

X-Sender: abolition2000@mail.abolition2000.org
Date: Tue, 1 May 2001 12:21:08 -0600
To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
From: Carah Lynn Ong
Subject: (abolition-usa) President Bush speech on missile defense
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

President Bush speech on missile defense

May 1, 2001

Web posted at: 3:08 PM EDT (1908 GMT)

Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary. I appreciate you being here.

I also want to thank Secretary Powell for being here as well.

My national security advisor, Condi Rice, is here, as well as the vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs, General Myers. Appreciate Admiral Clark and General Ryan for being here as well. But most of all, I want to thank you, Admiral Gaffney, and the students for NDU for having me here today.

For almost 100 years, this campus has served as one of our country's premier centers for learning and thinking about America's national security. Some of America's finest soldiers have studied here: Dwight Eisenhower and Colin Powell. Some of America's finest statesmen have taught here: George Kennan (ph).

Today, you're carrying on this proud tradition forward, continuing to train tomorrow's generals, admirals and other national security thinkers, and continuing to provide the intellectual capital for our nation's strategic vision.

This afternoon, I want us to think back some 30 years to a far different time in a far different world. The United States and the Soviet Union were locked in a hostile rivalry. The Soviet Union was our unquestioned enemy, a highly armed threat to freedom and democracy. Far more than that wall in Berlin divided us.

Our highest ideal was and remains individual liberty. Their's was the construction of a vast communist empire. Their totalitarian regime held much of Europe captive behind an Iron Curtain. We didn't trust them, and for good reason. Our deep differences were expressed in a dangerous military confrontation that resulted in thousands of nuclear weapons pointed at each other on hair-trigger alert.

The security of both the United States and the Soviet Union was based on a grim premise that neither side would fire nuclear weapons at each other, because doing so would mean the end of both nations.

We even went so far as to codify this relationship in a 1972 ABM Treaty, based on the doctrine that our very survival would best be ensured by leaving both sides completely open and vulnerable to nuclear attack. The threat was real and vivid. The Strategic Air Command had an airborne command post called the Looking Glass, aloft 24 hours a day, ready in case the president ordered our strategic forces to move toward their targets and release their nuclear ordnance.

The Soviet Union had almost 1.5 million troops deep in the heart of Europe, in Poland, in

Czechoslovakia, Hungary and East Germany.

We used our nuclear weapons, not just to prevent the Soviet Union from using their nuclear weapons, but also to contain their conventional military forces, to prevent them from extending the Iron Curtain into parts of Europe and Asia that were still free.

In that world, few other nations had nuclear weapons, and most of those who did were responsible allies, such as Britain and France. We worried about the proliferation of nuclear weapons to other countries, but it was mostly a distant threat, not yet a reality.

Today, the sun comes up on a vastly different world. The Wall is gone, and so is the Soviet Union. Today's Russia is not yesterday's Soviet Union.

Its government is no longer communist. Its president is elected. Today's Russia is not our enemy, but a country in transition with an opportunity to emerge as a great nation, democratic, at peace with itself and its neighbors.

The Iron Curtain no longer exists. Poland, Hungary and Czech Republic are free nations and they are now our allies in NATO, together with a reunited Germany. Yet, this is still a dangerous world; a less certain, a less predictable one.

More nations have nuclear weapons and still more have nuclear aspirations. Many have chemical and biological weapons. Some already have developed a ballistic missile technology that would allow them to deliver weapons of mass destruction at long distances and incredible speeds, and a number of these countries are spreading these technologies around the world.

Most troubling of all, the list of these countries includes some of the world's least-responsible states. Unlike the Cold War, today's most urgent threat stems not from thousands of ballistic missiles in the Soviet hands, but from a small number of missiles in the hands of these states -- states for whom terror and blackmail are a way of life.

They seek weapons of mass destruction to intimidate their neighbors, and to keep the United States and other responsible nations from helping allies and friends in strategic parts of the world. When Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait in 1990, the world joined forces to turn him back. But the international community would have faced a very different situation had Hussein been able to blackmail with nuclear weapons.

Like Saddam Hussein, some of today's tyrants are gripped by an implacable hatred of the United States of America.

They hate our friends. They hate our values. They hate democracy and freedom, and individual liberty. Many care little for the lives of their own people. In such a world, Cold War deterrence is no longer enough to maintain peace, to protect our own citizens and our own allies and friends.

We must seek security based on more than the grim premise that we can destroy those who seek to destroy us. This is an important opportunity for the world to rethink the unthinkable and to find new ways to keep the peace. Today's world requires a new policy, a broad strategy of active nonproliferation, counter-proliferation and defenses.

We must work together with other like-minded nations to deny weapons of terror from those seeking to acquire them.

We must work with allies and friends who wish to join with us to defend against the harm they can inflict. And together, we must deter anyone who would contemplate their use.

We need new concepts of deterrence that rely on both offensive and defensive forces. Deterrence can no longer be based solely on the threat of nuclear retaliation. Defenses can strengthen deterrence by reducing the incentive for proliferation.

We need a new framework that allows us to build missile defenses to counter the different threats

of today's world. To do so, we must move beyond the constraints of the 30-year-old ABM Treaty. This treaty does not recognize the present or point us to the future. It enshrines the past.

No treaty that prevents us from addressing today's threats, that prohibits us from pursuing promising technology to defend ourselves, our friends and our allies is in our interests or in the interests of world peace.

This new framework must encourage still further cuts in nuclear weapons. Nuclear weapons still have a vital role to play in our security and that of our allies.

We can and will change the size, the composition, the character of our nuclear forces in a way that reflects the reality that the Cold War is over. I'm committed to achieving a credible deterrent with the lowest possible number of nuclear weapons consistent with our national security needs, including our obligations to our allies.

My goal is to move quickly to reduce nuclear forces. The United States will lead by example to achieve our interests and the interests for peace in the world.

Several months ago, I asked Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld to examine all available technologies and basing modes for effective missile defenses that could protect the United States, our deployed forces, our friends and our allies. The secretary has explored a number of complementary and innovative approaches.

The secretary has identified near-term options that could allow us to deploy an initial capability against limited threats. In some cases, we can draw on already established technologies that might involve land-based and sea-based capabilities to intercept missiles in mid-course or after they re-enter the atmosphere.

We also recognize the substantial advantages of intercepting missiles early in their flight, especially in the boost phase. The preliminary work has produced some promising options for advanced sensors and interceptors that may provide this capability. If based at sea or on aircraft, such approaches could provide limited but effective defenses.

We have more work to do to determine the final form the defenses might take. We will explore all of these options further. We recognize the technological difficulties we face, and we look forward to I've made it clear from the very beginning that I would consult closely on the important subject with our friends and allies, who are also threatened by missiles and weapons of mass destruction.

This treaty ignores the fundamental breakthroughs in technology during the last 30 years. It prohibits us from exploring all options for defending against the threats that face us, our allies and other countries.

That's why we should work together to replace this treaty with a new framework that reflects a clear and clean break from the past, and especially from the adversarial legacy of the Cold War. This new cooperative relationship should look to the future, not to the past. It should be reassuring, rather than threatening. It should be premised on openness, mutual confidence and real opportunities for cooperation, including the area of missile defense.

It should allow us to share information so that each nation can improve its early warning capability and its capability to defend its people and territory. And perhaps one day, we can even cooperate in a joint defense.

I want to complete the work of changing our relationship from one based on a nuclear balance of terror to one based on common responsibilities and common interests. We may have areas of difference with Russia, but we are not and must not be strategic adversaries.

Russia and America both face new threats to security. Together, we can address today's threats

and pursue today's opportunities. We can explore technologies that have the potential to make us all safer.

This is a time for vision, a time for a new way of thinking, a time for bold leadership. The Looking Glass no longer stands its 24- hour-a-day vigil. We must all look at the world in a new, realistic way to preserve peace for generations to come.

God bless.

(APPLAUSE)

Reply-To: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
From: "Brink Campaign" <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
To: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
Subject: MAY DAY MAY DAY MAY DAY
Date: Tue, 1 May 2001 04:23:25 -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

MAY DAY MAY DAY MAY DAY MAY DAY MAY DAY
Bush's "Vision for Security" based on missile defenses increases nuclear dangers!

WE URGE YOU TO RESPOND TO PRESIDENT BUSH'S SPEECH BY SENDING A MESSAGE TO THE WHITE HOUSE AND TO THE MEDIA.

Included: Message and addresses to contact the White House
Sample Letter-to-the-Editor
Background information
Talking Points on the Impact of NMD on Weapons on Hair-Trigger Alert

SEND A MESSAGE TO PRESIDENT BUSH
Phone: 202.456-1414,
E-mail: president@whitehouse.gov.
Write: The White House, 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington DC, 20500
Fax: 202.456-2561

Dear President Bush,

The real missile threat facing the US and the world is the thousands of US and Russian weapons on hair-trigger alert. Your rush to pursue missile defenses will only push Russia to keep their weapons on high alert and will likely spark a new arms race. If cold war policies don't make sense, as you say, then work to get all US and Russian weapons off launch-on-warning, hair-trigger alert.

Encourage your contacts to visit www.backfromthebrink.org and send this message directly to President Bush.

*

WRITE A LETTER TO THE EDITOR OF YOUR LOCAL PAPER
SAMPLE LETTER (Send your personalized version)

President Bush's push for missile defenses (NMD) may cost US taxpayers more than the hundreds of billions of dollars it will take to see if the system is workable. It may also cost us a chance to reduce the threat of nuclear war.

NMD will present the Russians with the possibility that the U.S. could

deliver a one-two punch to their nuclear forces—a quick first-strike attack that would destroy most of their nuclear weapons, and a defensive shield to handle the small number of weapons that are left.

To overwhelm missile defenses, Russia must plan to launch massively and quickly in a crisis or on warning of an attack

The security of the U.S. now rests on deteriorating Russian early warning and nuclear command systems. One false alarm could lead to nuclear war.

While missile defenses won't protect the US from Russian nuclear weapons on high alert, what they will do is ensure that the nuclear hair-trigger gets drawn tighter.

If the President really wanted to reduce the nuclear threat his first priority would be to work with the Russians to stand-down all nuclear missiles. That's protection we can afford.

If your letter is published, please send us a copy.

**

BACKGROUND

Today President Bush announced the broad outlines of his new nuclear strategy that includes exploring “all missile defense options—land, sea, and space-based” (Washington Post 5/01/01) and paves the way for the likely withdrawal of the US from the ABM treaty. The system is promoted as a means to protect the US (and possibly our allies) from “rogue and accidental missile launch in the post-Cold War era” (White House spokesman Ari Fleisher).

The Question: “WILL BUSH'S "NEW NUCLEAR STRATEGY" MAKE THE US AND THE WORLD SAFER?

The Answer: NO. The BIGGEST NUCLEAR MISSILE THREAT FACING THE WORLD TODAY is the existence of thousands of missiles on hair-trigger alert in the US and in Russia. These missiles have the potential of being launched accidentally either through human or computer error.

Removing the constraints provided by the ABM Treaty will increase Russia's perception of vulnerability and may encourage them to reduce the time needed to launch their missiles.

Instead of pushing for a unproven technology, likely to cost US taxpayers hundreds of billions of dollars the President should be calling for the removal of all nuclear weapons from hair-trigger alert.

TALKING POINTS

The Impact of National Missile Defense (NMD)
On Standing-Down Nuclear Weapons

Deploying a National Missile Defense system will increase the threat of an accidental nuclear war involving the approximately 4,400 Russian and U.S. nuclear weapons that are on hair-trigger alert, and encourage a new arms race among other nuclear powers.

- NMD will present the Russians with the possibility that the U.S. could deliver a one-two punch to their nuclear forces—a quick-first strike attack that would destroy most of Russia’s nuclear weapons, and a defensive shield to handle the small number of Russian weapons that are left.
- Russia’s perception of vulnerability most likely will dictate their response to a crisis or warning of an apparent attack.
- To overwhelm an NMD shield, Russia must plan to launch massively and quickly in a crisis or on warning of an attack
- Russia’s early-warning system is decaying--leaving them increasingly susceptible to false alarms, as happened in 1995 when a scientific rocket launched by Norway set off an alarm in Russia that brought them to within minutes of launching nuclear missiles at U.S. cities.
- Russia’s command and control of nuclear weapons is also deteriorating, increasing the risks of mistaken, unauthorized or accidental launch of Russia’s vast nuclear arsenal.
- NMD will spur the Russians to keep their nuclear weapons on high levels of alert. It might even move them to increase their readiness to launch-on-warning of an attack—i.e. to shorten the decision making time for launching their sea-based and land-based missiles.
- China is even more vulnerable to a “one-two punch” because they currently have only approximately 20 long-range missiles---which are liquid fueled and thus cannot be launched quickly.
- U.S. plans to field a NMD system may spur nuclear powers like China, to upgrade their arsenals to allow for nuclear missiles on hair-trigger alert.
- Many U.S. allies have voiced strong concerns that the development of NMD will prevent significant reductions in nuclear arsenals.
- A national missile defense system could lead to a worldwide resumption of an arms race—spurring a new generations of nuclear weapons, including weapons launched from space.

Background Sources: National Missile Defense What Does It All Mean? A CDI Issue Brief. Bruce Blair, Center for Defense Information, 9/200. Nuclear Defense and Offense: An Analysis of US Policy, Arjun Makhijani, Science for Democratic Action, Institute for Energy and Environmental Research, 2/2000. Pushing the Limits: The Decision on National Missile Defense, Steven Young, Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers and Council for a Livable World Education Fund, 7/2000.

Please take a few minutes at this critical time.

Thanks for all your hard work on this issue.
Ira Shorr and Esther Pank

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
www.backfromthebrink.org

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\TALKING POINTS NMD_2.doc"

To: mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: National missile defense
Cc:
Bcc: icnd
X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\icnd.069.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Dear Colleagues,

Now that President Bush has laid down a public challenge for national missile defense, we need to respond vigorously. I urge you to have your organization write the president in opposition to national missile defense and to get your grassroots networks to do likewise. You might send out a news release to your denominational press. You may also contact members of Congress and have your grassroots do likewise to register opposition to national missile defense.

Three reasons for our opposition were stated in the sign-on letter of March 5, 2001. I am attaching a copy along with the list of signers.

Shalom,
Howard

To: joe@fcl@fcl.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Sign-on letter on national missile defense
Cc: david@fcl.org, kathy@fcl.org
Bcc:
X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\icnd.069.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Joe,

I am re-issuing the sign-on letter of March 5, 2001 from religious leaders to President Bush in opposition to national missile defense. You didn't sign then because you planned to take up this issue later. I'm wondering if you would be willing to add your name to the letter now that the president has laid down the gauntlet.

A copy and list of signers is attached.

Shalom,
Howard

To: joe@fcnl.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Religious leaders letter on NMD
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\icnd.069.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Joe,

I am re-issuing the sign-on letter of March 5, 2001 from religious leaders to President Bush in opposition to national missile defense. You didn't sign then because you planned to take up this issue later. I'm wondering if you would be willing to add your name to the letter now that the president has laid down the gauntlet.

A copy and list of signers is attached.

Shalom,
Howard

To: jdi@clw.org, dkimball@clw.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Religious leaders on NMD
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\icnd.069.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear John and Daryl,

In case you can use the March 5 sign-on letter from religious leaders to President Bush on national missile defense, I am sending a copy as an attachment.

We sent a similar letter to all members of Congress on March 5. Probably very few members or their staff would remember it. If there are key Hill contacts who should get a fresh copy, please let me know. Also I would welcome suggestions for media contacts to send it to.

Shalom,
Howard

To: jwinkler@umc.gbcs.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: National missile defense
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\icnd.069.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Jim,

I know that you're with the Council of Bishops. I hope you are receiving your e-mail.

I realize that the bishops are working on a statement dealing with nuclear disarmament and national missile defense. It will be very timely after President Bush's speech yesterday.

Previously I sent Bishops Ives, Chamberlain, Oden, and Shamana a copy of the March 5 letter from religious leaders to President Bush, which you signed. In case this letter would be of use to the bishops now, I am attaching a copy.

Shalom,
Howard

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

Date: Thu, 03 May 2001 13:24:25 -0400

Subject: FW: Reunion

From: Edward Brueggemann

To: Mary Brueggemann , Howard Hallman

From: EAABurns@aol.com

Date: Thu, 3 May 2001 10:38:52 EDT

To: EDBruegge@mediaone.net

Cc: HALLEDEE@aol.com, vhall110@southwind.net, maxandlil@yahoo.com,

bhallman@slb.com, cpepper@towerhill.org, BPBurns@aol.com, DKNUTSONR@aol.com

Subject: Reunion

We have been thinking about seeing everyone this summer and have wondered who will be attending. Since being here in the Denver area, we have visited with Stan and Nancy. We all enjoyed being in touch with family.

With regrets we will have to change our plans for attending the reunion this year. Brian has just completed the request process for summer vacation at the United Airlines Training Center. Because he is so new on his job and his seniority is low, his request for summer vacation was denied. As a result, we are unable to attend the reunion as we thought. Originally, Carol and Jim made the hotel reservations for us, and I remember that you were looking for additional rooms. Carol will be in touch with you to free up the room for someone else in the family who may need it before cancelling the reservation altogether.

Thank you for all of your hard work on putting the reunion together, and I am sorry that we won't be there to enjoy it.

Best wishes.

Ellen

To: EAABurns@aol.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Hotel for Hallman 2001
Cc: Edward Brueggemann <edbruegge@mediaone.net>, Mary Brueggemann <mubruegg@aol.com>
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Ellen,

I'm sorry to hear that you won't be attending Hallman 2001. I haven't seen you for a long time, and its always good to catch up on everybody.

Since we made our reservations last fall, my daughter, Joy, has become engaged, and her finace wants to attend and bring his two children (ages 6 and 9) from a previous marriage. The motel is fully booked. If you are giving up your reservation, we request that you transfer it to us. We're looking for a room with two double beds, which I think is standard.

You can ask the motel to transfer it to: Howard Hallman, 6508 Wilmet Road, Bethesda, MD 20817; phone, 301 897-3668. They can add it to our reservation, #129 953 and my credit card guarantee. I can contact them directly if necessary. Is it for Friday and Saturday night, June 29 and 30? We'll take whatever days you have, including before and after those dates.

If you have more than one room, let Ed Brueggemann know in case somebody else needs another room.

We're inviting the clan to observe Hallman 2004 in Washington, D.C. either on the July 4 weekend or the one before. Put those dates on you calendar and await further communication.

Again sorry to miss you.

Cordially,
Howard

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express Macintosh Edition - 4.5 (0410)
Date: Wed, 02 May 2001 10:58:03 -0500
Subject: Change attachment text format
From: "William Stuart-Whistler" <stuwhis@enter.net>
To: mupj@igc.org

Dear Howard,

I am a MacIntosh user and cannot receive your attachments.

Would you please re-send the attachment in a form I can receive? I believe the format is HTML.

Thanks - Bill Stuart-Whistler

X-Lotus-FromDomain: UCC
From: stiefr@ucc.org
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Date: Wed, 2 May 2001 16:20:20 -0400
Subject: Re: National missile defense

Howard,
We are working on an action alert for the UCC and Disciples of Christ on NMD, and are actively networking our pastors and laypeople who are concerned to take action. Thanks for your good work.

Ron Stief

From: Rachel Labush <rlabush@rac.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: National missile defense
Date: Wed, 2 May 2001 18:10:04 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

we had a problem with our e-mail last night, and my message to you bounced back - please use David's name in support of the letter against missile defense in any way you see useful:

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

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Wednesday, May 02, 2001 8:03 AM
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: National missile defense

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Dear Colleagues,

Now that President Bush has laid down a public challenge for national missile defense, we need to respond vigorously. I urge you to have your organization write the president in opposition to national missile defense and to get your grassroots networks to do likewise. You might send out a news release to your denominational press. You may also contact members of Congress and have your grassroots do likewise to register opposition to national missile defense.

Three reasons for our opposition were stated in the sign-on letter of March 5, 2001. I am attaching a copy along with the list of signers.

Shalom,
Howard

X-Sender: dkimball@[63.106.26.66]
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)
Date: Tue, 01 May 2001 19:21:58 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: NMD/Deep Cuts Update: Bush speech; early reactions

May 1, 2001

TO: Coalition members and friends

RE: NMD/Deep Cuts Update -- Bush speech; early reactions

FR: Daryl Kimball, Director

Attached below is the text of the President's speech on strategic nuclear policy, early news coverage, reaction statements from Sens. Tom Daschle and Joseph Biden, Minority Leader Dick Gephardt, other political figures, and NGOs.

For the Coalition's press statement and addition information and links on NMD and strategic reductions, see <<http://www.crnd.org>>

The early signs suggest that Mr. Bush's missile defense plan will be a tough sell at home and abroad, but this is only the opening salvo in the White House's campaign for NMD.

More later.

- DK

Transcript: President Bush speech on missile defense

May 1, 2001

Web posted at: 3:08 PM EDT (1908 GMT)

Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary. I appreciate you being here.

I also want to thank Secretary Powell for being here as well.

My national security advisor, Condi Rice, is here, as well as the vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs, General Myers. Appreciate Admiral Clark and General Ryan for being here as well. But most of all, I want to thank you, Admiral Gaffney, and the students for NDU for having me here today.

For almost 100 years, this campus has served as one of our country's premier centers for learning and thinking about America's national security. Some of America's finest soldiers have studied here: Dwight Eisenhower and Colin

Powell. Some of America's finest statesmen have taught here: George Kennan (ph).

Today, you're carrying on this proud tradition forward, continuing to train tomorrow's generals, admirals and other national security thinkers, and continuing to provide the intellectual capital for our nation's strategic vision.

This afternoon, I want us to think back some 30 years to a far different time in a far different world. The United States and the Soviet Union were locked in a hostile rivalry. The Soviet Union was our unquestioned enemy, a highly armed threat to freedom and democracy. Far more than that wall in Berlin divided us.

Our highest ideal was and remains individual liberty. Their's was the construction of a vast communist empire. Their totalitarian regime held much of Europe captive behind an Iron Curtain. We didn't trust them, and for good reason. Our deep differences were expressed in a dangerous military confrontation that resulted in thousands of nuclear weapons pointed at each other on hair-trigger alert.

The security of both the United States and the Soviet Union was based on a grim premise that neither side would fire nuclear weapons at each other, because doing so would mean the end of both nations.

We even went so far as to codify this relationship in a 1972 ABM Treaty, based on the doctrine that our very survival would best be ensured by leaving both sides completely open and vulnerable to nuclear attack. The threat was real and vivid. The Strategic Air Command had an airborne command post called the Looking Glass, aloft 24 hours a day, ready in case the president ordered our strategic forces to move toward their targets and release their nuclear ordnance.

The Soviet Union had almost 1.5 million troops deep in the heart of Europe, in Poland, in Czechoslovakia, Hungary and East Germany.

We used our nuclear weapons, not just to prevent the Soviet Union from using their nuclear weapons, but also to contain their conventional military forces, to prevent them from extending the Iron Curtain into parts of Europe and Asia that were still free.

In that world, few other nations had nuclear weapons, and most of those who did were responsible allies, such as Britain and France. We worried about the proliferation of nuclear weapons to other countries, but it was mostly a distant threat, not yet a reality.

Today, the sun comes up on a vastly different world. The Wall is gone, and so is the Soviet Union. Today's Russia is not yesterday's Soviet Union.

Its government is no longer communist. Its president is elected. Today's Russia is not our enemy, but a country in transition with an opportunity to emerge as a great nation, democratic, at peace with itself and its neighbors.

The Iron Curtain no longer exists. Poland, Hungary and Czech Republic are free nations and they are now our allies in NATO, together with a reunited Germany. Yet, this is still a dangerous world; a less certain, a less predictable one.

More nations have nuclear weapons and still more have nuclear aspirations. Many have chemical and biological weapons. Some already have developed a ballistic missile technology that would allow them to deliver weapons of mass destruction at long distances and incredible speeds, and a number of these countries are spreading these technologies around the world.

Most troubling of all, the list of these countries includes some of the world's least-responsible states. Unlike the Cold War, today's most urgent threat stems not from thousands of ballistic missiles in the Soviet hands, but from a small number of missiles in the hands of these states -- states for whom terror and blackmail are a way of life.

They seek weapons of mass destruction to intimidate their neighbors, and to keep the United States and other responsible nations from helping allies and friends in strategic parts of the world. When Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait in 1990, the world joined forces to turn him back. But the international community would have faced a very different situation had Hussein been able to blackmail with nuclear weapons.

Like Saddam Hussein, some of today's tyrants are gripped by an implacable hatred of the United States of America.

They hate our friends. They hate our values. They hate democracy and freedom, and individual liberty. Many care little for the lives of their own people. In such a world, Cold War deterrence is no longer enough to maintain peace, to protect our own citizens and our own allies and friends.

We must seek security based on more than the grim premise that we can destroy those who seek to destroy us. This is an important opportunity for the world to rethink the unthinkable and to find new ways to keep the peace. Today's world requires a new policy, a broad strategy of active nonproliferation, counter-proliferation and defenses.

We must work together with other like-minded nations to deny weapons of terror from those seeking to acquire them.

We must work with allies and friends who wish to join with us to defend against the harm they can inflict. And together, we must deter anyone who would contemplate their use.

We need new concepts of deterrence that rely on both offensive and defensive forces. Deterrence can no longer be based solely on the threat of nuclear retaliation. Defenses can strengthen deterrence by reducing the incentive for proliferation.

We need a new framework that allows us to build missile defenses to counter the different threats of today's world. To do so, we must move beyond the constraints of the 30-year-old ABM Treaty. This treaty does not recognize the present or point us to the future. It enshrines the past.

No treaty that prevents us from addressing today's threats, that prohibits us from pursuing promising technology to defend ourselves, our friends and our allies is in our interests or in the interests of world peace.

This new framework must encourage still further cuts in nuclear weapons. Nuclear weapons still have a vital role to play in our security and that of our allies.

We can and will change the size, the composition, the character of our nuclear forces in a way that reflects the reality that the Cold War is over. I'm committed to achieving a credible deterrent with the lowest possible number of nuclear weapons consistent with our national security needs, including our obligations to our allies.

My goal is to move quickly to reduce nuclear forces. The United States will lead by example to achieve our interests and the interests for peace in the world.

Several months ago, I asked Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld to examine all available technologies and basing modes for effective missile defenses that could protect the United States, our deployed forces, our friends and our allies. The secretary has explored a number of complementary and innovative approaches.

The secretary has identified near-term options that could allow us to deploy an initial capability against limited threats. In some cases, we can draw on already established technologies that might involve land-based and sea-based capabilities to intercept missiles in mid-course or after they re-enter the atmosphere.

We also recognize the substantial advantages of intercepting missiles early in their flight, especially in the boost phase. The preliminary work has produced some promising options for advanced sensors and interceptors that may provide this capability. If based at sea or on aircraft, such approaches could provide limited but effective defenses.

We have more work to do to determine the final form the defenses might take. We will explore all of these options further. We recognize the technological difficulties we face, and we look forward to I've made it clear from the very beginning that I would consult closely on the important subject with our friends and allies, who are also threatened by missiles and weapons of mass destruction.

This treaty ignores the fundamental breakthroughs in technology during the last 30 years. It prohibits us from exploring all options for defending against the threats that face us, our allies and other countries.

That's why we should work together to replace this treaty with a new framework that reflects a clear and clean break from the past, and especially from the adversarial legacy of the Cold War.

This new cooperative relationship should look to the future, not to the past. It should be reassuring, rather than threatening. It should be

premised on openness, mutual confidence and real opportunities for cooperation, including the area of missile defense.

It should allow us to share information so that each nation can improve its early warning capability and its capability to defend its people and territory. And perhaps one day, we can even cooperate in a joint defense.

I want to complete the work of changing our relationship from one based on a nuclear balance of terror to one based on common responsibilities and common interests. We may have areas of difference with Russia, but we are not and must not be strategic adversaries.

Russia and America both face new threats to security. Together, we can address today's threats and pursue today's opportunities. We can explore technologies that have the potential to make us all safer.

This is a time for vision, a time for a new way of thinking, a time for bold leadership. The Looking Glass no longer stands its 24- hour-a-day vigil. We must all look at the world in a new, realistic way to preserve peace for generations to come.

God bless.

(APPLAUSE)

Tuesday May 1 3:55 PM ET

"Bush Says Time to Move Beyond ABM Treaty"

By Steve Holland

WASHINGTON (Reuters) - President Bush (news - web sites) on Tuesday called for replacing the Anti-Ballistic Missile treaty to allow deployment of a missile defense system, and offered unilateral nuclear arms cuts to sweeten the pill for Russia.

``This treaty does not recognize the present or point us to the future. It enshrines the past," Bush said.

Bush, in a major speech to a military audience, said the 1972 ABM treaty between the United States and Russia, which forbids deployment of a missile defense system, needs to be replaced to permit a missile system that would protect the United States and its allies from attack from so-called ``rogue nations" or accidental launches.

Addressing the topic for the first time at length since taking office Jan. 20, Bush said the treaty ignores technological breakthroughs of the past 30 years and prohibits the United States from exploring options to defending against threats facing America and its allies.

``That's why we should work together to replace this treaty with a new

framework, that reflects a clear and clean break from the past, and especially from the adversarial legacy of the Cold War," he said.

Bush, who spoke to Russian President Vladimir Putin earlier in the day to brief him on his speech, also said he was inclined to make unilateral cuts in nuclear weapons in a way that ``reflects the reality that the Cold War is over."

``I'm committed to achieving a credible deterrent with the lowest possible number of nuclear weapons consistent with our national needs, including our obligation to our allies. My goal is to move quickly to reduce nuclear forces. The United States will lead by example to achieve our interests," he said.

The United States currently has 7,295 deployed warheads compared to Russia's 6,094. Russia has been looking for big cuts, while the Bush administration has been discussing making unilateral cuts down to 1,500 nuclear warheads.

Bush spoke with the government leaders of Britain, Canada, France and Germany on Monday to outline his plan and next week U.S. delegations will fan out across Europe and Asia to consult with allies.

Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage will lead a contingent to Asia while Deputy White House National Security Adviser Stephen Hadley and Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz will head a team to Europe.

Bush's missile defense plans are opposed by Russia and China and key European allies have been skeptical, fearing they will trigger a new arms race.

At home, Democrats question the high price tag of the system and its feasibility.

In early tests the technology -- missile interceptors homing in and destroying a fast-moving target -- has not proved successful.

Missile defense critics were quick to react.

``The Bush administration is unwisely betting our nation's security against nuclear dangers on unproven and costly missile defenses," said John Isaacs, president of the Council for a Livable World.

``U.S. national missile defense deployment would prod Russia into keeping a larger number of its strategic weapons on hair-trigger alert, thus perpetuating the dangerous nuclear standoff and risk of accidental nuclear war," said Stephen Young of the Union of Concerned Scientists.

May 1, 2001

"Bush Commits U.S. to Missile Defense"

By THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

Filed at 4:58 p.m. ET

WASHINGTON (AP) -- President Bush on Tuesday committed the United States to building a defense against ballistic missile attack and indicated he would not allow a Cold War-era arms treaty to stand in the way.

"We need a new framework that allows us to build missile defenses to counter the different threats of today's world," said Bush, who spoke with Russian President Vladimir Putin before announcing his plan.

He said he told the Russian leader he would like to meet with him soon. White House officials said they were exploring the possibility of a meeting somewhere in Europe during the president's travels in connection with a European Union summit June 15-16. "I told him I'd love to meet with him beforehand, to look him in the eye and let him know how sincere I am about achieving a new way of keeping the peace," Bush said.

The president's remarks on defense marked the start of an intensified campaign to convince America's European and Asian allies -- as well as Russia, China and others hostile to the idea of missile defense -- that attacks by ballistic missiles can best be deterred by defenses rather than large offenses.

"Cold War deterrence is no longer enough," Bush said in a speech at the National Defense University.

"To maintain peace, protect our own citizens and our own allies and friends we must seek security based on more than the grim premise that we can destroy those who seek to destroy us," he said.

He said he was sending senior aides to allied capitals in Europe, Asia, Australia and Canada to discuss "our common responsibility to create a new framework for security and stability that reflects the world of today."

The delegations will be headed by Richard Armitage, the deputy secretary of state; Paul Wolfowitz, the deputy secretary of defense; and Steve Hadley, a deputy national security adviser, Bush said.

"These will be real consultations. We are not presenting our friends and allies with unilateral decisions already made. We look forward to hearing their views, the views of our friends, and to take them into account."

Cost estimates for a missile defense have ranged from \$30 billion to \$200 billion, depending on its structure. Among the main criticisms of missile defense are its high cost and unknown effectiveness.

Senate Minority Leader Tom Daschle, D-S.D., was quick to question Bush's commitment to missile defense.

“We fear the president may be buying a lemon here,” Daschle said. “There has not been a shred of evidence that this works. We’ve got to ask some very tough questions.”

Bush called the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile treaty -- which prohibits large-scale missile defenses -- a relic of the Cold War.

“We must move beyond the constraints of the 30-year-old ABM treaty,” the president said. “This treaty does not recognize the present or point us to the future. It enshrines the past.”

Bush did not say the United States would withdraw from the treaty but he focused much of his speech on what he views as its shortcomings.

Bush said the United States would move quickly to reduce its stockpile of nuclear weapons, although he mentioned no numbers.

In an indication that these reductions might be made unilaterally, Bush said the cuts would show the United States is ready to “lead by example.”

The United States now has about 7,200 nuclear weapons and is committed to cutting to between 3,000 and 3,500 under the START II treaty. Both the United States and Russia have indicated a willingness to drop even lower, to a range of 2,000 to 2,500 warheads, although that has not been settled in a formal treaty.

Without offering specifics, Bush said his administration would change “the size, the composition, the character of our nuclear forces” in ways that “reflect the reality that the Cold War is over.”

The administration believes deep reductions, whether taken unilaterally or as part of a formal agreement with Russia, would help convince Moscow that U.S. missile defense is not aimed at Russia or intended to give the United States, the world's remaining superpower, absolute military dominance.

A major obstacle to deploying a large-scale missile defense is the strong support in Europe and Russia for the ABM treaty. The Clinton administration tried unsuccessfully to get Russia to agree to amend the treaty in ways that would permit national missile defenses.

Bush noted the ABM treaty was written when the United States and the former Soviet Union were avowed enemies with thousands of nuclear weapons aimed at each other.

“We should leave behind the constraints of an ABM treaty that perpetuates a situation based on mistrust,” he said. “It prohibits us from exploring all options.”

Just hours before his speech, Bush called Russian President Vladimir Putin to discuss disarmament and nuclear weapons. The White House quoted Bush as saying that Putin “was very appreciative” that Bush reached out to him. On Monday Bush called several European leaders and NATO's chief.

