM General Board of Church and Society within the next two weeks. You can pay that balance when it arrives and is cleared.

3. If my figures are correct, this will leave \$241.58 in the Rockefeller account in the General Fund. To use this up you might assign some previous payments, such as telephone bills and photocopying service. That is my preference so that we can close it out. But if that is too difficult, you can assign other bills as they come to you. However, that shouldn't include Peace Leaf expenses.

If you need clarification, please call me.

Shalom,
Howard

From: WStarman@cathedral.org To: mupj@igc.org Subject: RE: Agenda and draft statement for November 14 meeting Date: Fri, 10 Nov 2000 11:55:22 -0500 X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

Dear Howard,

Thank you very much for forwarding this note and the materials.

Unfortunately, I am under such an extreme work crunch right now that I will not have an opportunity to review these materials before your meeting, or attend.

I have two proposal deadlines that are looming on Dec. 1, that are critical to our project's staying alive. Plus, my soon-to-be boss is on her way to Germany in the middle of next week. This is just to say that the pace is very intense...to both keep our outreach efforts going strong, while also managing the fundraising. In light of our limited manpower, it's a tall task right now and I'm stretching at the seams.

Thanks for your patience and understanding.

Best,

Wendy

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

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

Sent: Friday, November 10, 2000 11:40 AM

To: mupj@igc.org

Subject: Agenda and draft statement for November 14 meeting

Dear Colleague:

For the meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, scheduled to take place from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m., Tuesday, November 14 in the conference room of the National Council of Churches, Room 108, 110 Maryland Avenue, NE (around the corner from the Methodist Building entrance), I propose the following agenda:

1. Introductions
2. Reflections on the election
3. Bipartisan approach to nuclear disarmament
 - a. Draft statement
 - b. Priorities for 2001
4. Contacting transition team of president-elect
5. Contacting members of 107th Congress
 - a. In Washington

b. Grassroots

6. Next meeting

As a point of departure for item 3, I have drafted the attached statement on a bipartisan approach to nuclear disarmament. As this statement is further developed and refined, it can provide us a set of goals to seek with the new presidential administration during the next four years. It can provide an agenda for discussion with the transition team and designated appointees and with members of Congress. Our grassroots contacts can use this statement as they make contact with senators and representatives who will serve in the next Congress.

The draft statement deals with more issues than we are likely to encompass in 2001. Therefore, we will want to determine our priorities for next year.

My guess is that we will not have time on November 14 to go very far into discussion of grassroots outreach. This can be taken up at a subsequent meeting.

Along with the draft statement, I am attaching an excerpt from the Final Document of the NPT 2000 Review Conference that lists 13 practical steps toward nuclear disarmament.

If you cannot attend the November 14 meeting, I would welcome your comments in advance on the draft statement and other agenda items. Call me at 301 896-0013 or respond by e-mail to mupj@igc.org.

Shalom,
Howard

Date: Fri, 10 Nov 2000 12:56:09 -0500
From: "L. William Yolton" <lwyolton@prodigy.net>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.75 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Agenda and draft statement for November 14 meeting

Howard, I am sorry that I must excuse myself from the Tuesday meeting. An important group I am meeting with in Richmond set that date for its next meeting after I had left the room. Then they extended it to meet the whole day, and getting back to Washington in time for the last half-hour is now out of the question.

I am not flagging in zeal for the cause...just divided by competing responsibilities. In this case I have an opportunity to influence the standards and administration of community mental health programs in Virginia.

--Bill Yolton

"Howard W. Hallman" wrote:

> Dear Colleague:

>

> For the meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament,
> scheduled to take place from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m., Tuesday, November 14

>

>

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

Phil,

I forgot to ask for a check for my registration for the annual Monday Lobby retreat that will take place in January at Coolfont. Please provide me with a check for \$268.75. payable to the Council for a Livable World Education Fund. It doesn't matter which fund it comes from, but don't assign it to Rockefeller.

Thanks,
Howard

Date: Tue, 14 Nov 2000 11:51:44 +0100
From: "m.h.h. de weerd" <larissa@casema.net>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.08 [en] (Win95; I)
To: "Dessart Veronique, CEC Brussels" <ved@cec-kek.be>
CC: "Anthea.Bethge@t-online.de" <Anthea.Bethge@t-online.de>,
"gbirks@ploughshares.ca" <gbirks@ploughshares.ca>,
"c2mpower@fx.ro" <c2mpower@fx.ro>,
"nbutler@acronym.org.uk" <nbutler@acronym.org.uk>,
"bem@wcc-coe.org" <bem@wcc-coe.org>,
"mupj@igc.org" <mupj@igc.org>,
"qcea@ngonet.be" <qcea@ngonet.be>,
"ifpnuc@hq.nato.int" <ifpnuc@hq.nato.int>,
"a-p-m@ath.forthnet.gr" <a-p-m@ath.forthnet.gr>,
"CPKerton@yahoo.com" <CPKerton@yahoo.com>,
"paul@paxchristi.net" <paul@paxchristi.net>,
"smarten@gn.apc.org" <smarten@gn.apc.org>,
"mm@deuroconsult.ro" <mm@deuroconsult.ro>,
"eregehr@ploughshares.ca" <eregehr@ploughshares.ca>,
"nonviolence@callnetuk.com" <nonviolence@callnetuk.com>,
"comece@glo.be" <comece@glo.be>,
"steve@quaker.org.uk" <steve@quaker.org.uk>,
"paulw@nccusa.org" <paulw@nccusa.org>,
"Lamont Stewart, CEC Brussels" <sjl@cec-kek.be>,
"Salpy Eskidjian (E-mail)" <sal@wcc-coe.org>,
"Jenkins Keith, CEC Brussels" <kpj@cec-kek.be>,
"Pavlovic Peter, CEC Brussels" <ppt@cec-kek.be>,
"Rev.Rüdiger Noll (E-mail)" <rud@cec-kek.org>,
"OKRin Heidrun Tempel (E-mail)" <Heidrun.Tempel@advalvas.be>
Subject: Re: Final Communiqué Nuclear Issues, Brussels 5-6 October

Dear Friends,

Up to now I didn't hear anything about the implementation of points 1 and 2. I did a lot to activate the attention in the Netherlands (Uniting Churches and Interchurch Peace Council), but without international backing as was suggested in Brussels, this will hardly bear fruit I am afraid. So please, inform me.

Greetings,
Ries

Dessart Veronique, CEC Brussels wrote:

> COMMUNIQUE
> October 6, 2000
>
> An international gathering of church representatives met in Brussels on Oct
> 5 and 6, 2000 to explore effective church responses to the current NATO
> review of its nuclear arms control and security policies. Present were
> American, Canadian, and European church staff with responsibility for public
> policy issues, individuals from related denominational and ecumenical
> committees and institutions, and representatives of 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. They were

> assisted by researchers in security and arms control, and benefitted from a
> session with a senior NATO official.

>

> The consultation reminded the churches that the end of the Cold War has not
> meant an end to the threat of nuclear conflict and nuclear proliferation.

> While the recent Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference ended with "an
> unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear weapon states to accomplish the total
> elimination of their nuclear arsenals," many other recent developments
> undermine progress toward nuclear disarmament. Notably, the defeat of the
> Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty in the US Senate, the nuclearization of South
> Asia, and the retention of Cold War-era nuclear postures by the United
> States and Russia have tended instead towards the indefinite retention and
> even the spread of nuclear capabilities. The looming prospect of missile
> defence deployment threatens further damage to nuclear arms control and
> disarmament efforts.

>

> As part of the review process, NATO will over the next few months be making
> key decisions that will do much to determine the future of nuclear weapons
> and nuclear arms control and disarmament efforts. With that in mind, the
> consultation agreed:

> 1. to recommend to the ecumenical community that it should engage directly
> with the current NATO Review process with a view to encouraging NATO states
> and NATO itself to conform to the obligations undertaken in the Non
> Proliferation Treaty; and

> 2. to impress upon churches the need to re-energise their peace witness and,
> within the framework of the Decade to Overcome Violence to undertake
> education, public awareness activity, and advocacy regarding the continuing
> threat of nuclear weapons.

>

> For more information contact Salpy Eskidjian, Program Executive,
> International Relations, World Council of Churches.

>

> Tel: 41 22 791 6111
> E-mail: disarm@wcc-coe.org <<mailto:disarm@wcc-coe.org>>

X-eGroups-Return: sentto-1300601-263-974151738-mupj=igc.org@returns.onelist.com
X-Sender: MingoMae@aol.com
X-Apparently-To: bumc@egroups.com
To: <bumc@egroups.com>
X-Mailer: Unknown
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, 13 Nov 2000 16:41:33 EST
Subject: [bumc] Fwd: UMNS #510-More United Methodists will serve in new Congress

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

eLerts

It's Easy. It's Fun. Best of All, it's Free!

http://click.egroups.com/1/9699/2/_/118274/_/974151738/

----->

Return-Path: <owner-umnsdn@LISTSERV.UMC.ORG>

Received: from rly-yc03.mx.aol.com (rly-yc03.mail.aol.com [172.18.149.35]) by air-yc05.mail.aol.com (v76_r1.23) with ESMTP; Mon, 13 Nov 2000 16:03:34 -0500

Received: from smtp.umcom.net (host81.umcom.org [209.194.114.81]) by rly-yc03.mx.aol.com (v76_r1.19) with ESMTP; Mon, 13 Nov 2000 16:02:35 -0500

Received: from umcom2c01 (youth.umc.org [209.194.114.78])
by smtp.umcom.net (8.9.3/8.8.7) with ESMTP id KAA18112;
Mon, 13 Nov 2000 10:03:00 -0600

Received: from LISTSERV.UMC.ORG by LISTSERV.UMC.ORG (LISTSERV-TCP/IP release
1.8d) with spool id 20250 for UMNSDN@LISTSERV.UMC.ORG; Mon, 13 Nov
2000 14:57:41 -0800

Received: from 10.1.2.10 by LISTSERV.UMC.ORG (SMTPPL release 1.0d) with TCP;
Mon, 13 Nov 2000 14:57:40 -0700

Received: by mail.umcom.web with Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8) id
<T9D3YXB7>; Mon, 13 Nov 2000 14:52:37 -0600

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: <F081FCEC704BD3118DA700105A61DECACBE584@mail.umcom.web>

Date: Mon, 13 Nov 2000 14:52:19 -0600

Reply-To: newsdesk@UMCOM.UMC.ORG

Sender: UMNS Daily News <UMNSDN@LISTSERV.UMC.ORG>

From: NewsDesk <NewsDesk@UMCOM.UMC.ORG>

Subject: UMNS #510-More United Methodists will serve in new Congress

To: UMNSDN@LISTSERV.UMC.ORG

More United Methodists will serve in new Congress

Nov. 13, 2000 News media contact: Joretta Purdue ·(202) 546-8722· Washington
10-21-71B{510}

NOTE: A list of United Methodist members of Congress follows the end of this report.