As Bush's motorcade entered the university grounds at Fort McNair on the banks of the Potomac River, it passed a demonstration of about a dozen people holding a large yellow banner that said, "Stop Star Wars."

Bush did not say whether he would seek to amend the treaty.

Although he did not provide details on the kind of missile defense his administration will build, he indicated it likely would include not only land-based interceptors but also weapons based on ships at sea.

He said these defenses are needed not to deter Russia or other established nuclear powers but rogue nations -- "states for whom terror and blackmail are a way of life." He mentioned no countries by name.

"Bush suggests junking missile treaty with Russia; President short on details in defense plan"

CNN.com, May 1, 2001

Web posted at: 4:16 PM EDT (2016 GMT)

WASHINGTON (CNN) -- Seeking to build support for a controversial missile defense system, President Bush called Tuesday for a "new framework" for national defense and said a 30-year-old ABM treaty with Russia should be scrapped.

"No treaty that prevents us from addressing today's threats, that prohibits us from pursuing promising technology to defend ourselves, our friends and our allies is in our interests or in the interests of world peace," Bush said in a speech before National Defense University.

The president also called for a reduction in the nation's nuclear stockpile, although he did not cite precise numbers.

Bush was short on specifics, but he reiterated positions he took as a presidential candidate -- that a national missile defense program is technologically possible and that the treaty with Russia should not preclude its development.

Critics say such a system would be both costly and unfeasible.

Bush said the antiballistic missile treaty was signed under different conditions, when the Soviet Union and the United States were engaged in a "hostile rivalry" and security came through a nuclear weapons buildup on both sides.

Bush said today's threats come from "a small number of missiles" in the hands of rogue states "for whom terror and blackmail are a way of life."

"In such a world, Cold War deterrence is no longer enough to maintain

peace, to protect our own citizens and our own allies and friends," he said.

Bush said he is dispatching high-level delegations -- composed of officials from the State and Defense departments and the National Security Council -- to Europe, Asia, Australia and Canada to talk about building a new missile defense strategy.

"We can and will change the size, the composition, the character of our nuclear forces in a way that reflects the reality that the Cold War is over," Bush said.

"I'm committed to achieving a credible deterrent with the lowest possible number of nuclear weapons consistent with our national security needs, including our obligations to our allies."

Sen. Joseph Biden, D-Delaware, said much of Bush's speech sounded appealing, but he stressed that the president left much unsaid.

"The devil is in the details," said Biden, who sits on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. "It makes a great deal of difference."

NEWS FROM THE HOUSE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

House Democratic Leader Richard A. Gephardt

May 1, 2001

H-204, U.S. Capitol

<<http://democraticleader.house.gov/>>

Gephardt Statement on the National Missile Defense System:

"I am concerned that the President's approach to strategic nuclear and missile defense policy may have the effect of undermining our nation's security rather than enhancing it.

"By announcing his intent to move forward with as yet unproven, costly and expansive national missile defense systems, the President is jeopardizing an arms control framework that has served this nation and the world well for decades. Initial reactions from our allies and other nations suggest that this approach is likely to increase threats to the U.S. and decrease global stability, as exhibited by the likely consequences: Russia's preservation and China's construction of large stocks of nuclear weapons to counter U.S. missile defenses; an end to transparency and verification of other nations' nuclear arsenals, which has preserved strategic stability and advanced U.S. interests; and the continued proliferation of weapons of mass destruction as other nations follow America's lead in taking unilateral steps that may serve their own immediate interests. Furthermore, at a projected cost of more than \$100 billion, the missile defenses proposed by

the President will sap resources from other vital defense priorities.

"Unfortunately, the Administration's disregard for reducing and eliminating threats appears to be a recurring -- and disturbing -- theme of its first 100 days. In its short time in office, this Administration has backed away from negotiations with North Korea on a ballistic missile agreement, and proposed significant cuts in programs to secure and dismantle Russian nuclear weapons. It has sent confused signals about renewed U.N. weapons inspections in Iraq, and suggested that it may lift sanctions against Iran and Libya, allowing them to generate hard currency to support weapons development and terrorism.

"A truly comprehensive strategy to address weapons of mass destruction must include identifying the threats, reducing them at their source, preventing them from spreading elsewhere, and improving our defensive capabilities against them. This cannot be done unilaterally - the nature of these threats requires that we cooperate with nations that share our interests and collectively confront those that do not. And while a technologically proven national missile defense system may serve to address one particular manifestation of the threat, a singular focus on this course could very well undermine our ability to develop and fund a multifaceted strategy against weapons of mass destruction."

###

Contact: Erik Smith/Julianne Corbett (202) 225-0100

SENATE MINORITY LEADER THOMAS DASCHLE (D-SD), May 1, 2001:

Let me just say on national missile defense. We fear that the president may be buying a lemon here. I don't know how you support the deployment of a program that doesn't work. We've got to ask some very tough questions: first about whether or not this system will ever work; secondly, whether or not it's worth abrogating a treaty that has been longstanding, one supported by our allies and adversaries alike; and third, what kind of a relationship will we have with our allies if we violate the ABM Treaty and move ahead without adequate consultation with them?

Q Senator, on what are your concerns regarding the cost of a shift in policy? Could you address that? SEN. DASCHLE: Well, my concern about the cost is not only the overall size, of which we still are not sure -- they have not been clear about the numbers -- but we're worried about committing additional resources to a system that just hasn't worked. I mean, this is one of the biggest turkeys I've seen to date, and it's a turkey, in large measure, because there has not been a shred of evidence that this works. Now, we're for additional research. We're for finding ways with which to improve the technology, but to deploy and to violate or abrogate the ABM Treaty before we've ensured that it works is absolute silliness, and really has to be addressed.

May 1, 2001

Reaction to the Presidents speech from the Associated Press:

``The important issue is the clear commitment we have seen today to work together with allies and with Russia. We will work closely with the Bush administration as we always do -- as close allies, with common strategic interests." -- British Foreign Secretary Robin Cook

^-----

``The president's statement moves our nation in the right direction by making clear that America, our allies, and our friends will be defended against ballistic missiles and the weapons of mass destruction they carry." -- Rep. Bob Stump, R-Ariz., chairman of House Armed Services Committee.

^-----

"I do not oppose missile defense. Neither do many Democrats. But I believe, as with any aspect of national security, that our expenditure should be proportional to the threat posed." -- Rep. Ike Skelton, D-Mo., top Democrat on the House Armed Services Committee.

^-----

``By announcing his intent to move forward with as yet unproven, costly and expansive national missile defense systems, the president is jeopardizing an arms control framework that has served this nation and the world well for decades." -- House Minority Leader Richard Gephardt, D-Mo.

^-----

``Congress must guard against allowing missile defense systems becoming the policy, allowing the technology, in effect, to develop its own psychology. There is gradually being created in the United States a burgeoning military and corporate apparatus dependent in large measure on missile defense to rationalize its existence."

-- Rep. Neil Abercrombie, D-Hawaii, ranking Democrat on House Armed Services' research and development subcommittee.

^-----

``We urge President Bush to abstain from the National Missile Defense, just as we urge China, India and Pakistan to discontinue their nuclear arsenals." -- Swedish Foreign Minister Anna Lindh.

^-----

``The bottom line is that the technology for (the missile defense) system is not ready." -- Dr. David Wright, professor at Massachusetts Institute of Technology and member of the Union of Concerned Scientists.

NATO Press Release (2001)054

1 May 2001

Statement by the Secretary General
Concerning Missile Defences

I have listened with great interest to US President Bush's speech on the growing challenges to global security, including the requirement for missile defences. The President is right to focus on these new security challenges, and I welcome his commitment to close consultation with the Allies. I spoke with him by phone yesterday, and am pleased that he is sending a team to brief NATO on the details of his thinking next week.

When I met with Russian President Putin in February, he also focused on the threats posed by weapons of mass destruction, and the need for some military response in addressing these threats. So there is a wide consensus on the need for defences against the proliferation of ballistic missiles, and I look forward to working closely with the US Administration and other Allies on exactly how these challenges will be met.

"Scientists Urge Congress: Reject Bush's Missile Defense System"

1 May 8:30

Scientists Urge Congress: Reject Bush's Missile Defense System;
Sen. Durbin and Fmr. Pentagon Testing Dir. Coyle to be Honored May 2

Contact: Rabinowitz Media, 202-547-3577 or Paul Fain, 202-223-6133

News Advisory:

Concerned that the Bush administration may rush ahead with unproven missile defenses following this afternoon's policy announcement speech, more than 30 scientists and missile experts from over a dozen states will converge on the U.S. Capitol tomorrow, Wednesday, May 2, to tell lawmakers that there is no scientific basis for building any of the proposed NMD systems. The scientists, who will assemble at 1:30 p.m. in Russell Senate Office Building Room 189, will present Illinois Senator Richard Durbin and former Pentagon Director of Operational Testing Philip Coyle with awards for their efforts to ensure that U.S. security policy is based on sound science.

The scientists will urge President Bush to keep his call for the use of "sound science" consistent in the effort to achieve his agenda. Last Tuesday, responding to criticism from some environmental groups, Bush stated that his Administration will "make decisions

based upon sound science, not some environmental fad or what may sound good."

States represented by scientists in attendance are California, Colorado, Connecticut, Illinois, Massachusetts, Maryland, North Carolina, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Rhode Island, Texas, and Washington.

WHAT: Scientists' Press Conference and Award Ceremony on National Missile Defense

WHEN: Wednesday, May 2, 1:30 p.m.

WHERE: Russell Senate Office Building, Room 189

WHO: Sen. Richard Durbin (D-Ill.), Dr. Philip Coyle (former director of the Pentagon's testing oversight office), and more than 30 scientists from across the nation.

Speaking on behalf of the scientists:

- Dr. Julian Palmore, professor at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign
- Roy Danchick, mathematician and former employee of TRW, a major NMD contractor
- Tom Z. Collina, Director of the Global Security Program, UCS

PSR: Likely Bush Defense Proposals a Blow to Security

1 May 10:48

PSR: Likely Bush Defense Proposals A Blow To National Security

Contact: Martin Butcher of Physicians for Social Responsibility,
202-667-4260

WASHINGTON, May 1 /U.S. Newswire/ -- The following was released today by Physicians for Social Responsibility:

President Bush is expected to lay out his policy priorities for national security in a speech today. Carefully timed leaks by the administration indicate that the President will propose cuts in the strategic nuclear arsenal, development and deployment of a multi-layered 'son of Star Wars' missile defense, and the creation of a so-called flexible nuclear force. These plans seem innocuous enough at first glance, but contain great danger for U.S. and global security. The President's package ignores the real security needs of the American people. The global elimination of nuclear weapons is the only way to be safe from the possibility of nuclear attack.

"President Bush should be leading the way to eliminating the nuclear threat, not wasting trillions of dollars on the mirage of

missile defense and a new nuclear arms race," said Martin Butcher, director of Security Programs for Physicians for Social Responsibility (PSR). "Proposed deep cuts in nuclear weapons are welcome, but not nearly sufficient for the current strategic situation. The cuts that Bush proposes achieve little beyond cutting away Cold War dead wood."

Development and construction of a multi-layered national missile defense (NMD) would be a multi-trillion dollar fraud on the American public and result in a net decrease in security. It will likely spur Russia to abandon proposed and agreed nuclear cuts; push China to build up its strategic arsenal, with the side effect of boosting the nuclear arms race between India and Pakistan. It will prevent any meaningful arms control or confidence-building measures being negotiated or implemented for years to come; and will do nothing to protect the American people, since there can never be a guarantee that no warheads will ever penetrate the so-called 'missile shield'.

Development of a so-called 'flexible' arsenal is code for the production of war-fighting 'mini-nukes' designed for use in regional conflicts -- especially to counter chemical and biological weapons. This dangerous policy would bring nuclear conflict for the first time since 1945, making the United States the world's worst rogue state.

"The package proposed by President Bush will reshape the nuclear arsenal from one intended primarily for deterrence to a force intended primarily for war-fighting," said Robert K. Musil, Ph.D., executive director and CEO of PSR. "The sword of the mini-nuke and the shield of missile defense will be a dangerously destabilizing factor for global security."

British American Security Advisory Council

Press Advisory, April 30, 2001

"Bush Proclaims Nuclear Anarchy"

US president George W. Bush is expected to deliver a speech on Tuesday outlining his administration's stance on developing a National Missile Defence (NMD) system and other nuclear issues, amid a highly-publicized barrage of criticism from Europe over the rejection of the Kyoto global warming agreement and the cut off of North Korean missile talks. Anticipated to affirm US commitment to deploying NMD, while offering substantial unilateral cuts in the nuclear arsenal as compensation, Bush stands to upset international strategic stability and widen the transatlantic divide over actions that affect the global community.

A commitment to instigate deep cuts in the US nuclear arsenal will rightly be welcomed by the international community. However, Bush's refusal to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and government consideration of

new nuclear weapons indicate increased opposition to all forms of international constraint on US nuclear policy. Most troublesome is the fact that plans to deploy a missile defence in the United States have continued despite emphatic objections by Russia, China, and NATO allies over strategic stability and proliferation concerns.

US defence secretary, Donald Rumsfeld, has described NMD as a "moral issue". BASIC director, Dan Plesch, said today, "The real moral issue is the choice between multilateral disarmament and the impossible dream of personal invulnerability. The United States is increasingly revealing itself as the true 'rogue state', run by an administration determined not to be constrained by international law."

One of the first opportunities for Europeans to respond publicly to the US president's statement will be on Wednesday, when the Danish Parliament will hold a debate on the use of a radar site in Greenland for US NMD, and the system's impact on global nuclear proliferation. This bold move, following a parliamentary hearing on 25 April 2001 featuring testimony from a variety of international NMD experts, reflects the long-standing concern felt throughout Europe over the potentially destabilising effect of missile defence.

The Danish government is pursuing a "wait and see" policy over whether to permit NMD-related radars on its territory, and Britain also has abstained from making a decision. Washington has reassured its allies on numerous occasions that it would consult with them before moving forward on NMD. But with Bush expected to give a preliminary outline of his proposal within the month, it will not be long before a decision has to be made.

For more information, contact Dan Plesch or Mark Bromley in BASIC's London office, at +44 (0)20 7407 2977; or Christine Kucia in Washington, at +1 202 347 8340.

Council for a Livable World

Press release

For immediate release: May 1, 2001

Contact: John Isaacs - 202.543-4100 x131 (w); 202.387.6474 (h)

Luke Warren - 202.546.0795 x127

"Spoonful of Sugar Helps the Poison Go Down;
Bush Announces Plans for Missile Defense, Nuclear Reductions"

Washington - President Bush today announced plans to move ahead with deployment of national missile defenses, regardless of the impact on the Anti-Ballistic Missile treaty, while seeking to mollify allies by pledging consultations and to unilaterally reduce the U.S. nuclear arsenal.

"President Bush is trying to sugar coat a poison pill," said John Isaacs, president of the arms control advocacy group Council for a Livable World.

James Walsh, a Council board member and Research Fellow at the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard University "The benefits of reducing nuclear weapons will be lost if missile defense deployment sparks a new arms race."

While the President announced a series of consultations abroad, most of the United States' close allies in Europe and Asia oppose U.S. deployment of a missile shield, despite Bush's promise to extend it to protect them as well. Both Russia and China have threatened to halt cooperation with arms control efforts, to increase their nuclear arsenals, and to proliferate missile technology to other states.

"Simply put: Missile defense will make us less, not more secure," said John Kenneth Galbraith of Harvard University, a board member and adviser to the Council. "The technology is not ready, the threat does not exist, and the cost is immense."

Former President Clinton's land based interceptor system, estimated to cost over \$60 billion by the Congressional Budget Office, has only been tested three times, resulting in two failures and one questionable success. President Bush has proposed a more comprehensive system including sea and space based interceptors that could carry a price tag in the hundreds of billions of dollars.

President Bush earlier this year cut \$100 million from non-proliferation programs in Russia and refused to continue the Clinton Administration policy of negotiating with North Korea to end its missile program.

"There is no reason to make decisions about deployment or the status of the ABM treaty now," argued Isaacs. He added, "if the Administration is serious about protecting Americans from missile threats they should negotiate with North Korea to end its missile program, fully fund non-proliferation programs in Russia to help prevent the spread of nuclear materials to unfriendly nations, and engage in bi-lateral reductions with Russia to prevent accidental launches."

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>>

From: "Paul Lansu"

To: Subject: report biological weapons meeting Geneva

Date: Wed, 2 May 2001 10:29:52 +0200

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook CWS, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)

Importance: Normal X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300

X-MDAemon-Deliver-

To: mupj@igc.org X-Return-Path: paul@paxchristi.net

Dear friends,

Ineke Malsch of the Dutch Pax Christi is working on the issue of biological weapons. She went to Geneva and wrote a report of the Ad Hoc Group meeting, 23 – 24 April. Feedback from you to her would be appreciated. Her e-mail address is: postbus@malsch.demon.nl

With kind regards,

Paul Lansu

Ref.: SD.08.E.01

Banish the Bio-bomb

Report of a mission to the 23rd session of the BWC Ad Hoc Group, UN, Geneva, 23-24 April 2001

Ineke Malsch, 2 May 2001

As one of the first steps in the preparation of a Pax Christi declaration on biological weapons, I visited the 23rd session of the BWC Ad Hoc Group at the UN in Geneva, 23-24 April 2001. The International Peace Bureau had organised an NGO briefing on the negotiations on a new protocol to enable on-site verification of declared facilities, which could be used for hostile purposes. The aim of this briefing was to explain the issues at stake to NGO's which had not dealt with the topic beforehand. It also seemed a good opportunity to get in contact with other NGO's interested in this topic.

The verification protocol

The protocol should strengthen the existing BTWC by enforcing:

- a) Annual declarations of dual-use facilities, which can be used for peaceful as well as hostile purposes;
- b) Challenge visits, when one state party accuses another of having biological weapons;
- c) Random visits.

The protocol also addresses trade, scientific co-operation and measures to promote compliance. An international Organisation for the Prohibition of Biological Weapons (OPBW) should be responsible for the execution of the protocol, once it is operational.

2001 negotiations

During the last Review conference to the BTWC convention, in 1996, states party agreed to a timetable in which the verification protocol should be finished by the next review conference, which will be held 19 November - 7 December 2001. An ad hoc group of these states, chaired by Ambassador Tibor Toth of Hungary has been negotiating a text in the mean time. This has resulted in a "rolling text", with more than a 1000 disputed issues. Mr Toth has worked out a "composite text", in an attempt to make a big step forward in solving these issues. His compromises are supposed not to satisfy any of the negotiating states. His main strategy during the 23rd session of the Ad Hoc group is to keep this compromise text on the table, and to list the points all negotiating countries wish to change, in order to reach the definitive text before the review conference. Apart from this session 23 April-11 May, there is one remaining ad hoc group meeting of 4 weeks in July-August. Some observers, mainly NGO's, were pessimistic and believe that the passive attitude of the US will lead to a "blame game": at the end of the year there is no protocol, and everybody blames others for torpedoing it. The Dutch Ambassador, Mr. Sanders was optimistic, but said that if there is no protocol at the review conference, it will take years before a new attempt can be made. He did not believe a delay of a few months to work out an agreement is feasible.

Country's positions

Roughly, the political playing field appears to be split in three camps: the EU and likeminded countries; the USA, and developing countries. The EU and its allies are in favour of finishing the negotiations this year, even if they have to agree to a much weaker protocol than they aimed for. They consider any protocol a step forward from the present situation. The Netherlands is very optimistic: they lobbied strongly for getting the seat of the OPBW to The Hague (The Bio-Logical Choice, as they call it.) Geneva in Switzerland is the other candidate.

The US is currently reconsidering its position towards all international treaties. They did not say anything about their position on the composite text for the BWC protocol. Developing countries, especially China and Iran, were very negative about the composite text. They want more guarantees for technology transfer for peaceful purposes. This can be a problem. The Dutch Ambassador, Chris Sanders, doubted whether the Western countries collaborating in the Australia Group would be willing to sell fermenters to Iran, even though Iran is a state party to the BTWC treaty. The Australia group is a self-organised group of countries which share information on export controls on suspect materials and goods which can be used for biological weapons production. According to Mr Sanders, all stakeholders in the Netherlands, including industry, government and the parliament are loyal to the BTWC convention and the new protocol. He believed the US and Germany were more trying to protect their national industry's interests.

Other NGO's

There are so far only a few NGO's actively following biological weapons. Some are small consultancy-type NGO's with specific expertise in biological weapons (Sunshine project, Genewatch UK) or in verification issues (Vertic). Others are Scientists' associations (FAS, Student Pugwash) or specialist researchers in renowned institutes like Bradford, SIPRI and Sussex. I met a few more general NGO's in peace and human rights issues which showed some interest, including WILPF.

The sunshine project led the discussion in the NGO briefing. They do not have a position on the contents of the protocol text, but are in favour of finishing it. Any protocol is better than no protocol. Jan van Aken of the Sunshine project tried to open a debate with delegates of the states party on two issues the review conference should clarify in the text of the convention itself: what is a hostile purpose? According to him, law enforcement such as in the drug eradication programme in Colombia should be explicitly included. Also, he was concerned that the definition of biological weapons does not explicitly include anti-material agents such as oil eating bacteria. The delegates present believed such anti-material agents are included. Jan van Aken welcomes a statement by Pax Christi, especially if we could manage to interest the Vatican for the Biological Weapons convention.

Vertic representative Oliver Meier was busy collecting information on the positions of the national delegations present. Vertic publishes a newsletter reporting on this and other verification issues. They work as a "think tank" for other NGO's. He would be interested if Pax Christi could set up a publicity campaign, as well as convince the Church to make a statement.

Genewatch UK (not present) is apparently quite active in the UK in public campaigning about the issue of biological weapons. In the US, the Federation of American Scientists (FAS) (not present) is the leading NGO working on biological weapons. Apparently, they have a high level of expertise. The Geneva delegation of Student Pugwash also follows the issue. They promote an ethical declaration for science graduates.

Research groups

Researchers and graduate students of the Bradford-SIPRI project and the Harvard-Sussex project on biological weapons were also present. Graham Pearson of Bradford offered to comment on a draft Pax Christi statement.

Industry

Ms Gillian Woollett represented the Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America. PhRMA is in favour of a strong protocol, but questions non-challenge visits, a kind of "bio-tourism". In stead they offer their co-operation in educational visits.

Opportunities for Pax Christi

It is possible to have a draft Pax Christi statement ready by September, building on ideas worked out by experts active in the Pax Christi working group, in academia and other NGO's. Such a statement could be endorsed by the board of Pax Christi Netherlands in October, and discussed or hopefully endorsed by the Council of Pax Christi International in Mainz in the first week of November 2001. This statement could then be published just before or during the 5th review conference of the BTWC convention, 19 November until 7 December 2001. Pax Christi International could organise a workshop or press conference in Geneva, at the UN, to attempt to lobby the delegates of the states party to the BTWC convention. I would like to investigate possibilities to press for an official statement by the Catholic Church.

At a later stage, during 2002, we could try to set up a publicity campaign, to raise public awareness about the danger of dual use technology for biological weapons, and the responsibility of individuals and companies. In preparing for this, we could get in touch with Genewatch UK to learn from their experience, possibly through Pax Christi UK. We could investigate whether the ethical declaration for science graduates promoted by Students Pugwash is useful in such a campaign.

Websites:

The Sunshine project: www.sunshine-project.org

Vertic: www.vertic.org

Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America: www.phrma.org

Science Policy Research Unit, University of Sussex: www.sussex.ac.uk/spru

Bradford-Sipri project: www.brad.ac.uk/acad/sbtwc

Netherlands' ministry of Foreign Affairs: www.minbuza.nl

International Peace Bureau: www.ipb.org

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\SD08E01.doc"

X-Sender: lerskine@[63.106.26.66]
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)
Date: Tue, 01 May 2001 17:26:45 -0400
To: lerskine@clw.org
From: Lynn Erskine <lerskine@clw.org>
Subject: Report recommends nuclear weapons cuts, caution on NMD

PRESS RELEASE

For Immediate Release
Tuesday, May 1, 2001

Contact: Lynn Erskine, 202-543-4100 x135
Chris Madison, 301-509-7474

INTERVIEWS WITH 40 KEY POLICYMAKERS SHOW SUPPORT FOR NUCLEAR WEAPONS CUTS, DELAY ON MISSILE DEFENSE DECISION

Washington, DC -- A bipartisan panel of national security specialists today issued a report urging President Bush to delay deployment of a national missile defense system and endorsed the administration's plan to make significant reductions in the U.S. stockpile of strategic nuclear weapons. The report, "Policymakers Views on Addressing the Nuclear Threat," was based on interviews conducted in recent months with more than 40 key policymakers and defense experts.

The panel, known as the Annapolis Group, after the site of its original meeting back in 1989, interviewed both Republican and Democratic policymakers to determine consensus on the key nuclear weapons issues facing President Bush. Its recommendations, based on those interviews, are contained in a memorandum presented to President Bush and other administration officials today. Transcripts of the interviews were also provided to the administration.

"We sampled views across the spectrum, from the most conservative Republican to classic liberal Democrat. What we are offering to the President and his national security team is solid, mainstream thinking on nuclear weapons issues," said John Rhinelander, arms control expert and member of the Annapolis Group.

Among those interviewed were former Senator Sam Nunn; former Joint Chiefs chairman Gen. John Shalikashvili; Senators James Inhofe, Joseph Biden, Carl Levin, Max Cleland; Reps. Lindsey Graham, Porter Goss, John Spratt; and former Bush and Clinton administration officials Arnold Kanter, James Steinberg, Douglas Paal, Peter Rodman, and William Perry.

The group's central recommendations are as follows:

-- The President needs to pay closer attention to Russia if the U.S. is to make progress on a number of important issues affecting national security, including reductions in strategic nuclear weapons and materials, missile defense, and proliferation.

-- The administration should seek significant reductions in U.S. strategic nuclear weapons in consultation with Russia.

-- Research and development should go forward on missile defense, but the President should delay a decision on deployment.

-- Additional funding and attention is needed to prevent the spread of weapons of mass destruction, including threat reduction and stockpile programs with Russia, unfinished missile negotiations with North Korea, and the recommendations of the Baker-Cutler report.

-- The administration should continue its comprehensive review of nuclear weapons policy, and consider building on the Rumsfeld review by seeking additional outside views to build bipartisan support for national security policy.

"A careful reading of history in the nuclear age will reveal that despite the inclination of new administrations to change policy abruptly from that of its predecessor, success in this vital area of national security almost always requires a return to a policy based on consensus," the report stated.

The Annapolis Group includes: Alton Frye, Joseph Cirincione, John Isaacs, Amb. Thomas Graham, Jr., Edith B. Wilkie and John Rhinelander. The Group is chaired by Beth DeGrasse, who coordinated the 1989 memorandum that was presented to then incoming President George Bush.

On missile defense, the group noted that missile defense was "one of the most divisive issues in the entire national security debate." The report stated, "While support for missile defense in the future is evident, there is little enthusiasm for immediate deployment of any system and or near-term withdrawal from the Anti Ballistic Missile Treaty.

For a copy of the report, call 202-543-4100 x135 or visit <http://www.clw.org/theannapolisgroup>

###

Date: Tue, 01 May 2001 16:46:37 -0500

From: Kevin Martin

Reply-To: kmartin@projectabolition.org

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win98; U) X-Accept-Language: en

To: Kevin Martin

Subject: talking points in response to Bush's speech on missile defense and nuclear weapons policy

Dear Friends,

While President Bush's speech today on missile defense and nuclear weapons policy was short on details, it's clear the direction he is moving: unproven missile defense, abrogating the Anti-Ballistic Missile treaty, and a more dangerous world. We need to show the Bush administration that we want a safe and secure future. Please come (and bring your friends) to Washington, DC on June 10 to 12 to raise your voice against Star Wars and a new arms race.

Registration for the June 11-12 Congressional Education Days is now on our web site: <http://www.projectabolition.org/> You needn't register for the demonstration at Lafayette Park on Sunday, June 10 at 2:00 pm, but we'd sure like to know you're coming. Below are talking points you can use in contacting the president, your member of Congress, and the media.

In Peace,

Kevin Martin
Director, Project Abolition

Bush intends to go beyond National Missile Defense (NMD) to include a multi-layered program that will be made up of:

* Theatre Missile Defense (TMD) systems on ships, land, and air which would be forward-deployed surrounding China and would provoke a new arms race.

* Space-based laser (SBL) which was Ronald Reagan's original dream of weapons in space. This constellation of 20-30 orbiting lasers would likely be powered with nuclear reactors and would knock out other countries satellites in space and hit targets on the Earth.

Contact Congress immediately and say no to Bush's Star Wars program:

- * White House Comment Line: (202) 456-1111
- * Congressional Switchboard: (202) 224-3121

(Thanks to Bruce Gagnon of Global Network Against Weapons & Nuclear Power in Space for the above information)

Here are some further talking points for contacting your members of Congress or for a letter to the editor of your local paper:

* What missile defense?

The United States has spent over \$120 billion on missile defense schemes, \$60 billion of it since Ronald Reagan's 1983 Star Wars speech. Yet, there has been no real progress towards anything that would actually stop incoming missiles. There's nothing to deploy, and there won't be for at least a decade.

* Moving to deploy Star Wars will make the world more dangerous

The CIA predicts that Russia and China, who need to act as if Star Wars will work, will beef up their nuclear arsenals in response to a new Star Wars system. India and then Pakistan would likely ratchet up their nuclear confrontation in response to China. A new arms race will bring the danger of nuclear war even closer.

* It will lead to the militarization of outer space

Star Wars National Missile Defense is but the opening hand in the bid to militarize outer space. U.S. Space Command already has in development offensive weapons including lasers to deploy in space, and their doctrine is clear: they come right out and say in plain English they consider space to be "the next medium of warfare."

* Bush's (as yet undefined) proposed reductions don't go far enough

To be fair, the Bush Administration is considering two good moves: further reductions in deployed strategic arsenals, possibly to as low as 1,500 to 2,500 warheads each for the U.S. and Russia, and taking some portion of our arsenal off the current hair-trigger alert status. (This is known as "de-alerting.") While these steps would be welcome, the other aspects of the emerging Bush nuclear policy would overwhelm them.

On the reductions, those would cover only deployed, strategic weapons. Regardless of any reductions, the U.S. plans to keep an arsenal of about 10,000 total nuclear warheads, most of them in a "hedge" or reserve arsenal.

* The U.S. is pursuing new nukes

The Navy wants a new sea-launched Trident warhead, the Air Force wants a new ground-launched Minuteman warhead, and the weapons laboratories and some members of

Congress want to design "mini-nukes" that would be more "useable" against bunkers or hardened targets than are our current behemoth warheads.

We might very well reduce old weapons and replace them with these or other new ones.

ALL THIS MAKES OUR JUNE 10 - 12 EVENTS ALL THE MORE IMPORTANT!
PLEASE PLAN TO JOIN US!

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

The Impact of National Missile Defense (NMD) On Standing-Down Nuclear Weapons

Talking Points

Deploying a National Missile Defense system will increase the threat of an accidental nuclear war involving the approximately 4,400 Russian and U.S. nuclear weapons that are on hair-trigger alert, and encourage a new arms race among other nuclear powers.

NMD will present the Russians with the possibility that the U.S. could deliver a one-two punch to their nuclear forces—a quick-first strike attack that would destroy most of Russia's nuclear weapons, and a defensive shield to handle the small number of Russian weapons that are left.

Russia's perception of vulnerability most likely will dictate their response to a crisis or warning of an apparent attack.

To overwhelm an NMD shield, Russia must plan to launch massively and quickly in a crisis or on warning of an attack

Russia's early-warning system is decaying--leaving them increasingly susceptible to false alarms, as happened in 1995 when a scientific rocket launched by Norway set off an alarm in Russia that brought them to within minutes of launching nuclear missiles at U.S. cities.

Russia's command and control of nuclear weapons is also deteriorating, increasing the risks of mistaken, unauthorized or accidental launch of Russia's vast nuclear arsenal.

NMD will spur the Russians to keep their nuclear weapons on high levels of alert. It might even move them to increase their readiness to launch-on-warning of an attack—i.e. to shorten the decision making time for launching their sea-based and land-based missiles.

China is even more vulnerable to a “one-two punch” because they currently have only approximately 20 long-range missiles---which are liquid fueled and thus cannot be launched quickly.

U.S. plans to field a NMD system may spur nuclear powers like China, to upgrade their arsenals to allow for nuclear missiles on hair-trigger alert.

Many U.S. allies have voiced strong concerns that the development of NMD will prevent significant reductions in nuclear arsenals.

A national missile defense system could lead to a worldwide resumption of an arms race—spurring a new generations of nuclear weapons, including weapons launched from space.

Background Sources: National Missile Defense *What Does It All Mean?* A CDI Issue Brief. Bruce Blair, Center for Defense Information, 9/200. *Nuclear Defense and Offense: An Analysis of US Policy*, Arjun Makhijani, Science for Democratic Action, Institute for Energy and Environmental Research, 2/2000. *Pushing the Limits: The Decision on National Missile Defense*, Steven Young, Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers and Council for a Livable World Education Fund, 7/2000.

Back from the Brink Campaign

6856 Eastern Avenue, NW Suite 322, Washington DC 20012 202.545-1001 ph / 202.545-1004 fax

Web: www.backfromthebrink.org / **E-mail:** prgrm@backfromthebrink.net

4/27/01

4. "Missile Shield Misses Mark?"

Baltimore Sun - May 3, 2001 - By Jay Hancock, Sun National Staff

Russia 'loose nukes' pose greater threat to U.S., analysts say; Bombs could be smuggled

WASHINGTON - While President Bush is proposing to spend tens of billions of dollars to try to defend the United States from nuclear-tipped ballistic missiles, critics contend he is overlooking a far more immediate nuclear threat that could be eased much less expensively.

The most probable vehicle for a U.S.-targeted nuclear bomb, defense analysts say, is not the one Bush has focused on: an expensive intercontinental missile launched by North Korea, Iran or some other mercurial Third World nation.

Instead, people wishing to kill Americans with a nuclear explosion are far more likely to steal or buy a bomb from Russia and smuggle it into the United States by truck or ship, analysts say.

But so far Bush has taken no action on an urgent recommendation by a bipartisan task force to quadruple U.S. spending on controlling "loose nukes" in Russia.

In fact, amid a feeling in the administration and on Capitol Hill that Moscow gets too much U.S. aid already, Bush's 2002 budget cuts nuclear-control assistance for Russia and other states of the former Soviet Union by more than 10 percent, to about \$750 million.

That raises the already substantial risk that Russian nuclear warheads, thousands of which exist in disorganized warehouses secured by poorly paid guards, will slip into the wrong hands, critics say.

"We were not spending enough to begin with" on controlling nuclear materials in former Soviet states, California Rep. Ellen Tauscher, ranking Democrat on a congressional panel overseeing the program, said in an interview yesterday.

"Now we have, in the president's budget, dramatic cuts. My sense is that he should look at the whole bandwidth of the issue [of nuclear threats] and not the one little piece he seems to have seized on."

Bush, in a speech Tuesday, pledged to develop and deploy a multilayered defensive system to shoot down missiles headed toward the United States, its allies and friends. He put no price tag on the project, but the Clinton administration's far less ambitious missile defense plan was projected to cost \$60 billion.

In January a task force headed by former Clinton White House counsel Lloyd N. Cutler and former Republican Sen. Howard H. Baker Jr. called loose Russian nuclear weapons "the most urgent unmet national security threat." The panel recommended boosting annual U.S. spending on the problem to \$3 billion, a four-fold increase.

Baker, Bush's nominee to be ambassador to Japan, said he's amazed that the problem hasn't prompted more concern.

"It really boggles my mind that there could be 40,000 nuclear weapons ... in the former Soviet Union, poorly controlled and poorly stored, and that the world isn't in a near state of hysteria about the danger," Baker told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee a month ago. "But it's a function of the human mind that, after you live with something for a while, you get used to it."

The world has lived with poorly secured Russian weapons for a decade, ever since the fall of the Soviet Union eviscerated the Communist Party structure that controlled the nuclear arsenal.

The so-called Nunn-Lugar program and similar measures have provided more than \$4 billion in U.S. financing to help Russia and other former Soviet states secure their nuclear assets, destroy some 5,000 warheads and employ out-of-work nuclear physicists.

But arms-control specialists say the problem isn't close to being solved. Between 15,000 and 40,000 - nobody seems to know for sure - warheads remain.

"We will have a whole different problem on our hands if the terrorism threat, which is continuing and is serious, finds the means to express itself through weapons of mass destruction," said Charles B. Curtis, former deputy secretary of energy and now president of the Nuclear Threat Initiative, a nonprofit group financed by media mogul Ted Turner.

Alleged terrorist mastermind Osama bin Laden "has said that he considers it a holy duty to acquire such things," Curtis added. "We have to take that seriously. We know that Russian weapons scientists are subject to recruitment by various outside elements, and that's a serious problem."

The White House is doing a comprehensive review of U.S. nonproliferation programs, expected to be finished by July. Curtis and others hope the review will lead to an increase in administration support and funding for the various control measures.

Administration officials denied that Bush has given short shrift to the United State's Russian nonproliferation programs.

John Gordon, Energy Department undersecretary for nuclear security, told

Congress last month that the administration's review will look at "the quality of those programs and then see how that fits into their Russian and nonproliferation programs."

The fact that the president's speech Tuesday didn't broach the topic of poorly guarded Russian nuclear assets "doesn't mean it's not going to be addressed," said Mary Ellen Countryman, White House national security spokeswoman. "That wasn't the topic of our speech."

Nobody has documented a case of Russian warheads or weapons-grade materials being acquired by U.S. enemies. But by many accounts it hasn't been for lack of trying by criminal elements in Russia.

Law-enforcement authorities in various countries have seized more than a dozen shipments of illegal, weapons grade uranium or plutonium in the last decade, according to Rennselaer Lee, author of "Smuggling Armageddon: The Nuclear Black Market."

In at least two cases, Russian government officials offered to sell plutonium to visiting foreign scientists, says Lee, a senior fellow at the Foreign Policy Research Institute.

In another instance, documented by the Baker-Cutler panel, Russian sailors in Murmansk were caught recently with stolen uranium submarine fuel.

A recent poll of Russian weapons engineers and other nuclear workers conducted for the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace illuminates the motivations that may underlie such actions.

Of hundreds of nuclear-weapons employees surveyed, 62 percent earn less than \$50 a month, 58 percent hold second jobs, 14 percent would like to work outside Russia and 6 percent expressed an interest in moving "any place at all."

The Energy Department's "nuclear cities" program - which seeks to boost the salaries and business prospects of such people, but took a 75 percent, \$20 million cut in Bush's budget - "is not foreign aid," Tauscher said. "We have a huge national security issue here."

Analysts say that many warheads and other nuclear materials still are inadequately stored throughout Russia.

From: EAABurns@aol.com
Date: Fri, 4 May 2001 11:48:23 EDT S
Subject: Re: Hotel for Hallman 2001
To: mupj@igc.org
X-Mailer: AOL 6.0 for Windows US sub 10519

Yes, we will take care of the transfer for June 29 and 30. I am glad that we will be able to help out someone else. Hallman 2004 in Washington, D. C. sounds great! We will be eager to hear more.....

Ellen

X-Sender: jdi@[63.106.26.66]
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)
Date: Fri, 04 May 2001 14:13:07 -0400
To: jdi@clw.org
From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>
Subject: Congressional critics on NMD

WHAT CONGRESSIONAL CRITICS ARE SAYING ABOUT
THE PRESIDENT'S SPEECH ON NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE

Sen. Tom Daschle (SD), Democratic Minority Leader, May 1, 2001

``We fear the president may be buying a lemon here. I don't know how you support the deployment of a program that doesn't work. We've got to ask some very tough questions: first about whether or not this system will ever work; secondly, whether or not it's worth abrogating a treaty that has been longstanding, one supported by our allies and adversaries alike; and third, what kind of a relationship will we have with our allies if we violate the ABM Treaty and move ahead without adequate consultation with them?

Sen. Joseph Biden (DE), Ranking Democrat Foreign Relations Committee, May 1, 2001

"We should not head down the "Star Wars" road again. The fundamental question regarding a national missile defense system is whether it would make us more secure or less secure. We must decide if the investment of tens of billions of dollars in what the Pentagon thinks is the least likely threat to our security – an ICBM attack by another nation – is appropriate, or whether we should defend ourselves against the threat of terrorists, who have the ability, for example, to inflict devastating damage by placing a "dirty atom bomb" in the hull of a ship in New York harbor."

Sen. Carl Levin (MI), Ranking Democrat on Armed Services Committee, May 1, 2001

"If we proceed to deploy national missile defenses unilaterally and in a manner other nations may find threatening, we risk a new Cold War, Cold War II. It could prompt Russia to keep nuclear weapons that they are ready to dismantle, and it could prompt China to deploy more nuclear weapons than it would otherwise build. Those greater numbers of nuclear weapons increase the risk of proliferation to nations and terrorist groups seeking to acquire nuclear material or nuclear weapons. These consequences could make the United States less secure rather than more secure . . .

Sen. Jack Reed (D-RI), Armed Services Committee, May 2, 2001

"We have to recognize that this world is interdependent and we cannot act

unilaterally without great cost. Our actions have consequences. We must act in a manner which preserves strategic stability and improves our security. Improved security, strategic stability and a recognition of what we are doing were absent, I think, from the president's speech yesterday."

Sen. Ben Nelson (D-NE), Armed Services Committee, CNN, May 1, 2001

"When you don't know whether something is going to work, I don't know whether you want to continue to plow 100 billion or another 100 billion into the technology."

Sen. Bill Nelson (D-FL), March 29, 2001 Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing

"My sense is that the technology has not been developed where we could do a full-up-scale system, nor even a limited system at this point. This, Mr. Chairman, is where you and I would have common ground, in that if we can, in fact, technologically develop such a system -- which I don't think we're there yet -- and if we get past the question of cost of the system, and we get past the question of the diplomatic relations, then I'm somebody who likes the advance of technology, particularly when it comes to the defense of the United States.

But what concerns me is what I read about policy coming out of the new administration, it's "To hell with it, we be damned, we're going to put it up there." And we're not there yet, and we're probably not there for several number of years. But, clearly, we ought to push on the R&D to see if it is in fact technologically feasible. Until we get to that point, how do you think we can defend ourselves against such rogue states that might want to launch missiles against the interests of the United States?"

Sen. John Kerry (D-MA), Foreign Relations Committee, Senate floor speech, May 2, 2001

"Missile defense is only a response of last resort, when diplomacy and deterrence have failed. And given that no missile defense system will be 100% effective, we must not set aside the logic of deterrence that has kept us safe for 40 years. . . . Nothing in this changed environment suggests that we will be better off by walking away from the ABM Treaty. If somehow Russia and China are not persuaded by President Bush's assurances that our missile defense system is not aimed at undermining their nuclear deterrent capabilities, and instead they perceive a growing threat to their interests, they will act to counter that threat. We will not be safer if our NMD system focuses their energies on developing -- and eventually selling -- new ways to overwhelm our defenses. The ABM Treaty can be amended to reflect our changed security environment. But to abandon it all-together is to welcome an arms race that will make us more vulnerable, not less."

Sen. Dick Durbin, Select Intelligence Committee, May 2, 2001

"The Pentagon itself has said that a missile strike with a "return address" from a rogue state is among the least likely threats it faces. Worse, such a system could give us a false sense of security – our own Maginot Line – and be completely ineffective in countering threats that simply go around it – like the terrorist with chemical, biological or nuclear weapons. It could be totally overwhelmed by intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) held by Russia."

Sen. Paul Wellstone, member Senate Foreign Relations Committee, May 1, 2001

"The most important question we must ask ourselves is whether a missile shield will make us more or less secure. I think it is likely to make us less secure by encouraging Russia to retain more nuclear weapons than it had planned, including ICBM's on hair- trigger alert, thereby increasing the risk of accidental war. Deployment of a missile shield will also spur China to build up its limited nuclear strategic arsenal, which in turn would fuel the nuclear arms race between India and Pakistan. These and other potential consequences of building NMD will make the U.S. less, not more secure."

Sen. Mark Dayton (D-MN), Armed Services Committee, Star Tribune, May 2, 2001

"I would be, at this point, not in favor of anything that would cause abrogation of the ABM treaty. I think that's a very, very serious step. (It is) the essential cornerstone of the era that we've managed to live through without a nuclear holocaust."

Sen. Byron Dorgan, Senate floor statement, April 30, 2001

"I happen to support research and development for our national missile defense system. I do not support deployment of a system we have not yet demonstrated to be workable. The threat it is supposed to counter is one of the least likely threats this country faces. By far the most likely threat we face is for a terrorist or a rogue nation to get ahold of a suitcase-size nuclear bomb and put it in the trunk of an old rusty Desoto car and park it on a dock somewhere in New York or Chicago. That is by far a much more likely scenario of a terrorist act. Or instead of a suitcase bomb, perhaps someone will use a deadly vial of chemical or biological agents that can kill millions of people. That is a much more likely scenario--a much more likely weapon of mass destruction to be used by a rogue nation or a terrorist state."

Former Sen. Nunn, NBC News, May 1, 2001

"The most serious threats right now are not a missile from a third world country that has a return address. If we end up spending a huge amount of money on defending limited attack from three or four countries in the world -- three, four, five missiles -- and we don't have money left over to try and get the weapons and materials and know how under control, we could end up

with a more dangerous situation in ten years than we have now."

Sen. Max Cleland (D-GA), member Senate Armed Services Committee (Hardball, MSNBC, April 30, 2001)

On "Hardball," Sen. Max Cleland (D-GA) maintained that he is "not for deploying a national missile defense system at this time. I am very much for a theater missile defense system. I think we ought to continue research both on the sea-based and land-based systems."

Richard Gephardt (MO), House Minority Leader, May 1, 2001

"I am concerned that the President's approach to strategic nuclear and missile defense policy may have the effect of undermining our nation's security rather than enhancing it.

"By announcing his intent to move forward with as yet unproven, costly and expansive national missile defense systems, the President is jeopardizing an arms control framework that has served this nation and the world well for decades. Initial reactions from our allies and other nations suggest that this approach is likely to increase threats to the U.S. and decrease global stability, as exhibited by the likely consequences: Russia's preservation and China's construction of large stocks of nuclear weapons to counter U.S. missile defenses; an end to transparency and verification of other nations' nuclear arsenals, which has preserved strategic stability and advanced U.S. interests; and the continued proliferation of weapons of mass destruction as other nations follow America's lead in taking unilateral steps that may serve their own immediate interests. Furthermore, at a projected cost of more than \$100 billion, the missile defenses proposed by the President will sap resources from other vital defense priorities.

Rep. Ike Skelton (MO), Ranking Democrat on Armed Services Committee, May 1, 2001

"I do not oppose missile defense. Neither do many Democrats. But I believe, as with any aspect of national security, that our expenditure should be proportional to the threat posed."

Rep. John Spratt (SC), Ranking Democrat on Budget Committee - May 1, 2001

While I believe the ABM Treaty should be modified, I am not for walking away from it. As long as Russia has enough weapons to annihilate us, we should be seeking strategic stability with Russia. Even more importantly, we must keep working with cash-strapped Russia to make sure its nuclear components and know-how do not fall into the hands of terrorists or nations hostile to us. If we end the ABM Treaty, we may also end these programs which make sure that Russia's "loose nukes" do not fall into the wrong hands.

The President's speech did not talk about the budgetary implications of national missile defense. Last Friday, USA Today reported that Secretary Rumsfeld plans to ask for \$200 billion to \$300 billion more for defense

over the next six years. If we add these increases to the budget the President has already put on the table, we will tap in to the Medicare surplus in most of the next ten years and probably tap into the Social Security surplus as well.

Rep. John Tierney (D-MA), New York Times, May 2, 2001

"The whole principle of fly before you buy is one we should adhere to. This is placing the political cart before the technical horse."

Rep. Tom Allen (D-ME), Armed Services Committee, May 1, 2001

"The strategic policy announced by President Bush today, if implemented, will make the world less stable and undermine U.S. national security. Rushing deployment of national missile defense (NMD) will provoke other nations to increase their offensive arms."

Rep. Neil Abercrombie (HI), ranking Democrat on House Armed Services' research and development subcommittee, May 1, 2001

"Congress must guard against allowing missile defense systems becoming the policy, allowing the technology, in effect, to develop its own psychology. There is gradually being created in the United States a burgeoning military and corporate apparatus dependent in large measure on missile defense to rationalize its existence."

Rep. Martin Meehan (D-MA), Armed Services Committee, Boston Globe, May 3, 2001

By signaling his willingness to abandon the 1972 Antiballistic Missile defense treaty, Bush has decided that scoring points with the GOP's right wing is more important than working with our allies to curb nuclear proliferation. He has also decided to siphon scarce resources away from more pressing priorities, like investing in education and providing for a Medicare prescription drug benefit."

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: Sat, 05 May 2001 16:14:30 -0700
Subject: hotel for hallman reunion
To: mupj@igc.org
Cc: edbruegge@mediaone.net, EAABurns@aol.com
From: "Carol Pepper" <cpepper@towerhill.org>

Howard:

Ellen forwarded to me your email requesting one of the rooms we had reserved for the reunion. Neither her family nor mine will be able to attend the reunion this summer.

My husband Jim made reservations in the Fall for two adjoining rooms. Check-in is for Friday and check-out is for Sunday. I will contact the hotel and ask that they transfer 1 room to you. I will also jot you a note when I have called the hotel. I will wait to hear from Ed Brueggemann to see if he knows of anyone else in search of a room.

We had been looking forward to seeing everyone. The last time we were at a reunion was the one in Hudson. Seems like there have been so many changes since then. I now have two boys, Graham (3 years old) and Hudson (18 months old). We want them to meet their Hallman relatives, and it looks like we'll need to wait until 2004. We're thrilled that the next reunion will be in DC - an easy drive from our home in Wilmington DE.

For your information, our hotel confirmation # is 129839.

Again, I'll be in touch after I hear from Ed and after I call the hotel.

Carol Anderson Pepper

Date: Sun, 06 May 2001 11:40:01 -0400

From: Kerri Wright Platais

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en]C-CCK-MCD NSCPCD47 (Win95; I) X-Accept-Language: en

To: Dwight Smith , Tony Andrews , Pat Beverly , Jerry Muys , Jeanne North , Ron and Holly Foster , Howard Hallman , Jo Allen

Subject: Minutes from the March Meeting Greetings all,

Please find attached (both as text and file) the Minutes from the March Meeting. I apologize the delay in getting these out. I am unable to attend the meeting this month, as ask that someone else take minutes in my absence. Thanks. Please let me know if we are meeting in July or not. Thanks!!

Kerri

Minutes of the Meeting of the Outreach Committee

The Outreach Committee of BUMC met on March 14, 2001. The meeting was chaired by Dwight Smith. The following people were in attendance: Haven and Jeanne North, Kerri Platais, Howard Hallman, Sue Wells, Marie Bourgeois and Dwight Vincent. Jo Allen's recent hospitalization was discussed, and a card would be sent out from the Committee for her speedy recovery. The meeting covered the following topics:

Revision of the Last Minutes. It was clarified that the Youth Work Camp would get an additional \$400.00 to top off at \$800.00 for the year. The \$500.00 for Vacation Bible School would stay in the Committee's budget for the community outreach provided.

Publicity for Community Activities. In keeping with what was discussed at the last meeting, the Committee wanted to highlight some of the church activities by featuring them in the Messenger. Howard said it was important to coordinate the oral and written pieces. VIM would serve this purpose with the April trip to North Carolina. Kerri would work with Ron to get an idea of what was ahead in the next few months, so the Committee could help get the word out.

Budget. Sue raised a question about the Feinstein matching funds for Christ House, and Dwight said this could be discussed further at the next meeting. Jeanne said in the future we may want to contemplate more work with the Africa University, as it was Methodist sponsored and was currently encountering some financial difficulties. The University was working to develop a health science course to deal with the problems of HIV/AIDS.

Community Ministries. Haven North and Pat Beverly attended, "What it Means to be Poor in Montgomery County" (an evening discussion) put on by Paul Bittner, the new head of the advocacy group. Haven reported it was a very interesting evening and said that he would look into organizing a Fall Forum in conjunction with some other churches, hosted by BUMC. He had in mind an evening seminar, approximately two to two and half hours long. (Haven circulated a follow-up to this at the time of writing these minutes, for inclusion at our next meeting).

Haven also reported that the Development Committee had decided not to continue with the Hunger Drive in the Fall. For the time being, Thanksgiving in February was still ongoing. The goal this past February was to raise \$10,000 for this year, but the total amount made was not yet known. He said a phone-a-thon would take place for the Horizon House Community Based Shelter soon, if anyone wanted to help.

Jeanne added that a letter calling for Governor Glendening to increase funding for mental health work in Montgomery County was circulating on email and said she would forward it to all interested Committee members, for their help in lobbying for needed funds.

VIM 2001. Sue reported that the Pancake Supper had cleared a profit of \$752.00, after feeding a total of 175 people in February. The night was a success and 8 people from BUMC would head to North Carolina to help in the flood recovery efforts and house building in April.

Other Business. Coffee hour for March would be covered by the Outreach Committee and different weeks were assigned.

Jeanne asked if the Committee would be interested in sponsoring a Sunday discussion time with the head of Development for the African University, who is living in Annandale. She would look into his availability for a Sunday in June. She also received a letter from the Hoovers, and circulated copies of that to the group.

Date of the Next Meeting

The Outreach Committee would next meet in May.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Submitted by: Kerri Wright Platais
Outreach Scribe

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\Minutes of the Meeting of the Outreach Committee March 14, 2001.doc"

X-Sender: bhallman@gqserver.houston.geoquest.slb.com

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.0.2

Date: Mon, 07 May 2001 10:52:04 -0500

To: Jeanette Hallman <vhall110@southwind.net>,
Edgar Hallman <halledee@aol.com>,
Gordon Hallman <JoanHallman@hotmail.com>,
Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.org>, Don Knutson <dknutsonr@aol.com>,
Ellen and Brian Burns <eaa.burns@aol.com>,
Jeanette and Ken Spencer <SPENCERSAGE@aol.com>,
Carol Pepper <cpepper@towerhill.org>, Diane Gniadek <pgni@aol.com>,
Edward Brueggemann <edbruegge@mediaone.net>

From: Brian Hallman <bhallman@houston.geoquest.slb.com>

Subject: Obituaries

Hi Everyone,

I am still collecting information for this summers reunion. I would like to collect the obituaries for those family members who have passed away since our first reunion in 1979. If you have a clipping, would you send me a copy? You can e-mail it to me or send it via fax or mail at:

Brian Hallman
931 Bayhill Dr.
Sugarland, TX 77479

Fax: 713-513-2507

Thanks,
Brian

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

Date: Mon, 07 May 2001 15:47:37 -0400

Subject: FW: Obituaries

From: Edward Brueggemann <edbruegge@mediaone.net>

To: Jeanette Hallman <vhall110@southwind.net>,

Edgar Hallman <halledee@aol.com>, Brian Hallman <bhallman@slb.com>,

Gordon Hallman <JoanHallman@hotmail.com>,

Jim Brueggemann <jbbruegg@aol.com>,

John Brueggemann <jbruegge@skidmore.edu>,

Debby Guarino <Guari@mediaone.net>, David Sanborn <bdq@mediaone.net>,

Howard Anderson <howardfran@yahoo.com>, Terri McQueen <maxandlil@yahoo.com>,

Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.org>, Don Knutson <dknutsonr@aol.com>,

Elisha/ Paul Churchill <paulnlish@aol.com>,

Eric / Mitzi Hallman <jems0615@aol.com>, Joy Hallman <jlhallman@aol.com>,

Ellen and Brian Burns <ea.burns@aol.com>,

Lisa and David Briggs <lisahbriggs@msn.com>,

Katrina Hallman <katrinaeh@yahoo.com>,

Jennifer and Jeff Moore <jenhallman_moore@yahoo.com>,

Jeanette and Ken Spencer <SPENCERSAGE@aol.com>,

Sara Vettraino <mvettraino@aol.com>, Carol Pepper <cpepper@towerhill.org>,

Bruce Hallman <hallman7@juno.com>, Diane Gniadek <pgni@aol.com>,

David Hallman <dhall29106@aol.com>, Suzanne Knutson <sknutsone@aol.com>,

Karen and Greg Walaitis <walaitis@uswest.net>,

John and Corine Knutson <knutson6@juno.com>,

Ben Spencer <spencbe@opp.51.org>

I do not know how many of you got this nte from Brian so am forwarding it to you. Ed Brueggemann

From: Brian Hallman <bhallman@houston.geoquest.slb.com>

Date: Mon, 07 May 2001 10:52:04 -0500

To: Jeanette Hallman <vhall110@southwind.net>, Edgar Hallman

<halledee@aol.com>, Gordon Hallman <JoanHallman@hotmail.com>, Howard Hallman

<mupj@igc.org>, Don Knutson <dknutsonr@aol.com>, Ellen and Brian Burns

<ea.burns@aol.com>, Jeanette and Ken Spencer <SPENCERSAGE@aol.com>, Carol

Pepper <cpepper@towerhill.org>, Diane Gniadek <pgni@aol.com>, Edward

Brueggemann <edbruegge@mediaone.net>

Subject: Obituaries

Hi Everyone,

I am still collecting information for this summers reunion. I would like to collect the obituaries for those family members who have passed away since our first reunion in 1979. If you have a clipping, would you send me a copy? You can e-mail it to me or send it via fax or mail at:

Brian Hallman

931 Bayhill Dr.

Sugarland, TX 77479

Fax: 713-513-2507

Thanks,

Brian

To: mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Meeting on May 15
Cc:
Bcc: icnd
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Dear Colleagues:

The next meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament will take place from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. on Tuesday, May 15 in Conference Room 3 of the Methodist Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, D.C. This represents a shift to the third Tuesday of the month as the regular meeting date. It replaces the previously scheduled meeting on May 8, which will not take place.

Shalom,
Howard

To: mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: May 15 meeting of Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament
Cc:
Bcc: icnd
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Colleagues:

I've heard from two people that on May 15 they will be involved in an all-day meeting of the Center for Conscience and War. Will that involved a number of others from the faith community? If so, should we postpone the meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament until Tuesday, May 22.

Please let me know. But don't take May 15 off your calendar until I get back in touch with you.

Howard

To: mupj@igc.org, umgbcs
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Peace/Justice Alert #2
Cc:
Bcc: umbishops, umconf, umcs, umpj, umgbcs
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Peace/Justice Alert #2
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
May 7, 2001

SPEAK OUT ON NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE

Last week President George W. Bush made a major speech advocating multi-layered national missile defense. Although his views were already known, his administration is now launching a major campaign to build public support.

On this subject the United General Conference in a resolution on "Saying No to Nuclear Deterrence" has called upon all possessors of nuclear weapons to "halt all efforts to develop and deploy strategic antimissile defense systems because they are illusory, unnecessary, and wasteful." Please add your opposition to national missile defense by writing to President Bush at the White House, Washington, D.C. 20500. Share your views with your U.S. senators and representative.

Reasons for opposing national missile defense were stated in a recent letter from representatives of 27 denominational offices and national faith-based organizations, as follows:

Dear Mr. President:

We the undersigned representatives of faith-based organizations share with you the desire to keep God's people, including those in the U.S. homeland, safe from nuclear attack. However, we are deeply concerned about the haste to make a commitment to deploy unproven technology for national missile defense.

First, the real and present danger for nuclear attack on the United States comes from the several thousand Russian missiles now on hair trigger alert and thousands of Russian nuclear weapons in reserve with inadequate security. The best remedies are mutual de-alerting, strategic arms reduction, and stable control of fissile material. These opportunities could be jeopardized if the United States withdraws from the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty to erect a national missile defense. Russia might then withdraw from other arms control treaties and retain multi-warhead missiles now scheduled for elimination under START II. Also, China might increase its nuclear arsenal. This would pose far greater danger to U.S. homeland security than the remote threat of a few missiles a small nation might develop years from now.

Second, heavy emphasis on unproven anti-missile technology to counter a speculative future threat from a few small nations neglects other elements of a comprehensive non-proliferation strategy. More promising methods include international monitoring of nuclear test explosions, rigorous fissile material control, stringent missile technology control, diplomacy, financial assistance to nations cooperating in nuclear non-proliferation, and countering social, economic, and political instability that provides the breeding ground for terrorist groups

Third, we are seriously concerned about budgetary implications. Since 1983 the United States has spent \$69 billion on national missile defense, enriching major defense contractors but producing no effective system. President Clinton's plan, which you have criticized as inadequate, would cost \$60 billion. Indications are that the layered approach you favor could cost more than \$100 billion. A budgetary commitment of this magnitude along with the tax cut you are promoting would preclude achieving the goal of "Leave No Child Behind" and dealing with other urgent domestic needs.

For these reasons we urge you to pull back from the dangerous rush to a premature decision on national missile defense and withdrawal from the ABM Treaty.

Signed by representatives of 27 faith-based organizations.

From: "Lisa Wright" <lisaw@nccusa.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: May 15 meeting of Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament
Date: Mon, 7 May 2001 17:08:27 -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 V4.72.2106.4

Tuesday May 22 coincides again with the Latin America Working Group meeting, just fyi.

Lisa

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Monday, May 07, 2001 4:51 PM
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: May 15 meeting of Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Dear Colleagues:

I've heard from two people that on May 15 they will be involved in an all-day meeting of the Center for Conscience and War. Will that involved a number of others from the faith community? If so, should we postpone the meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament until Tuesday, May 22.

Please let me know. But don't take May 15 off your calendar until I get back in touch with you.

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.

Date: Mon, 7 May 2001 14:20:12 -0700 (PDT)
From: Egbert Lawrence <egbertl4pj@yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: May 15 meeting of Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>

Thanks, Howard,

I have a local interfaith meeting but, if the 22nd is better, I will be there.

Peace! Larry

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

> Dear Colleagues:

>

> I've heard from two people that on May 15 they will
> be involved in an

> all-day meeting of the Center for Conscience and

> War. Will that involved a

> number of others from the faith community? If so,

> should we postpone the

> meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear

> Disarmament until Tuesday,

> May 22.

>

> Please let me know. But don't take May 15 off your

> calendar until I get

> back in touch with you.

>

> Howard

>

>

> Howard W. Hallman, Chair

> Methodists United for Peace with Justice

> 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036

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

>

> Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a

> membership association of

> laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any

> Methodist denomination.

Do You Yahoo!?

Yahoo! Auctions - buy the things you want at great prices

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

From: David Culp <david@fcnl.org>
To: "'Howard W. Hallman'" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: May 15 meeting of Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament
Date: Mon, 7 May 2001 17:33:49 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

May 15 or 22 is O.K.

June 19 may not work for the bigger meeting. The Pentagon review is way behind schedule. Rumsfeld may be testifying that day (June 19) before the Senate Armed Services Committee to lay out the program.

David

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Monday, May 07, 2001 4:51 PM
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: May 15 meeting of Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Dear Colleagues:

I've heard from two people that on May 15 they will be involved in an all-day meeting of the Center for Conscience and War. Will that involved a number of others from the faith community? If so, should we postpone the meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament until Tuesday, May 22.

Please let me know. But don't take May 15 off your calendar until I get back in touch with you.

Howard

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

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

From: Janet Horman <JHorman@UMC-GBCS.ORG>
To: "'Howard W. Hallman'" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: May 15 meeting of Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmamen
t
Date: Tue, 8 May 2001 09:12:34 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

If you are able to move it to the 22nd, I would be able to attend. If not, however, I look forward to meeting with you on thursday.

thanks,
Janet Horman

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Monday, May 07, 2001 4:51 PM
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: May 15 meeting of Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Dear Colleagues:

I've heard from two people that on May 15 they will be involved in an all-day meeting of the Center for Conscience and War. Will that involved a number of others from the faith community? If so, should we postpone the meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament until Tuesday, May 22.

Please let me know. But don't take May 15 off your calendar until I get back in touch with you.

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: jdi@[63.106.26.66]
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)
Date: Tue, 08 May 2001 08:43:06 -0400
To: jdi@clw.org
From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>
Subject: 'Fuzzy' Logic on Missile Defense

'Fuzzy' Logic on Missile Defense
Council for a Livable World
May 8, 2001

President Bush's latest speech on missile defense on May 1 did little more than repeat the same disingenuous arguments made during his campaign. While missile defense should be evaluated on the basis of the four common-sense criteria of cost, technological readiness, effect on arms control, and the presence of a threat, Bush made no mention of the first three criteria and talked only in vague terms about the threat. Instead, he skirted the issue by attacking the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty and talking about how the world has changed over the past 30 years.

BUSH: "More nations have nuclear weapons and still more have nuclear aspirations."

REALITY: Thirty years ago the world had five nuclear powers: the U.S., U.S.S.R., Britain, France, and China. Several other countries, including India, Israel, Pakistan, and North Korea, were already engaging in nuclear research. In recent years, the number of states possessing or seeking nuclear weapons has actually decreased. Although Iran and Iraq can be considered to have nuclear aspirations, several other countries—South Africa, Ukraine, Kazakhstan, Belarus, Argentina, and Brazil—have abandoned their nuclear programs and joined the Non-Proliferation Treaty as non-nuclear weapon states. Thus, the world is hardly the nuclear free-for-all that the President's language implies.

BUSH: "Some [countries] already have developed a ballistic missile technology that would allow them to deliver weapons of mass destruction at long distances and incredible speeds, and a number of these countries are spreading these technologies around the world."

REALITY: Most countries developing ballistic missile technology possess systems capable of traveling only modest distances. The only countries that currently possess intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) capable of hitting U.S. territory as well as nuclear warheads that can be mounted on ICBMs are Russia, Britain, France, and China. The U.S. insists that missile defense is not directed against Russia and China, and Britain and France are U.S. allies. Although North Korea may be developing a longer-range ICBM, there are less expensive and more effective alternatives to missile defenses for dealing with this threat. For instance, the U.S. can negotiate an agreement with North Korea that would eliminate its development and export of ballistic missile technology.

BUSH: "Defenses can strengthen deterrence by reducing the incentive for proliferation."

REALITY: This statement contradicts one of the main arguments of missile defense proponents: that deterrence does not work against "irrational" rogue states leaders determined to attack the U.S. If such states are not deterred by certain and devastating U.S. retaliation, then they would not be deterred by an anti-ballistic missile system that even Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld admits would be less than perfect.

Furthermore, missile defenses do nothing to discourage proliferation, and may make the problem worse by stimulating buildups in offensive nuclear forces around the world. Some countries may simply build more missiles in order to overwhelm the anti-missile system. According to an August 2000 National Intelligence Estimate, China's nuclear arsenal may increase to ten times its present size as a response to U.S. missile defenses. A Chinese buildup could in turn spark nuclear buildups in India and Pakistan.

Another option for overwhelming missile defenses would be to place multiple warheads on individual missiles. Russia could equip each of its new Topol SS-27 ICBMs with as many as three independently targetable warheads, a step that would entail Russia's withdrawal from the START II agreement, which prohibits multiple-warhead ICBMs.

Countries such as North Korea could employ simple and inexpensive countermeasures to confuse the missile defense system. According to a September 1999 National Intelligence Estimate, China and Russia already possess the technology for such countermeasures, and may be willing to sell the technology to interested states.

Finally, countries such as China and North Korea that have been major suppliers of missile technology may react to U.S. missile defenses by refusing to cooperate on nonproliferation efforts and increasing their missile exports.

BUSH: "When ready, and working with Congress, we will deploy missile defenses to strengthen global security and stability." "We're not presenting our friends and allies with unilateral decisions already made."

REALITY: Although President Bush has repeatedly vowed to consult with U.S. allies on the subject of missile defense, other administration statements indicate that the decision has already been made. For instance, in a September 2000 campaign speech at the Citadel, Bush stated, "If Russia refuses the changes which we propose in the ABM Treaty, we will give prompt notice, under the provisions of the treaty, that we can no longer be a party to it." Promises of consultations appear to be nothing more than a euphemism for telling our allies to "deal with it." According to Sen. Carl Levin (D-MI), "President Bush's speech on missile defenses was a unilateral decision wrapped in conciliatory rhetoric."

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

To: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: 'Fuzzy' Logic on Missile Defense
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <3.0.5.32.20010508084306.0081c210@[63.106.26.66]>
References:

John,

Thanks for your analysis. I have forwarded it to participantes in the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament.

Howard

To: kjulian@inareaumc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Letter to Senator Lugar on de-alerting
Cc:
Bcc: esther
X-Attachments: A:\iclt.105.doc; A:\iclt.112.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Bishop White:

We greatly appreciate your signing the letter from Indiana religious leaders to Senators Lugar and Bayh on the issue of de-alerting the nuclear arsenal. You have been joined by leaders from other denominations. The final version and list of signers is attached.

We are wondering if you would be willing to transmit the letter to the two senators. With the hope that you will, I have drafted a transmittal letter, which you can adapt as you see fit. It is attached.

Our next step is to circulate the letter within the Indiana religious community and encourage others to contact Senators Lugar and Bayh on the de-alerting issue.

Thanks for your support for this effort. If there are any questions, please have your Ms. Julian call me at 301 896-0013. Please let me know when the letter goes out.