By Albert J. Menendez*

WASHINGTON (UMNS) -- Reversing a four-decade decline, the United Methodist representation in Congress has increased from 59 to 65.

The increase is particularly pronounced in the Senate, which will have 16 United Methodists in the new 107th Congress, compared with 12 in the 106th Congress.

Five new United Methodist Democrats were elected Nov. 7, including Hillary Rodham Clinton in New York, Jon Corzine of New Jersey, Ben Nelson of Nebraska, Debbie Stabenow of Michigan (who moved from the House of Representatives to the Senate), and Zell Miller of Georgia. Miller was appointed earlier this year upon the death of Paul Coverdell and went on to win the Georgia seat in the current election.

Both of Kansas' senators are United Methodists and Republicans; and the senators from Georgia and New Jersey are all United Methodists and Democrats.

While Democratic United Methodists outnumber their Republican counterparts 10 to six in the Senate, the story in the House of Representatives is quite different. There, in the United Methodist family, Republicans outnumber Democrats 33 to 16.

Among all 65 United Methodists in the 107th Congress, 39 (or 60 percent) are Republicans, and 26 (or 40 percent) are Democrats. The Democrats posted a small gain compared with the 106th Congress, elected in 1998.

The United Methodists hail from all regions, though more than half of them - 33 - were elected in the South. Three more came from the border states of Kentucky and Maryland. This gives the United Methodists as a group a distinctly Southern flavor.

With 11 delegates, Texas contributed the largest number to the United Methodist congressional contingent, followed by Georgia with six and Ohio with five.

In terms of relative strength within state delegations, the church's representation is strongest in Nebraska, where three of five members belong to the denomination, and in neighboring Kansas, where three of six members are United Methodists.

Nearly half of the Georgia delegation - six of 13 - and one-third of those from Louisiana and Texas belong to the United Methodist Church. Twenty-five states sent at least one United Methodist to Congress.

United Methodists remain the third largest religious group in Congress, with Roman Catholics in first place and Baptists second. Presbyterians, Episcopalians and Jews are in fourth, fifth and sixth places in the

rankings, as they were in the 106th Congress. Nondenominational Protestants, Lutherans, Mormons and members of the United Church of Christ fill out the 10 most-represented religious groups in Congress.

###

* Menendez is an associate director of Americans for Religious Liberty. He lives in Maryland.

United Methodist members of the 107th Congress:

Senate

Jeff Sessions	R	Alabama
Zell Miller	D	Georgia
Max Cleland	D	Georgia
Daniel Inouye	D	Hawaii
Larry Craig	R	Idaho
Richard Lugar	R	Indiana
Pat Roberts	R	Kansas
Sam Brownback	R	Kansas
Debbie Stabenow	D	Michigan
Ben Nelson	D	Nebraska
Jon Corzine	D	New Jersey
Robert Torricelli	D	New Jersey
Jeff Bingaman	D	New Mexico

To: "Kris Hoxha" <bethesdaum@aol.com>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Bulletin announcement
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Kris,

If there is space, I would like a report on the Pennies into Potatoes project to be in next Sunday's bulletin. I won't have the complete information until I see Mike Moran on Thursday evening, but here is a draft with blanks to be filled in.

Howard

###

KEEP THE PENNIES COMING for the Pennies into Potatoes project. During the last eight weeks we have received \$xx. Of this amount \$66 came from Sunday School children. This brings the total since 1998 to \$xxx, enough for xx,xxx servings of potatoes. The money goes to the Society of St. Andrew to help pay the cost of shipping donated potatoes to food kitchens for the homeless and other persons in need. Jars are placed in the narthex and the hallway of the education wing for your contribution.

To: dringler@umc-gbcs.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Grant request
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\01009.10.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Robin,

As we've discuss on the phone and in previous communications, I request a grant of \$500 to Methodists United for Peace with Justice to pay part of my expenses in attending a meeting of church representatives that took place in Brussels, Belgium on October 5 and 6, 2000. In attendance were representatives of the World Council of Churches, Conference of European Churches, Canadian Council of Churches, National Council of Churches (USA), several national denominations in Europe, and several unofficial organizations. I was invited because of my leadership role in the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament.

The purpose of the consultation was to develop a common strategy for dealing with a current review of NATO nuclear posture. This is a major concern for churches, which together want to reduce NATO's reliance on nuclear weapons as a step toward nuclear disarmament. As the attached communiqué indicates, participants agreed to form a delegation to call upon key non-nuclear NATO states to urge them to provide leadership for nuclear weapons reduction by NATO. While at the meeting I also talked with representatives of the World Council of Churches and Pax Christi International about forming a delegation of church leaders from different continents to call upon heads of the nuclear-weapon states to press for decisive action on nuclear disarmament. These are actions favored by the United Methodist Church, as expressed in the General Conference resolution on "Nuclear Abolition".

My expenses for this trip are as follows.

Airfare	\$ 401.49	
Transportation to and from airport		34.00
Hotel	281.00	
Meals	116.30	
Metro	5.75	
 Total	 \$ 838.54	

Our request to the UM General Board of Church and Society is for \$500. We will pay the balance from other funds. The check can be mailed to us at 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC.

Thank you for your consideration,

Howard W. Hallman

From: Robin Ringler <DRingler@UMC-GBCS.ORG>
To: "mupj@igc.org" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: FW: WISC Retreat-
Date: Tue, 14 Nov 2000 14:57:12 -0500
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

Howard- When I returned from our meeting just now I had this e-mail. I wonder if others in our interfaith anti-nuke group will be effected by this???? I'm not a big WISC mtg. attender, but I think others in the community are. I guess Jaydee wants me to attend this one. . . Should we try to re-schedule the anti-nuke mtg.? Not just because of me, but maybe others? Do you want to check with Kathy Guthrie, Lisa Wright, others, and see if they would need to attend the WISC mtg.?

Sorry to throw a kink into the process. . .

Robin

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Jaydee Hanson

> Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2000 1:16 PM

> To: All Staff

> Subject: WISC Retreat-

>

> The program staff should place December 19th on their calendars for a

> Washington Interreligious Staff Council Retreat. I do not have the

> location, but in will be in the DC Area. Jaydee

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2
Date: Tue, 14 Nov 2000 00:48:06 -0600
From: "Greg Laszakovits" <glaszakovits_gb@brethren.org>
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: Re: Agenda and draft statement for November 14 meeting

Howard,

I'll be unable to attend today's meeting. Please send minutes when available.

Thanks, Greg Laszakovits

>>> "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> 11/10/00 11:39AM >>>

Dear Colleague:

For the meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, scheduled to take place from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m., Tuesday, November 14 in the conference room of the National Council of Churches, Room 108, 110 Maryland Avenue, NE (around the corner from the Methodist Building entrance), I propose the following agenda:

1. Introductions
2. Reflections on the election
3. Bipartisan approach to nuclear disarmament
 - a. Draft statement
 - b. Priorities for 2001
4. Contacting transition team of president-elect
5. Contacting members of 107th Congress
 - a. In Washington
 - b. Grassroots
6. Next meeting

As a point of departure for item 3, I have drafted the attached statement on a bipartisan approach to nuclear disarmament. As this statement is further developed and refined, it can provide us a set of goals to seek with the new presidential administration during the next four years. It can provide an agenda for discussion with the transition team and designated appointees and with members of Congress. Our grassroots contacts can use this statement as they make contact with senators and representatives who will serve in the next Congress.

The draft statement deals with more issues than we are likely to encompass in 2001. Therefore, we will want to determine our priorities for next year.

My guess is that we will not have time on November 14 to go very far into discussion of grassroots outreach. This can be taken up at a subsequent meeting.

Along with the draft statement, I am attaching an excerpt from the Final Document of the NPT 2000 Review Conference that lists 13 practical steps toward nuclear disarmament.

If you cannot attend the November 14 meeting, I would welcome your comments

in advance on the draft statement and other agenda items. Call me at 301
896-0013 or respond by e-mail to mupj@igc.org.

Shalom,
Howard

To: blythe-goodman@erols.com, tlheath@churchwomen.org, epf@igc.org, kathy@fcl.org, "Judy Coode" <mknollde.@igc.org>, lisaw@nccusa.org, cgordon@ctr.pcusa.org, dringler@umc-gbcs.org, esterpank@hotmail.com, david@fcl.org, timb@2020vision.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Meeting follow-up
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\icnd.049.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Colleagues:

(1) When Robin Ringler returned to her office after the meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, she received an announcement of a WISC staff retreat on December 19, the day we had chosen for our next meeting. We will therefore need to re-schedule our meeting. For the period from Monday, December 11 to Wednesday, December 20 will you please tell me your preference for an hour and a half meeting and when you cannot attend. If you know of any other competing meetings, let me know.