Shalom,
Howard W. Hallman

X-Lotus-FromDomain: MCC
From: J._Daryl_Byler@mail.mcc.org
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Date: Tue, 8 May 2001 10:32:28 -0400
Subject: Re: May 15 meeting of Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj @ igc.org>
From: J. Daryl Byler
Date: 5/8/2001 10:32:19 AM
Subj: Re: May 15 meeting of Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Hi Howard:

The 15th is ok with me.

Daryl

To: mupj@igc.org, icnd
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: May 15 meeting is on
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

We will have our meeting on Tuesday, May 15 as scheduled. The possibility of changing it to May 22 ran into other conflicts. It will run from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. in Room 3 of the Methodist Building

Howard

Senator Richard G. Lugar Speech
Eisenhower Leadership Award Presentation
Eisenhower Institute
April 26, 2001

Thank you Judy.

I am honored to share with Sam Nunn, my good friend and talented partner, the 2001 Eisenhower Leadership Prize given by The Eisenhower World Affairs Institute and Gettysburg College. I thank you for your support of the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction program and the generous boost you have given our efforts through this prize.

I want to share with you this evening a few thoughts on the "condition" of our relations with the country that has been at the heart of our cooperative threat reduction efforts - namely, the Russian Federation. Recent exchanges with Russian colleagues on the state of the Russian American relationship quickly take the form of competing hyperboles as to how low relations have sunk.

But low points in Russian-American relations are nothing new. Over the last ten years, the pendulum has swung from euphoric highs to artificially-adjusted lows, with the tenor of the relationship modulated by both sides in accordance with domestic and external needs. The current lows, however, coincide with the assumption of power by new leadership in both capitals, each seeking a new and more appropriate characterization of the ideal relationship with the other.

As the United States seeks an appropriate Russia policy, we must resist the temptation to simply continue the status quo or to shift to a more limited, constrained conception of Russia as a bundle of security problems. Instead, I would recommend an agenda for the renewal of the Russian-American relationship. Our chief policy objective should be the consolidation of a cooperative, productive relationship based on common security interests. The threats associated with the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction should be our primary focus. We must recognize and state explicitly that there is still a large set of common interests that we and the Russians have in the world. These are interests that neither of us can defend or advance as effectively alone as we can together.

Herein lies the continuing utility of the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction program. Not only has the Nunn-Lugar program made important contributions to our security but it has also provided a diplomatic basis for relationships with Russia. Through the ups and downs of the bilateral relationship, there has been one constant: the Nunn-Lugar program. Even during moments of greatest tension, when talks were broken off and trips were cancelled, Nunn-Lugar continued its important

work. In many ways, the program has represented the cornerstone and, at times, almost the totality, of the U.S.-Russian relationship. It has given expression to an area of cooperation where only competition might have existed, were it not for our common goal of dismantling the weapons of the Cold War.

The new Bush Administration is in the midst of a comprehensive review of U.S. policy towards Russia and our cooperative nonproliferation strategy. I applaud this initiative. In my view, there are no programs as critical to U.S. security as those aimed at containing and dismantling the nuclear, chemical, and biological warfare infrastructure of the former Soviet Union. The Administration must ensure that these efforts are managed effectively and funded properly. We must continue to place a priority on redressing the instability of the former Soviet arsenal by continuing and expanding joint approaches to eliminating weapons of mass destruction in Russia and in other countries all over the world.

But the Nunn-Lugar program is a tool, a means to an end. It is not foreign aid; it is not charity; and it is not a "carrot" to be withdrawn if Russian behavior is not "correct." Nunn-Lugar has prospered when U.S. policy towards Russia has been guided by a firm hand and a logical policy prescription. Nunn-Lugar cannot take the place of effective and coherent policy; in fact, it cannot operate without effective policy guidance.

Despite the success of the Nunn-Lugar programs, the threat to U.S. national security from proliferation remains. The Bush administration should use its nonproliferation review to develop a comprehensive plan that sets goals for securing the Russian arsenal and prescribes a step-by-step time-frame for achieving those goals.

Ultimately, the choice is stark. We can either spend resources today to eliminate the threat at its source, or we will be forced to spend much more tomorrow to defend ourselves from weapons and technology after they have proliferated.

We have a window of opportunity to reduce the threat of former Soviet weapons of mass destruction. Historically, no great power has ever possessed such an opportunity to work with a former adversary in removing the threat that confronts both of them. Statesmanship and patience will be required over many years.

I have been strengthened and sustained during the past ten years by my wife, Charlene, and sons Mark, John, and David who are present to share this honor with me. Ken Myers helped me, and Dick Combs helped Sam, draft and implement the legislation. We have been supported for years by Senators Pete Domenici, John Warner, Carl Levin, Joe Biden, Pat

Roberts, Ted Stevens and Chuck Hagel. We have been guided through Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazakstan by Colonel Jim Reid, Susan Cook, Roland LaJoie, Laura Holgate, Ash Carter, General Tom Kenning, and Bill Perry.

I look forward to continuing our important work to ensure that a decade from now, we have met this most urgent threat and secured a more peaceful future. As former Senate Majority Leader Howard Baker recently testified before a hearing I chaired of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee: "No cause is more important to the security of our country. The only thing we can't do is nothing -- and if we don't do it no one will."

I am grateful for the strong support provided for these endeavors by the Eisenhower Institute. Along with Sam Nunn, I thank you for the honor you have accorded us with the awarding of the 2001 Eisenhower Leadership Prize. When the United States toyed with the idea of turning inward after World War II, Dwight David Eisenhower helped to lead the country and his party into a new era of internationalism.

That same sense of enthusiasm and support, this time evidenced through the Institute that bears his name, gives Sam and me additional confidence that we are on the right side of history, along with all of you who share the practical and constructive idealism embodied in the Nunn-Lugar program.

Thank you.

From: Rachel Labush <rlabush@rac.org>
To:
Subject: Religious Leaders' Letter Against Federal Executions
Date: Tue, 8 May 2001 11:42:02 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

The religious leaders' letter to President Bush advocating a moratorium on federal executions will be delivered to him and his staff momentarily. Thank you very much to everyone who signed the letter and/or helped me gather signatures. I am attaching the letter in a format suitable for printing or e-mailing. It will be sent on our letterhead, but please feel free to put it on yours if you signed it.

I am also attaching our press release. If your denomination or organization is a signatory and does any press work, please consider issuing a statement of your own. Use any language from our press release that is useful to you. As you know, the religious community is in the forefront of the response to the scheduled federal execution of Timothy McVeigh, and the press is paying renewed attention to religious opposition to the death penalty. This is a good opportunity to remind the press and the general public that our opposition to the death penalty has been consistent and strong, and is not just a reaction to the McVeigh circus.

L'shalom,
Rachel

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 on RAC letterhead.doc>> <<050801moratorium.doc>>

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\Federal Moratorium on RAC letterhead.doc"

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\050801moratorium.doc"

RELIGIOUS ACTION CENTER OF REFORM JUDAISM

The Religious Action Center pursues social justice and religious liberty by mobilizing the American Jewish community and serving as its advocate in the nation's capital

2027 Massachusetts Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20036
Phone (202) 387- 2800
Fax (202) 667- 9070

Contact: Alexis Rice or Rachel Labush (202) 387-2800

PROMINENT RELIGIOUS LEADERS URGE BUSH TO ENACT A MORATORIUM ON FEDERAL EXECUTIONS

Letter to Bush notes: *“As men and women of faith, many of whom work to bring comfort and support to those who have suffered unspeakable grief, we know that their pain, and the pain of a community, a state or even a nation, cannot be healed through the retribution of capital punishment or by vengeance.”*

WASHINGTON, May 8, 2001 – Leaders from the Reform Jewish movement today joined a broad coalition of religious leaders urging President George W. Bush to enact a moratorium on federal executions and grant clemency to Timothy McVeigh and Juan Raul Garza. Mr. McVeigh’s execution, set for May 16, will be the first federal execution in almost forty years. Mr. Garza is scheduled to be executed on June 19.

Since 1959, the Central Conference of American Rabbis (CCAR) and the Union of American Hebrew Congregations (UAHC) have formally opposed the death penalty. The Reform Jewish leaders who signed the letter include Rabbi Eric Yoffie, President, Union of American Hebrew Congregations; Rabbi David Saperstein, Director, Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism; Rabbi Charles Kroloff, President, Central Conference of American Rabbis; Rabbi Paul J. Menitoff, Executive Vice President, Central Conference of American Rabbis; Ellen Y. Rosenberg, Executive Director, Women of Reform Judaism; and Judith Silverman, President of Women of Reform Judaism. Other Jewish leaders included Rabbi Vernon H. Kurtz, President of the Rabbinical Assembly, Rabbi Joel Meyers, Executive Vice President, The Rabbinical Assembly; Douglas Mirell, President, the Progressive Jewish Alliance; and Murray Polner, Chair, Jewish Peace Fellowship.

Voicing their strong moral and ethical support for a moratorium on executions, the religious leaders noted that “the purpose of a moratorium – a sustained opportunity for a conscientious and thorough examination of the administration of the federal death penalty – cannot be achieved while any executions take place.”

Among the other prominent religious leaders who signed the letter are Rev. Dr. Robert Edgar, General Secretary, National Council of Churches; the Most Reverend Frank Tracy Griswold, Presiding Bishop and Primate, Episcopal Church USA; Rev. Clifton Kirkpatrick, Stated Clerk of the General Assembly, Presbyterian Church U.S.A; Dr. Robert H. Roberts, Interim General Secretary, America Baptist Churches USA; Archbishop Nicholas Lambrou, Archbishop-Primate, Autocephalous Holy Eastern Orthodox Church, Archdiocese of the Americas; Rev. John H. Thomas, General Minister and President, United Church of Christ; Rev. Wesley Granberg-Michaelson, General Secretary, the Reformed Church in America; Joseph K. Grieboski, President, Institute on Religion and Public Policy; Dr. Richard L. Hamm, General Minister and President, Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) in the U.S. and Canada; Rev. Judy Mills Reimer, Executive Director, Church of the Brethren General Board; Rev. Dr. Joan Brown Campbell, the first clergywoman to serve as General Secretary of the National Council of Churches of Christ; and Sister Helen Prejean, Author, *Dead Man Walking*.

In addition, numerous other clergy and leaders of religious social justice groups signed the letter. They represent a range of denominations and organizations such as the Friends Committee on National Legislation (Quakers), Catholics Against Capital Punishment, and the American Ethical Union. (more)

The full text of the letter with signatories follows:

Dear President Bush:

On December 4, 2000, many of us wrote to President Clinton to urge him to declare an executive moratorium on federal executions and to grant clemency to Juan Raul Garza. At that time, Mr. Garza was scheduled to be the first individual executed under the federal death penalty in nearly forty years. Pressing the need for a moratorium on federal executions, we called upon President Clinton to respond decisively to questions that were troubling all Americans who care about fundamental fairness, due process and equal protection of law. A copy of this letter of December 4 is provided under cover of this correspondence.

As you know, on December 7, 2000, President Clinton granted a reprieve to Mr. Garza because he concluded that “the examination of possible racial and regional bias should be completed before the United States goes forward with an execution in a case that may implicate the very questions raised by the Justice Department's continuing study.” Mr. Garza now faces an execution date of June 19, 2001. It is our understanding that the Department of Justice study, which now also includes participation by independent investigators, is many months from completion. Certainly, it will be many more months before we will know how racial and geographic disparities affect the administration of the federal death penalty, and whether such disparities can be eliminated.

As we write to you, Timothy McVeigh is scheduled to be the first individual executed under the federal death penalty since 1963. We believe that even those who support capital punishment will agree **that no federal execution should proceed** until the questions raised by the initial DOJ survey are answered and the nation is assured that the federal death penalty is neither biased nor arbitrary in its application. These questions go to the very core of the American justice system. The purpose of a moratorium – a sustained opportunity for a conscientious and thorough examination of the administration of the federal death penalty – cannot be achieved while any executions take place.

As Americans, we could not fail to ask President Clinton to respond to systemic problems concerning the death penalty that have been in the news and on the minds of so many of our fellow citizens, and have produced a growing national support for a moratorium on executions. However, our letter was also clear in stating that “[t]he overwhelming majority of communities of faith are united in their opposition to the death penalty.” By urging President Clinton to grant clemency to Mr. Garza, we expressed our unequivocal support for rational and just alternatives to capital punishment such as life imprisonment. It is, above all, this message of faith that leaders of many different religious communities deliver to you today.

Our December 4 letter to President Clinton explained our opposition to capital punishment, which derives from our shared and strongly held belief in the sanctity of life and our certainty that when the government responds to violence with violence -- even to an act as horrific as the one which took the lives of 168 people in Oklahoma City – its action breeds more violence. As men and women of faith, many of whom work to bring comfort and support to those who have suffered unspeakable grief, we know that their pain, and the pain of a community, a state or even a nation, cannot be healed through the retribution of capital punishment or by vengeance.

May 16 and June 19 are fast approaching. We appeal to you in the strongest possible terms to grant clemency to Mr. McVeigh and Mr. Garza and to impose a moratorium on federal executions.

Sincerely,

Dr. Russell B. Barber, Former Religion & Ethics Editor, NBC Television, New York

Rev. Fred H. Beebe, Sr. Deacon, Holy Comforter Church, Welaka, FL

Rabbi Leonard Beerman, Los Angeles, CA

(more)

Kay Bengston, Assistant Director – Domestic Policy, Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

Herbert Blinder, Director, Washington Ethical Action Office, American Ethical Union

Rev. Monsignor Eugene J. Boyle, Chair Emeritus, Interfaith Council of Santa Clara County

Rev. John Buehrens, President, Unitarian Universalist Association of Congregations

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

Rev. Dr. Joan Brown Campbell

Janet Chisholm, Interim Co-Executive Director, Fellowship of Reconciliation

Craig Corbett, Clergy Member, Florida Annual Conference, The United Methodist Church

Carol Q. Cosby, Staff, Disciples Peace Fellowship

Richard Deats, Interim Co-Executive Director, Fellowship of Reconciliation

Marie Dennis, Director, Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns

Rev. Michael Dodd, Director, Columban Fathers Justice and Peace Office

Sister Audrey Doetzel, NDS, Director, Christian-Jewish Relation and Encounter, Sisters of Our Lady of Sion, Brooklyn, NY

Fr. Chuck Durante, Co-Chair, Life, Peace & Justice Commission of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Reno

Dr. Bob Edgar, General Secretary, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.

The Reverend Jess Gaither, Rector, St. John's Episcopal Church, Salem, New Jersey

Wesley Granberg-Michaelson, General Secretary, The Reformed Church in America

Joseph K. Grieboski, President, Institute on Religion and Public Policy, Inc.

The Most Reverend Frank T. Griswold, Presiding Bishop and Primate, Episcopal Church U.S.A.

Howard Hallman, Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice

Dr. Richard L. Hamm, General Minister and President, Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) in the United States and Canada

The Rt. Rev. Sanford Z. K. Hampton, Bishop Assistant, Diocese of Olympia (Episcopal)

Tiffany Heath, Interim Legislative Director, Church Women United D.C.

Joel Heim, Moderator, Disciples Peace Fellowship

Rev. Charles Hubbard, Pastor, Gloria Dei Lutheran Church (ELCA), Garland, Texas

Rev. Bernice Powell Jackson, Executive Minister, United Church of Christ

Rev. R. Burke Johnson, President, Moravian Church - Northern Province

The Rev. Sister Catherine Joy, CSF

The Rev. Dale R. Kelley, Pastor, Soldotna United Methodist Church, Alaska Missionary Conference, former Executive Director, Alaskans Against the Death Penalty

Rev. Clifton Kirkpatrick, Stated Clerk of the General Assembly, Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)

Rabbi Charles A. Kroloff, President, Central Conference of American Rabbis

Rabbi Vernon H. Kurtz, President, The Rabbinical Assembly

Archbishop Nicholas Lambrou, Archbishop-Primate, Autocephalous Holy Eastern Orthodox Church, Archdiocese of the Americas

Ven. Kobutsu Malone, zenji, Executive Director, The Engaged Zen Foundation, Ramsey, NJ

James C. McCloskey, Founder and Director, Centurion Ministries, Inc.

Rev. Melinda V. McLain, Editor, "The Pacific", newspaper for the Northern California Nevada Conference of the United Church of Christ

J. E. McNeil, Executive Director, Center on Conscience & War (formerly NISBCO)

Frank McNeirney, National Coordinator, Catholics Against Capital Punishment

Mary Ellen McNish, General Secretary, American Friends Service Committee

Rabbi Paul J. Menitoff, Executive Vice President, Central Conference of American Rabbis

Rabbi Joel H. Meyers, Executive Vice President, The Rabbinical Assembly

Douglas Mirell, President, Progressive Jewish Alliance

Sala Nolan, Minister for Criminal Justice and Human Rights, United Church of Christ

John D. Paarlberg, Minister for Social Witness and Worship, Reformed Church in America

Murray Polner, Chair, Jewish Peace Fellowship

Sister Helen Prejean, C.S.J., Honorary Chair, Moratorium 2000, and author, *Dead Man Walking*

Rev. Judy Mills Reimer, Executive Director, Church of the Brethren General Board

Dr. Robert H. Roberts, Interim General Secretary, American Baptist Churches USA

Ellen Y. Rosenberg, Executive Director, Women of Reform Judaism

Rabbi Peter J. Rubinstein, Senior Rabbi, Central Synagogue, New York City

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

Stuart A. Schlegel, Rector Emeritus, St. Luke's Episcopal Church, Los Gatos, California

Sister Susan Seitz, O.S.J., Pastoral Associate for Ministries, Cathedral of the Immaculate Conception, Tyler, Texas

Rita R. Semel, Executive Vice-Chair, San Francisco Interfaith Council

Russ Siler, Director, Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

Judith Silverman, President, Women of Reform Judaism

The Rev. Melodee Smith, Clergy Coalition to End Executions

Douglas Sturm, Professor of Religion, Emeritus, Bucknell University

Susan Teshu, Leader, American Ethical Union

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

Bishop James C. Timlin, Diocese of Scranton

Joe Volk, Executive Secretary, Friends Committee on National Legislation (Quakers)

Rev. Jim Wallis, Editor-in-Chief, *Sojourners*

Mr. James E. Winkler, General Secretary, General Board of Church and Society, United Methodist Church

Harmon L. Wray, Executive Director, Restorative Justice Ministries, The United Methodist Church

Rev. Dr. Aidsand Wright-Riggins, Executive Director of National Ministries, American Baptist Church U.S.A.

Rabbi Eric Yoffie, President, Union of American Hebrew Congregations

s the Washington office of the **Union of American Hebrew Congregations**
merica encompass **1.5 million Reform Jews**, and the **Central Conference of**
whose membership includes **over 1700 Reform rabbis**.

RELIGIOUS ACTION CENTER OF REFORM JUDAISM

The Religious Action Center pursues social justice and religious liberty by mobilizing the American Jewish community and serving as its advocate in the nation's capital

2027 Massachusetts Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20036
Phone (202) 387- 2800
Fax (202) 667- 9070

May 8th, 2001

The Honorable George Walker Bush
President of the United States
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear President Bush:

On December 4, 2000, many of us wrote to President Clinton to urge him to declare an executive moratorium on federal executions and to grant clemency to Juan Raul Garza. At that time, Mr. Garza was scheduled to be the first individual executed under the federal death penalty in nearly forty years. Pressing the need for a moratorium on federal executions, we called upon President Clinton to respond decisively to questions that were troubling all Americans who care about fundamental fairness, due process and equal protection of law. A copy of this letter of December 4 is provided under cover of this correspondence.

As you know, on December 7, 2000, President Clinton granted a reprieve to Mr. Garza because he concluded that “the examination of possible racial and regional bias should be completed before the United States goes forward with an execution in a case that may implicate the very questions raised by the Justice Department's continuing study.” Mr. Garza now faces an execution date of June 19, 2001. It is our understanding that the Department of Justice study, which now also includes participation by independent investigators, is many months from completion. Certainly, it will be many more months before we will know how racial and geographic disparities affect the administration of the federal death penalty, and whether such disparities can be eliminated.

As we write to you, Timothy McVeigh is scheduled to be the first individual executed under the federal death penalty since 1963. We believe that even those who support capital punishment will agree **that no federal execution should proceed** until the questions raised by the initial DOJ survey are answered and the nation is assured that the federal death penalty is neither biased nor arbitrary in its application. These questions go to the very core of the American justice system. The purpose of a moratorium – a sustained opportunity for a conscientious and

thorough examination of the administration of the federal death penalty – cannot be achieved while any executions take place.

As Americans, we could not fail to ask President Clinton to respond to systemic problems concerning the death penalty that have been in the news and on the minds of so many of our fellow citizens, and have produced a growing national support for a moratorium on executions. However, our letter was also clear in stating that “[t]he overwhelming majority of communities of faith are united in their opposition to the death penalty.” By urging President Clinton to grant clemency to Mr. Garza, we expressed our unequivocal support for rational and just alternatives to capital punishment such as life imprisonment. It is, above all, this message of faith that leaders of many different religious communities deliver to you today.

Our December 4 letter to President Clinton explained our opposition to capital punishment, which derives from our shared and strongly held belief in the sanctity of life and our certainty that when the government responds to violence with violence -- even to an act as horrific as the one which took the lives of 168 people in Oklahoma City – its action breeds more violence. As men and women of faith, many of whom work to bring comfort and support to those who have suffered unspeakable grief, we know that their pain, and the pain of a community, a state or even a nation, cannot be healed through the retribution of capital punishment or by vengeance.

May 16 and June 19 are fast approaching. We appeal to you in the strongest possible terms to grant clemency to Mr. McVeigh and Mr. Garza and to impose a moratorium on federal executions.

Sincerely,

Dr. Russell B. Barber

Former Religion & Ethics Editor, NBC Television, New York

Rev. Fred H. Beebe

Senior Deacon, Holy Comforter Church, Welaka, FL

Rabbi Leonard Beerman

Los Angeles, CA

Kay Bengston

Assistant Director – Domestic Policy, Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

Herbert Blinder

Director, Washington Ethical Action Office, American Ethical Union

Rev. Monsignor Eugene J. Boyle

Chair Emeritus, Interfaith Council of Santa Clara County

Rev. John Buehrens

President, Unitarian Universalist Association of Congregations

J. Daryl Byler

Director, Mennonite Central Committee U.S., Washington Office

Rev. Dr. Joan Brown Campbell

Janet Chisholm

Interim Co-Executive Director, Fellowship of Reconciliation

Rev. Craig Corbett,

Florida Annual Conference, The United Methodist Church

Carol Q. Cosby

Disciples Peace Fellowship

Richard Deats

Interim Co-Executive Director, Fellowship of Reconciliation

Marie Dennis

Director, Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns

Rev. Michael Dodd

Director, Columban Fathers Justice and Peace Office

Sister Audrey Doetzel, NDS

Director, Christian-Jewish Relation and Encounter, Sisters of Our Lady of Sion, Brooklyn, NY

Fr. Chuck Durante

Co-Chair, Life, Peace & Justice Commission of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Reno

Dr. Bob Edgar

General Secretary, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.

The Rev. Jess Gaither

Rector, St. John's Episcopal Church, Salem, New Jersey

Rev. Wesley Granberg-Michaelson

General Secretary, The Reformed Church in America

Joseph K. Grieboski

President, Institute on Religion and Public Policy, Inc.

The Most Reverend Frank T. Griswold
Presiding Bishop and Primate, Episcopal Church U.S.A.

Howard Hallman
Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice

Dr. Richard L. Hamm
General Minister and President, Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) in the United States and Canada

The Rt. Rev. Sanford Z. K. Hampton
Bishop Assistant, Diocese of Olympia (Episcopal)

Tiffany Heath
Interim Legislative Director, Church Women United D.C.

Joel Heim
Moderator, Disciples Peace Fellowship

Rev. Charles Hubbard
Pastor, Gloria Dei Lutheran Church (ELCA), Garland, Texas

Rev. Bernice Powell Jackson
Executive Minister, United Church of Christ

Rev. R. Burke Johnson
President, Moravian Church - Northern Province

The Rev. Sister Catherine Joy, CSF

The Rev. Dale R. Kelley
Pastor, Soldotna United Methodist Church, Alaska Missionary Conference, former Executive Director, Alaskans Against the Death Penalty

Rev. Clifton Kirkpatrick
Stated Clerk of the General Assembly, Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)

Rabbi Charles A. Kroloff
President, Central Conference of American Rabbis

Rabbi Vernon H. Kurtz
President, The Rabbinical Assembly

Archbishop Nicholas Lambrou
Archbishop-Primate, Autocephalous Holy Eastern Orthodox Church, Archdiocese of the Americas

Ven. Kobutsu Malone

Zenji, Executive Director, The Engaged Zen Foundation, Ramsey, NJ

James C. McCloskey

Founder and Director, Centurion Ministries, Inc.

Rev. Melinda V. McLain

Editor, *The Pacific*, newspaper for the Northern California Nevada Conference of the United Church of Christ

J. E. McNeil

Executive Director, Center on Conscience & War (formerly NISBCO)

Frank McNeirney

National Coordinator, Catholics Against Capital Punishment

Mary Ellen McNish

General Secretary, American Friends Service Committee

Rabbi Paul J. Menitoff

Executive Vice President, Central Conference of American Rabbis

Rabbi Joel H. Meyers

Executive Vice President, The Rabbinical Assembly

Douglas Mirell

President, Progressive Jewish Alliance

Rev. Sala Nolan,

Minister for Criminal Justice and Human Rights, United Church of Christ

Rev. John D. Paarlberg

Minister for Social Witness and Worship, Reformed Church in America

Murray Polner

Chair, Jewish Peace Fellowship

Sister Helen Prejean, C.S.J.

Honorary Chair, Moratorium 2000, and author, *Dead Man Walking*

Rev. Judy Mills Reimer

Executive Director, Church of the Brethren General Board

Dr. Robert H. Roberts

Interim General Secretary, American Baptist Churches USA

Ellen Y. Rosenberg

Executive Director, Women of Reform Judaism

Rabbi Peter J. Rubinstein

Senior Rabbi, Central Synagogue, New York City

Rabbi David Saperstein

Director, Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism

Stuart A. Schlegel

Rector Emeritus, St. Luke's Episcopal Church, Los Gatos, California

Sister Susan Seitz, O.S.J.

Pastoral Associate for Ministries, Cathedral of the Immaculate Conception, Tyler, Texas

Rita R. Semel

Executive Vice-Chair, San Francisco Interfaith Council

Russ Siler

Director, Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

Judith Silverman

President, Women of Reform Judaism

The Rev. Melodee Smith

Clergy Coalition to End Executions

Douglas Sturm

Professor of Religion, Emeritus, Bucknell University

Susan Teshu

Leader, American Ethical Union

Rev. John H. Thomas

General Minister and President, United Church of Christ

Bishop James C. Timlin

Diocese of Scranton

Joe Volk

Executive Secretary, Friends Committee on National Legislation (Quakers)

Rev. Jim Wallis

Editor-in-Chief, *Sojourners*

Mr. James E. Winkler

General Secretary, General Board of Church and Society, United Methodist Church

Harmon L. Wray

Executive Director, Restorative Justice Ministries, The United Methodist Church

Rev. Dr. Aidsand Wright-Riggins

Executive Director of National Ministries, American Baptist Church U.S.A.

Rabbi Eric Yoffie

President, Union of American Hebrew Congregations

Cc: Alberto R. Gonzales, Chris Bartolomucci, Andrew H. Card, John Bridgeland

Reply-To: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
From: "Brink Campaign" <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
To: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
Subject: FW: Agenda for meeting next week
Date: Tue, 8 May 2001 02:16:23 -0400
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6600
Importance: Normal

Reminder about meeting on Thursday May 10, 1:30 -3:30 PM at PSR's new offices at 1875 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1012.

AGENDA

1. Update on Recent De-alerting Activities
 - statewide efforts (IN, ME, NM)
 - media (response to Bush speech)
 - GAO Request
 - Justice project meeting
 - Welden project
2. Responding to Bush's New Nuclear Policy--de-alerting focus
 - criteria
 - timing
 - message (PSR's new research)
 - editorial board contacts
 - grassroots action (through summer)
3. Legislation
 - update on Senate and House
 - Nuclear Threat Reduction Act (Justice Project Project)
4. New materials?

Get your FREE download of MSN Explorer at <http://explorer.msn.com>

Reply-To: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
From: "Brink Campaign" <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
To: "Howard Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Indiana letter response
Date: Tue, 8 May 2001 03:23:50 -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

Thanks, Howard. Let's hope this moves the letter on. I'll be in touch. Did you receive the notice about our strategy meeting for this Thursday, at PSR's new offices? I hope you can attend.

Esther

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2001 10:49 AM
To: kjulian@inareaumc.org
Subject: Letter to Senator Lugar on de-alerting

Dear Bishop White:

We greatly appreciate your signing the letter from Indiana religious leaders to Senators Lugar and Bayh on the issue of de-alerting the nuclear arsenal. You have been joined by leaders from other denominations. The final version and list of signers is attached.

We are wondering if you would be willing to transmit the letter to the two senators. With the hope that you will, I have drafted a transmittal letter, which you can adapt as you see fit. It is attached.

Our next step is to circulate the letter within the Indiana religious community and encourage others to contact Senators Lugar and Bayh on the de-alerting issue.

Thanks for your support for this effort. If there are any questions, please have your Ms. Julian call me at 301 896-0013. Please let me know when the letter goes out.

Shalom,
Howard W. Hallman

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
www.backfromthebrink.org

Reply-To: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
From: "Brink Campaign" <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: Letter to Senator Lugar on de-alerting
Date: Tue, 8 May 2001 03:26:15 -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

Thanks, Howard. Let us know when he does this.
Esther

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2001 10:49 AM
To: kjulian@inareaumc.org
Subject: Letter to Senator Lugar on de-alerting

Dear Bishop White:

We greatly appreciate your signing the letter from Indiana religious leaders to Senators Lugar and Bayh on the issue of de-alerting the nuclear arsenal. You have been joined by leaders from other denominations. The final version and list of signers is attached.

We are wondering if you would be willing to transmit the letter to the two senators. With the hope that you will, I have drafted a transmittal letter, which you can adapt as you see fit. It is attached.

Our next step is to circulate the letter within the Indiana religious community and encourage others to contact Senators Lugar and Bayh on the de-alerting issue.

Thanks for your support for this effort. If there are any questions, please have your Ms. Julian call me at 301 896-0013. Please let me know when the letter goes out.

Shalom,
Howard W. Hallman

Date: Tue, 08 May 2001 19:02:25 -0400
From: "L. William Yolton" <lwyolton@prodigy.net>
User-Agent: Mozilla/5.0 (Windows; U; Win98; en-US; m18) Gecko/20010131 Netscape6/6.01
X-Accept-Language: en
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: May 15 meeting of Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Same for me.

--Bill

Howard W. Hallman wrote:

> Dear Colleagues:

>
> I've heard from two people that on May 15 they will be involved in an
> all-day meeting of the Center for Conscience and War. Will that involved a
> number of others from the faith community? If so, should we postpone the
> meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament until Tuesday,
> May 22.

>
> Please let me know. But don't take May 15 off your calendar until I get
> back in touch with you.

>
> 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.

>
>

Date: Tue, 8 May 2001 20:57:27 -0400
From: Lonnie & Fran Turner <76622.637@compuserve.com>
Subject: May 15 meeting of Interfaith Committee for Nuclear
Disarmament
Sender: Lonnie & Fran Turner <76622.637@compuserve.com>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>

Dear Howard:

The 22/May would work better for me. I have to be out of town on the 15th.

Shalom!
Lonnie

To: mupj@igc.org
Date: Wed, 9 May 2001 10:39:47 -0400
Subject: Re: Paying Casa del Pueblo
X-Mailer: Juno 5.0.27
From: Dwight O Smith <dosmith6@juno.com>

Dear Howard,

I'm sorry it has taken so long to reply to your email. According to Kris' data, a total of \$2487 was sent to Casa del Pueblo last year. This doesn't agree with the data I have which indicates that the full \$3300 was sent. I plan to set up a meeting with Kris after the church audit is completed to resolve the difference.

Thanks for your input,

Dwight

On Tue, 10 Apr 2001 08:58:21 -0400 "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> writes:

> Dear Dwight,

>

> Here is a copy of a message I sent on March 19 to you and Ron

> regarding

> payment to Casa del Pueblo. It didn't go through to you because I

> didn't

> have your new address.

>

> Howard

>

> ###

>

> Dear Ron and Dwight,

>

> I met today with Dr. Hal Recinos, pastor of Casa del Pueblo, because

> I am

> going to help them with grant writing. In the process I gained a

> better

> understanding of their needs. One need is to pay off their van,

> for

> monthly payments are a drain on current income.

>

> I'm not sure where we are with our payments to Casa del Pueblo from

> the

> Building for the Future Fund. The last report I have shows that we

> have

> paid \$2,006 of the original allocation of \$3,300. I don't know

> whether

> another payment has been made. Nor do I know whether there was

> reimbursement to George Patrick for supplies for our January work.

> Whatever is the case I suggest that we pay the balance of the

> \$3,300

> allocation (which they have requested) and the \$1,000 allocated for
> 2001.

> This sum would go to help pay for their van, which is the kind of
> capital

> expense appropriate for Building for the Future Fund.

>

> If you have any questions, please call me at 301 897-3668.

>

> Shalom,

> Howard

>

>

>

>

Reply-To: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
From: "Brink Campaign" <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
To: <nuclear@wand.org>, "Tracey Moavero" <tmoavero@peace-action.org>,
"Tim Barner" <kathytim@earthlink.net>,
"Natalie Hildt" <natalie@2020vision.org>,
"Martin Butcher" <mbutcher@psr.org>, "Kimberly Robson" <wand@wand.org>,
"Kimberly Roberts" <kroberts@psr.org>,
"Kathy Guthrie" <kathy@fcnl.org>,
"Kathy Crandall" <kathycrandall@disarmament.org>,
"Joe Volk" <joe@fcnl.org>, "Jim Wyerman" <jwyerman@2020vision.org>,
"Ira Shorr" <irashorr@hotmail.com>,
"Gillian Gilhool" <ggilhool@ix.netcom.com>,
"Deedie Runkel" <drunkel@peacelinks.org>,
"David Culp" <david@fcnl.org>, "Daryl Kimball" <dkimball@clw.org>,
"Arjun Makhijani" <arjun@ieer.org>, "Ann Gallivan" <agallivan@psr.org>,
"Howard Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>

Subject: Brink Legislative Meeting
Date: Tue, 8 May 2001 23:47:21 -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

This is to confirm the meeting at PSR, 1875 Connecticut Ave. NW, Suite 1012,
at 1:30 PM tomorrow, Thursday, 5/10.

The agenda is predominately to discuss legislative strategy options along
with plans for media and grassroots responses to Bush's proposals.