(2) I have combined the two worksheets from our meeting into the attached Work Program. Please review it to see whether it accurately expresses our consensus, and let me know if there are any errors or omissions. By next Monday, November 20 I want to send it to others on the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear.

Shalom,
Howard

To: DKNUTSONR@aol.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: (no subject)
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <c7.338ad5c.27442e2b@aol.com>
References:

At 01:21 PM 11/15/00 EST, you wrote:

>The Boots Hallman cousins would like to have a spray of flowers from all the
>cousins at Vic's funeral. What do you think? May I go ahead and take care
>of it. Terri just called to say the funeral is Friday at 1:00. Ed, will
>you please contact Walt? Lynette, will you please check with your mom?
>Thanks. Marj

Marj,

Yes, please include me. Send me a bill for my share. If you haven't already contacted Mary Hurrel, I'm sure she will want to be included, so add her name. She's going the funeral.

We'll all miss Vic.

Howard

X-Sender: vhall110@pop.southwind.net (Unverified)

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 4.3.1

Date: Wed, 15 Nov 2000 15:20:40 -0600

To: DALE THOMAS <dalet1@swbell.net>, rhallman@worldnet.att.net,
bhallman@slb.com, cpepper@towerhill.org, cboles@usd350.k12.ks.us,
dcpohl@iland.net, prulld@crossnet.org, rmo@mcn.net,
Aurie Wornkey <abw@southwind.net>,
"DKNUTSONR@aol.com" <DKNUTSONR@aol.com>, critter1@southwind.net,
Edward Brueggemann <edbruegge@mediaone.net>, halledee@aol.com,
EAABurns@aol.com, JEMSO615@aol.com, mupj@igc.apc.org,
Jane Pohlman <BJLPOHLMAN@peoplepc.com>, jrader@midusa.net,
Spencersage@aol.com, LMEHALL@ibm.net, mvbryant@home.com,
MMBruegg@aol.com, PAULNLISH@aol.com, rainer@hkusa.com,
hoffstot@pdq.net, Russtokes@Earthlink.net, SPoh101489@aol.com,
dclark9607@aol.com, sapfromor@aol.com, maxandlil@yahoo.com,
"Ricky Anderberg" <anderberg@SF.K12.SD.US>

From: Vic and Jeanette Hallman <vhall110@southwind.net>

Subject: Dad's funeral arrangements

To all of our e-mail relatives,

As you all have heard, Dad passed away yesterday morning after a long battle with cancer. Funeral arrangements have been made and are as follows:

The following schedule is for Friday 11/17/00

11:00am - Family Luncheon at the First Presbyterian Church

1:00pm - Funeral services at the First Presbyterian Church

3:30pm - Committal at the Trinity cemetery in Hudson

Visitation will be from 9am to 9pm Thursday 11/16/00 at Elliott Mortuary.

The casket will be open for viewing at the church prior to the service.

There will be about 30 minutes after the funeral for visiting, then we will depart to Hudson.

If you are coming, travel safely.

Brian

Vic and Jeanette Hallman

110 Downing

Hutchinson, KS 67502

316-663-4355

X-Sender: epf@pop.igc.org
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.6 (32)
Date: Wed, 15 Nov 2000 12:25:28 -0500
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: Episcopal Peace Fellowship <epf@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Meeting follow-up (text)

I cannot do a meeting Thursday, December 14th. I'm o.k. any other day in that bloc of time. I can get to a meeting by 9 a.m.; I'll need to leave a meeting by 4 p.m.

At 10:40 AM 11/15/00 -0500, you wrote:

>Dear Colleagues:

>

>(1) When Robin Ringler returned to her office after the meeting of the
>Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, she received an announcement
>of a WISC staff retreat on December 19, the day we had chosen for our next
>meeting. We will therefore need to re-schedule our meeting. For the
>period from Monday, December 11 to Wednesday, December 20 will you please
>tell me your preference for an hour and a half meeting and when you cannot
>attend. If you know of any other competing meetings, let me know.

From: Kathy Guthrie <kathy@fcnl.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: Meeting follow-up
Date: Wed, 15 Nov 2000 14:12:00 -0500
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

Howard,
The afternoons of those days you asked about are ok with me.
Kathy

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Wednesday, November 15, 2000 10:39 AM
To: blythe-goodman@erols.com; ttheath@churchwomen.org; epf@igc.org;
kathy@fcnl.org; Judy Coode; lisaw@nccusa.org; cgordon@ctr.pcusa.org;
dringler@umc-gbcs.org; esterpank@hotmail.com; david@fcnl.org;
timb@2020vision.org
Subject: Meeting follow-up

Dear Colleagues:

(1) When Robin Ringler returned to her office after the meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, she received an announcement of a WISC staff retreat on December 19, the day we had chosen for our next meeting. We will therefore need to re-schedule our meeting. For the period from Monday, December 11 to Wednesday, December 20 will you please tell me your preference for an hour and a half meeting and when you cannot attend. If you know of any other competing meetings, let me know.

(2) I have combined the two worksheets from our meeting into the attached Work Program. Please review it to see whether it accurately expresses our consensus, and let me know if there are any errors or omissions. By next Monday, November 20 I want to send it to others on the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear.

Shalom,
Howard

User-Agent: Microsoft-Outlook-Express-Macintosh-Edition/5.02.2022
Date: Wed, 15 Nov 2000 16:50:09 -0500
Subject: Re: Meeting follow-up
From: Tim Barner <timb@2020vision.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>

Howard:

Thanks for the work plan. The only date I have meetings on right now is Friday, Dec 15th.

Tim

Howard W. Hallman 11/15/00 10:38 AM mupj@igc.org

> Dear Colleagues:

>

> (1) When Robin Ringler returned to her office after the meeting of the
> Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, she received an announcement
> of a WISC staff retreat on December 19, the day we had chosen for our next
> meeting. We will therefore need to re-schedule our meeting. For the
> period from Monday, December 11 to Wednesday, December 20 will you please
> tell me your preference for an hour and a half meeting and when you cannot
> attend. If you know of any other competing meetings, let me know.

>

> (2) I have combined the two worksheets from our meeting into the attached
> Work Program. Please review it to see whether it accurately expresses our
> consensus, and let me know if there are any errors or omissions. By next
> Monday, November 20 I want to send it to others on the Interfaith Committee
> for Nuclear.

>

> Shalom,
> Howard

>

To: sallyl@ploughshares.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Inquiry of grant possibility
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\icnd.049.doc; A:\icnd.050.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Sally:

I'm wondering whether in your 2001 budget there is room to consider support for the action-oriented Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair. Or will your funds for interfaith work continue to go mostly for the educational activities of the National Cathedral project? If there is a possibility that you would consider an action project, I would like to submit a proposal before your next deadline.

After several exploratory months following defeat of the CTBT, representatives of faith-based organizations which participated in the Interfaith Group for the CTBT decided to form the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament with a broader agenda. A list of those now participating is attached. We already have 50 percent more organizations than participated in the CTBT campaign, and our list continues to expand.

At a May 2000 planning meeting the Interfaith Planning Committee decided to focus our immediate attention on national missile defense. This led to:

- A letter from religious leaders to President Clinton asking him not to deploy the CTBT. The Friends Committee on National Legislation provided the leadership for this letter.
 - A postcard alert developed in cooperation with 20/20 Vision and with 28 faith organizations as cosponsors. More than 40,000 cards were distributed, and some organizations sent the message by e-mail to many more.
- In addition, we considered election issues and developed:
- A set of questions on nuclear disarmament issues addressed to congressional candidates and distributed by a number of organizations to their grassroots constituents.

Separately I worked with Pax Christi USA to produce a letter to presidential candidates, signed by 48 religious leaders from various denominations and regions of the country, asking ten questions on nuclear disarmament issues. We reported the candidates' responses at a news conference featuring United Methodist Bishop C. Dale White and Catholic Bishop Thomas Gumbleton. Both faith-based and civil-sector organizations distributed the responses to their members. This effort was financed by 501(c)(4) funds.

In October I participated in a meeting of European, Canadian, and U.S. church representatives plus staff of the World Council of Churches and Pax Christi International, held in Brussels, Belgium. The purpose was to develop a common approach to dealing with NATO's current review of its nuclear posture. The outcome was a decision to send a delegation to several key non-nuclear NATO states and urge them to work for a reduced role of nuclear weapons. As follow up I am urging the World Council of Churches, Pax Christi International, and hopefully the Holy See to send a delegation of religious leaders from different continents to the heads of the nuclear-weapon states and urge them to fulfill their NPT commitment to an "unequivocal undertaking to eliminate their nuclear arsenals". If this occurs, we will get a delegation of U.S. religious leaders to call upon the president of the United States with the same message.

Now that the election is over the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament has developed the attached work program for the next eight months. We will concentrate on building bipartisan support for de-alerting and strategic arms reduction outside the START process. If Al Gore is elected president, we will add the CTBT to the list of active issues. We will also stand ready to deal with "mini-nukes" and NMD when they come up. In practice we will concentrate particularly on 15 to 20 Republican senators to urge them to join Democrats in a bipartisan approach. We will encourage and assist our interfaith grassroots networks in their home states to be in touch with the key senators on these issues. We will produce educational material and send out action alerts when the issues come into a legislative focus,

such as in defense authorization legislation (which has some obstacles that need removing).