Hope to see you there.
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
www.backfromthebrink.org

Reply-To: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
From: "Brink Campaign" <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
To: "Tracey Moavero" <tmoavero@peace-action.org>,
"Tim Barner" <kathytim@earthlink.net>,
"Natalie Hildt" <natalie@2020vision.org>,
"Martin Butcher" <mbutcher@psr.org>, "Kimberly Robson" <>wand@wand.org>,
"Kimberly Roberts" <kroberts@psr.org>,
"Kathy Guthrie" <kathy@fcnl.org>,
"Kathy Crandall" <kathycrandall@disarmament.org>,
"Joe Volk" <joe@fcnl.org>, "Jim Wyerman" <jwyerman@2020vision.org>,
"Ira Shorr" <irashorr@hotmail.com>, "Howard Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>,
"Gillian Gilhool" <ggilhool@ix.netcom.com>,
"Deedie Runkel" <drunkel@peacelinks.org>,
"David Culp" <david@fcnl.org>, "Daryl Kimball" <dkimball@clw.org>,
"Carlean Ponder \ (WAND\)" <nuclear@wand.org>,
"Ann Gallivan" <agallivan@psr.org>, "Arjun Makhijani" <arjun@ieer.org>

Subject: Legislation to be reviewed tomorrow

Date: Wed, 9 May 2001 04:16:20 -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

Here is a copy of the latest Nuclear Threat Reduction Act (NTRA) from the Justice Project (Alan Cranston's Lobby organization), part of a larger discussion tomorrow on legislative options for de-alerting.

See you there.

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
www.backfromthebrink.org

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\NTRA2001.doc"

May 2, 2001 (F1)

NUCLEAR THREAT REDUCTION ACT OF 2001

The end of the Cold War a decade ago brought with it the promise of a more peaceful world. As the Berlin Wall came down, old enmities between Eastern and Western blocs dramatically decreased. Russia presents a diminished threat to the US, and the two countries have engaged in a wide range of cooperative efforts—from the expansion of economic ties, to joint military activities, to the space station.

Nevertheless, these two former adversaries continue to maintain enormous nuclear arsenals, with the only plausible targets of such massive destructive power being each other. Former Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, pointing out how preposterous this situation is, has noted a simple truth: “We are not going to attack you, and you are not going to attack us.” President Bush, in his May 1, 2001, speech at the National Defense University (NDU), sounded a similar note with respect to U.S.-Russia relations: “We are not and must not become strategic adversaries.” Earlier, as a candidate, he had said, “The Cold War logic that led to the creation of massive stockpiles on both sides is now outdated,” and he called unneeded nuclear weapons in the U.S. arsenal “expensive relics of dead conflicts.”

Despite the great opportunities that the last ten years presented for a new era of security and safety from nuclear attack, the promise has not yet been realized. In fact, in many ways the dangers posed by nuclear weapons have actually increased during this time—not in the sense of a global war but by the heightened risk of their actual use due to accident, miscalculation, or terrorism. The risk of a nuclear attack still poses the greatest single threat to our survival.

Russia and the United States each have thousands of nuclear warheads on high alert, ready to launch in minutes. At the same time, dire economic conditions in Russia have forced severe cutbacks in the maintenance of its nuclear infrastructure—including its nuclear early warning, surveillance, and command and control systems. Russia has a vast stockpile of weapons-grade materials that it cannot safeguard fully and a large cadre of nuclear weapons scientists, many of whose salaries it cannot afford. These materials and expertise are prime targets for rogue states and terrorist groups who may want to threaten us or our allies and friends.

Left unchanged, this set of circumstances creates not just the risk, but in the view of some experts, the distinct possibility of a nuclear attack on American citizens, either at home or abroad. The steps called for in the Nuclear Threat Reduction Act of 2001 (NTRA) respond to these concerns. They will set the nation on a course of action substantially decreasing these dangers and creating a safer world for our children and generations to come. While there are a number of initiatives under consideration for accomplishing this goal, the NTRA is focused on pragmatic and effective steps that can be taken now and on which there is a broad consensus. The NTRA also encourages sharing with other major powers the burden of supporting initiatives that will make the

world safer for all nations. The following is a brief summary of the three principal provisions of the Act.

1. Reducing the Number of Nuclear Warheads. Currently there are more than 30,000 nuclear warheads worldwide. It is estimated that the U.S. has 10,500 and Russia, 20,000. Of the U.S. total, 7,200 are strategic (long-range); and of the Russian total, 6,000. As noted, Presidential candidate George W. Bush described as “outdated” the thinking that gave rise to such large numbers. Thus, he proposed unilateral reductions and declared that “it should be possible to reduce the number of American nuclear weapons significantly” below the START II level (3,000-3,500 strategic warheads each) “without compromising our security in any way.” In his NDU speech, President Bush reiterated his commitment to reductions, stating, “My goal is to move quickly to reduce nuclear forces.” Likewise, Russian President Vladimir Putin has proposed that the U.S. and Russia each go down to 1,500 or fewer strategic warheads.

The NTRA would enable President Bush to, in his words, “lead by example” by repealing the provision of law prohibiting the President from reducing the number of nuclear warheads below the START I level (approximately 6,000). The Act also expresses the sense of the Congress that the President should undertake unilateral reductions below the 2,000 to 2,500 warheads currently envisioned under a START III treaty—more than enough to counter any potential attack—and to the lowest possible number consistent with the national security needs of the United States. In addition, the Act states that it is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) these reductions, in keeping with U.S. obligations under the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, are intended as permanent reductions in the U.S. force;

(2) the President should make efforts to ensure that Russia undertakes parallel reductions and should offer enhanced consultation and cooperation in the reduction process, as well as a strengthening of transparency, confidence-building, and predictability in their respective programs;

(3) unilateral reductions undertaken by the U.S. and Russia should be followed by agreements that would make the reductions transparent and verifiable; and

(4) the President should engage in further consultation with the Russian Federation regarding the steps that the two nations respectively have taken to implement the 1991 and 1992 understandings between President Bush and Presidents Gorbachev and Yeltsin regarding reductions in tactical nuclear weapons.

2. Taking Nuclear Weapons off High Alert Status. Both the U.S. and Russia have made significant reductions in their nuclear warheads and have altered the alert status of some of their delivery systems. However, it is also true that both sides retain prompt retaliatory war plans and are poised to “launch on warning,” that is, to launch nuclear missiles immediately if they believe they are under a nuclear-missile attack. In the event

of a perceived attack, U.S. or Russian leaders would have a terribly constrained time—about 3 to 12 minutes—in which to decide whether to launch a nuclear counter-attack. While this is disturbing in terms of U.S. decision-making, it is of greater concern in terms of the Russian system, with the gaps in its early-warning network.

As a candidate, President Bush contended that the US “should remove as many weapons as possible from high-alert, hair-trigger status” because an excess number “on high alert may create unacceptable risks of accidental or unauthorized launch.” Lower alert rates would lead to much safer nuclear postures.

This task requires immediate attention. The budget crisis facing the Russian military threatens to undermine the entire Russian system of command and control over the nuclear arsenal. Discernible erosion has already occurred. A strong case can be made that the Russian nuclear arsenal is an accident waiting to happen.

The NTRA expresses the sense of the Congress that the President should immediately take off high alert the maximum number of nuclear warheads that he deems in the national interest, beginning with those on missiles earmarked for dismantling or elimination under START II. This would include 1,268 warheads on land- and submarine-based missiles. The Act further states that it is the sense of the Congress that the President should—

- (1) make efforts to ensure that Russia responds in kind and offer Russia enhanced consultation and cooperation in removing weapons from high alert;
- (2) seek to follow up parallel changes in operational alert status with agreements that would make the changes transparent and verifiable; and
- (3) work with other nuclear states to ensure that all nuclear weapons are on as low alert status as possible.

3. Accelerating Programs to Prevent Diversion of Russian Nuclear Weapons, Materials, and Expertise: The 1991 Nunn-Lugar legislation launched an effort to prevent the nuclear chaos that the break-up of the Soviet Union threatened. Today, the Departments of Energy, State, and Defense conduct an array of nonproliferation programs in and in cooperation with Russia. These programs help Russia to reduce its nuclear arsenal; secure and safeguard the enormous quantities of nuclear weapons-grade uranium and plutonium in the Russian inventory; convert that material to non-weapons-grade levels; and prevent a “brain drain” of Russian nuclear weapons expertise to countries or terrorist groups who would like to develop or enhance their nuclear capability. These are tremendously important tasks. The U.S. should be proceeding at an accelerated pace matching the urgency of the situation and also working with our allies to increase their contributions substantially.

Russia at one point (in 1986) had 40,000 nuclear warheads and over 1,000 metric tons of nuclear materials. While significant reductions have been made, Russia still has a

huge active and inactive inventory and a large cadre of rocket scientists, nuclear physicists and other weapons experts, either unemployed or living on extremely low incomes, who are having a hard time meeting basic needs. According to a bipartisan Task Force headed by Senator Howard Baker and former White House Counsel Lloyd Cutler, “The most urgent unmet national security threat to the United States today is the danger that weapons of mass destruction or weapons-usable material in Russia could be stolen and sold to terrorists or hostile nation states and used against American troops abroad or citizens at home.”

The Baker-Cutler Task Force reviewed the Department of Energy’s nonproliferation programs. Their January 10, 2001, report strongly endorsed these programs and suggested that their goals could be achieved in eight to ten years if support were increased from the present level, less than one quarter of one percent of our annual defense budget, to about one percent of the defense budget. Such increased support would bring these programs more into line with the immediacy and scope of the dangers that they address. Also, in the words of the Task Force, “The national security benefits to U.S. citizens from securing and/or neutralizing the equivalent of more than 80,000 nuclear weapons and potential nuclear weapons would constitute the highest return on investment in any current U.S. national security and defense program.”

Presidential candidate Bush addressed these programs as follows, “I will ask Congress to increase substantially our assistance to dismantle as many of Russia’s weapons as possible as quickly as possible.” Secretary of State Colin Powell, during his confirmation hearing, said of the objectives of the Baker-Cutler Task Force, “I agree with them entirely.”

The NTRA endorses the approach of the Baker-Cutler report and seeks to accelerate the Russian nonproliferation programs because doing so is clearly in the interest of our national security.

The NTRA focuses on near-term funding needs and authorizes appropriations of \$1.4 billion for FY 2002 for the DOE nonproliferation programs. Appropriate increases to DOD and State nonproliferation programs should also be considered. Also, consistent with the Task Force recommendations, the NTRA urges the President—

(1) to seek greater contributions from other major powers, such as the European Union, Japan, and Canada, for this effort, which would include the approximately \$800 million in commitments that the U.S. is seeking from them for the Russian plutonium disposition program; and

(2) to work with the Russian government to increase its budget share devoted to these programs and to create the capacity in Russia to continue these efforts unaided after 2011.

The NTRA also requires that the President, as recommended by the Task Force, formulate and submit to the Congress a strategic plan to secure and neutralize over the

next eight years all weapons-usable material in Russia and to prevent the outflow of scientific expertise that could be used for nuclear or other weapons of mass destruction. The plan would be required to include the administrative and organizational changes necessary to provide effective coordination of these programs and to reflect the priority that the President attaches to them.

Finally, to provide an additional source of support for nonproliferation programs with Russia, the NTRA requires the President to submit to the Congress by April 1, 2002, a report on the feasibility and desirability of establishing with Russia a program of “debt for security.” Such a program has been suggested by Senator Richard Lugar. Under this concept, a portion of Russia’s debts to various major powers, including the U.S., would be forgiven in exchange for Russia agreeing to deposit funds (in Russian currency) into an account that would be dedicated to carrying out specified nonproliferation activities. If successful, the program could support a substantial portion of Russia’s securing, accounting for, and neutralizing its nuclear weapons and fissile materials. Based on the President’s report, Congress could consider the enactment of authority for the U.S. to participate in such a program next year.

Conclusion

The driving force behind the NTRA is the desire to develop a strong, bipartisan effort to create a safer, more secure world for America and all of humankind. It is particularly noteworthy that the U.S. effort to prevent the diversion of Russian nuclear materials and expertise has been epitomized by bipartisan cooperation—by both Senators Nunn and Lugar in their original legislation and the Baker-Cutler Task Force. In that spirit and building on directions set forth by President Bush, the NTRA contains pragmatic and effective steps to reduce the nuclear dangers we face as urgently as possible.

To: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Indiana letter response
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <NEBBKJHCMLACLOPKCPPBOEKNCCAA.prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
References:

At 03:23 AM 5/8/01 -0400, you wrote:

>Thanks, Howard. Let's hope this moves the letter on. I'll be in touch. Did
>you receive the notice about our strategy meeting for this Thursday, at
>PSR's new offices? I hope you can attend.

Esther,

I received your notice last week and the agenda today. So I'm getting your e-mail.

Howard

To: jhanson@umc-gbcs.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Nunn-Turner proposal
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\abolish.345.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Jaydee,

I am sending as an attachment the first eight pages of the proposal that I submitted to the Nunn-Turner initiative in January. It builds upon ideas developed during the past year and a half with participants in the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. In general they approve of my seeking funds for a larger endeavor, but I don't claim that this proposal has the specific endorsement of this ad hoc coalition.

I hope what that Rodney Shaw wants to do can relate to this initiative and complement rather than duplicate it. We certainly don't need competing Methodist proposals to the foundation world.

We can talk about this tomorrow when we meet.

Shalom,
Howard

From: "C. Dale White" <dwhite12@earthlink.net>
To: "Teri" <cehodeh@candw.ky>, "Susan" <sjgray@juno.com>,
"Nancy Smith" <smitheds@ici.net>, "Mia" <ejali@gbgm-umc.org>,
"Marty" <MARTHAMORRISON@aol.com>, "Lloyd" <lea@unlinfo.edu>,
"Lisa" <lisasion@hotmail.com>, "Levi" <levindjeck@email/.man.con>,
"Lee and Bonnie" <LADKINS@sover.net>, "Kendra" <blissfulkb@aol.com>,
"Kay" <KBues@aol.com>,
"Judy Sizer" <sizer@mhdma.moorhead.msus.edu.net>,
"Johnson's" <JUEV_Johnson@juno.com>, "John" <blairlines@juno.com>,
"Jody" <jmf@fertig.com>, "Jackie" <jackiebill@tecinfo.com>,
"Howard Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>, "Davison's" <jimnand1@aol.com>,
"Carol" <CDavison12@aol.com>, "Camille" <aldhomes@bellsouth.net>,
"Becky" <bblair@rsa.security.com>,
"Anne" <we-av.roth@worldnet.att.net>

Subject: New e-mail address.

Date: Fri, 11 May 2001 13:17:12 -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 V5.50.4133.2400

My e-mail went belly-up. Here is my new address, thanks to my genius consultant.

dwhite12@earthlink.net

Gwen's separate account.

gwenwhite12@earthlink.net

Dale White

"Washington Asks Seoul To Boost Understanding On Missile Defense"
Korea Times - May 11, 2001 - Son Key-young and Seo Soo-min, Staff Reporters

A U.S. delegation, headed by Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage, requested South Korean officials to squarely look at the changing international security environment and boost their understanding on the U.S. missile defense plan, which is one element of the "strategic framework" envisioned by the Bush administration, at a roundtable session here yesterday....

According to Armitage, the strategic framework, under formulation by the Bush administration, consists of four elements: nonproliferation, counterproliferation, missile defense and the unilateral reduction of nuclear arsenals below the level envisioned by START II.

Officials here said that nonproliferation refers mainly to diplomatic efforts to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, while counterproliferation might involve military strikes to stop proliferation.

To: mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Four elements of Bush strategic framework
Cc:
Bcc: icnd
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Colleagues:

The Bush Administration has three teams touring the globe to sell national missile defense. Below is an excerpt from a news story on the visit to South Korea by Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage. He explained that there are four elements to the Bush strategic framework that is under development: nonproliferation, counterproliferation, missile defense and the unilateral reduction of nuclear arsenals. We may need to be concerned about counter-proliferation as well as national missile defense.

Howard

###

"Washington Asks Seoul To Boost Understanding On Missile Defense"
Korea Times - May 11, 2001 - Son Key-young and Seo Soo-min, Staff Reporters

A U.S. delegation, headed by Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage, requested South Korean officials to squarely look at the changing international security environment and boost their understanding on the U.S. missile defense plan, which is one element of the ``strategic framework" envisioned by the Bush administration, at a roundtable session here yesterday....

According to Armitage, the strategic framework, under formulation by the Bush administration, consists of four elements: nonproliferation, counterproliferation, missile defense and the unilateral reduction of nuclear arsenals below the level envisioned by START II.

Officials here said that nonproliferation refers mainly to diplomatic efforts to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, while counterproliferation might involve military strikes to stop proliferation.

From: Starman Wendy <wstarman@wesleysem.edu>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: National missile defense
Date: Fri, 11 May 2001 08:42:02 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

Howard,

Would you like us to post this note and sample letter on our Web site?

Wendy

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Wednesday, May 02, 2001 8:03 AM
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: National missile defense

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Dear Colleagues,

Now that President Bush has laid down a public challenge for national missile defense, we need to respond vigorously. I urge you to have your organization write the president in opposition to national missile defense and to get your grassroots networks to do likewise. You might send out a news release to your denominational press. You may also contact members of Congress and have your grassroots do likewise to register opposition to national missile defense.

Three reasons for our opposition were stated in the sign-on letter of March 5, 2001. I am attaching a copy along with the list of signers.

Shalom,
Howard

To: Starman Wendy <wstarman@wesleysem.edu>

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

Subject: RE: National missile defense

Cc:

Bcc:

X-Attachments:

In-Reply-To: <DC1977460103D311B0DE0060943F439F636F22@WESLEY-EXCH1>

References:

At 08:42 AM 5/11/01 -0400, you wrote:

>Howard,

>

>Would you like us to post this note and sample letter on our Web site?

>

>Wendy

It's all right with me. Thanks for doing so.

Howard

X-Sender: dkimball@[63.106.26.66]
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)
Date: Mon, 14 May 2001 12:53:20 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: NMD/Deep Cuts Mtg. follow-up; next mtg. 6/1

May 14, 2001

TO: Coalition members and friends

RE: Followup on NMD/Deep Cuts Wkg. Grp. Mtg, 5/6; revised strategy; calendar

FR: Daryl Kimball, Victoria Samson

Thanks to everyone who contributed to our last NMD/Deep Cuts Working Group Meeting on Friday May 4.

The next meeting is scheduled for June 1 from 9:30-11:00am at UCS, 1707 H St. NW, and is open to Coalition members and like-minded groups.

In the meantime, there is much to do. The following is:

- * a list of the most time-urgent tasks and assignments
- * an updated NMD strategy outline
- * an updated calendar of NMD-related events.

Thank you,

- DK & VS

NMD/Deep Cuts Working Group Near-term Assignments, May 4, 2001

Bush's May 1 speech implies that the United States will, at some point, likely violate and/or withdraw from the ABM Treaty in the Bush Administration's attempt to research and deploy a multi-layered NMD system. There is also the distinct possibility that a more explicit NMD proposal will be announced by late-May or early June.

With this in mind, the NMD/Deep Cuts Working Group agreed to pursue work on the following items ASAP:

- * lining up "validators" skeptical of NMD - Spurgeon Keeny and John Isaacs
- * the Coalition will look into putting together small NGO experts delegation to the UK, Denmark, France, Brussels to provide "counterbriefings"
- Greenpeace will report what their European offices are doing

* PSR will collect newspaper editorials skeptical of NMD and will work with WAND and the Coalition staff to distribute these to the Hill and other key policy-makers. The Coalition will also produce an issue brief based on excerpts from the editorials.

* FCNL will organize briefings for House staff on key NMD topics and lobbying

* John Isaacs, Daryl Kimball and UCS to create list of Congressional offices to contact and will arrange meetings

* Back from the Brink will use its new PR person to release info about de-alerting

* John Rhinelander is writing a Coalition Issue Brief on the ABM Treaty and its continued relevance to be completed by May 22

* Phil Coyle at CDI will do milestone analysis of various missile defense programs and when they run into the limitations of the ABM treaty; CDI will also prepare a budgetary analysis of NMD

* the Coalition may organize a press briefing on May 24 on NMD, the ABM Treaty and strategic deterrence in the run up to the NATO meetings

* Nuclear Disarmament Partnership/Project Abolition will continue preparations for June 10-12 Congressional Action Days

* 20/20 Vision will distribute action alert postcard on NMD and try to generate lots of local letters to the editor

* Institute for Policy Studies will host a press briefing on May 14 at the NPC on Rumsfeld's strategic review

* Spurgeon Keeny will be at a briefing for foreign press only (via USIA) at the National Press Club May 10, 11-12

DRAFT NGO STRATEGY on National Missile Defense (NMD)

May 7, 2001

PRIMARY GOALS: Postpone actions leading to deployment of an NMD system and prevent abrogation of the ABM Treaty since both would undermine prospects for nuclear arms reductions; encourage more effective approaches to ballistic missile proliferation.

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES FOR 2001:

- * Re-establish the importance of the four common sense deployment criteria (see below)
- * Support of major U.S. opinion-leaders for our primary goals and arguments
- * Support from majority of Congress for holding Bush accountable on meeting four criteria (see below) before committing to deployment or withdrawing from ABM Treaty
- * Continued, public expression of concern and opposition about NMD from major U.S. Allies
- * Demonstrate that the proposed system is not operationally effective, the damage to arms control and natl/intl. security too great, the threat overstated, and the cost enormous
- * Support alternatives to NMD: maintain diplomatic support for efforts to achieve a permanent freeze of the North Korean ballistic missile and nuclear programs and curb missile proliferation

KEY VARIABLES:

- ? Outcome of scheduled NMD tests
- ? Level of Congressional support or opposition to Bush NMD plans
- ? Unwillingness/willingness of Russia/China to agree to proposed modifications to ABM Treaty
- ? Support/non-support of U.S. allies in Europe and Japan for NMD deployment
- ? North Korean missile program activities/progress on diplomatic initiatives to freeze program

PRIMARY ARGUMENTS CRITERIA — There is no workable NMD system available and the Bush Administration should not take action to deploy NMD and/or withdraw or violate the ABM Treaty; before a concrete commitment to deployment is made, the Bush administration must be able to demonstrate that common sense criteria for deployment can be met.

1. Technology and Operational Effectiveness. Operational effectiveness of existing or proposed NMD technology cannot be proven any time soon. Current and future NMD test programs should be reconfigured to provide a sufficient basis to prove that the system is operationally effective against realistic threats.

The current GBI test program will not provide rigorous testing against the full range of targets and countermeasures that could be launched by a country capable of fielding a long-range missile; and a national missile defense system cannot defend against weapons of mass destruction (WMD) delivered by other means.

2. Cost of a "layered" NMD system is high and will go higher. Current estimates of a multi-layered NMD place it at over \$100 billion over the next 20 years; however these studies do not include complete life-cycle costs for all the missile defense programs, meaning that the total will undoubtedly be much higher. The U.S. taxpayer has already spent more than \$120 billion over the life of the ballistic missile defense program without seeing the development of a workable system. A significant investment in NMD will incur significant opportunity costs in other, more cost-effective efforts to respond to WMD threats and may impinge on other areas of the defense budget.

3. Decision to deploy NMD will decrease -- not increase -- U.S. and

international security. Taking into account the impact on arms reductions, non-proliferation objectives, and U.S. relations with Russia, China, and our close allies, a decision to deploy and/or to withdraw from the ABM Treaty will decrease rather than increase U.S. security. National missile defenses are a "last line" of defense should only be pursued only if they work and if they do not undercut our "first lines" of defense to prevent and reduce nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons threats, including Nunn- Lugar-Domenici Cooperative Threat Reduction programs.

4. The long-range ballistic missile threat from North Korea has not and will not materialize if the United States and other nations work cooperatively to permanently freeze that nation's missile program and take action to strengthen existing ballistic missile controls (such as the MTCR) and implement new restrictions on such technologies (including variations on the Russian Global Control System proposal).

5. Contrary to President Bush's assertion that the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty is irrelevant, the ABM Treaty continues to promote stability and because it facilitates bilateral offensive nuclear weapons reductions. It does not impede research and early development of national missile defense systems planned in the near future. We must work with Russia, China, and others to accomplish our global security goals and not act to unilaterally withdraw from the ABM Treaty.

The President's proposal for unilateral nuclear reductions and the standing down of some U.S. nuclear weapons would be a long-overdue and very welcome initiative that could jump-start the stalled arms reduction process, but these proposals should be followed up with agreements that include tactical and "reserve" weapons and to ensure that the reductions are verifiable and irreversible.

Instead of eliminating the mutual-assured-destruction policies of the Cold War, the President proposal for a robust NMD, with no ABM Treaty would make it more difficult to deal with lingering Cold War dangers and create new proliferation problems. U.S. national missile defense deployment would prod Russia into keeping a larger number of its strategic weapons on hair-trigger alert, thus perpetuating the danger of a nuclear war by accident or miscalculation.

Projected NMD Developments Timeline, Updated May 7, 2001

May 14-June 13 -- 62nd Session of the ABM Treaty Standing Consultative Commission, Geneva

May 14-June 29 --Conference on Disarmament, Part II, Geneva

May 17-18 -- Powell/Ivanov meeting in Washington DC

May 25 -- President Bush to speak on defense issues at the Naval Academy

May 29-30 NATO Foreign Ministers meeting in Budapest

June 1 -- Coalition NMD/Deep Cuts wkg. grp. mtg

June -- Possible time Bush could give a more specific speech on his NMD plan; general elections in the United Kingdom; next NMD flight test (IFT-6) possible

June-Dec 2001 -- Approximate date of completion of the Nuclear Posture Review (the deadline is December 1, but the NPR and more focused policy reviews on NMD could be completed sooner)

June 7-8 -- NATO Defense Ministers meeting in Brussels

June 10-12 -- Project Abolition, Nuclear Disarmament Partnership Conference and Training Days on NMD

June 12 -- Bush in Spain

June 13 -- Bush in Brussels for informal meeting with heads of state with other NATO heads of state and European Commission on key issues including US plans for missile defense and the future of deterrence & arms-control.

June 14-15 -- Semi-annual presidential meeting with European Union officials

June 15 -- Bush in Warsaw

June 18-20 -- Carnegie Nonproliferation Conference

June 27 -- G-8 Foreign Affairs Sous-Sherpas Plenary Meeting, Genoa
Mid-summer;

July -- Likely time for committee markup, floor action on the FY 2002
Defense Authorization bill

July 18 -- G-8 Foreign Ministerial Meeting, Genoa

July 20-22 -- G-8 Summit, Genoa

July 30-Sept 14 -- Conference on Disarmament, Part III, Geneva

September 11 -- 56th United Nations General Assembly Begins, New York

September 25-27 -- Conference on Accelerating CTBT Entry Into Force, New York

September 24-Oct 5 -- United Nations General Assembly General Debate, New
York

October 1 -- Bush to visit South Korea

December 6-7 -- NATO Foreign Ministers meeting; NATO Defense Ministers
meeting;
EU-U.S. summit

December 11-12 Convention on Conventional Weapons (CCW) 2nd Review
Conference, Geneva

December 18-19 NATO Organization North Atlantic Council
Defense Ministerial, Brussels

Late 2001-2002 Approximate dates of intercept tests 5, 6, 7: The production-version booster, now more than a year behind schedule, will first be used in the sixth intercept test.

Late 2005 or 06 Estimated date for initial operating capability for NMD system, with 20 interceptors in Alaska.

2007-8 100 interceptors on-line in Alaska in "enhanced" C-1 capability.

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>>

Durbin (D-IL) sponsored this measure, and he'll need more support to carry it this year. Thwarting NMD is not impossible in such an evenly-divided Congress. The balance of power on specific votes can shift quickly, but we need to bolster the Democratic opponents and reinforce the skepticism of a few moderate Republicans.

ACTION: Write your Members of Congress and urge them to oppose deployment of national missile defense. If they already oppose it, ask them to do so publicly through a floor speech and co-sponsorship of future legislation to thwart deployment. And be sure to thank them for their leadership. If you are unsure of your Representative's position, call and ask, or visit our web site for voting records.

WRITE: YOUR MEMBER OF CONGRESS
United States House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

CALL: US Capitol Switchboard
(202) 224-3121

E-MAIL: Visit www.2020vision.org to use sample letters, get info and act on-line. For maximum effectiveness, print and mail your letter. You can even send a letter to the editor.

**** Note:** The following groups partnered in our last card on NMD, and we'll ask them again for this one. Please contact Natalie by Wed 5/16 to endorse and/or place an order of postcards.

20/20 Vision o Americans for Democratic Action o Business Leaders for Sensible Priorities Action Fund o Campaign for UN Reform o Center for a Responsible Budget o Center for International Policy o Disarmament Clearinghouse o Friends Committee on National Legislation o Fund for New Priorities in America o Greenpeace USA o NETWORK o Peace Action o Peace Links o Physicians for Social Responsibility o Project on Government Oversight o Union of Concerned Scientists o Veterans for Peace o Women's Action for New Directions o Women's International League for Peace & Freedom o Women's Strike for Peace o World Federalist Association.

From: CarolCWalker@aol.com
Date: Sun, 13 May 2001 23:32:27 EDT
Subject: Fwd: Council of Bishops Resolution
To: dcannon@umcswtx.org, sid@tumc.org, susiehawkins@yahoo.com,
jimstew4@home.com, kparker@cowebblink.net, lloyd.doggett@mail.house.gov,
mupj@igc.org, Rrpmyers@aol.com, Nabhankins@aol.com, DLBrown61@aol.com,
genec@texas.net, NHuff10060@aol.com, rogers33@swbell.net,
VFindeisen@aol.com, WWale@aol.com, pbw5w@cms.mail.virginia.edu,
Phil_Gramm@gramm.senate.gov, mimi@fumcaustin.org, revteres@the-cia.net,
senator@hutchison.senate.gov, mspivey@austin.rr.com
X-Mailer: AOL 5.0 for Mac sub 28

Thanks be to God, the UM bishops have gotten REALLY serious about the need to speak out in no uncertain terms concerning the Palestinian situation. If you are a United Methodist, please make this news known in your churches; I feel it is one of the most important steps the Council of Bishops has ever taken. Spread the word. If we want peace in the Middle East, we must speak out for justice.

Thanks, Carol Walker

Return-Path: <jbelmore@home.com>

Received: from rly-xd02.mx.aol.com (rly-xd02.mail.aol.com [172.20.105.167]) by air-xd02.mail.aol.com (v77_r1.36) with ESMTP; Thu, 10 May 2001 17:54:15 -0400

Received: from femail11.sdc1.sfba.home.com (femail11.sdc1.sfba.home.com [24.0.95.107]) by rly-xd02.mx.aol.com (v77_r1.36) with ESMTP; Thu, 10 May 2001 17:53:58 -0400

Received: from cx974133-a ([24.21.24.119]) by femail11.sdc1.sfba.home.com (InterMail vM.4.01.03.20 201-229-121-120-20010223) with SMTP id <20010510215350.LTGE22926.femail11.sdc1.sfba.home.com@cx974133-a>; Thu, 10 May 2001 14:53:50 -0700

X-Sender: jbelmore@mail

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0

Date: Thu, 10 May 2001 14:56:54 -0700

To: mickey@mozart.inet.co.th

From: Joe & Billye Elmore <jbelmore@home.com>

Subject: Council of Bishops Resolution

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Message-Id: <20010510215350.LTGE22926.femail11.sdc1.sfba.home.com@cx974133-a>

Council of Bishops, The United Methodist Church

>>April 29-May 4, 200

>>Whereas the Social Principles states in Para. 164 on Basic Rights and

>>Freedoms and Human Rights:

>>

>>Whereas basic freedoms and human rights of Palestinian people continue

>>to be violated.

>>

>>Whereas the building of new and expansion of existing settlements

>>continues in Palestine,

>>

>>Whereas the United States government has and continues to provide

>>funding for the Israeli government and that funding supports the

>>establishment of settlements in Occupied Territories (Palestine), the

>>building of road ways through the Occupied Territories which divide the
>>Palestinian lands,

>>

>>Whereas the Palestinian and Israeli forces continue violent acts of
>>terrorism and destruction often inflicted upon innocent men, women, and
>>children,

>>

>>We therefore call upon the United States government through Congress, to
>>use all measures possible, including the cutting off of all funding to
>>the Israeli government, to insure that the following conditions are met:

>>

- >>1. All human rights violations cease
- >>2. Building of roads for the purpose of dividing the Palestinian lands
>>through the West Bank and Gaza cease
- >>3. No more Jewish settlements are built in occupied territories
- >>4. All home demolitions cease.

>>

>>Furthermore, we call upon the Israeli and Palestinian leaders to bring
>>an end to all hostilities.

>>

>>Furthermore, we call upon all United Methodists to become educated on
>>the issues, pray for all people of the region, and provide financial
>>support to the Palestinian people through contributions to the General
>>Board of Global Ministries.

>>

>>And Furthermore, we call upon all United Methodist communities and
>>churches to invite religious leaders (Jewish, Christians, and Muslim)
>>into conversations in order to foster deeper understanding of the issues,

>>

>

From: Starman Wendy <wstarman@wesleysem.edu>
To: "'Howard W. Hallman'" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: National missile defense
Date: Mon, 14 May 2001 12:34:48 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

Howard,

I realize that I need something additional in order to post your NMD info. and attribute the material to the rightful producers -- you and the Committee.

Since the memo you sent me is addressing the Committee, it would not make sense as it is to put that on our Web site. So, can you provide a memo that is for the general public/people of faith that describes the opportunities to respond to NMD? We can then post your memo along with your sample letter and signatories. At the end of the memo, perhaps you could put your contact information too, so people can get in touch with you for additional involvement. We need to maintain clarity that it comes from you and the Committee, and make sure it's clear that we are not the producers of the information. As you know, as home of NR/DI, we cannot generate material that specifically seeks political change or which could be construed as lobbying in any way. That would conflict with the nature and neutrality of our position as an educational resource.

We could call your reference on the Web something like "Suggestions for Responding to NMD: Ideas from Howard Hallman, Chair of Methodists United for Peace with Justice/ Chair of Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament." When they click on that it can take them to your memo of introduction and also the letter with signatures. Right now all I have is the memo made out to the Interfaith committee...it would be confusing to post the information that way...

Thanks!

Wendy

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Friday, May 11, 2001 2:28 PM
To: Starman Wendy
Subject: RE: National missile defense

Wendy, Here's a fresh copy.

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Dear Colleagues,

Now that President Bush has laid down a public challenge for national missile defense, we need to respond vigorously. I urge you to have your

organization write the president in opposition to national missile defense and to get your grassroots networks to do likewise. You might send out a news release to your denominational press. You may also contact members of Congress and have your grassroots do likewise to register opposition to national missile defense.

Three reasons for our opposition were stated in the sign-on letter of March 5, 2001. I am attaching a copy along with the list of signers.

Shalom,
Howard

To: Starman Wendy <wstarman@wesleysem.edu>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: National missile defense
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <DC1977460103D311B0DE0060943F439F636F2C@WESLEY-EXCH1>
References:

Wendy,

Here is what I sent out as an alert to United Methodist networks. You can post this if you want to.

I didn't include the signers because I wanted to keep it short. However, you can add them. You have them from my previous posting, but I can send them again if you want to.

Thanks for doing this,
Howard

###

Peace/Justice Alert #2
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
May 7, 2001

SPEAK OUT ON NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE

Last week President George W. Bush made a major speech advocating multi-layered national missile defense. Although his views were already known, his administration is now launching a major campaign to build public support.

On this subject the United Methodist General Conference in a resolution on "Saying No to Nuclear Deterrence" has called upon all possessors of nuclear weapons to "halt all efforts to develop and deploy strategic antimissile defense systems because they are illusory, unnecessary, and wasteful." Please add your opposition to national missile defense by writing to President Bush at the White House, Washington, D.C. 20500. Share your views with your U.S. senators and representative.

Reasons for opposing national missile defense were stated in a recent letter from representatives of 27 denominational offices and national faith-based organizations, as follows:

Dear Mr. President:

We the undersigned representatives of faith-based organizations share with you the desire to keep God's people, including those in the U.S. homeland, safe from nuclear attack. However, we are deeply concerned about the haste to make a commitment to deploy unproven technology for national missile defense.

First, the real and present danger for nuclear attack on the United States comes from the several thousand Russian missiles now on hair trigger alert and thousands of Russian nuclear weapons in reserve with inadequate security. The best remedies are mutual de-alerting, strategic arms reduction, and stable control of fissile material. These opportunities could be jeopardized if the United States withdraws from the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty to erect a national missile defense. Russia might then withdraw from other arms control treaties and retain multi-warhead missiles now scheduled for elimination under START II. Also, China might increase its nuclear arsenal. This would pose far greater danger to U.S. homeland security than the remote threat of a few missiles a small nation might develop years from now.

Second, heavy emphasis on unproven anti-missile technology to counter a speculative future threat from a few small nations neglects other elements of a comprehensive non-proliferation strategy. More promising methods include international monitoring of nuclear test explosions, rigorous fissile material control, stringent missile technology control, diplomacy, financial assistance to nations cooperating in nuclear non-proliferation, and countering social, economic, and political instability that provides the breeding ground for terrorist groups

Third, we are seriously concerned about budgetary implications. Since 1983 the United States has spent \$69 billion on national missile defense, enriching major defense contractors but producing no effective system. President Clinton's plan, which you have criticized as inadequate, would cost \$60 billion. Indications are that the layered approach you favor could cost more than \$100 billion. A budgetary commitment of this magnitude along with the tax cut you are promoting would preclude achieving the goal of "Leave No Child Behind" and dealing with other urgent domestic needs.

For these reasons we urge you to pull back from the dangerous rush to a premature decision on national missile defense and withdrawal from the ABM Treaty.

Signed by representatives of 27 faith-based organizations.

X-Sender: epf@pop.igc.org
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.6 (32)
Date: Mon, 14 May 2001 07:55:16 -0400
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: Episcopal Peace Fellowship <epf@igc.org>
Subject: Re: National missile defense discussion at May 15 meeting
Cc: Bill Stuart-Whistler <stuwhis@enter.net>

Howard,

I know you are aware that I won't be at tomorrow's meeting of the ICND, that last month was my last meeting, that Bill Stuart-Whistler will be the primary contact. I just want to be sure he's getting messages like this one. He cannot be at this meeting and how often he or another EPF representative can participate in person is still be worked out. For the time being, I guess the best thing to do is keep the EPF office on your circulation list - that will allow me to share current info with whoever needs it in our "household." The office is moving to Chicago in mid-June but the e-mail address will remain the same (one of the really nice things about electronic communication!).

Hope things go well. I'm not going to participate in the decision-making at this point or in the future, but will leave it to Bill and the EPF Executive Committee to decide how we'll be at the table.

peace,
mary

At 08:20 AM 5/14/01 -0400, you wrote:

>To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

>

>Dear Colleagues:

>

>President Bush's speech on national missile defense (NMD), while containing
>nothing new, is the beginning of a vigorous campaign to gain public
>support. We should respond with equal vigor, for NMD has become the most
>visible of the issues we are working on.

>

>Therefore, at tomorrow's meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear
>Disarmament, I would like to consider what we can do together on this
>issue. If you cannot attend, I would appreciate your responding with your
> views or calling me this afternoon (Monday) between 1 and 5 p.m. or
>Tuesday morning until noon. The meeting is on Tuesday, May 15 from 1:00 to
>2:30 p.m. in Conference Room 3 (not 4 like recent meetings) of the
>Methodist Building.

>

>Based upon what we have done together in the past, here are some
>alternatives to consider:

>

>Sign-on letter from representatives of national organization. Already
>done with 27 organizations represented. Went to President Bush and all
>members of Congress.

>
>At this stage concentrate on Congress, both Democrats and Republicans.
>Unlike the CTBT when most Senate Democrats favored ratification, many
>Democrats have supported development of NMD (but not necessarily
>deployment). The same moderate Republicans we focused on for the CTBT
>should also be approached.
>
>Adapt the national sign-on letter for state and local use. For example,
>encourage state religious organizations to modify the letter for use with
>senators and representatives.
>
>Condense the reasons for opposition into a petition.
>
>Form interfaith delegations for home state visits to members of Congress.
>
>Denominational offices and peace fellowships send out alerts to foster
>letters and calls to members of Congress.
>
>Develop a joint postcard alert with help from 20/20 Vision for the same
>purpose.
>
>Post information on denomination web sites.
>
>Promote letters-to-the-editor in state and local newspapers.
>
>Promote op-ed pieces in state and local newspapers, and with help from
>civil sector organizations try to place some in national newspapers.
>
>Prepare and distribute a bulletin insert.
>
>Promote participation in the national mobilization to "Stop the New Arms
>Race" on June 10to 12, sponsored by a number of civil sector organizations.
>
>Develop and release new denominational statements opposing national missile
>defense or re-release existing statements. The United Methodist Council
>of Bishops did this ten days ago.
>
>Encourage the executive committee (or whatever it is called) of the
>National Council of Churches to issue a statement when it meets in
>Washington toward the end of this month.
>
>You may have other ideas.
>
>This is a rich menu to choose from. We are unlikely to do all of these
>things immediately. We will need to prioritize.
>
>So come to the Tuesday meeting prepared to offer your ideas. And please
>call me in advance or respond by e-mail if you cannot attend.
>
>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.

>

Date: Mon, 14 May 2001 07:44:34 -0700 (PDT)
From: Egbert Lawrence <egbertl4pj@yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: National missile defense discussion at May 15 meeting
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>

I will see you tomorrow and will study about priorities. Your words, "rich manu" is true!

Thanks. Larry

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

> To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

>

> Dear Colleagues:

>

> President Bush's speech on national missile defense
> (NMD), while containing
> nothing new, is the beginning of a vigorous campaign
> to gain public
> support. We should respond with equal vigor, for
> NMD has become the most
> visible of the issues we are working on.

>

> Therefore, at tomorrow's meeting of the Interfaith
> Committee for Nuclear
> Disarmament, I would like to consider what we can do
> together on this
> issue. If you cannot attend, I would appreciate
> your responding with your
> views or calling me this afternoon (Monday) between
> 1 and 5 p.m. or
> Tuesday morning until noon. The meeting is on
> Tuesday, May 15 from 1:00 to
> 2:30 p.m. in Conference Room 3 (not 4 like recent
> meetings) of the
> Methodist Building.

>

> Based upon what we have done together in the past,
> here are some
> alternatives to consider:

>

> Sign-on letter from representatives of national
> organization. Already
> done with 27 organizations represented. Went to
> President Bush and all
> members of Congress.

>

> At this stage concentrate on Congress, both
> Democrats and Republicans.
> Unlike the CTBT when most Senate Democrats favored
> ratification, many
> Democrats have supported development of NMD (but not
> necessarily
> deployment). The same moderate Republicans we
> focused on for the CTBT

- > should also be approached.
- >
- > Adapt the national sign-on letter for state and
- > local use. For example,
- > encourage state religious organizations to modify
- > the letter for use with
- > senators and representatives.
- >
- > Condense the reasons for opposition into a petition.
- >
- > Form interfaith delegations for home state visits to
- > members of Congress.
- >
- > Denominational offices and peace fellowships send
- > out alerts to foster
- > letters and calls to members of Congress.
- >
- > Develop a joint postcard alert with help from 20/20
- > Vision for the same
- > purpose.
- >
- > Post information on denomination web sites.
- >
- > Promote letters-to-the-editor in state and local
- > newspapers.
- >
- > Promote op-ed pieces in state and local newspapers,
- > and with help from
- > civil sector organizations try to place some in
- > national newspapers.
- >
- > Prepare and distribute a bulletin insert.
- >
- > Promote participation in the national mobilization
- > to "Stop the New Arms
- > Race" on June 10 to 12, sponsored by a number of
- > civil sector organizations.
- >
- > Develop and release new denominational statements
- > opposing national missile
- > defense or re-release existing statements. The
- > United Methodist Council
- > of Bishops did this ten days ago.
- >
- > Encourage the executive committee (or whatever it is
- > called) of the
- > National Council of Churches to issue a statement
- > when it meets in
- > Washington toward the end of this month.
- >
- > You may have other ideas.
- >
- > This is a rich menu to choose from. We are unlikely
- > to do all of these

> things immediately. We will need to prioritize.
>
> So come to the Tuesday meeting prepared to offer
> your ideas. And please
> call me in advance or respond by e-mail if you
> cannot attend.
>
> Shalom,
> Howard
>
> Howard W. Hallman, Chair
> Methodists United for Peace with Justice
> 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036
> Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail: mupj@igc.org
>
> Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a
> membership association of
> laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any
> Methodist denomination.

Do You Yahoo!?

Yahoo! Auctions - buy the things you want at great prices

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

To: Janet Horman <JHorman@UMC-GBCS.ORG>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: Bishops' resolution
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <619BD1E95646D311B69D0008C79FE32D542454@CHURCH2>
References:

Janet,

If all you have on e-mail is the entire release from the Council of Bishops, send that. I can extract the part I want.

The proposed event for June 20 is a reception in honor of Senator Lugar. We don't have him pinned down for the date. I'll keep you informed.

Howard

To: jhanson@umc-gbcs.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: May 15 meeting of Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament
Cc: jhorman@umc-gbcs.org
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Jaydee,

Janet Horman can't attend the monthly meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament on Tuesday, May 15 from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. in Conference Room 3 of the Methodist Building because of her previous commitment to go to the conference on Conscience on War. Is there any chance that you could attend at least part of the meeting to report on what the UM Council of Bishops has done and will be doing on national missile defense? And also to contribute to the discussion of the interfaith response. It would be helpful to us.

Howard

From: Jaydee Hanson <JHanson@UMC-GBCS.ORG>
To: "'Howard W. Hallman'" <mupj@igc.org>
Cc: Janet Horman <JHorman@UMC-GBCS.ORG>
Subject: RE: May 15 meeting of Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament
t
Date: Mon, 14 May 2001 17:44:54 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Howard, I will be in the North Central New York annual conference conducting two workshops. I would love to attend the meeting of the Interfaith Committee, but even if both Janet and I were available I probably would be sending her. I hired her, in part, because of her long anti-war and church experience. She would ordinarily be the person to attend the monthly meetings. We need to try to get all of our activists on the same page. It's too bad that the monthly nuclear disarmament committee meeting conflicts with the meeting on Conscientious Objection, but I promised this conference a year ago that our Peace with Justice Program director would be present.

Are the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament meetings always the 3rd Tuesday of the month? Are they always in the UM Building? Please let Janet know the schedule.

Thanks for your commitment to this work,

Jaydee Hanson
Assistant General Secretary
Public Witness and Advocacy
General Board of Church and Society
United Methodist Church
100 Maryland Ave, NE
Washington, DC 20002
(202) 488-5650

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Monday, May 14, 2001 1:53 PM
To: Jaydee Hanson
Cc: Janet Horman
Subject: May 15 meeting of Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Jaydee,

Janet Horman can't attend the monthly meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament on Tuesday, May 15 from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. in Conference Room 3 of the Methodist Building because of her previous commitment to go to the conference on Conscience on War. Is there any chance that you could attend at least part of the meeting to report on what the UM Council of Bishops has done and will be doing on national missile defense? And also to contribute to the discussion of the interfaith response. It would be helpful to us.

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.

Incoming mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).
Version: 6.0.251 / Virus Database: 124 - Release Date: 4/26/01

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).
Version: 6.0.251 / Virus Database: 124 - Release Date: 4/26/01

To: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: May 15 meeting of Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <NEBBKJHCMLACLOPKCPPBMEPPCAA.prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
References:

Esther,

I don't remember whether I told you that the monthly meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament has been changed to the third Tuesday. We will meet tomorrow, Tuesday, May 15 from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. in Conference Room 3 of the Methodist Building. We will give considerable attention to building opposition to national missile defense. We will also be reviewing the status of the de-alerting campaign and would want your input. Sorry for the late notice.

Howard.

To: jwyerman@2020vision.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: NMD and Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Jim,

Tomorrow at the monthly meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament we will discuss how we can contribute to the campaign against national missile defense. One option is to get out alerts, by each organization or together. If participants are interested in the latter, does 20/20 Vision have resources available to help with another interfaith alert? The text would likely be somewhat different than the card you are now getting sponsors for in order to introduce a faith perspective.

If someone from 20/20 wants to come tomorrow, she or he would be welcome. The meeting is from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. in Conference Room 3 of the Methodist Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE.

If you want to discuss this with me, I'll be available at 301 896-0013 this afternoon (Monday) or until 12 noon on Tuesday.

Shalom,
Howard

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express Macintosh Edition - 4.5 (0410)
Date: Mon, 14 May 2001 17:16:16 -0400
Subject: Re: NMD and Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament
From: "James K. Wyerman" <JWyerman@2020vision.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
CC: Natalie Hildt <Natalie@2020vision.org>

Hi Howard--yes, we are already preparing another card and it would be great if your interfaith colleagues could help get it out. I'll try to get someone to your meeting or at least get you a copy before hand. we can pay for most of the paper and printing, though we can print more if we can a bit of reimbursement from those groups that are able. But usually we print, and your folks mail and that seems to work well for both of us. Let's talk soon about this. Jim

James K. Wyerman
Executive Director
20/20 Vision
1828 Jefferson Pl. N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Phone: (202)833-2020
Fax: (202)833-5307
Web: <http://www.2020vision.org>

"20 minutes a month to save the Earth"

>From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
>To: jwyerman@2020vision.org
>Subject: NMD and Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament
>Date: Mon, May 14, 2001, 2:04 PM
>

> Jim,
>
> Tomorrow at the monthly meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear
> Disarmament we will discuss how we can contribute to the campaign against
> national missile defense. One option is to get out alerts, by each
> organization or together. If participants are interested in the latter,
> does 20/20 Vision have resources available to help with another interfaith
> alert? The text would likely be somewhat different than the card you are
> now getting sponsors for in order to introduce a faith perspective.
>
> If someone from 20/20 wants to come tomorrow, she or he would be welcome.
> The meeting is from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. in Conference Room 3 of the Methodist
> Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE.
>
> If you want to discuss this with me, I'll be available at 301 896-0013 this
> afternoon (Monday) or until 12 noon on Tuesday.
>
> 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: dkimball@clw.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: May 15 meeting of Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Daryl,

At its monthly meeting tomorrow, May 15, the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament will discuss how we can contribute to the campaign against national missile defense. We would welcome your participation or someone else from the Coalition. Sorry for such a late invitation. The meeting will run from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. in Room 3 of the Methodist Building.

If you can't be there, David Culp will be in attendance. Also, I have you report on the May 4 meeting.

Howard

X-Sender: dkimball@[63.106.26.66]
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)
Date: Mon, 14 May 2001 17:40:24 -0400
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: Re: May 15 meeting of Interfaith Committee for Nuclear
Disarmament
Cc: vsamson@clw.org

Howard,

Not sure if I can make it, but even if I could, I would like to send
Victoria Samson, our new Senior Research Assoc. who is specializing on NMD.

Thanks, DK

At 02:08 PM 5/14/01 -0400, you wrote:

>Daryl,
>
>At its monthly meeting tomorrow, May 15, the Interfaith Committee for
>Nuclear Disarmament will discuss how we can contribute to the campaign
>against national missile defense. We would welcome your participation or
>someone else from the Coalition. Sorry for such a late invitation. The
>meeting will run from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. in Room 3 of the Methodist Building.
>
>If you can't be there, David Culp will be in attendance. Also, I have you
>report on the May 4 meeting.
>
>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.
>

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>>

From: Janet Horman <JHorman@UMC-GBCS.ORG>
To: "mupj@igc.org" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: FW: UMNS #224-Church's leaders oppose U.S. missile defense plan
Date: Mon, 14 May 2001 14:23:27 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

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

From: Erik Alsgaard
Sent: Friday, May 04, 2001 4:19 PM
To: AGS; James Winkler; Janet Horman
Subject: FW: UMNS #224-Church's leaders oppose U.S. missile defense plan

Howard:

You are right..it was there all along. Sorry I will miss the meeting tomorrow.
Janet

NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE

The Council of Bishops recommends the following actions:

1. That each bishop send a personal letter to President Bush and members of Congress expressing concern for national missile defense and include a copy of the Council's resolution.
2. That each bishop work with annual conference leadership, Conference Boards of Church and Society, and ecumenical groups to resist development and deployment of a national missile defense system, and
3. That the council, through the General Board of Church and Society "provide leadership, guidance and educational materials to United Methodists" as called for in General Conference Resolution #315 of the Book of Resolutions, pages 782-785.

In a resolution titled "Saying No to Nuclear Deterrence," citizens from around the world at the 2000 General Conference of the United Methodist Church called upon "all possessors of nuclear weapons to . . . halt all efforts to develop and deploy strategic antimissile defense systems because they are illusory, unnecessary and wasteful." The resolution also calls upon the "Council of Bishops and the General Board of Church and Society to provide leadership, guidance, and educational materials to United Methodists, congregations, and conferences in order to assist them in understanding and working for the goal and objective of nuclear abolition."

Fifteen years ago, the threat nuclear weapons posed to the earth and its people caused the Council of Bishops to write "In Defense of Creation." More recently, vast numbers of children, the poor and oppressed suffering lives of cruel deprivation around the world, led the council to mobilize the church in the initiative "Children and Poverty."

The nuclear arms race is an issue of social justice for people throughout the world. Large numbers of children and the poor are shut out of the

economic blessings of society as a result of the arms race.

Since children and all creation are endangered by the threat of nuclear weapons, the Council of Bishops, meeting in Scottsdale, Ariz., April 29-May 4, 2001, commends President George W. Bush for his commitment to persuade Russia to join the United States in reducing nuclear arsenals to "the lowest number of nuclear weapons consistent with our present and future national security needs and to lead by example by making substantial unilateral reductions if necessary. We further commend President Bush for his commitment to take a large number of missiles off hair-trigger alert, especially in light of the dangers inherent in the deterioration of the Russian military infrastructure.

While commending President Bush for these initiatives, the Council of Bishops strongly objects to legislation passed by the U.S. Congress to deploy a limited national missile defense system "as soon as technologically feasible." We call upon the President and the Congress to refrain from the development of a national missile defense system because it is illusory, unnecessary, and wasteful.

Even if such a defensive system could be built, ways can be devised to defeat it. Effective countermeasures to NMD can be built inexpensively, using simple technologies. Biological or chemical weapons can be divided into dozens of small bomblets upon impact. Such numerous targets or many lightweight decoys could confuse and overwhelm the system. Weapons can be delivered in many ways other than by missiles, as shown in the bombing attack against the U.S. Destroyer Cole in Yemen.

United Methodist bishops across the world, some from nations once caught in old East-West tensions, fear re-escalation of those conflicts if the United States proceeds with plans to build the NMD. It could well mean the end of the Anti-Ballistic Missiles Treaty which has been crucial to the attempt to end the threat of nuclear war. Without the treaty, countries could feel free to increase their nuclear arsenals. The present ability to do mutual on site inspections of nuclear arsenals, a key component in monitoring current arms control agreements, would be lost.

Present steps toward creating a missile defense system are creating profound tensions between the United States, Russia and China threatening to scuttle the nuclear arms reduction process. China has announced that it will upgrade its nuclear arsenal in the face of a U.S. missile defense system. Russia could halt the agreed upon reduction in its nuclear arsenal. With the collapse of its economy, its early warning systems and command and control networks are deteriorating, increasing the chance of accidental or unauthorized nuclear attacks.

European nations vigorously oppose plans to deploy a national missile defense system fearing the dangerously destabilizing impact of the loss of nuclear disarmament treaties carefully created over several decades.

We call upon all people of goodwill to join actively in the struggle to achieve peace with justice. We must join together to see that the untold billions of dollars proposed for a meaningless search for security through a national missile defense system are not once again taken from the mouths of

children and the poor.

VIEQUES

WHEREAS the General Conference and the Council of Bishops of the United Methodist Church have consistently called for an end of the presence of the U.S. Navy on the island of Vieques, off of Puerto Rico;

WHEREAS for over 20 years our church has witnessed the great harm to the people of Vieques, to their land, ecology, health, unemployment, and loss of precious human life because of the bombing and military training by the U.S. Navy;

WHEREAS a cessation of live bombing, reparation of land ownership, clean-up of the environment had been agreed upon until a referendum was held whereby the people of Vieques would determine any or no future relationship with the U.S. Navy, which agreements had been reached by the U.S. government, the Puerto Rican government and the people of Vieques;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of Bishops of the United Methodist Church urge President George W. Bush and the U.S. Navy to immediately halt all Navy training exercises, including bombing, on the island of Vieques. We implore President Bush and the U.S. military leaders to honor commitments already in place and in partnership with the Puerto Rican government.

MIDDLE EAST

WHEREAS the General Conference of the United Methodist Church has addressed the issues in the Middle East and Israel regarding the Palestinian people in resolutions titled: "The Building of Settlements in the Occupied Territories," "Economic Support for Palestinians," "The Middle East and North Africa," "Justice for the Rev. Alex Awad," "Holy Land Tours," and "Our Muslim Neighbors,"

WHEREAS the Social Principles states in Paragraph 164 on Basic Freedoms and Human Rights: "We hold governments responsible for the protection of the rights of the people to free and fair elections and to the freedoms of speech, religion, assembly, communications media, and petition for redress of grievances without fear of reprisal; to the right to privacy; and to the guarantee of the rights to adequate food, clothing, shelter, education, and health care. The form and the leaders of all governments should be determined by exercise of the right to vote guaranteed to all adult citizens. We also strongly reject domestic surveillance and intimidation of political opponents by governments in power. ... The use of detention and imprisonment for the harassment and elimination of political opponents or other dissidents ... or torture of persons by governments for any purpose violates Christian teaching and must be condemned and/or opposed by Christians and churches wherever and whenever it occurs."

WHEREAS basic freedoms and human rights of Palestinian people continue to be violated,

WHEREAS the building of new and expansion of existing settlements continues in Palestine,

WHEREAS the United States government has and continues to provide funding for the Israeli government and that funding supports the establishment of settlements in Occupied Territories (Palestine), the building of roadways through the Occupied Territories which divide the Palestinian lands,

WHEREAS the Palestinian and Israeli forces continue violent acts of terrorism and destruction, often inflicted upon innocent men, women and children,

WE THEREFORE CALL UPON the United States government, through Congress, to use all measures possible, including the cutting off of all funding to the Israeli government, to insure that the following conditions are met:

1. All human rights violations cease.
2. Building of roads for the purpose of dividing the Palestinian lands through the West Bank and Gaza cease.
3. No more Jewish settlements are built in occupied territories.
4. All home demolitions cease.

FURTHERMORE, WE CALL UPON the Israeli and Palestinian leaders to bring an end to all hostilities,

FURTHERMORE, WE CALL UPON all United Methodists to become educated on the issues, pray for all people of the region, and provide financial support to the Palestinian people through contributions to the General Board of Global Ministries.

AND FURTHERMORE, WE CALL UPON all United Methodist communities and churches to invite religious leaders (Jewish, Christians, and Muslim) into conversations in order to foster deeper understanding of the issues.

U.S. POLICY ON THE KOREAN PENINSULA

WHEREAS President Kim Dae Jung of the Republic of Korea and Chairman Kim Jong Il of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea met in the DPRK's capital, Pyongyang, for the three-day inter-Korean summit meeting June 13-15, 2000, and

WHEREAS the Pyongyang Summit produced a broad agreement to work for peace and unity of a divided Korea, and;

WHEREAS the Committee (Council of Bishops) on the U.S. Policy on the Korean Peninsula continues to coordinate an effort to keep the Council of Bishops informed about Korean Peninsula peace efforts; and

WHEREAS continued holding of war games and exercises by the United States on the Korean Peninsula,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of Bishops of the United Methodist Church urges President George Bush to formulate a U.S. government policy that

supports the good faith efforts of the two Korean governments to work for peace and unity, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the council urges President Bush and the U.S. Government to desist from war games during these days of critical negotiations.

2001 LABOR DAY LETTER

"Woe to them who build their houses by unrighteousness and their upper rooms by injustice; who make their neighbors work for nothing and do not give them their wages." -- Jeremiah 22:13.

On this Labor Day Sunday we reaffirm our historic witness on behalf of justice and mercy for all workers as an expression of our devotion to Jesus Christ.

Our scriptural and Wesleyan tradition provide the foundation for our belief that God grants dignity to workers and their labor. The Social Principles of the United Methodist Church uphold the right of every person to a job at a living wage that ensures their safety and right to collective bargaining.

In the pursuit of justice and solidarity with workers, we commend the full text of "The Economic Community" as contained in The Book of Resolutions 2000, the official policy statement that guides the work and ministry of our church in the global and domestic arenas of this concern.

On this Labor Day 2001, let us pray and act boldly for workers around the world as a testament to the One who labored with his hands as a carpenter and who showed us the dignity and sacred worth of the work God gives us to do.

#

United Methodist News Service
Photos and stories also available at:
<http://umns.umc.org>

You may leave the list at any time by going to
<http://umns.umc.org/unsubscribe.html>

Reply-To: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
From: "Brink Campaign" <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: May 15 meeting of Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament
Date: Mon, 14 May 2001 02:54:09 -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

I didn't know, but I'll try to get there. I will have a legislative and other report on de-alerting. See you then.

Esther

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Monday, May 14, 2001 1:58 PM
To: prgrm@backfromthebrink.net
Subject: May 15 meeting of Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Esther,

I don't remember whether I told you that the monthly meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament has been changed to the third Tuesday. We will meet tomorrow, Tuesday, May 15 from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. in Conference Room 3 of the Methodist Building. We will give considerable attention to building opposition to national missile defense. We will also be reviewing the status of the de-alerting campaign and would want your input. Sorry for the late notice.

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: jwinkler@umc-gbcs.org, jhanson@umc-gbcs.org, mharrison@umc-gbcs.org, jhorman@umc-gbcs.org,
david@fcnl.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Lugar reception
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Friends,

Senator Lugar has accepted the invitation to be honored by the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society for his efforts over many years to contain, reduce, and eliminate weapons of mass destruction. This will occur at a reception at the Methodist Building on Wednesday, June 20 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m.

Now we need to work out the details. David Culp of FCNL has agreed to chair the working committee for this event. Jim Winkler has asked Jaydee Hanson, Mark Harrison, and Janet Horman to be part planning and execution of the event. At the meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament on May 15 I will seek volunteers from other offices.

David, can you provide a checklist of matters that need to be decided and arrangements to be worked out? Others can add their input. We can talk about this at our May 15 meeting.

Amy Oberhelman, Senator Lugar's scheduler, wants two things: (1) an emergency phone number reachable at the reception in case the senator is called for a vote and (2) the program of the event, including who will be involved and the time when Senator would be called upon to make remarks. She assumes, and so do I, that he would not be expected to give a lengthy speech. I indicated that Jim will be joined by a United Methodist bishop (if possible). I said we might have someone else speak, such as Lee Hamilton, a United Methodist from Indiana.

Howard

From: "CAROL Q. COSBY" <ccosby@dhm.disciples.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Date: Mon, 14 May 2001 15:49:59 -0500
Subject: Re: National missile defense discussion at May 15 meeting
X-Confirm-Reading-To: "CAROL Q. COSBY" <ccosby@dhm.disciples.org>
X-pmrqc: 1
Priority: normal
X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Win32 (v3.12c)

I especially like having info posted on denominational web site.
Carol Q. Cosby

To: mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: United Methodist Bishops on NMD
Cc:
Bcc: icnd
X-Attachments: A:\icnd.090.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Colleagues,

I would like to share with you the attached statement by the United Methodist Council of Bishops on national missile defense. It was adopted ten days ago at their semi-annual meeting.

Howard

To: epf@peacenet.org stuwhis@enter.net
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: UM Bishops on NMD
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Here is the United Methodist Bishop's statement on NMD as text.

Howard

###

Statement by United Methodist Council of Bishops
May 2001

NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE

The Council of Bishops recommends the following actions:

1. That each bishop send a personal letter to President Bush and members of Congress expressing concern for national missile defense and include a copy of the Council's resolution.
2. That each bishop work with annual conference leadership, Conference Boards of Church and Society, and ecumenical groups to resist development and deployment of a national missile defense system, and
3. That the council, through the General Board of Church and Society "provide leadership, guidance and educational materials to United Methodists" as called for in General Conference Resolution #315 of the Book of Resolutions, pages 782-785.

In a resolution titled "Saying No to Nuclear Deterrence," citizens from around the world at the 2000 General Conference of the United Methodist Church called upon "all possessors of nuclear weapons to . . . halt all efforts to develop and deploy strategic antimissile defense systems because they are illusory, unnecessary and wasteful." The resolution also calls upon the "Council of Bishops and the General Board of Church and Society to provide leadership, guidance, and educational materials to United Methodists, congregations, and conferences in order to assist them in understanding and working for the goal and objective of nuclear abolition."

Fifteen years ago, the threat nuclear weapons posed to the earth and its people caused the Council of Bishops to write "In Defense of Creation." More recently, vast numbers of children, the poor and oppressed suffering lives of cruel deprivation around the world, led the council to mobilize the church in the initiative "Children and Poverty."

The nuclear arms race is an issue of social justice for people throughout the world. Large numbers of children and the poor are shut out of the economic blessings of society as a result of the arms race.

Since children and all creation are endangered by the threat of nuclear

weapons, the Council of Bishops, meeting in Scottsdale, Ariz., April 29-May 4, 2001, commends President George W. Bush for his commitment to persuade Russia to join the United States in reducing nuclear arsenals to "the lowest number of nuclear weapons consistent with our present and future national security needs and to lead by example by making substantial unilateral reductions if necessary. We further commend President Bush for his commitment to take a large number of missiles off hair-trigger alert, especially in light of the dangers inherent in the deterioration of the Russian military infrastructure.

While commending President Bush for these initiatives, the Council of Bishops strongly objects to legislation passed by the U.S. Congress to deploy a limited national missile defense system "as soon as technologically feasible." We call upon the President and the Congress to refrain from the development of a national missile defense system because it is illusory, unnecessary, and wasteful.

Even if such a defensive system could be built, ways can be devised to defeat it. Effective countermeasures to NMD can be built inexpensively, using simple technologies. Biological or chemical weapons can be divided into dozens of small bomblets upon impact. Such numerous targets or many lightweight decoys could confuse and overwhelm the system. Weapons can be delivered in many ways other than by missiles, as shown in the bombing attack against the U.S. Destroyer Cole in Yemen.

United Methodist bishops across the world, some from nations once caught in old East-West tensions, fear re-escalation of those conflicts if the United States proceeds with plans to build the NMD. It could well mean the end of the Anti-Ballistic Missiles Treaty which has been crucial to the attempt to end the threat of nuclear war. Without the treaty, countries could feel free to increase their nuclear arsenals. The present ability to do mutual on site inspections of nuclear arsenals, a key component in monitoring current arms control agreements, would be lost.

Present steps toward creating a missile defense system are creating profound tensions between the United States, Russia and China threatening to scuttle the nuclear arms reduction process. China has announced that it will upgrade its nuclear arsenal in the face of a U.S. missile defense system. Russia could halt the agreed upon reduction in its nuclear arsenal. With the collapse of its economy, its early warning systems and command and control networks are deteriorating, increasing the chance of accidental or unauthorized nuclear attacks.

European nations vigorously oppose plans to deploy a national missile defense system fearing the dangerously destabilizing impact of the loss of nuclear disarmament treaties carefully created over several decades.

We call upon all people of goodwill to join actively in the struggle to achieve peace with justice. We must join together to see that the untold billions of dollars proposed for a meaningless search for security through a national missile defense system are not once again taken from the mouths of children and the poor.

X-Lotus-FromDomain: UCC
From: jpmdc@ucc.org
Date: Tue, 15 May 2001 17:10:49 -0400
Subject: Weekly Message 2001, #14 from the UCC Justice and Peace Ministry

Weekly Message 2001, #14 from the UCC Justice and Peace Ministry

**STOP DEVELOPMENT AND DEPLOYMENT OF
NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE**

On May 1, President George W. Bush warned that "Some of today's tyrants are gripped by an implacable hatred of the United States of America... In such a world, cold war deterrence is no longer enough." He called for a "new framework" for U.S. nuclear policy, with a National Missile Defense (NMD) at its core. President Bush is even willing to break the Antiballistic Missile Treaty (ABM) of 1972, which has ensured a stable, legally-binding context for arms reduction.

Rather than encouraging a reduction of nuclear arms, building an expensive air, sea, and space-based national missile defense will trigger an arms race. Members of the European Union have condemned the building of NMD. Russia has threatened to stop reducing its 7,000 warhead arsenal if the U.S. breaks the ABM treaty. China urges the U.S. to adhere to the ABM and not build NMD, saying such a shield would escalate tensions over Taiwan.

Not only is NMD dangerous, it is costly. Current estimates by the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers put the cost of NMD at more than \$100 billion, well beyond the \$60 billion the Bush administration set aside for research and testing. Further, the technology itself has failed each time it has been tested. Effective countermeasures to NMD can be built inexpensively, using simple technologies.

Contact President Bush and urge him NOT to move towards development and deployment of NMD. This costly, unproven system alienates other nations and limits the resources available for programs that could be used to help the poorest and most vulnerable among us. Also, consider joining members of the UCC Justice and Peace Ministry at the National Mobilization Against Star Wars, June 10-12, in Washington, DC. For more information, write to jpmdc@ucc.org.