If you would consider financial support for this interfaith action program on nuclear disarmament, I would like to submit an application for a grant to support the leadership role I play in this endeavor. If generous multi-foundation support becomes available, our second funding priority is for a field coordinator to pull together our grassroots activities.

Please advise me whether it would be appropriate to submit a complete application.

With best regards,
Howard

To: KMagraw@wajones.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Inquiry about funding possibility
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\icnd.049.doc; A:\icnd.050.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Ms. Magraw:

I'm wondering whether in your 2001 budget there is room to consider support for the action-oriented Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair. Or will your funds for interfaith work continue to go mostly for the educational activities of the National Cathedral project? If there is a possibility that you would consider an action project, I would like to submit a proposal before your next deadline.

After several exploratory months following defeat of the CTBT, representatives of faith-based organizations which participated in the Interfaith Group for the CTBT decided to form the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament with a broader agenda. A list of those now participating is attached. We already have 50 percent more organizations than participated in the CTBT campaign, and our list continues to expand.

At a May 2000 planning meeting the Interfaith Planning Committee decided to focus our immediate attention on national missile defense. This led to:

- A letter from religious leaders to President Clinton asking him not to deploy the CTBT. The Friends Committee on National Legislation provided the leadership for this letter.
 - A postcard alert developed in cooperation with 20/20 Vision and with 28 faith organizations as cosponsors. More than 40,000 cards were distributed, and some organizations sent the message by e-mail to many more.
- In addition, we considered election issues and developed:
- A set of questions on nuclear disarmament issues addressed to congressional candidates and distributed by a number of organizations to their grassroots constituents.

Separately I worked with Pax Christi USA to produce a letter to presidential candidates, signed by 48 religious leaders from various denominations and regions of the country, asking ten questions on nuclear disarmament issues. We reported the candidates' responses at a news conference featuring United Methodist Bishop C. Dale White and Catholic Bishop Thomas Gumbleton. Both faith-based and civil-sector organizations distributed the responses to their members. This effort was financed by 501(c)(4) funds.

In October I participated in a meeting of European, Canadian, and U.S. church representatives plus staff of the World Council of Churches and Pax Christi International, held in Brussels, Belgium. The purpose was to develop a common approach to dealing with NATO's current review of its nuclear posture. The outcome was a decision to send a delegation to several key non-nuclear NATO states and urge them to work for a reduced role of nuclear weapons. As follow up I am urging the World Council of Churches, Pax Christi International, and hopefully the Holy See to send a delegation of religious leaders from different continents to the heads of the nuclear-weapon states and urge them to fulfill their NPT commitment to an "unequivocal undertaking to eliminate their nuclear arsenals". If this occurs, we will get a delegation of U.S. religious leaders to call upon the president of the United States with the same message.

Now that the election is over the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament has developed the attached work program for the next eight months. We will concentrate on building bipartisan support for de-alerting and strategic arms reduction outside the START process. If Al Gore is elected president, we will add the CTBT to the list of active issues. We will also stand ready to deal with "mini-nukes" and NMD when they come up. In practice we will concentrate particularly on 15 to 20 Republican senators to urge them to join Democrats in a bipartisan approach. We will encourage and assist our interfaith grassroots networks in their home states to be in touch with the key senators on these issues. We will produce educational material and send out action alerts when the issues come into a legislative focus,

such as in defense authorization legislation (which has some obstacles that need removing).

If you would consider financial support for this interfaith action program on nuclear disarmament, I would like to submit an application for a grant to support the leadership role I play in this endeavor. If generous multi-foundation support becomes available, our second funding priority is for a field coordinator to pull together our grassroots activities.

Please advise me whether it would be appropriate to submit a complete application.

With best regards,
Howard

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

Dear Ms. Magraw:

In my recent e-mail to you I inadvertently left off the tag-end identification to let you know that it came from Methodists United for Peace with Justice. Here it is this time.

Howard Hallman

To: "James Land" <frontdesk@comptonfoundation.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Supplemental information
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\icnd.049.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Mr. Lamb:

Will you please provide the attached information to the person reviewing our request of September 14, 2000 for a grant in support of interfaith activities for nuclear disarmament.

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair, met yesterday, November 14, to develop its action program for the next eight months. It is attached.

Although there are uncertainties because of the presidential election hasn't been settled, we intend to concentrate upon building bipartisan support for de-alerting and strategic arms reduction outside the START process. If Al Gore is elected president, we will add CTBT ratification to our active agenda. We will also be prepared to deal with mini-nukes and national missile defense when these issues arise.

We hope that you will give favorable consideration to our request for a grant to Methodists United for Peace with Justice in support of the catalytic leadership I provide for the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament.

With best regards,
Howard Hallman

To: "Ruth Henning" <jmf@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Supplemental information
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\icnd.049.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Ms. Henning:

I would like to provide supplemental information to our request of September 28, 2000 for a grant in support of interfaith activities for nuclear disarmament.

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair, met yesterday, November 14, to develop its action program for the next eight months. It is attached.

Although there are uncertainties because of the presidential election hasn't been settled, we intend to concentrate upon building bipartisan support for de-alerting and strategic arms reduction outside the START process. If Al Gore is elected president, we will add CTBT ratification to our active agenda. We will also be prepared to deal with mini-nukes and national missile defense when these issues arise.

We hope that you will give favorable consideration to our request for a grant to Methodists United for Peace with Justice in support of the catalytic leadership I provide for the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament.

With best regards,
Howard Hallman

To: "Christine Shelton" <info@towncreekfdn.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Request for further consideration
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\icnd.049.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Ms. Shelton:

I appreciate the careful review that you gave to our application for a grant in support of interfaith activities for nuclear disarmament. I was glad to talk with Meg Gage about our work and our intentions. I understand that you receive requests for far more funds than you have available.

However, is there any possibility that you might give our application further consideration at your next board meeting? If so, I would like to share with you the work program for the next eight months, adopted yesterday, November 14, by the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. It is attached.

Although there are uncertainties because of the presidential election hasn't been settled, we intend to concentrate upon building bipartisan support for de-alerting and strategic arms reduction outside the START process. If Al Gore is elected president, we will add CTBT ratification to our active agenda. We will also be prepared to deal with mini-nukes and national missile defense when these issues arise.

Therefore, we hope that you might give further consideration to our request for a grant to Methodists United for Peace with Justice in support of the catalytic leadership I provide for the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament.

With best regards,
Howard Hallman

To: "Kris Hoxha" <bethesdaum@aol.com>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Bulletin information
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Kris,

Here is the information on the Pennies into Potatoes project for the Sunday bulletin.

Howard

###

KEEP THE PENNIES COMING for the Pennies into Potatoes project. During the last eight weeks we have received \$167. Of this amount \$66 came from Sunday School children. This brings the total since 1998 to \$797, enough for 79,700 servings of potatoes. The money goes to the Society of St. Andrew to help pay the cost of shipping donated potatoes to food kitchens for the homeless and other persons in need. Jars are placed in the narthex and the hallway of the education wing for your contribution.

From: DKNUTSONR@aol.com
Date: Wed, 15 Nov 2000 18:53:16 EST
Subject: Re: (no subject)
To: mupj@igc.org
X-Mailer: sub 117

Yes, I talked to Mary and e-mailed Lynette. I ordered \$100 worth of flowers, so it will come to \$11.85 each, I think. Mary indicated that she'd pay your share. She also indicated that she expected you to pay her! Yes, Vic was one of the good ones!! Marj

X-eGroups-Return: sentto-1092538-29-974502504-mupj=igc.org@returns.onelist.com
X-Sender: dbryden@j2000usa.org
X-Apparently-To: j2000-usa-news@egroups.com
X-eGroups-Return: dbryden@j2000usa.org
To: j2000-usa-news@egroups.com
User-Agent: eGroups-EW/0.82
X-Mailer: eGroups Message Poster
X-Originating-IP: 165.247.98.183
From: dbryden@j2000usa.org
Mailing-List: list j2000-usa-news@egroups.com; contact j2000-usa-news-owner@egroups.com
Delivered-To: mailing list j2000-usa-news@egroups.com
List-Unsubscribe: <mailto:j2000-usa-news-unsubscribe@egroups.com>
Date: Fri, 17 Nov 2000 23:08:10 -0000
Reply-To: j2000-usa-news-owner@egroups.com
Subject: [j2000-usa-news] Proposal for the future of the Jubilee campaign

Greetings Jubilee supporter! The following message is from the Transition Team, which is making a proposal for US Jubilee 2000 in the year 2001 ... and beyond! (As was mentioned in our last list serve announcement) There's so much more important work to be done, and we need you to stay involved. Note a Jubilee assembly, for activists across the US, is being proposed for mid-February 2001!!

Look over the message and if you have comments please write to comments@neerucc.net. Thanks. --David Bryden, Outreach & Communications, Jubilee 2000/USA

==

PLEASE REDISTRIBUTE WIDELY

November 17, 2000

Dear Friends of Jubilee,

While much progress has been made toward real awareness in the U.S. of the need for definitive debt cancellation, and some good steps have been taken toward making that a reality, the work of the Jubilee campaign is far from done. Six months ago, at the urging of Jubilee South and many of you, the Steering Committee agreed to continue the campaign beyond its original end date of December 31, 2000. A transition team comprised of people from different parts of the movement in the U.S. has been working for several months now to develop a proposal for the future of the Jubilee campaign. Now we are sending you the first fruits of our efforts to invite your comments and ideas.

Following are (1) a proposal for a renewed structure that is more open and inclusive; for now we calling it the Jubilee USA Network; (2) some initial thoughts on staffing and location, (3) a statement of where we are and where we might go in relation to the platform of Jubilee 2000/USA, and (4) the platform of Jubilee 2000/USA. We

realize that many details are missing; most of these will have to be worked out within the new structure once the transition has taken place.

Please let us know if you think these move in the right direction. We welcome your suggestions. You can send your comments to the transition team at comments@neerucc.net or by fax at 202-832-5195 (Attn: Jubilee 2000 Transition Team). Suggestions received by the end of the day on Friday, December 1, will be considered in a redraft, which will be presented to the Jubilee 2000/USA Steering Committee at its meeting on Wednesday, December 6.

We are also proposing that a Jubilee Network assembly be planned as soon as possible. We are proposing the weekend of February 16-18. The assembly would be open to anyone interested and would give all of us a chance to affirm the general direction and work out some important details of the new Jubilee Network together. It would also be a time to identify the first Network Council and select the Network Coordinating Committee.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Diana Bohn, Marie Dennis, Bill Ferguson, Seamus Finn, Darlene Gramigna, Doug Hunt, Melanie Hardison, Sue Larson, Bronwyn Mauldin, Njoki Njoroge Njehu, Rajiv Rawat, Pat Rumer, Susan Thompson, Mara Vanderslice, Andrea Vargas

Jubilee 2000/USA
Transition Team Report
November 17, 2000

Introduction

Jubilee 2000 was originally conceived as a time-limited campaign, with an equally limited goal: cancellation of debts of the world's poorest countries by the end of the year 2000.

As the year 2000 draws to a close, Jubilee Steering Committee members, grassroots activists and other supporters from across the United States have come together to decide what will happen to the movement in the coming months. This process began with a national meeting in Chicago on September 8-10, 2000, where a discussion of Jubilee past and future took place. A Transition Team was created, consisting of eight grassroots representatives and six representatives from the existing Jubilee 2000/USA Steering Committee. The team was charged with setting out a path for the future of Jubilee 2000/USA.

The Transition Team decided that the Jubilee 2000/USA platform should continue to stand as the platform for debt cancellation work. However, we also decided that both the structure and focus of the organization (and the movement more broadly in the US) needed to change in order to reflect the realities of developments since the

creation of the platform. Various models for the future structure were discussed and our proposal for the new structure is included. The proposed structure was designed to broaden the membership of the campaign and to create space for a wider range of voices from the north and the south in developing Jubilee's policies and strategies. In addition, the Transition Team proposes adding a new Preamble to the existing platform. The Preamble is designed to serve as a guidepost both for the national decision-making body and Jubilee activists across the country. The Preamble seeks to indicate the direction and focus that the movement should take as it advances beyond the year 2000.

This Transition Team Report includes background information, the proposed structure, recommendations concerning staff and office location, the Preamble, and the existing Platform.

Where Are We Now?

The Jubilee 2000/USA campaign began in 1997 in Denver, Colorado. Much has happened related to debt cancellation since then, both in the United States and internationally:

Debt cancellation is on the agenda in Washington, DC, and around the world. One of Jubilee's great successes is that by the start of the year 2000, the concept of debt cancellation had become so mainstream that the debate was no longer over whether it was possible, but how much debt would be canceled, which countries would qualify, under what conditions, and when. The Group of Seven governments, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund and transnational corporations all claim to support some forms of conditional debt relief.

Some bilateral debt cancellation has occurred. In another global Jubilee success, the US government and other G7 governments appropriated funds to write off some amount of bilateral debt for a limited number of countries, while multilateral lending institutions, including the IMF, World Bank, and regional development banks, also eliminated some poor country debt. Nevertheless, what is offered will not correct the current imbalance created by forcing indebted countries to pay more in debt service payments than they use to fund domestic social, environmental and economic needs, and it is not applied to enough countries. In all these ways, the cancellation that has happened thus far falls far short of the goals of Jubilee 2000.

The Highly Indebted Poor Countries initiative of the IMF and World Bank has failed to provide real debt relief. In fact, many countries going through the process actually will owe more at the end of it than when they began.

Structural adjustment policies are still in place at the IMF and the World Bank. These policies are at the root of the debt crisis. Lending countries have used structural adjustment programs attached to debt relief and new lending to force countries to restructure their economies in ways that undermine the economic, environmental,

social and cultural well-being of both individuals and governments.

As a broad global justice movement has emerged, the terms and locus of the debate over the global economy have changed. Since Jubilee 2000/USA began its work, a wide array of organizations covering a broad range of economic issues have developed their own analysis of the global economy, and these organizations are working together in unprecedented ways. In the year 2000, large mobilizations, in conjunction with events and actions all over the world, began to call for a significantly restructured and transformed global economy which will be just and will place people before profits.

Activists in the global South offer new visions of the Jubilee movement. Jubilee activists in the global South have developed an analysis that has given the Jubilee movement of the North new ways of understanding the debt cycle that has enslaved Southern countries and their people.

Elected officials, the international financial institutions and other policy makers have not done enough for debt cancellation. Despite their claims to the contrary, they have not fought for true debt cancellation, as their words have been inconsistent with their actions. They have continued to insist on structural adjustment programs and have sought to maintain what they call "sustainable debt." The Jubilee USA Network calls for an end to debt.

What Do We Know Today?

As a result of our legislative, educational and organizing work since 1997, we have learned a great deal about the debt which crushes developing countries, the institutions that create and sustain that debt, and the history of how that debt was created.

* In many cases, funds lent to developing countries were used for development projects that displaced people from their homelands or undermined local markets and agriculture. In other cases, the funds were used to purchase weapons to oppress their people.

* These loans generally benefitted wealthy first world companies, developing country elites, and Western political interests.

* In many developing countries, the amount of debt principle has been paid many times over, and it is often only the unjust system of never-ending interest payments that keep these countries enslaved by debt repayment.

* Debt repayment kills and keeps countries poor. It limits the ability of developing countries to raise themselves out of poverty. In Africa, 19,000 children die every day as funds are diverted from health and education to debt service. Families cannot afford education for their children when governments impose fees for attending school.

* Debt and structural adjustment policies undermine democracy and economic self-determination. Governments are forced to implement policies set by the IMF, World Bank, regional development banks and lending governments, instead of responding to the pressing needs of their own citizens.

Therefore, if funds loaned were used for projects that hurt the poor and benefited wealthy elites, if the amount of the debt has already been paid to the lenders, if debt service payments are killing people and keeping populations poor, and if the cycle of debt repayment undermines democracy, then the Jubilee USA Network can only conclude that much of the debt is illegitimate.

Various initiatives of lending countries and agencies have failed to provide real debt relief in a timely manner. Brady bonds failed. The Highly Indebted Poor Countries initiative of the IMF and World Bank is a failure, and should be shut down. The Poverty Reduction and Growth Facility, formerly known as the Enhanced Structural Adjustment Facility (ESAF), has exacerbated poverty and should be eliminated. The Cologne Initiative of the G8 is still tied to structural adjustment programs and remains unfulfilled and underfunded, and would not lead to significant cancellation of bilateral debt even if it were fully funded. New, more sweeping action on debt cancellation is needed. Jubilee 2000's original call for a write-off of debt has not been met and therefore remains as important and urgent today as it was in 1997.

A great deal of the debt is held by the IMF, World Bank and the regional development banks, not by individual lending countries. While there has been some success at national levels, debt cancellation at the multilateral level has been inadequate. Furthermore, transnational banks and other private corporations have added to the debt crisis. Therefore, a new focus on changes at those institutions is necessary. The analysis, strategies and coalition building of the Jubilee USA Network must be as global as those institutions.

References to debt cancellation in this document do not imply that rich countries will hand over cash to poor ones. Rather it is meant that indebted countries will be empowered to use their own assets, including natural resources, markets and labor, for their own domestic priorities. Debt cancellation means an end to forcing poor countries to sell raw goods at low prices or cut domestic spending in order to earn cash to repay debts. The "money" referred to is not cash in US coffers, but is exploited wealth created by work done in the developing world. It does not belong to people in the North, but to the people who create it.

Debt is used by wealthy countries and transnational corporations to extract wealth from poorer countries. Many view the cycles of debt as a perpetuation of colonial relationships between wealthy and impoverished countries. The All Africa Council of Churches refers to debt as "a new form of slavery." Still others refer to "debt bondage."

Debt cancellation is only one step on the way to a more just global economy. Debt cancellation will have a real effect on people's lives if the cycle of debt is broken, and if the broader global economy is restructured in a way that puts people before profits.

Structure Proposal

The Transition Team proposes a three part nationwide network to be called the Jubilee USA Network. The network would be composed of individuals, groups and organizations committed to the debt cancellation work of the network.

The Transition Team also strongly recommends that the Network make a commitment to reach out to and facilitate participation in the Network by groups with areas of focus such as: Latin American solidarity, African solidarity, advocacy, direct action, Latino, Asian and Native peoples' public interest, unions/organized labor, policy, immigration, refugee, anti-poverty, welfare, public health, sustainable development, peace, human rights, and youth. This is in addition to continuing and expanding our relations with religious, environmental, and social and economic justice organizations.

The proposed structure, in addition to staff, includes three structural elements, a Network Council, a Coordinating Committee, and working groups.

1. Network Council: The primary decision making body of the Network regarding policy, major programs and activities, and budget. The Council will meet face to face at least once annually and is open to participation by any organization or group that:

a. Agrees with and is committed to advancing the platform of the Network and works to embody the principles of equity, justice and sustainability.

b. Participates regularly in Network activities and, at a minimum, periodically reports on other debt-related activities of the organization to the Network.

c. Pays an annual modest sliding-scale fee that can be waived as necessary. (Payment of this fee does not imply that the Network will not seek financial and/or other support from Network participants.)