President George W. Bush
1600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20500
202/456-1414
president@whitehouse.gov

This Weekly Message is sent by e-mail every Monday for use

in church newsletters and bulletins the following Sunday. To add new names to this weekly advocacy service from the UCC Justice and Peace Ministry, for more information or to remove your name from the list, reply to jpmc@ucc.org. For additional information on the UCC and the Justice and Peace Ministry, log on to the UCC website at www.ucc.org.

To: mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Report of May 15 meeting
Cc:
Bcc: icnd
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Dear Colleagues:

This is a report on the May 15 meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament.

National Missile Defense

Many denominations and peace fellowships oppose national missile defense. In order to work together in our opposition we decided to develop joint material for posting on web sites of denominations and other religious organizations. This can include background material, policy statements, action alerts, sample letters to public officials, sample letters to the editor and op-ed pieces, religious education material, worship material, and bulletin inserts. There can be linkages to other sites for further information. Civil sector organizations can also provide linkage to faith-based web sites.

There was a consensus that this common material should be professionally designed and made available for incorporation into the web sites. Of those present Larry Egbert (Unitarian), David Cup (FCNL), and Catherine Gordon (Presbyterian) agreed to work on this initiative. We need to know which offices want to place this kind of information on national missile defense on their web sites. Please let me know by a quick reply to this communication.

The first votes in Congress on missile defense will come in the House and Senate Armed Services Committees, probably in July. It appears that the Bush defense budget won't go to Congress until June 18 (or so). It is likely to contain many research and development items on missile defense but not a request for a decision on deployment. How opposition will be manifested in the Armed Services Committees is not yet known, but we need to be ready. The consensus at our meeting was that we should concentrate on the Senate Armed Services Committee because the equally-divided Senate offers more prospect for success than the House. Floor votes probably won't occur until September.

20/20 Vision is now circulating a postcard on national missile defense for signers as co-sponsors and distributors. I will send it to you in a separate communication. At our meeting we decided that we would work with 20/20 to develop a faith-based postcard targeted at states with senators on the Armed Services Committee and get it out in the latter part of June in order to influence committee mark-up in July. By then we may know more details on how the issue will come into focus.

De-alerting

The de-alerting campaign is proceeding. Bank from the Brink and other organizations are seeking legislation to put Congress on record on de-alerting, perhaps focused upon a call for initial de-alerting of missiles that are scheduled for elimination under START II. The grassroots campaign is proceeding in Oregon, New Mexico, Nebraska, and Maine. Back from the Brink has a new set of talking points for grassroots use.

Lugar Reception

The United Methodist General Board of Church and Society is organizing a reception to honor Senator Richard Lugar, a United Methodist, for his work over the years to contain, reduce, and eliminate weapons of mass destruction. It will

take place in the Methodist Building on Wednesday, June 20 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. All of you are invited. A framed resolution or plaque will be presented by the UMGBCS on its behalf, but other denominational offices will be invited to become sponsors of the reception and have their names on the invitation. You will be hearing about this separately.

Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament will take place on Tuesday, June 19 from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. at the Methodist Building, Conference Room 4.

Shalom,
Howard

To: jhorman@umc-gbcs.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Help for web site material
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Janet,

In my report on the May 15 meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament I indicated the desire to develop common material for use on denominational web sites. Would you be willing to help on this? Could you tap Jaydee's ideas based on his experience with the environmental web site? Do you have an in-house expert or a consultant who could help? If we need to hire a consultant, other offices could share the cost. I'll call you about this.

The next meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament will take place on Tuesday, June 19. Subsequent meetings will occur on the third Tuesday of the month except for August.

Shalom,
Howard

Date: Mon, 14 May 2001 16:52:00 -0500

From: Kevin Martin

Reply-To: kmartin@projectabolition.org

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win98; U) X-Accept-Language: en

To: Alistair Millar , Bob Musil , Alice Slater , Cora Weiss , Naila Bolus , John Burroughs , Jackie Cabasso , Jonathan Granoff , David Krieger , Dave Robinson , Jim Wallis , Eugene Carroll , "Ibrahim Malik Abdil-Mu'id" , Tom Roderick , Susan Shaer , David Cortright , Jonathan Granoff , Jonathan Schell , Deedie Runkel , Tracy Moavero , Karina Wood , Kimberly Robson , Bobbie Wrenn Banks , Zack Allen , Tracy Moavero , Anna Smiles , Ira Shorr , Arjun Makhijani , Michael Carrigan , Daryl Kimball , Daniel Fine , Carah Ong , Steve Sidorak , Peter Weiss , Howard Hallman , Don Whitmore <3rdm@gte.net> , Debby Reelitz-Bell , Chuck Johnson , Joseph Gainza , Roger Burkholder , Guy Quinlan , Bernice Bild , Vicky Brockman , Frida Berrigan , Leslie Shelton , Carol Wolman , Cynthia Skagen , Patti McKee , Felicity Hill , Ellen Thomas , Jean Gordon , Jeanne Whitesell , Lauri Apple , Paul Martin , Kathy Crandall , Scott Lynch , Peter Deccy

Subject: folks from 27 states coming to DC June 10-12 Dear Friends,

You'll see this tomorrow, but I thought you'd be (at least mildly) excited to know that, by my count, we've got folks from 27 states (well, 26 plus the disenfranchised colony of the District of Columbia) planning to come to DC for our "Stop the New Arms Race" White House Rally and Congressional Education Days June 10-12. Not bad, but I'd like to get up to 40 or more. Here's the list, if you know folks in states not listed we should be recruiting, please let me know.

Maine, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, the District of Columbia, North Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Arkansas, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, Iowa, Wisconsin, Tennessee, Texas, New Mexico, Colorado, Minnesota, Montana, Washington, California.

Peace,

Kevin Martin

Director, Project Abolition Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\kmartin.vcf"

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

Date: Mon, 14 May 2001 22:18:18 -0400

Subject: FW: Hallman Reunion

From: Edward Brueggemann

To: Jeanette Hallman , Edgar Hallman , Brian Hallman , Gordon Hallman , Jim Brueggemann , John Brueggemann , Debby Guarino , David Sanborn , Howard Anderson , Terri McQueen , Howard Hallman , Don Knutson , Elisha/ Paul Churchill , Eric / Mitzi Hallman , Joy Hallman , Ellen and Brian Burns , Lisa and David Briggs , Katrina Hallman , Jennifer and Jeff Moore , Jeanette and Ken Spencer , Sara Vettraino , Carol Pepper , Bruce Hallman , Diane Gniadek , David Hallman , Suzanne Knutson , Karen and Greg Walaitis , John and Corine Knutson , Ben Spencer

Anyone who needs a room please contact Don at this address. e

db

From: DKNUTSONR@aol.com

Date: Mon, 14 May 2001 19:11:53 EDT

To: edbruegge@MEDIAONE.NET

Subject: Hallman Reunion

Ed,

Marj, Dakota and I will be the only ones attending the Reunion from our family. Consequently, we have an extra room at the Confort Inn, front of Inn - veiw of mountains, for Jun 28 through July 1. Does anyone need a room? If not, I will cancel that reservation.

Look forward to seeing you.

Don

From: Rina.Radov@CliffordChance.com
To: mupj@igc.org, kmartin@projectabolition.org,
brinkprogram@backfromthebrink.net
Subject: UU Clergy letter on missile defense
Date: Tue, 15 May 2001 16:51:15 +0100
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

<<348653_1.DOC>>

Greetings all,

FYI, attached is the text of the Unitarian Universalist clergy letter on NMD, which will be sent to Pres. Bush and members of Congress. Besides John Buehrens, the President of the UUA, 17 other UU ministers from around the country have signed on thus far, and we anticipate adding more. It will be placed on the UUA web site, along with model individual letters to Congress and to the editor.

Shalom,

Guy

guy.quinlan@cliffordchance.com
Tel. (212) 878-8219
Fax (212) 878-8375

Rina C. Radov
Asst. to Paul C. Meyer and Guy C. Quinlan

This message and any attachment are confidential and may be privileged or otherwise protected from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, please telephone or email the sender and delete this message and any attachment from your system. If you are not the intended recipient you must not copy this message or attachment or disclose the contents to any other person.

For further information about Clifford Chance please see our website at <http://www.cliffordchance.com> or refer to any Clifford Chance office.

begin 600 348653_1.DOC

MT,\1X*&Q&N\$"/@`#/[_"0`&`!`

M`"(P`"\$`\$`")0`"\$`#^`_`"(``#`_`

M_____
M_____
M_____
M_____
M_____
M_____
M_____

M
M
M LI<\$`<0`)!`*`_`\$`!`!
M-@D`X`8FIB:G0K="L`))!8`(A(`!9!`0`6
M00\$`&@4`#_P\
M`#_P`#_P`%T`X`
M`C@(`X`C@(`.`@`X`C@(`!0`
M`+X`O@(`^`@`+X`X`]@(`
M`P`P`#`+X`0`/X`P`!H#`
M&@,`P`!H#`J0,`#UP`/4#`
M`M00`(`W!`+<\$`MP0`W!`+<\$`
M`MP0`0`#N!0`]`\$`.(`!^`VP0`!4`
M`C@(`#UP`#UP`
M`/4#`J0,`#UP`-L\$`000`.
M`@`X`&@,`!H#`#;`&@,`
M`!!!`\$\$\$`000`#UP`3`X`&@,`
M`".`@`!H#`M00`
MH@(`X`P`@`#@`X`C@(`.`@`X`
M`J0,`"U!`\$\$\$`!T`000`+4\$`
M`C@(`.`@`
M`M00`P`
M`X#`,`P%/4HY+8P`&^`@`+X`000`"U`
M!
M`
M`
M`
M`1%)!1E0Z"34O.2]P,0T-07,@8VET:7IE;G,@86YD(&%S(&UE;6)E
M<G,@;V8@82!F86ET:"!C;VUM=6YI='DL('=E('=R:71E('1O(&5X<')E<W,@
M;W5R(&1E97`@8V]N8V5R;B!A8F]U="!R96-E;G1L>2!A;FYO=6YC960@<&QA
M;G,@9F]R(&\$@;F%T:6]N86P@;6ES<VEL92!D969E;G-E("A.340I+B`@169F
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M(&9R;VT@=&AE(\$%N=&EB86QL:7-T:6,@36ES<VEL92!4<F5A='DL(&%N(&%C
M=&EO;B!W:&EC:"!C;W5L9"!U;G)A=F5L(&5X:7-T:6YG(&%R;7,@8V]N=')O
M;"!A9W)E96UE;G1S+"!A;F0@:7-O;&%T92!T:&4@56YI=&5D(%-T871E<R!I
M;B!T:&4@:6YT97)N871I;VYA;"!C;VUM=6YI='DN#0U792!A<F4@86QS;R!C
M;VYC97)N960@86)O=70@=&AE(&5N;W)M;W5S(&5X<&5N<V4@;V8@=&AE('!R
M;W!O<V5D(\$Y-1"!P<F]J96-T+"!W:&EC:"!W;W5L9"!C;VYS=6UE(')E<V]U
M<F-E<R!B971T97(@9&5V;W1E9"!T;R!H96%L=&@8V%R92P@961U8V%T:6]N
M+"!A;F0@;W1H97(@:'5M86X@;F5E9',N#0U4:&4@9&%N9V5R(&]F(&YU8VQE
M87(@8V]N9FQI8W0@:7,@=F5R>2!R96%L+"!B=70@3DU\$(&ES(&YO="!T:&4@
M86YS=V5R+B`@5&AE(')I<VL@;V8@86-C:61E;G1A;"!O<B!U;F%U=&AO<FEZ
M960@;&%U;F-H+"!W:&EC:"!H87,@8F5E;B!O;F4@<W1A=&5D(&]B:F5C=&EV
M92!O9B!D97!L;WEI;F<@=&AE(\$Y-1"P@<VAO=6QD(&)E(&%D9')E<W-E9"!B
M>2!A;B!E87)L>2!A9W)E96UE;G0@=&\@=&%K92!N=6-L96%R('=E87!O;G,@
M;V9F(&AA:7(M=')I9V=E<B!A;&5R="X@(%1H92!5;FET960@4W1A=&5S('H
M;W5L9"!A;'O('1A:V4@=&AE(&QE860@:6X@;F5G;W1I871I;F<@9&5E<"!C
M=71S(&EN('1H92!S:7IE(&]F(&YU8VQE87(@87)S96YA;'L('=I=&@=&AE
M('5L=&EM871E(&=O86P@;V8@82!V97)I9FEA8FQE(&%N9"!E;F9O<F-E86)L
M92!A9W)E96UE;G0@=&\@<)O:&EB:70@;G5C;&5A<B!W96%P;VYS(&%L=&]G

To: Rina.Radov@CliffordChance.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: UU Clergy letter on missile defense
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <BFF9C681D030D411968500508BCFC72E2CB499@nyc-msg-11.NY.RW.COM>
References:

At 04:51 PM 5/15/01 +0100, you wrote:

> <<348653_1.DOC>>

>

>Greetings all,

>

>FYI, attached is the text of the Unitarian Universalist clergy letter on

>NMD, which will be sent to Pres. Bush and members of Congress....

Thanks for sending this letter. However, it came in symbols rather than text. Could you send a text version.

Thanks,
Howard Hallman

From: "Bob and Elaine Tiller" <tiller64@starpower.net>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: National missile defense discussion at May 15 meeting
Date: Mon, 14 May 2001 21:32:01 -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,

I will not be able to attend tomorrow's meeting. My spouse has an appointment with her oncologist, and I am going with her to help with asking questions and writing down the answers. Let me know what happens at the meeting.

Bob Tiller

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

From: Howard W. Hallman <mupj@igc.org>
To: <mupj@igc.org>
Sent: Monday, May 14, 2001 8:20 AM
Subject: National missile defense discussion at May 15 meeting

> To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament
>
> Dear Colleagues:
>
> President Bush's speech on national missile defense (NMD), while
> containing
> nothing new, is the beginning of a vigorous campaign to gain public
> support. We should respond with equal vigor, for NMD has become the most
> visible of the issues we are working on.
>
> Therefore, at tomorrow's meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear
> Disarmament, I would like to consider what we can do together on this
> issue. If you cannot attend, I would appreciate your responding with
> your
> views or calling me this afternoon (Monday) between 1 and 5 p.m. or
> Tuesday morning until noon. The meeting is on Tuesday, May 15 from 1:00
> to
> 2:30 p.m. in Conference Room 3 (not 4 like recent meetings) of the
> Methodist Building.
>
> Based upon what we have done together in the past, here are some
> alternatives to consider:
>
> Sign-on letter from representatives of national organization. Already
> done with 27 organizations represented. Went to President Bush and all
> members of Congress.
>

- > At this stage concentrate on Congress, both Democrats and Republicans.
- > Unlike the CTBT when most Senate Democrats favored ratification, many
- > Democrats have supported development of NMD (but not necessarily
- > deployment). The same moderate Republicans we focused on for the CTBT
- > should also be approached.
- >
- > Adapt the national sign-on letter for state and local use. For example,
- > encourage state religious organizations to modify the letter for use with
- > senators and representatives.
- >
- > Condense the reasons for opposition into a petition.
- >
- > Form interfaith delegations for home state visits to members of Congress.
- >
- > Denominational offices and peace fellowships send out alerts to foster
- > letters and calls to members of Congress.
- >
- > Develop a joint postcard alert with help from 20/20 Vision for the same
- > purpose.
- >
- > Post information on denomination web sites.
- >
- > Promote letters-to-the-editor in state and local newspapers.
- >
- > Promote op-ed pieces in state and local newspapers, and with help from
- > civil sector organizations try to place some in national newspapers.
- >
- > Prepare and distribute a bulletin insert.
- >
- > Promote participation in the national mobilization to "Stop the New Arms
- > Race" on June 10to 12, sponsored by a number of civil sector
- organizations.
- >
- > Develop and release new denominational statements opposing national
- missile
- > defense or re-release existing statements. The United Methodist Council
- > of Bishops did this ten days ago.
- >
- > Encourage the executive committee (or whatever it is called) of the
- > National Council of Churches to issue a statement when it meets in
- > Washington toward the end of this month.
- >
- > You may have other ideas.
- >
- > This is a rich menu to choose from. We are unlikely to do all of these
- > things immediately. We will need to prioritize.
- >
- > So come to the Tuesday meeting prepared to offer your ideas. And please
- > call me in advance or respond by e-mail if you cannot attend.
- >
- > Shalom,
- > Howard
- >
- > Howard W. Hallman, Chair

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

From: "Bob and Elaine Tiller" <tiller64@starpower.net>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: National missile defense discussion at May 15 meeting
Date: Mon, 14 May 2001 21:53:44 -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,

I have not consulted with Ken Sehested, so I can not speak for the BPFNA on this subject.

My own view is that the Interfaith Committee should consider these approaches on national missile defense:

1. Emphasize the moral arguments against it. It is unlikely that anyone else will claim this niche, so we should.
2. Ask others (e.g. Monday Lobby colleagues) what they think would be the most effective steps for us to take. I imagine they will want us to undertake some tasks that are pretty standard, such as: (a) alerts to peace fellowships and councils of churches, urging letters to Congress, (b) local media work, such as letters to the editor, and (c) heads-of-communion and regional bishops contact their Members of Congress.

Bob Tiller

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

From: Howard W. Hallman <mupj@igc.org>
To: <mupj@igc.org>
Sent: Monday, May 14, 2001 8:20 AM
Subject: National missile defense discussion at May 15 meeting

> To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament
>
> Dear Colleagues:
>
> President Bush's speech on national missile defense (NMD), while
> containing
> nothing new, is the beginning of a vigorous campaign to gain public
> support. We should respond with equal vigor, for NMD has become the most
> visible of the issues we are working on.
>
> Therefore, at tomorrow's meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear
> Disarmament, I would like to consider what we can do together on this
> issue. If you cannot attend, I would appreciate your responding with
> your
> views or calling me this afternoon (Monday) between 1 and 5 p.m. or
> Tuesday morning until noon. The meeting is on Tuesday, May 15 from 1:00
> to
> 2:30 p.m. in Conference Room 3 (not 4 like recent meetings) of the
> Methodist Building.

- >
- > Based upon what we have done together in the past, here are some
- > alternatives to consider:
- >
- > Sign-on letter from representatives of national organization. Already
- > done with 27 organizations represented. Went to President Bush and all
- > members of Congress.
- >
- > At this stage concentrate on Congress, both Democrats and Republicans.
- > Unlike the CTBT when most Senate Democrats favored ratification, many
- > Democrats have supported development of NMD (but not necessarily
- > deployment). The same moderate Republicans we focused on for the CTBT
- > should also be approached.
- >
- > Adapt the national sign-on letter for state and local use. For example,
- > encourage state religious organizations to modify the letter for use with
- > senators and representatives.
- >
- > Condense the reasons for opposition into a petition.
- >
- > Form interfaith delegations for home state visits to members of Congress.
- >
- > Denominational offices and peace fellowships send out alerts to foster
- > letters and calls to members of Congress.
- >
- > Develop a joint postcard alert with help from 20/20 Vision for the same
- > purpose.
- >
- > Post information on denomination web sites.
- >
- > Promote letters-to-the-editor in state and local newspapers.
- >
- > Promote op-ed pieces in state and local newspapers, and with help from
- > civil sector organizations try to place some in national newspapers.
- >
- > Prepare and distribute a bulletin insert.
- >
- > Promote participation in the national mobilization to "Stop the New Arms
- > Race" on June 10to 12, sponsored by a number of civil sector
- organizations.
- >
- > Develop and release new denominational statements opposing national
- missile
- > defense or re-release existing statements. The United Methodist Council
- > of Bishops did this ten days ago.
- >
- > Encourage the executive committee (or whatever it is called) of the
- > National Council of Churches to issue a statement when it meets in
- > Washington toward the end of this month.
- >
- > You may have other ideas.
- >
- > This is a rich menu to choose from. We are unlikely to do all of these
- > things immediately. We will need to prioritize.

>
> So come to the Tuesday meeting prepared to offer your ideas. And please
> call me in advance or respond by e-mail if you cannot attend.
>
> 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: "Bob and Elaine Tiller" <tiller64@starpower.net>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: National missile defense discussion at May 15 meeting
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <00e001c0dcea\$82099d20\$c30a2c42@user>
References: <3.0.3.32.20010514082056.0068f414@pop2.igc.org>

Bob,

I hope and pray that your wife is making good progress in her treatment.

I have reported separately on decisions on NMD. I shared your perspective that we should emphasize the moral issue. I hope that we can incorporate this view into the web site material that we want to develop.

Shalom,
Howard

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express Macintosh Edition - 4.5 (0410)
Date: Tue, 15 May 2001 11:03:41 -0500
Subject: Star Wars Resolution Passes in Philadelphia Diocese Convention in
Nov. 2000
From: "William Stuart-Whistler" <stuwhis@enter.net>
To: mupj@igc.org

Dear Howard:

The resolution I mentioned in our telecon today (May 15) follows.

It was good to talk this morning. Sorry it was impossible for an Episcopal representation at your meeting today - hope to have the situation corrected by your next meeting.

Yours in Peace - Bill Stuart-Whistler

From: "William Stuart-Whistler" <stuwhis@enter.net>
Date: Wed, Nov 8, 2000, 11:00 PM
To: Christopher Pottle <cp16@cornell.edu> , "David O. Selzer" <dos403@aol.com> , "Verna M. Fausey" <vfausey@aol.com> , "Janet G. Chisholm" <nonviolence@forusa.org> , "Rev. Barbara Armstrong" <bobbie.armstrong@ecunet.org> , "Virginia F. Kerner" <rekerner@aol.com> , "Rev. Sunny Lopez" <FraSuDoDa@juno.com> , "REv. thomas Trimmer" , "Rev. Jess E. Gaither" <jess.gaither@ecunet.org> , "Madeleine G. trichel" <mtrichel@peace-center.org> , "William K. Yates" <wmkyates@earthlink.net> , "Peter M. Carey" <Carey@ea.pvt.k12.pa.us> , "Laura D. Chase" <laurachase@aol.com> , "Rev. J. Gary Gloster" <ggloster@episdionc.org> , Mary Miller <mary.miller@ecunet.org> , "RT. Rev Sanford z.k. Hampton" <shampton@olympia.anglican.org>
Subject: Resolution on Star Wars Passes in Phila Diocese

The following Resolution R-7-2000 was passed by the Philadelphia Episcopal Diocese Convention:

ON NUCLEAR WAR IN SPACE

RESOLVED: That this convention opposes any abrogation of existing nuclear treaties especially the ABM or Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty) agreed to by our National Government and previousy endorsed by this Convention, and be it further

RESOLVED: That this resolutionbe submitted by the Secretary of this convention to the Presidet of the United States, the Secretaries of State and Defense and the Chairpersons of the House and Senate Armed Services Committees, the Pennsylvania Senators and the Congress people from the five county area.

EXPLANATION:

* Abrogation of the ABM Treaty especially permits extending the field of uclear warfare into Space and permits approval of the \$60 Billion program to advance space warfare to at least the year 2020.

* Previous Episcopal Conventionshave gone on record as opposing nuclear warfare: this new facet of nuclear space warfare should additionally be opposed as continuing and expanding the danger of nuclear annihilation of our whole planet.

* All signers of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (this includes the United States) are bound by this treaty by its Article VI to "work for the elimination of all nuclear weapons".

* Abrogating the ABM Treaty and building a costly "defense shield" will continue the climate of fear of nuclear annihilation in the world that has existed since the first use of nuclear bombs in 1945.

* Extending nuclear warfare into space continues our country's worship of a nuclear idol in defiance of our Church's teachings.

--Submitted by Margaret Moore and William Stuart-Whistler for the Peace, Justice and Environment Committee.

REFERENCES: Decalogue: "Thou Shalt have no other gods but me".

* Baptismal Covenant: "Will you strive for justice and peace among all people?" "I will, with God's help"

* MISSION FOR 2020: (brochure by the Ballistic Missile Defense Office outlining their plan for war in space.

To: redgar@nccusa.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Possible statement against missile defense
Cc: lisaw@nccusa.org
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Bob,

Would it be possible for the Executive Board of the National Council of Churches to adopt a statement in opposition to President Bush's missile defense initiative when it meets later this month? Or re-affirm an early policy position?

I realize that your agenda is packed. However, missile defense will be the first element of the Bush nuclear policy to come up for congressional decision in the form of the defense authorization bill. Mark-up is likely to occur in July with a floor vote just before the August recess or in September. So now is the time to speak out.

Most of your member organizations with Washington offices are opposing missile defense. A statement by the NCC Executive Board might encourage other member organizations to become actively involved in the opposition.

If I can help with drafting or background material, please let me know.

Shalom,
Howard

To: nsmall@paxchristiusa.org, dave@paxchristiusa.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Opposing missile defense
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Nancy and David,

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament is stepping up its campaign to build opposition to national missile defense (NMD). Among other things we are going to develop common web site material for use by various religious organizations, and we will seek to influence the Senate Armed Services Committee when it marks up the defense authorization bill, probably in July. Beyond that there will be floor votes, probably in September but possibly just before the August recess begins.

It would be great if Pax Christi USA played an active role in this effort. Jerry Powers says that the U.S. Catholic Conference is unlikely to get involved because their policy statement on this subject goes back to 1988 when it was addressed to President Reagan's Star Wars which focused on defense against massive Soviet attack. Bush's NMD is of a different character, and the National Conference of Catholic Bishops isn't going to come up with a statement on this version. So we need you to help mobilize Catholic opposition.

Do you have a statement on missile defense? If not, could you produce a statement by Catholic bishops and other leaders? (The United Methodist Council of Bishops just adopted a strong statement opposing NMD.) Do you have a web site that could use the common material? Would you be able to mobilize your membership, especially in some key states? Would you be able to tap into diocesan networks in some of these states?

Please let me know what you are able and willing to do. If you want to be part of the web site project, I'll put you on the e-mail list to receive information as it develops.

Shalom,
Howard

Date: Wed, 16 May 2001 20:20:37 -0400
From: Lonnie & Fran Turner <76622.637@compuserve.com>
Subject: Report of May 15 meeting
Sender: Lonnie & Fran Turner <76622.637@compuserve.com>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>

Dear Howard:

We are getting ready to do our first web site so we want the information.
Will keep you posted.

Shalom!
Lonnie Turner

Date: Wed, 16 May 2001 21:20:05 -0400
From: Lonnie & Fran Turner <76622.637@compuserve.com>
Subject: 20/20 NMD card
Sender: Lonnie & Fran Turner <76622.637@compuserve.com>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>

Please sign us on and we need at least 1000 cards for our General Assembly
in Atlanta.

Rev. Lonnie Turner
Cooperative Baptist Fellowship
Washington Office
1233 Mass. Ave. SE
Washington, DC 2003
Phone 202-675-0687

Shalom!
Lonnie Turner

To: natalie@2020vision.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: 20/20 NMD card sign-on
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

>Date: Wed, 16 May 2001 21:20:05 -0400
>From: Lonnie & Fran Turner <76622.637@compuserve.com>
>Subject: 20/20 NMD card
>Sender: Lonnie & Fran Turner <76622.637@compuserve.com>
>To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
>
>Please sign us on and we need at least 1000 cards for our General Assembly
>in Atlanta.
>
>Rev. Lonnie Turner
>Cooperative Baptist Fellowship
>Washington Office
>1233 Mass. Ave. SE
>Washington, DC 2003
>Phone 202-675-0687
>
>Shalom!
>Lonnie Turner
>

1.

"A Dangerous Step Backwards" Why Has President Bush Cut Funding To Combat Nuclear Proliferation In Russia, And Will Congress Be Able To Bring It Back?

Fiona Morgan

Salon.com

May 16, 2001

(for personal use only)

Since the fall of the Soviet Union, it's been hard to keep tight watch over all 7,000 warheads and all 650 tons of plutonium and highly enriched uranium still spread out across Russia. Talented Russian weapons scientists live in a seriously depressed economy, uncertain if they'll receive another paycheck or be able to feed their families.

For years there's been a broad bipartisan consensus that the combined problems of "loose nukes" -- weapons and materials that aren't adequately secured -- and the "brain drain" of Russian scientists -- some of whom are being lured by governments like Iran and Iraq to make those nations nuclear powers -- pose the greatest threat to national security that the U.S. faces.

That's why there's now bipartisan alarm at President Bush's decision to cut \$100 million from highly successful federal programs that keep tabs on Russia's nuclear weapons and material and prevent those materials from falling into the hands of hostile states and terrorists.

The cuts are part of the administration's 2001 budget, which was approved by Congress last Thursday. Many in the security field are particularly distressed by the cuts to the Department of Energy's Nuclear Nonproliferation Office, which oversees a variety of programs dealing with both the "loose nukes" and the "brain drain" problems, in Russia especially.

These programs have traditionally received widespread bipartisan support -- so much so that in the past, Congress has allocated more than the agency has requested. Now it will face cuts of more than \$60 million to its programs in Russia alone, just as those in the field say those programs are most needed and gaining momentum.

Cuts to these programs come at the same time that Bush is trying to sell allies on a multibillion-dollar missile defense system to combat nuclear ballistic missile attacks. On Monday the administration reaffirmed that it would construct a missile defense, despite a chilly response from Russia. Russian officials complain that such a system would violate the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, the hallmark agreement of arms control, and have threatened to stop reducing their own nuclear stockpile if the U.S. pursues such a plan.

Furthermore, intelligence reports indicate that the most likely form of nuclear attack the U.S. could face would not involve ballistic missiles, but would likely come under the radar of such a defense system.

Sen. Pete Domenici, R-N.M., the Budget Committee chairman and key founder of the Department of Energy's nonproliferation programs, is expected to fight to restore the cuts. "The whole idea of cutting programs before policy reviews are completed is of great concern," Domenici said in a public statement last Friday.

The New Mexico senator says he is "very hopeful" that such a review will show that increasing funding for the programs is "not only appropriate, but urgently needed." At a conference of the Institute of Nuclear Materials Management in Washington on Wednesday, Domenici will call for restoring at least some of the cuts.

But it won't be an easy task. Nonproliferation programs will have to vie for part of the same pie that will be split among all of the Department of Energy's programs -- cleanup of nuclear sites within the U.S., scientific research at the national laboratories -- not to mention efforts to deal with the nation's energy crisis. No matter how grave the national security issues involved may be, the issue arises at a time when the most pressing energy concerns facing the public are high gas prices and the West Coast electricity outages.

In a country where poverty makes entrepreneurship a necessity, those with access to Russia's more than 100 nuclear sites face constant temptation. Nowhere is that temptation greater than in Russia's 10 closed nuclear cities. Built in secret during the Cold War, not officially on the map, they produced nuclear, chemical and biological weapons. Now cities like Sarov, Lesnoy and Ozersk are virtual ghost towns. Those who could leave did leave, mostly during the early '90s. But a few remain there -- specialists who used to be pampered by the Soviet government and given free housing, but who now find it difficult to find any work at all. The average monthly wage is less than \$100 in most of these cities, and in some it is less than \$50.

In 1998, workers at the Sarov nuclear lab were charged with selling nuclear documents to Iraq and Afghanistan. That same year, the Russian Federal Security Service caught staff members at a nuclear weapons plant in Chelyabinsk trying to steal 18.5 kilograms of weapons-usable nuclear material, about enough to make a bomb. According to Russian authorities, there are at least 100 suitcase-sized bombs currently missing from storage

While she served on the National Security Council from 1993-1996, Jane Wales saw some potentially terrifying lapses in security that were caught and stopped by authorities. "There was one case where a janitor

who hadn't been paid in a long time, who didn't know what kind of future there was for his family, took highly enriched uranium and put it in a mitt and took it home and put it in his refrigerator. Then it occurred to him that he didn't have any notion of how one sells highly enriched uranium on the market. You can't exactly take out a classified ad. So finally, after struggling with his situation, he chose to return it and admit that he had done this."

And while the end of the Cold War convinced many Americans the Russian nuclear threat had been vanquished, "in many respects the nuclear danger has gone up, not down, since the end of the Cold War," Wales says. "We have lost the tight Soviet controls over their nuclear arsenal and over the expertise that supports it."

In just 10 years, the anti-proliferation programs have helped lead Russia to agree to close one of its four nuclear weapons assembly facilities (the U.S. has only one). And hundreds of tons of plutonium and highly enriched uranium have been processed down so that they can't be used for nuclear weapons. One DOE program even recycles that uranium for use in American nuclear power plants, and has so far blended down 110 metric tons of the stuff as of last December -- the equivalent of 4,400 nuclear devices.

"This may be the single smartest investment in our security that we could be making," says Wales, who is currently the president and CEO of the World Affairs Council of Northern California.

A top-level government report issued last year agreed. The Secretary of Energy Advisory Board task force on Russia programs, chaired by former White House Counsel Lloyd Cutler and former Senate Majority Leader Howard Baker, praised the Russia programs, saying they had shown impressive results so far.

But the bipartisan task force said the programs were moving too slowly because their funding was inadequate, and urged a \$30 billion increase in funding for the programs -- in other words, it urged that the funding be quintupled. In that report, Baker called the proliferation dangers in Russia "the most urgent unmet national security threat to the United States today."

Now, instead of increases, the programs face cuts. The International Materials Protection Control & Accounting Program (IMPC&A), which puts in place security measures at Russia's more than 100 nuclear sites, now faces reductions of nearly \$40 million. The Nuclear Cities Initiative, which works to combat "brain drain" by creating civilian jobs for nuclear workers in the closed nuclear cities, was cut by \$20 million. The Initiative for Proliferation Prevention faces cuts of only \$2 million, but the cuts will affect Russian programs most severely,

hindering the project's efforts to couple displaced weapons scientists with private companies doing research in their region.

So far the Department of Energy has been tight-lipped about the impact of the cuts. Sarah Lennon, a spokesperson for the DOE's Office of Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, would not discuss the budget issues except to say "None of our programs are being cut entirely. There has been a reduction in funding for some of the programs, but none of them are being phased out."

But anti-proliferation advocates say the cuts will have ripple effects, touching even nongovernmental programs that work on the same goals. The Nuclear Threat Initiative is a nonprofit organization founded by Nunn and Lugar, with a \$250 million grant from CNN media mogul Ted Turner. Laura Holgate, the vice president of Russian nuclear programs at NTI, says, "These cuts are very concerning." She views the cuts as doubly severe considering that "this was the year when a lot of these programs were scheduled for some very major increases."

Holgate, who worked closely with the programs a few years ago when she was the director of the DOE's plutonium disposition program, says that the IMPC&A program in particular had been transitioning from "a Band-Aid approach of quick fixes for glaring problems" -- such as bricking up glass windows into nuclear vaults and putting fences around facilities -- to a much more systematic approach to help the Russians improve their security. It also aims "to really change their mindset to recognize the importance of the insider threat, which didn't used to be a problem in the Soviet Union. That takes a lot of effort and time and training. That process will be significantly slowed if these cuts persist."