2. Coordinating Committee: The Network Council will select from among its participants, ___ organizational or group representatives to become the Coordinating Committee. These selections will be made with sensitivity to diversity in terms of gender, region, race, ethnicity, class, etc. This Committee will be responsible for the day-to-day administration and management as well as oversight and coordination of staff and activities of the Network.

3. Working Groups: The Network will establish Working groups that will study issues, organize events and activities, etc. Working

groups are open to all Network participants and may be established at the request of the Network Council, Coordinating Committee, or any Network participant.

It is the strong recommendation of the of the Transition Team that the Network consult with the Jubilee South organization on policy positions and campaign directions. Network participants are expected to continue to consult with their own partners in the global south.

The Transition Team recommends that the Center for New Creation be asked to (continue to) serve as fiduciary agent for the Network.

Transition Team Proposal Regarding Staff and Office Location

Based upon the assumption that the new Jubilee USA Network will adopt a broad program and multiple strategies, including education, grassroots organizing, direct action, and policy advocacy in numerous venues (one of which is the US government, but including others), the Transition Team recommends the following:

1. That the Jubilee USA Network maintain a staff.
2. That the staff consist of:
 - National Coordinator
 - Office Manager or Administrative Coordinator
 - National Organizer
 - Regional Organizer/Organizers as possible, numbers depending on financial resources available and possibly connected with "host" offices.

Job descriptions will have to be developed with thought and consultation, including with present staff, but responsibilities of the positions are likely to include the following: National Coordinator - coordination of the network and staff, public spokesperson, probable oversight of development/fundraising, interaction with Jubilee South campaign and other international campaigns Office Manager/Administrative Coordinator - administration, office management National Organizer - working with regional organizers to animate and support the grassroots network Regional Organizers - animation and support of grassroots network in one part of the US.

The ability of the Jubilee USA Network to hire more staff, including office staff, media staff, development staff and so on will depend on the need and the availability of financial resources and should be considered as the transition process continues. That would also be true of contracted staff (bookkeeper, media consultants etc.).

3. After much discussion, we also recommend that a National Coordinating Office with National Coordinator and Office Manager/Administrative Coordinator be maintained in Washington D.C. and that the National Organizer be based elsewhere in the United

States. This recommendation is based on the assumption that an office in Washington would not be primarily about policy advocacy and on the fact that there is already a functioning office in Washington - moving would require significant effort and cost.

Preamble to the Existing Jubilee 2000/USA Platform

Looking back at our past, reviewing what we have learned, the Jubilee USA Network starts the year 2001 with a renewed call for real debt cancellation. We recognize that the debt crisis does not exist in isolation but is rather interconnected with a wide range of global economic issues.

As debt cancellation activists, we commit the Jubilee campaign to work in partnership with labor organizations, immigrant and refugee groups, environmental groups, women's organizations, direct action organizations, anti-poverty groups, civil rights groups and others. We recognize that their fight is ours, and our fight is theirs. In the coming months Jubilee USA Network will support other campaigns that are working to transform the global economy. In particular we will work with campaigns and initiatives that offer alternatives to current lending practices and that eliminate illegitimate debt. We also call for the following:

An immediate moratorium on debt service payments and accrual of interest - The Jubilee USA Network calls on our government, the other G7 governments and the multilateral lending agencies to stop accepting debt service payments until a way out of the debt crisis can be found. We endorse the call of Archbishop Ndungane of South Africa for indebted countries to stop making debt service payments, and to instead reinvest those funds in the needs of their own citizens, according to their own domestic priorities. A moratorium is needed because debt relief initiatives are taking too long and offering too little for too few countries.

An end to structural adjustment programs under any name - The Jubilee USA Network demands that these initiatives be replaced by real debt cancellation and affirms its commitment to challenge any policy or program that imposes or resembles structural adjustment.

Opposition new policies that increase illegitimate debt - The Jubilee USA Network will work to oppose policies of the United States, G7 or multilateral lending agencies that would result in increased illegitimate debt in developing countries. Among these are the new US policy to sell AIDS drugs to African countries through Export-Import bank loans.

Work in partnership with activists in the South. The Jubilee USA Network recognizes that each of the above emphases and actions must be infused with intentional work in partnership with activists in the South. As beneficiaries of the global debt crisis we do not fully understand the impact of debt on their lives, nor are we able to fully analyze the crisis from their point of view. Therefore, we will

work in true partnership with our allies in the global South in our goal of truly improving the lives of the people. When considering legislation and other initiatives, we commit to seeking guidance from the Jubilee South campaign. We intend to hear the voices of southern partners as we form opinions, make decisions and adopt policies.

Jubilee 2000/USA Platform

The Biblical tradition calls for a Jubilee year, when slaves are set free and debts cancelled. As the new millennium approaches, we are faced with a particularly significant time for such a Jubilee. Many impoverished countries carry such high levels of debt that economic development is stifled and scarce resources are diverted from health care, education, and other socially beneficial programs to make debt service payments. Much of the debt they carry is the result of ill-conceived development, flawed policies that creditors required of recipient countries in exchange for assistance, and shortsighted decisions of their own leaders. Much of the borrowing benefited only elites in receiving countries, whereas the burden of paying the debt is falling upon the most impoverished members of society.

Recognizing that many of these debts are unpayable and exact a great social and environmental toll, the Jubilee 2000/USA Campaign calls for a time of Jubilee and cancellation of debt that includes:

1. definitive cancellation of the crushing international debt in situations where countries burdened with high levels of human need and environmental distress are unable to meet the basic needs of their people or achieve a level of sustainable development that ensures a decent quality of life;
2. definitive debt cancellation that benefits ordinary people and facilitates their participation in the process of determining the scope, timing and conditions of debt relief, as well as the future direction and priorities of their national and local economies;
3. definitive debt cancellation that is not conditioned on policy reforms that perpetuate or deepen poverty or environmental degradation;
4. acknowledgement of responsibility by both lenders and borrowers, and action to recover resources that were diverted to corrupt regimes, institutions, and individuals;
5. establishment of a transparent and participatory process to develop mechanisms to monitor international monetary flows and prevent recurring destructive cycles of indebtedness.

To unsubscribe from this list, just send an empty e-mail to J2000-usa-news-unsubscribe@egroups.com

People can subscribe by sending an empty email message to

J2000-usa-news-subscribe@egroups.com

For full campaign news visit www.j2000usa.org

Date: Fri, 17 Nov 2000 08:45:50 -0600 From: brenda hardt X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.75 [en] (Win98; U) X-Accept-Language: en To: PeaceWithJustice Ministry Message Subject: EVERY CHURCH A PEACE CHURCH This just came from EVERY CHURCH A PEACE CHURCH movement (New Call To Peacemaking) Contact them if you want to see a copy of their newsletter, etc. Please help spread the word about this initiative. Thank you. Brenda

Dear Every Church and New Call contacts:

Please help to get out the word about this December 13 meeting in the Bronx. If you can come yourself, that would be great. If not, please send someone in your place! Forward this email to everyone you know in New York, the city and the state, and basically, all up and down the east coast. Our goal is to have a similar meeting in Chicago in February, but it's not yet finalized.

Especially, send this to denominational offices in New York and Washington, to seminaries, peace fellowships--all of our 6 pillars/categories of potential participants. Make some phone calls if you will, please! This is an important meeting for finding people who will be part of the ongoing process, whether as organizers of one of the categories, or potential steering committee members.

Great News!! Opey Russ in Florida has given us free website hosting, and shortly we will be at a new permanent URL there.

John K. Stoner, Coordinator, New Call to Peacemaking, PO Box 500, Akron PA 17501
EVERY CHURCH A PEACE CHURCH , A Global Network of Creative Nonviolence
ph/fax 717 859-1958 temporary website
<http://members.nbc.com/churchpeace/>

jkstoner@ptd.net

PUBLIC MEETING

EVERY CHURCH A PEACE CHURCH

A GLOBAL NETWORK OF CREATIVE NONVIOLENCE

Time: Wednesday, December 13, 2000 1:00 pm - 8:30 pm. (A light meal will be served.)

Place: King of Glory Tabernacle, 2019 Grand Ave, Bronx, NY. Phone 718 299-1211, or
717 859-1958

The is the meeting place of a Mennonite church pastored by Michael and Addie Banks.
Registration: Phone one of the numbers above to register, but if you fail to register, come anyway!

PURPOSE: To share information and generate discussion about Every Church A Peace Church, a venture to mobilize six communities for nonviolent action around the belief that the church could turn the world toward peace if every congregation lived and taught as Jesus lived and taught.

Program resource people:

Michael and Addie Banks, pastoral team, King of Glory Tabernacle church.

The Banks have traveled widely with the Mennonite Church as "peace evangelists."

They are experienced people with a vision for urban ministry and global peacemaking.

The Banks are developing a peace center at their church. 718 299-1211

David Jehnsen, Galena Ohio, social change activist, organizer and educator in adult

education for democracy with emphasis on projects and systems related to nonviolence and social responsibility. His experience with nonviolence began at an early age in the Church of the Brethren and was stimulated by exposure to Martin Luther King, Jr.'s leadership of the nonviolent civil rights campaigns. Founder (1978) and chair of the Institute for Human Rights and Responsibilities. He and Bernard LaFayette, Jr. co-authored THE LEADERS MANUAL: A STRUCTURED GUIDE AND INTRODUCTION TO KINGIAN NONVIOLENCE, and THE COMMUNITY LEADER'S WORKBOOK. 740 965-5118 John Stoner, Akron, Pennsylvania, Coordinator, New Call to Peacemaking, pastor, writer, activist, gardener, parent, and grandparent. Originator of Every Church A Peace Church vision. 717 859-1958

Everyone in attendance will be a resource person as they share their ideas.

After some introductory input, most of the time will be spent discussing the possibilities for this nonviolent activist movement and planning next steps to reach new constituencies.

Please share this invitation far and wide by email, snail mail, phone and word of mouth.

John K. Stoner, Coordinator, New Call to Peacemaking, PO Box 500, Akron PA 17501
EVERY CHURCH A PEACE CHURCH , A Global Network of Creative Nonviolence
ph/fax 717 859-1958 (temporary website <http://members.nbc.com/churchpeace/>)
jkstoner@ptd.net

X-Sender: flick@pop.igc.org
Date: Mon, 20 Nov 2000 13:41:27 -0400
To: updates@reachingcriticalwill.org
From: Felicity Hill <flick@igc.org>
Subject: Evaluation of First Committee Reports
Cc: wilpf-news@igc.topica.com

<x-rich><fontfamily><param>Times_New_Roman</param><bigger>Dear First Committee
watchers,

We hope that you have found our recent First Committee reports and
web

postings useful. We look forward to continuing such an arrangement in
the future.

To improve our work we encourage you to respond to this brief
evaluation and

send it back along with your comments. Also, if you would like a
complete

set of the draft resolutions from the First Committee by post, we have
ten

sets available on a first come, first served basis. Please let us know
if

you would like a set.

Merav Datan Int'l Physicans for the Prevention of Nuclear War,
Physicians

for Social Responsibility

Felicity Hill Women's International League for Peace and Freedom

David Jackman Quaker United Nations Office,

Pam Jordan NGO Committee on Disarmament,

Tracy Moavero Peace Action Education Fund,

Alyn Ware, Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy

Jim Wurst Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy,

1. Reports

Were they sufficiently comprehensive?

Did we explain the First Committee in clear terms?

Were reports too frequent or not frequent enough? Were they timely?

Which subject areas were most helpful to you?

Was anything missing that you'd like to see better covered or explained in

the future?

How did you use our reports? (for lobbying, articles, forwarding to other

lists, etc.)

2. Web site

Which items were most useful to you (speeches, draft resolutions, etc.)?

Were the postings timely enough?

Was there anything missing from the web site that you needed?

Was the format easy to use?

3. Input from you

In our own evaluation we found that we could have emphasized this

invitation more. Would you like to make such submissions in the future for

inclusion in the First Committee reports? Would you like to see such

submissions included from NGOs working outside NY in our reports? In

separate reports?

How can we have a better flow of information from you to us and the First

Committee?

Any other comments or suggestions:

Do you know of any new NGOs (in your country/area) that plan to follow

disarmament developments at the UN and would like to be placed on our list

for next year's First Committee?

</bigger></fontfamily>

***** ***** ***** *****

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

***** ***** ***** *****

</x-rich>

Reply-To: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
From: "Brink Campaign" <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
To: "howard hollman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: returning your call
Date: Mon, 20 Nov 2000 21:19:36 -0500
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)
Importance: Normal
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6600

Hi Howard,

Sorry I haven't gotten back to your Friday call. Our board is in town and I will be in a meeting all day today also (Monday). Then, I leave Tuesday for CA and won't be in the office until Monday Nov 27th.

I do want to talk with you about the briefing for your committee. Bruce Blair is very interested in doing that briefing sometime in December, or at the very least early January. Let's talk when I get back about how we can arrange that, if it fits in with your schedule and what you want to do with the committee.

Hope you have a nice holiday.

Esther

Esther Pank

Back from the Brink Campaign

6856 Eastern Avenue, NW, # 322

Washington DC 20012

202.545.1001 ph

202.545.1004 fax

brinkprogram@backfromthebrink.net

To: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Request for briefing
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <NEBBKJHCMLACLOPKCPPBAEDMCAAA.prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
References:

Esther,

Thanks for your e-mail response. We would like a briefing on de-alerting for the faith community in the second or third week of December or the first week of January. We would also like you to prepare a two-page briefing paper for use not only with Washington staff but also with our grassroots contacts. For the latter I would like to arrange a conference call in early January, perhaps with help from 20/20.

Let's talk about this the week of November 27.

Shalom,
Howard

To: dkimball@crnd.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Request for assistance
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\icnd.049.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Daryl,

At its November 14 meeting the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament developed the attached work program for the next eight months. We will concentrate on developing bipartisan support for de-alerting and strategic arms reduction. If Gore wins the presidency, we will add CTBT ratification. As a beginning, we will initiate dialogue on these issues with some key Republican senators through visits by grassroots interfaith delegations and interfaith contacts in D.C.

Would you be willing to help us by providing a two-page issues briefing on strategic arms reduction? It will be used by Washington staff and provided to our grassroots networks. It can cover the status of START II and START III and also the possibility of executive action to achieve reciprocal national initiatives.

We would also like someone from the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers to undertake an oral briefing for Washington staff from the faith community.

We are asking Back from the Brink to help us in a similar manner on de-alerting.

I'll give you a call to discuss this further.

Shalom,
Howard

To: mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Work program on nuclear disarmament
Cc:
Bcc: icnd
X-Attachments: A:\icnd.049.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Colleagues:

Participants at the November 14 meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament discussed priorities for action in the coming year with a new president and a new Congress. We developed the attached work plan, which is offered for your consideration and your participation in implementation.

The consensus at the meeting was to focus on developing bipartisan support for (a) de-alerting the nuclear arsenal and (b) strategic arms reduction. If Al Gore is elected president, CTBT ratification will be added. We will be prepared to deal with other issues as they arise.

We decided to start by initiating dialogue with some key Republican senators. This will be done by interfaith groups in their home states and by representatives of faith-based organizations in Washington. The purpose will be to learn their thinking on de-alerting and strategic arms reduction. We won't be pushing for a particular approach in initial meetings but rather set the stage for continual contact.

In the next four weeks we will select the senators and make contact with our networks in their states to gain their participation. We will obtain and distribute briefing material from the Back from the Brink Campaign and the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers for use by the faith community in Washington and around the country. We will schedule a briefing session for Washington-based staff on these issues during the first week of January and a conference call for state contacts the same week. Visits with senators and their staffs will begin in January.

While this is going on, the Friends Committee on National Legislation will be circulating a sign-on letter to the president-elect on de-alerting.

The next meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament will take place from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m., Monday, December 18 at the National Council of Churches conference room, 110 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, D.C. (At the November 14 meeting we set the meeting for December 19 but later found out that there is a WISC staff retreat that day.)

Please call or e-mail me any comments you may have on the work program.

Shalom,
Howard

To: wgreene@aol.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Update on Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\icnd.049.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Mr. Greene:

I want to update you on the work of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. At our November 14 meeting we adopted the attached work program. In the next eight months we will focus particularly on de-alerting the nuclear arsenal and strategic nuclear arms reductions. If Al Gore is elected president, we will add CTBT ratification. We will be prepared to deal with other issues as they arise.

We will seek to build bipartisan support for de-alerting and strategic arms reduction by initiating grassroots and Washington contacts with some key Republican senators. We also expect to be in touch with the presidential transition team after the victor is decided and with officials of the incoming presidential administration when appointed.

I hope that you and the Rockefeller family members you work with will consider the leadership role I play in mobilizing the faith community on these issues to be worthy of support.

With best regards,
Howard

To: epf@peacenet.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Text of attachment
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Mary,

Here is the attachment in text format for the e-mail I sent to you.

Howard

###

Work Program of Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament
November 2000 to June 2001

Objectives

- 1) Develop bipartisan support for de-alerting the nuclear arsenal and for strategic arms reduction. (If Gore is elected president, add Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.)
- 2) Seek to remove statutory obstacles to these measures.
- 3) Be prepared to deal with other issues as they arise, such as "mini-nukes" and national missile defense.

Work Schedule

November -December

- Develop talking points and other resources on de-alerting and strategic arms reduction (assistance from Bank from the Brink Campaign and Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers).
- Complete and circulate for signatures a religious leaders' letter on de-alerting to president-elect (FCNL).
- Identify key senators for dialogue.
- Identify interfaith contacts in key states; obtain their commitment to talk with the key senators on de-alerting and strategic arms reduction; provide them briefing material.
- Make contact with transition team of president-elect.

January

- Briefing for Washington-based staff on de-alerting and strategic arms reduction.
- Conference call briefing for state interfaith contacts.
- Commence visits with senators and staff in D.C. and in home states.
- Religious leaders letter on de-alerting to president-elect (FCNL).
- Seek meetings with top officials of new presidential administration.

February

- Continue meetings with senators.
- February 5-6: national call-in days on de-alerting (Back from the Brink).

February-June

- Grassroots mobilization in support of legislation to remove statutory obstacles to de-alerting and strategic arms

reduction.

- Contacts with representatives as well as senators.
- Deal with other nuclear disarmament issues as they arise.

This work program was developed at a meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament on November 14, 2000. For further information, contact Howard W. Hallman,

X-Sender: vhall110@pop.southwind.net X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 4.3.1 Date: Mon, 20 Nov 2000 20:53:06 -0600 To: DALE THOMAS , rhallman@worldnet.att.net, bhallman@slb.com, cboles@usd350.k12.ks.us, dcpohl@iland.net, DPBrensing@aol.com, prulld@crossnet.org, rmo@mcn.net, Edward Brueggemann , halledee@aol.com, EAABurns@aol.com, mupj@igc.apc.org, Jane Pohlman , LMEHALL@ibm.net, mvbryant@home.com, MMBuegg@aol.com, rainer@hkusa.com, maxandlil@yahoo.com, vhall110@southwind.net From: Vic and Jeanette Hallman Subject: Life's reflection for Dad - text Hi Everyone,

Thought I would go ahead and send the eulogy as text. Here it is.

Brian

Dad's Funeral
17-NOV-00

According to my count, Dad should have had at least another 20 years or more left, so I have asked for a recount.

We have come here today, not to mourn the death of my father, but to celebrate the life of a son, husband, father, grandfather, and friend.

It has been my pleasure to have known this man of honor and integrity who touched my life in so many ways.

Dad introduced me to many of his favorite past times.

Dragging me out of bed well before dawn just to set in the freezing rain and telling me to be patient, the ducks will come, while mom questioned our sanity as we walked out the door.

For any of you that had the opportunity to duck hunt with Dad, I am sure you will remember him saying "Shh wait, wait, wait, GET EM".

Or to leave late on a Friday evening to arrive at Camp BooNee only to have to pitch our tent in the darkest of night. And then hear Dad commenting on how nice the snow was. Which incidentally turned out to be the worst blizzard in Kansas history.

Or to endure the windiest Kansas day on the hottest of afternoons just to try and get a little white ball into what seemed like a littler hole.

But it wasn't just my life that Dad touched. He touched the lives of all his family. Through his Wednesday suppers with his children or game nights to celebrate birthdays and holidays, or an evening bike ride with Mom, All Dad wanted was to be together. When asked what he wanted for Christmas, all he would say is "To have you home".

When the kids grew up and moved away, Dad developed new friendships or rekindled old ones. Whether it was with old school buddies, business associates, long time acquaintances, or relatives.

When we would come home to visit, we would hear stories about the supper club or bridge club. It was quite apparent that his kids had grown up and the grown ups had become kids.

We have many fond memories of Dad. Whether you remember Grandpa feeding the squirrels, Vic riding his scooter in a parade, or Dad playing marbles, he will always be a part of our lives.

Simon and Garfunkel wrote in their song "Our House",
Time it was and what a time it was,
It was, a time of innocence, a time of confidences.
Preserve your memories, they're all that's left you.
We are fortunate to have those memories.

We all wonder what will happen to us when we pass on. When Dad came home for the last time, his Hospice nurse gave us a book called *Midwife for the Soul*.

She marked two chapters. The first chapter talked about the physical phase of dying. The second was about the spiritual phase of dying.

It was a difficult book to read, but the most awesome book I will ever read.

I was fortunate to experience the beginning of life with the birth of my 3 children. Now I was experiencing the end of life. And after reading the spiritual phase of dying, I realized I was experiencing something very few people will ever experience.

When Terri's husband, Mike, related an experience to me he had the evening Dad died, I couldn't help but think Dad was home.

Mike was driving home from work Tuesday evening and as he was driving, he asked, "Vic, give me a sign to let me know you're ok". As he looked to the sunset in the west, he noticed two jets had passed in the sky leaving the symbol of a cross from their exhaust.

We know Dad is in a happier and more peaceful place, although I bet every now and then he can hear Velda break the silence.

So as we go away today, we should not be afraid to mourn for those he left behind, but let us also celebrate his passing to a new and eternal life.

Dad, remember all of those new words and phrases Mom would come up with? You said you could write a book about them. We look forward to seeing that book.

You will be missed but not forgotten. Until we meet again, God bless you, your family, and your

friends.

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\Dad's funeral1.doc" Vic and Jeanette Hallman 110 Downing Hutchinson, KS 67502 316-663-4355

X-eGroups-Return: sentto-1413460-1777-974811363-mupj=igc.apc.org@returns.onelist.com
X-Sender: johnburroughs@earthlink.net
X-Apparently-To: abolition-caucus@egroups.com
X-Sender: johnburroughs@mail.earthlink.net
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0.1
To: abolition-caucus@egroups.com
From: John Burroughs <johnburroughs@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: Tue, 21 Nov 2000 06:00:43 -0500
Subject: [abolition-caucus] New Agenda Adopted by General Assembly

New Agenda Adopted by General Assembly

Jim Wurst, UN Coordinator, Middle Powers Initiative and
Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy

The draft resolutions of the First (Disarmament and Security) Committee came before the UN General Assembly on the afternoon of 20 November 2000. The New Agenda resolution was adopted 154 to 3, with eight abstentions. In the First Committee vote on 1 November, the draft passed 146 to 3, with eight abstentions. The "no" voters were the same: India, Israel and Pakistan. There was a switch in the abstentions: Bhutan, France, Kyrgyzstan, Mauritius, Monaco, Russia, and Uzbekistan abstained in both Comm I and plenary. However, Kazakhstan abstained in Comm I but voted "yes" in the plenary; Tajikistan did the exact opposite.

This, of course, means the eight countries that did not vote in Comm I but did vote in the plenary all voted "yes."

The official UN resolution number is now 55/ 33C.

As in the First Committee, there were two votes on separate paragraphs:

Preambular Para 15: 160-3-1

Operative Para 16: 161-0-4

Both paragraphs welcome the Final Document of the 2000 NPT Review Conference.

France did not participate in the votes on these paras in Comm I or the plenary.

There were no significant changes in the voting patterns between the First Committee and GA: the increased number of countries voting is typical when drafts move from a committee to the plenary.

Other nuclear disarmament resolutions of interest [brackets show Comm I vote]:

Japan draft on "A path to the total elimination of nuclear weapons":

155-1-12 [144-1-12]

Myanmar draft on "nuclear disarmament": 109-39-20 [99-39-17]

Malaysia draft on "ICJ Advisory Opinion": 119-28-22 [109-27-21]

India draft on "reducing nuclear dangers": 110-45-14 [102-42-14]

Russia draft on "ABM Treaty": 88-5-66 [78-3-65]

Iran draft on "Missiles": 97-0-65 [90-0-60]

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

eLerts

It's Easy. It's Fun. Best of All, it's Free!

http://click.egroups.com/1/9699/1/_/91925/_/974811363/

----- _->

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

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

To: Felicity Hill <flick@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Evaluation of First Committee Reports
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <v04210107b63f12bd6491@[192.168.0.2]>
References:

At 01:41 PM 11/20/00 -0400, you wrote:

>Dear First Committee watchers,

>

> We hope that you have found our recent First Committee reports and web
> postings useful. We look forward to continuing such an arrangement in the
>future....

Dear Felicity and others,

I found your running account of the First Committee very useful. Thanks for providing this information.

Howard

To: "Rev. Ron" <HolRonFost@aol.com>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Strathdee collection
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Ron,

As we discussed, I'd like to get the Strathdee collection from you -- CDs, tapes, songbooks -- so that I can offer suggestions. If this reaches you Tuesday morning at church, Carlee will be there from 9:30 to 10:00 a.m. at the prayer group. You can give them to her. Otherwise I'll pick them up some time.

Thanks,
Howard

X-Sender: epf@pop.igc.org
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.6 (32)
Date: Tue, 21 Nov 2000 09:01:33 -0500
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: Episcopal Peace Fellowship <epf@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Text of attachment

Thanks much, Howard. Hope you have a happy Thanksgiving. mm

At 04:10 PM 11/20/00 -0500, you wrote:

>Mary,

>

>Here is the attachment in text format for the e-mail I sent to you.

>

>Howard

>

>###

>

>Work Program of Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

>November 2000 to June 2001

To: "Angela Gay Kinkead" <nymo@aol.com>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Music suggestions
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Angela,

I have been in touch with you in the past about gaining youth participation on our Board of Directors. Now I have a query of a different nature.

The local church I belong to has organized a praise band with singers, guitars, keyboard, drums, and my viola (a surprise but it works well on some of the music). After two years our repertoire covers mainly one-half of the gospel -- love God and personal salvation -- but scarcely deals with the other half -- love your neighbor and social holiness (John Wesley's term or peace with justice in today's language). Our minister, who started the praise band and sings in it, has supplied most of the music, but he is open to a fuller representation of the whole gospel.

I heard and talked with Jim Strathdee at General Conference and bought his songbooks and recordings. I know of some collections of new hymns with peace and justice themes. Many are good, but their regularity of repeated verse doesn't work very well with a praise band.

Because you work with youth, perhaps you could suggest songs in "praise-band" style that express a concern for social action, for mercy and justice, for peace and environmental integrity. Or maybe you could refer me to someone else who would have suggestions. To the extent feasible it will be useful to know not only titles and composers but also sources in print and on recordings if that information is readily available.

I will greatly appreciate whatever assistance you can provide.

Shalom,
Howard Hallman

To: hhartley@gbhem.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Song suggestions
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Hal,

I have been in touch with you in the past about gaining young adult participation on our Board of Directors. Now I have a query of a different nature.

The local church I belong to has organized a praise band with singers, guitars, keyboard, drums, and my viola (a surprise but it works well on some of the music). After two years our repertoire covers mainly one-half of the gospel -- love God and personal salvation -- but scarcely deals with the other half -- love your neighbor and social holiness (John Wesley's term or peace with justice in today's language). Our minister, who started the praise band and sings in it, has supplied most of the music, but he is open to a fuller representation of the whole gospel.

I heard and talked with Jim Strathdee at General Conference and bought his songbooks and recordings. I know of some collections of new hymns with peace and justice themes. Many are good, but their regularity of repeated verse doesn't work very well with a praise band.

Because you work with youth, perhaps you could suggest songs in "praise-band" style that express a concern for social action, for mercy and justice, for peace and environmental integrity. Or maybe you could refer me to someone else who would have suggestions. To the extent feasible it will be useful to know not only titles and composers but also sources in print and on recordings if that information is readily available.

I will greatly appreciate whatever assistance you can provide.

Shalom,
Howard Hallman