The Bush budget slightly increases Defense Department nonproliferation programs, which were created by the Cooperative Threat Reduction Act, sponsored by Sens. Sam Nunn, D-Ga., and Richard Lugar, R-Ind., in 1991. But the DOE programs work closely with the Nunn-Lugar efforts, and both Nunn and Lugar have opposed the cuts, which Nunn called "a dangerous step backward."

Ironically, the cuts come at a time when missile defense is on the front page of newspapers across the globe, and there is much talk about the threat of nuclear attack from "rogue" states such as Iran, Iraq and North Korea, and from terrorist organizations. But none of these rogue states or terrorist groups have ballistic missiles capable of reaching the continental U.S. The biggest threat to the U.S., experts say, may be a bomb made of black-market nuclear material, smuggled over the border in a briefcase, or hidden in freight headed straight for a major port city.

"I think that threat is very plausible," says Holgate. "Even if it

doesn't work quite as it's designed to, [a nuclear weapon] can still make a lot of mess and bring a lot of terror and public panic, and create an environmental nightmare. The same goes for nuclear material, you can either make a real mess with it or, in the hands of a knowledgeable and talented proliferator, they may be able to transform weapons material directly into a bomb."

"The first thing you do to protect against the threat is the same," says Holgate, "whether you're worried about Iran or about Osama bin Laden, you have to protect the material where it is and make sure it stays put. So you don't really have to address the demand side as quickly if you're taking care of the supply side effectively."

Restoring cuts to the DOE's programs now depends on two things: the National Security Council's review of those programs, still underway, and the final stage of the budget process. In the next couple of weeks, appropriations money will be divvied up and budget priorities will be set into law. And Domenici, who also chairs the appropriations subcommittee on energy, is firmly committed to restoring the programs' funding, according to a spokesperson for his office.

Holgate says she is hopeful that the budget can be adjusted. "There is consensus that there is a big problem out there," noting that bipartisan effort created both the DOE programs and her own organization. "There is a very obvious common ground that all sides of the question come to, and say, 'Whatever you think about missile defense down the road, or whatever you think about the future of Russia -- wherever the partisanship differences occur -- the bottom line is that this material should be protected, you don't want the scientists going to places that they shouldn't be, and you don't want these facilities to continue to operate with their excessive capability."

Even if funds are restored later this year, Domenici expressed fear that programs could lose critical staff. "We are sending an unfortunate message to our own program workers, to say nothing of the Russians with whom we are cooperating."

Wales says she witnessed an impressive level of cooperation on the part of the Russians while working for the NSC. "What stood out for me in this experience was the fact that folks who hadn't been paid in a long time, who really felt at risk and who had the opportunity to benefit, either by selling their knowledge or potentially by diverting materials, chose not to. By and large the people working at these sites were patriots first, who did not want to be part of spreading proliferation, and they chose to do the honorable thing.

"But you can't rely on that forever," she cautions. Scientists who are finding it hard to make a living "would find it quite easy to be

employed if they were willing to turn their backs on their own country and on the international community. That's a huge temptation for people, no matter how honorable, over a sustained period of time."

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

The following article from Aerospace Daily puts the proposed increase for missile defense in FY2002 at \$3 billion on top \$4.8 billion authorized for 2001. It also notes a public relations program to sell this increase. That's something we need to counter.

Howard

###

"Rep. Weldon Expects Missile Defense Budget Boost Of Up To \$3 Billion"
Aerospace Daily - May 17, 2001

A senior member of the House Armed Services Committee said May 16 that he expects the Bush Administration will ask Congress to boost missile defense spending by up to \$3 billion in fiscal 2002.

Based on Defense Department briefings, Rep. Curt Weldon (R-Pa.) anticipates the Administration will propose an increase of roughly \$1 billion to \$3 billion for missile defense, the congressman told The DAILY after speaking at a Capitol Hill seminar on missile defense. The fiscal 2001 defense authorization act, which the committee helped write, authorized \$4.8 billion for various ballistic missile defense programs.

Clementine revival possible

Weldon said there is a strong possibility the Administration will seek to revive the dormant Clementine satellite program. Clementine was originally designed to test technology to track and intercept missiles, but it is probably best known for discovering ice on the moon in 1994 (DAILY, April 13, 1994).

The Administration also may propose to speed up some missile defense programs, including the Airborne Laser, Weldon said. The Air Force now plans to achieve initial operational capability for the ABL with three aircraft in 2007.

President Bush pledged in a May 1 speech at National Defense University to deploy missile defenses "when ready," but he has not yet released details. The Administration is expected to be more specific about its missile defense plans when it requests additional funding for its FY 2002 defense budget within the coming weeks, following a broad review of defense programs.

Weldon estimated that a total of about \$30 billion to \$35 billion could be available to pay for additional FY 2002 defense spending and a FY 2001 supplemental defense spending bill.

Public relations effort eyed

Weldon said an increase of that size won't be enough to meet all defense needs, but it will hard to win vital public support for increases beyond that unless defense advocates do a better sales job, since defense is low on the public's policy agenda. To rally support for bigger defense budgets, Weldon intends to organize conferences with defense contractors, labor unions, university research institutions and ethnic groups that have an interest in U.S. defense policy.

-- Marc Selinger

To: mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: FY2002 increase for missile defense
Cc:
Bcc: icnd
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

The following article from Aerospace Daily puts the proposed increase for missile defense in FY2002 at \$3 billion on top \$4.8 billion authorized for 2001. It also notes a public relations program to sell this increase. That's something we need to counter.

Howard

###

"Rep. Weldon Expects Missile Defense Budget Boost Of Up To \$3 Billion"
Aerospace Daily - May 17, 2001

A senior member of the House Armed Services Committee said May 16 that he expects the Bush Administration will ask Congress to boost missile defense spending by up to \$3 billion in fiscal 2002.

Based on Defense Department briefings, Rep. Curt Weldon (R-Pa.) anticipates the Administration will propose an increase of roughly \$1 billion to \$3 billion for missile defense, the congressman told The DAILY after speaking at a Capitol Hill seminar on missile defense. The fiscal 2001 defense authorization act, which the committee helped write, authorized \$4.8 billion for various ballistic missile defense programs.

Clementine revival possible

Weldon said there is a strong possibility the Administration will seek to revive the dormant Clementine satellite program. Clementine was originally designed to test technology to track and intercept missiles, but it is probably best known for discovering ice on the moon in 1994 (DAILY, April 13, 1994).

The Administration also may propose to speed up some missile defense programs, including the Airborne Laser, Weldon said. The Air Force now plans to achieve initial operational capability for the ABL with three aircraft in 2007.

President Bush pledged in a May 1 speech at National Defense University to deploy missile defenses "when ready," but he has not yet released details. The Administration is expected to be more specific about its missile defense plans when it requests additional funding for its FY 2002 defense budget within the coming weeks, following a broad review of defense programs.

Weldon estimated that a total of about \$30 billion to \$35 billion could be

available to pay for additional FY 2002 defense spending and a FY 2001 supplemental defense spending bill.

Public relations effort eyed

Weldon said an increase of that size won't be enough to meet all defense needs, but it will hard to win vital public support for increases beyond that unless defense advocates do a better sales job, since defense is low on the public's policy agenda. To rally support for bigger defense budgets, Weldon intends to organize conferences with defense contractors, labor unions, university research institutions and ethnic groups that have an interest in U.S. defense policy.

-- Marc Selinger

From: Starman Wendy <wstarman@wesleysem.edu>
To: "mupj@igc.org" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: FW: to Howard
Date: Fri, 18 May 2001 08:50:24 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

Hi Howard,

FYI, I replied to this e-mail by sending Jonathan the information from you, which will soon go up on our Web site, plus I told him to contact you for more information about your efforts.

Reply to follow!

Wendy

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

From: Jonathan Parfrey [mailto:psrsm@psr.org]
Sent: Thursday, May 17, 2001 4:08 PM
To: wstarman@wesleysem.edu
Subject:

Wendy,

Do you know of an organizing effort to gather an interfaith statement opposing NMD?

Where are the denominations on this issue? Statements issued?

.....

Jonathan Parfrey
Executive Director
Physicians for Social Responsibility, Los Angeles
1316 Third Street Promenade - Suite B1
Santa Monica, CA 90401-1325
310 458 2694 voice - 310 458 7925 fascimile - 310 261 0832 cellular
psrsm@psr.org <http://www.psrla.org>

From: Starman Wendy <wstarman@wesleysem.edu>
To: "'mupj@igc.org'" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: FW: reply from Wendy Starman at NR/DI
Date: Fri, 18 May 2001 08:51:06 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

Howard,

Here's my reply to Jonathan's e-mail (sent earlier).

Wendy

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Starman Wendy

> Sent: Friday, May 18, 2001 8:48 AM

> To: 'psrsm@psr.org'

> Subject: reply from Wendy Starman at NR/DI

>

> Dear Jonathan,

> I think the below organizing effort, by Howard Hallman, is the kind of

> thing your looking for. Please take a close look at these attachments to

> get a feel for what he's been coordinating with interfaith groups. His

> contact information is on the bottom and you can feel free to tell him

> that I referred you. I will also forward your message to Howard.

> I just forwarded this information to our Web guru, to have it added to our

> Web site www.nrdi.org. and it should be posted soon.

> Best,

>

> Wendy Starman

>

> * Responding to National Missile Defense: Information, suggestion,

> letter, & list of signatories provided by Howard Hallman (Chair,

> Methodists United for Peace with Justice/ Chair, Interfaith Committee for

> Nuclear Disarmament).

> <<National missile defense.txt>> <<signatories.doc>>

>

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\National missile defense.txt"

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

From: J._Daryl_Byler@mail.mcc.org
X-Lotus-FromDomain: MCC
To: mupj@igc.apc.org
Date: Fri, 18 May 2001 17:06:56 -0400
Subject: Report on May 15 meeting

To: Howard Hallman
From: J. Daryl Byler
Date: 5/18/2001 5:05:44 PM
Subj: Report on May 15 meeting

Howard:

My plan is to place NMD info on our web site. I need to work this out with our web designer, and also to see whether we are able to commit funds to this.

Warm regards,
Daryl

From: "Rutledge, Philip"

To: Yvonne Burke , Adam Herbert , Alvin Schexnider , "Merget, Astrid Elizabeth" , Barbara Sabol , Barbara Wamsley , Bernart Martin , Beryl Radin , Bill Davis , Bruce McDowell , Carl Stenberg , Charles Bingman , "Bonser, Charles F." , Charles Washington , "Wise, Charles R." , Cornelius Kerwin , Costis Toregas , Dale Krane , Daniel Skoler , David Garrison , David Mora , Deil Wright , "Henshel, Diane S." , Eddie Williams , Edward Perkins , "Rhodes, Edwardo L." , Elaine Orr , Elizabeth Kellar , Emerson Markham , Emmett Carson , Enid Beaumont , Fred Riggs , Gail Christopher , George Carvalho , George Frederickson , George Goodman , Gilda Lambert , Glen Cope , Grantland Johnson , Harvey White , Herbert Jasper , Howard Hallman , "Barnes, A James" , James Carroll , James Kunde , James Murley , James Norton , Jane Pisano , Jim Svara , Johathan Howes , John Kelly , "Kirlin, John J" , Jose Bolton , Joseph Wholey , Larry Terry , Mark Pisano , Mary Hamilton , Maurice Brice , Mitchell Rice , Mortimer Downer , Nancy Tate , Norman Johnson , Norman King , Patricia Florestano , Philip Rutledge , Ralph Widner , Regina Williams , Richard Monteilh , "Agranoff, Robert" , Robert Knox , "Rosemary O'Leary" , Royce Hanson , Steven Carter , Susan Tolchin , Sylvester Murray , Timothy Clark , Tobe Johnson , Valerie Lemmie , Walter Boadnax , "William Hansell, Jr." , "WILLBERN, YORK"

Subject: Los Angeles Meeting

Date: Fri, 18 May 2001 16:18:53 -0500

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Colleagues:

Just a reminder that the Social Equity Panel will meet on Thursday morning, June 7, 10:00 AM to 11:30 AM, at the Wyndham Bel Age Hotel in Los Angeles as part of NAPA's Spring Conference. Panel members David Mora, George Carvalho, and Grantland Johnson are preparing a panel discussion on social equity issues in California as our main program. In addition our business will consist of: 1) a briefing on a new environmental justice grant which Social Equity Panel members will oversee, 2) updates on the special Panel meeting in Indianapolis, July 20-21, 3) discussion of a planning process for the Social Equity Summit in Dallas, November 12-13, for which funding now seems secure, thanks to the good work of Jim Kunde. And, as always, there will be our good fellowship together. The meeting room will be posted at the Hotel. Look forward to seeing you there.

Phil

From: "Andrews, Anthony P." <ANTHONY.P.ANDREWS@saic.com>

To: 'Kerri Wright Platais' <kiki@wizard.net>,
Dwight Smith <dosmith6@juno.com>,
Pat Beverly <beverly@erols.com>,
Jerry Muys <jcm@duncanallen.com>,
Jeanne North <jfnorth@aol.com>,
Ron and Holly Foster <holronfost@aol.com>,
Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.org>,
Jo Allen <frankjoall@aol.com>

Subject: Minutes of the 9 May 2001 Outreach Committee meeting

Date: Mon, 21 May 2001 09:00:54 -0400

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Hello All -

here is my best shot at the minutes. Please add your comments where I've missed the mark. Dwight - I am missing an e-mail address for Jean, Haven, and Sue, so please forward this for me if you can.

Tony

9 May 2001 BUMC Outreach Committee minutes

In attendance were:

Dwight Smith, chair
Rev. Ron
Jane North
Sue Wells
Howard Hallman
Haven North
Jean Vincent
Tony Andrews

Forum on Poverty

Haven discussed hosting a Forum on Poverty in Montgomery County, which would be in association with Community Ministries and be led by Paul Brittner.

The objective of such a meeting would be to educate the congregations which participate to the inadequacies of current welfare programs to meet the needs of the poor in the County. This is envisioned as a round-table discussion of issues and possible actions that would follow an introductory briefing. The forum would conclude with a pooling of the round-table findings and a collective action plan.

A consensus was reached that hosting the event should be done, and that the Committee would provide the ~ \$250 required for mailings and light refreshments. The target date is mid-October; there was discussion but no conclusion about the day of the week, but a Sunday evening was commented upon favorably.

Approximately 50-60 congregations associated with Community Ministries in the local geographical area (perhaps described as a pie shape between River Rd. and Wisconsin Ave) would be invited to send representatives, to yield

about 80 participants, with 3 or 4 people from each participating congregation. Inviting "other" participants was also mentioned, but who they might be was not specified.

Africa University

A special offering for Africa University was considered in conjunction with having Lloyd Rollins as a guest minister sometime in the next 6-8 weeks. Seminarians at Wesley who have worked with the Zimbabwe/Africa University efforts of the Church would also to be invited to participate. Rev. Ron is to make arrangements, and make advance announcement(s) of the special offering. Dwight will introduce the topic at the service with a retrospective on BUMC's related activities.

Mission Trips

Sue Wells and Rev. Ron summarized the recent volunteers-in-mission trip to North Carolina, which worked on a house-building effort connected with flood relief. It was noted that a partnership with the County enabled flood-relief funding of \$72K per home to be leveraged at a rate of 3:2; i.e., with volunteer labor, three houses could be built with funding nominally allocated for two.

The \$600 budget approved by the Committee for the project went unspent, since the volunteers paid their own expenses. Rev. Ron suggested that the budget might be transferred to the upcoming Youth mission trip to Mexico. A motion to this effect passed unanimously, with the sense that a shortage of funds up to this amount would be met. The Youth are in the midst of fund raising for the trip, and their exact needs are unknown at this time.

Costa (Casa?) del Pueblo

Howard discussed an effort on the part of this organization, which operates out of the old UMC on Columbia Road, to secure a federal grant for a drug-prevention effort. Howard will assist this 501-3(c) organization, which largely deals with the Latino community, with its proposal, and sought the committee's assent to write a letter describing BUMC's work with the organization in the past and belief in the value of their work. No objection was made to the proposed letter of support, which Howard would like signed-out by either Dwight or Ron. (The larger issue of passing on the merits of the upcoming proposal was not addressed, but a proposal abstract will become available in the coming months. No direct financial support of the effort was requested.)

Dwight noted that the disbursement of previously approved funds for this organization was still up-in-the-air, and he will look into the matter again in a few weeks.

The meeting then adjourned, a bit late as usual.

v/r, Tony Andrews

Substitute Outreach Scribe

Date: Mon, 21 May 2001 13:28:20 -0700 (PDT)
From: Egbert Lawrence <egbertl4pj@yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: Report of May 15 meeting
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>

Howard,

Can you send me David Culp and Catherine Gordon e-mail addresses? I will be working on our web site statement this Wednesday and would like to get their ideas as we "go to press".

Thanks. Larry

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

> To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

>

> Dear Colleagues:

>

> This is a report on the May 15 meeting of the

> Interfaith Committee for

> Nuclear Disarmament.

>

> National Missile Defense

>

> Many denominations and peace fellowships oppose

> national missile defense.

> In order to work together in our opposition we

> decided to develop joint

> material for posting on web sites of denominations

> and other religious

> organizations. This can include background

> material, policy statements,

> action alerts, sample letters to public officials,

> sample letters to the

> editor and op-ed pieces, religious education

> material, worship material,

> and bulletin inserts. There can be linkages to

> other sites for further

> information. Civil sector organizations can also

> provide linkage to

> faith-based web sites.

>

> There was a consensus that this common material

> should be professionally

> designed and made available for incorporation into

> the web sites. Of those

> present Larry Egbert (Unitarian), David Cup (FCNL),

> and Catherine Gordon

> (Presbyterian) agreed to work on this initiative. We

> need to know which

> offices want to place this kind of information on

> national missile defense

> on their web sites. Please let me know by a quick

> reply to this

> communication.

>
> The first votes in Congress on missile defense will
> come in the House and
> Senate Armed Services Committees, probably in July.
> It appears that the
> Bush defense budget won't go to Congress until June
> 18 (or so). It is
> likely to contain many research and development
> items on missile defense
> but not a request for a decision on deployment. How
> opposition will be
> manifested in the Armed Services Committees is not
> yet known, but we need
> to be ready. The consensus at our meeting was that
> we should concentrate
> on the Senate Armed Services Committee because the
> equally-divided Senate
> offers more prospect for success than the House.
> Floor votes probably
> won't occur until September.

>
> 20/20 Vision is now circulating a postcard on
> national missile defense for
> signers as co-sponsors and distributors. I will
> send it to you in a
> separate communication. At our meeting we decided
> that we would work with
> 20/20 to develop a faith-based postcard targeted at
> states with senators on
> the Armed Services Committee and get it out in the
> latter part of June in
> order to influence committee mark-up in July. By
> then we may know more
> details on how the issue will come into focus.

>
> De-alerting
>
> The de-alerting campaign is proceeding. Bank from
> the Brink and other
> organizations are seeking legislation to put
> Congress on record on
> de-alerting, perhaps focused upon a call for initial
> de-alerting of
> missiles that are scheduled for elimination under
> START II. The grassroots
> campaign is proceeding in Oregon, New Mexico,
> Nebraska, and Maine. Bank
> from the Brink has a new set of talking points for
> grassroots use.

>
> Lugar Reception
>
> The United Methodist General Board of Church and
> Society is organizing a

- > reception to honor Senator Richard Lugar, a United
- > Methodist, for his work
- > over the years to contain, reduce, and eliminate
- > weapons of mass
- > destruction. It will take place in the Methodist
- > Building on Wednesday,
- > June 20 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. All of you are
- > invited. A framed
- > resolution or plaque will be presented by the UMGBCS
- > on its behalf, but
- > other denominational offices will be invited to
- > become sponsors of the
- > reception and have their names on the invitation.
- > You will be hearing
- > about this separately.
- >
- > Next Meeting
- >
- > The next meeting of the Interfaith Committee for
- > Nuclear Disarmament will
- > take place on Tuesday, June 19 from 1:00 to 2:30
- > p.m. at the Methodist
- > Building, Conference Room 4.
- >
- > Shalom,
- > Howard
- >
- >
- > Howard W. Hallman, Chair
- > Methodists United for Peace with Justice
- > 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036
- > Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail: mupj@igc.org
- >
- > Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a
- > membership association of
- > laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any
- > Methodist denomination.

Do You Yahoo!?

Yahoo! Auctions - buy the things you want at great prices

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

To: Egbert Lawrence <egbertl4pj@yahoo.com>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Contact information
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <20010521202820.50468.qmail@web11102.mail.yahoo.com>
References: <3.0.3.32.20010516093202.0068a65c@pop2.igc.org>

At 01:28 PM 5/21/01 -0700, you wrote:

>Howard,
> Can you send me David Culp and Catherine Gordon
>e-mail addresses?

Larry,

They are david@fcnl.org and cgordon@ctr.pcusa.org.

Later today I will be sending out a communication regarding common web site material on missile defense.

Howard

To: matureyears@umpublishing.org
From: "Carlee L. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Writing lessons
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Marvin Cropsey:

Congratulations on being chosen chair-elect of the Committee on Uniform Series. Does this mean a change from editor of Mature Years?

Ever since you called in February and asked if I was interested in writing daily devotions, I have been sorrowing that I was so quick to say that I couldn't do it. I was surprised and honored. I have since prayed and turned the idea over in my mind. Finally, yesterday in church, I felt that I must write and see if there was any possibility that all has not been filled. Are the lessons broken down into smaller segments which I could try to see if I could do it? I am willing to clear my schedule.

Writing to you is a step of faith not sight.

Sincerely,

Carlee L. Hallman

To: website
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Web site on missile defense
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Colleagues:

I'm writing to those of you who may have a web site and would be interested in posting common information from the faith community on missile defense. Some of you have indicated that you are, but others I haven't heard from. If you are interested, please let me know.

The idea is that we would retain a consultant (unless somebody has an in-house expert) to help us design material that can be shared. Each organization would post this information on its own web site and would add what it wants to, such as denominational policy statements.

As a starter we can use the March letter to President Bush from representatives of 27 faith-based organizations. I am working on a piece that considers missile defense as a moral issue and expounds on the three reasons for opposition stated in the letter. I'll circulate it in draft form and ask whether it should be included with the common material. Does anybody else have anything to share?

What else should we include? A basic description of missile defense (borrowed from a civil sector organization)? A small selection of other material from civil sector organizations? We can also show linkages to these organizations. At the appropriate time we can post action alerts.

I would like to get something going before the month is over so that we can be prepared for grassroots outreach in the latter part of June into July when this issue heats up.

Shalom,
Howard

Reply-To: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
From: "Brink Campaign" <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
To: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
Subject: Brink Congressional Message Campaign
Date: Tue, 22 May 2001 02:02:37 -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

To Brink Legislative Strategy Committee Members.

Ira will make a presentation on a new de-alerting "Congressional Message Campaign" at the end of Thursday's NWWG meeting. (The concept was mentioned at the last Brink Legislative Committee meeting). Discussion will follow--and we look forward to everyone's feedback.

Hope to see you there.

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

www.backfromthebrink.org

Get your FREE download of MSN Explorer at <http://explorer.msn.com>

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

Dear Char and Jim,

Hi, how are the Hipkins? Char, I hope the arduous trip to our board meeting is well behind you. I'm glad you came. Our numbers are small, but our vision is large.

Carlee and I are driving to Galesburg, Illinois for her 50th class reunion at Knox College on June 1 and 2. We'll be heading back across northern Ohio on Monday, June 4. We're thinking we might stop by and say "hello" to you (and get a free bed), if you're going to be home. That morning we are stopping in Peru, Illinois to visit the editorial office of Cricket Magazine. Carlee had a recent article published in Spider, one of their series, so she wants to meet the editors. That means we are likely to arrive in your vicinity after supper. We can call ahead a let you know and take you out to eat if arrive earlier than that. At any rate let us know if you are available.

Jim, I'm working on a piece discussing missile defense as a moral issue. The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament is developing common material on missile defense for use on various organizations' web sites. This piece might be used in that way, but it could also serve as a Peace Leaf article if you're still looking for something. I never contacted Bishop Kim Hae-Jong for an article on Korea, but I may do so in the future.

Shalom,
Howard

To: tiller64@starpower.net, david@fcnl.org, dkimball@crnd.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Draft article on missile defense
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\icnd.095.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Bob, David, and Daryl,

Bob Tiller has suggested that that in dealing with missile defense the faith community should emphasize the moral issue. I have thought about this as I have tried to write an exposition of the reasons for opposing missile defense, as stated in a March 5 letter to President Bush from representatives of 27 national faith-based organizations. The product is the attached draft.

I'll probably use this as an article in our newsletter. I also want to make it available to various religious offices for their use and to circulate it on the Hill. Before I do, I would appreciate a critical review of my facts and arguments. If possible, I would like to have any comments you might offer by the end of the week.

Thanks,
Howard

To: jgeorgieff@earthlink.net
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: UM bishops on NMD
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\icnd.090.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Joyce,

Here is the statement of the United Methodist Council of Bishops on national missile defense. I'm also sending it as an attachment.

Thanks for including information about Methodists United for Peace with Justice in your annual conference kit.

Shalom,
Howard

###

Statement by United Methodist Council of Bishops
May 2001

NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE

The Council of Bishops recommends the following actions:

1. That each bishop send a personal letter to President Bush and members of Congress expressing concern for national missile defense and include a copy of the Council's resolution.
2. That each bishop work with annual conference leadership, Conference Boards of Church and Society, and ecumenical groups to resist development and deployment of a national missile defense system, and
3. That the council, through the General Board of Church and Society "provide leadership, guidance and educational materials to United Methodists" as called for in General Conference Resolution #315 of the Book of Resolutions, pages 782-785.

In a resolution titled "Saying No to Nuclear Deterrence," citizens from around the world at the 2000 General Conference of the United Methodist Church called upon "all possessors of nuclear weapons to . . . halt all efforts to develop and deploy strategic antimissile defense systems because they are illusory, unnecessary and wasteful." The resolution also calls upon the "Council of Bishops and the General Board of Church and Society to provide leadership, guidance, and educational materials to United Methodists, congregations, and conferences in order to assist them in understanding and working for the goal and objective of nuclear abolition."

Fifteen years ago, the threat nuclear weapons posed to the earth and its people caused the Council of Bishops to write "In Defense of Creation." More recently, vast numbers of children, the poor and oppressed suffering lives of cruel deprivation around the world, led the council to mobilize the church in the initiative "Children and Poverty."

The nuclear arms race is an issue of social justice for people throughout the world. Large numbers of children and the poor are shut out of the economic blessings of society as a result of the arms race.

Since children and all creation are endangered by the threat of nuclear weapons, the Council of Bishops, meeting in Scottsdale, Ariz., April 29-May 4, 2001, commends President George W. Bush for his commitment to persuade Russia to join the United States in reducing nuclear arsenals to "the lowest number of nuclear weapons consistent with our present and future national security needs and to lead by example by making substantial unilateral reductions if necessary. We further commend President Bush for his commitment to take a large number of missiles off hair-trigger alert, especially in light of the dangers inherent in the deterioration of the Russian military infrastructure.

While commending President Bush for these initiatives, the Council of Bishops strongly objects to legislation passed by the U.S. Congress to deploy a limited national missile defense system "as soon as technologically feasible." We call upon the President and the Congress to refrain from the development of a national missile defense system because it is illusory, unnecessary, and wasteful.

Even if such a defensive system could be built, ways can be devised to defeat it. Effective countermeasures to NMD can be built inexpensively, using simple technologies. Biological or chemical weapons can be divided into dozens of small bomblets upon impact. Such numerous targets or many lightweight decoys could confuse and overwhelm the system. Weapons can be delivered in many ways other than by missiles, as shown in the bombing attack against the U.S. Destroyer Cole in Yemen.

United Methodist bishops across the world, some from nations once caught in old East-West tensions, fear re-escalation of those conflicts if the United States proceeds with plans to build the NMD. It could well mean the end of the Anti-Ballistic Missiles Treaty which has been crucial to the attempt to end the threat of nuclear war. Without the treaty, countries could feel free to increase their nuclear arsenals. The present ability to do mutual on site inspections of nuclear arsenals, a key component in monitoring current arms control agreements, would be lost.

Present steps toward creating a missile defense system are creating profound tensions between the United States, Russia and China threatening to scuttle the nuclear arms reduction process. China has announced that it will upgrade its nuclear arsenal in the face of a U.S. missile defense system. Russia could halt the agreed upon reduction in its nuclear arsenal. With the collapse of its economy, its early warning systems and command and control networks are deteriorating, increasing the chance of accidental or unauthorized nuclear attacks.

European nations vigorously oppose plans to deploy a national missile defense system fearing the dangerously destabilizing impact of the loss of nuclear disarmament treaties carefully created over several decades.

We call upon all people of goodwill to join actively in the struggle to

achieve peace with justice. We must join together to see that the untold billions of dollars proposed for a meaningless search for security through a national missile defense system are not once again taken from the mouths of children and the poor.

To: jgeorgieff@earthlink.net
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Letter to Bush on NMD
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\icnd.069.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Joyce,

Here is a copy of a letter on national missile defense to President Bush from representatives of 27 national faith-based organizations. I'm also sending it as an attachment.

Shalom,
Howard

###

March 5, 2001

The Honorable George W. Bush
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

Re: National Missile Defense

Dear Mr. President:

We the undersigned representatives of faith-based organizations share with you the desire to keep God's people, including those in the U.S. homeland, safe from nuclear attack. However, we are deeply concerned about the haste to make a commitment to deploy unproven technology for national missile defense.

First, the real and present danger for nuclear attack on the United States comes from the several thousand Russian missiles now on hair trigger alert and thousands of Russian nuclear weapons in reserve with inadequate security. The best remedies are mutual de-alerting, strategic arms reduction, and stable control of fissile material. These opportunities could be jeopardized if the United States withdraws from the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty to erect a national missile defense. Russia might then withdraw from other arms control treaties and retain multi-warhead missiles now scheduled for elimination under START II. Also, China might increase its nuclear arsenal. This would pose far greater danger to U.S. homeland security than the remote threat of a few missiles a small nation might develop years from now.

Second, heavy emphasis on unproven anti-missile technology to counter a speculative future threat from a few small nations neglects other elements of a comprehensive non-proliferation strategy. More promising methods include international monitoring of nuclear test explosions, rigorous fissile material control, stringent missile technology control, diplomacy, financial assistance to nations cooperating in nuclear non-proliferation, and countering social, economic, and political instability that provides the breeding ground for terrorist groups

Third, we are seriously concerned about budgetary implications. Since 1983 the United States has spent \$69 billion on national missile defense, enriching major defense contractors but producing no effective system. President Clinton's plan, which you have criticized as inadequate, would cost \$60 billion. Indications are that the layered approach you favor could cost more than \$100 billion. A budgetary commitment of this magnitude along with the tax cut you are promoting would preclude achieving the goal of "Leave No Child Behind" and dealing with other urgent domestic needs.

For these reasons we urge you to pull back from the dangerous rush to a premature decision on national missile defense and withdrawal from the ABM Treaty.

Respectfully yours,

Rev. Dr. Stan Haste, Executive Director
Alliance of Baptists (organization listed for identification only)

Curtis Ramsey-Lucas
Director of Legislative Advocacy
National Ministries
American Baptist Churches

James Matlack
Director, Washington Office
American Friends Service Committee

Ken Sehested, Executive Director
Baptist Peace Fellowship of North America

David Radcliff
Director of Brethren Witness
Greg Laszakovits
Director, Washington Office
Church of the Brethren General Board

Tiffany Heath
Interim Legislative Director
Church Women United

Gary Baldrige
Global Missions Coordinator
Rev. Lonnie Turner
Washington Office
Cooperative Baptist Fellowship

Joel Heim, Moderator
Disciples Peace Fellowship

Thomas H. Hart
Director of Government Relations
Episcopal Church, USA

Rev. Mark Brown, Assistant Director
International Affairs and Human Rights
Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

Ronald J. Sider, President
Evangelicals for Social Action

Mary H. Miller, Executive Director
Episcopal Peace Fellowship

Murray Polner, President
Jewish Peace Fellowship

Rev. Carroll Houle
Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns

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

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

Rabia Terri Harris, Coordinator
Muslim Peace Fellowship

Brenda Girton-Mitchell, JD
Assoc. General Secretary for Public Policy
& Director of the Washington Office
National Council of Churches

Nancy Small, National Coordinator
Pax Christi, USA

Rev. Elenora Giddings Ivory
Director, Washington Office
Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.

L. William Yolton
Presbyterian Peace Fellowship

Rabbi David Saperstein, Director
Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism

Ann Rutan, csjp , President
Sisters of St. Joseph of Peace

Rev. Meg A. Riley
Washington Office for Faith in Action
Unitarian Universalist Association

Ron Stief
Justice and Witness Ministries
United Church of Christ

Jim Winkler, General Secretary
General Board of Church and Society
United Methodist Church

William J. Price
World Peacemakers

X-Sender: jameshipkn@mail.sssnet.com
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.0
Date: Wed, 23 May 2001 09:34:48 -0400
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: JamesHipkins <jameshipkn@sssnet.com>
Subject: Re: Possible visit

Howard:

We will be home and love to have you. We will look for you. Plan to stay with us. We can hold dinner and eat late if you like. No problem. Why not, better than eating on the way and more relaxing. I'll send you directions. How will you be coming? On the turnpike? Let me know.

Jim

At 03:02 PM 5/22/01 -0400, you wrote:

>Dear Char and Jim,

>

>Hi, how are the Hipkins? Char, I hope the arduous trip to our board meeting is well behind you. I'm glad you came. Our numbers are small, but our vision is large.

>

>Carlee and I are driving to Galesburg, Illinois for her 50th class reunion at Knox College on June 1 and 2. We'll be heading back across northern Ohio on Monday, June 4. We're thinking we might stop by and say "hello" to you (and get a free bed), if you're going to be home. That morning we are stopping in Peru, Illinois to visit the editorial office of Cricket Magazine. Carlee had a recent article published in Spider, one of their series, so she wants to meet the editors. That means we are likely to arrive in your vicinity after supper. We can call ahead a let you know and take you out to eat if arrive earlier than that. At any rate let us know if you are available.

>

>Jim, I'm working on a piece discussing missile defense as a moral issue. The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament is developing common material on missile defense for use on various organizations' web sites. This piece might be used in that way, but it could also serve as a Peace Leaf article if you're still looking for something. I never contacted Bishop Kim Hae-Jong for an article on Korea, but I may do so in the future.

>

>Shalom,

>Howard

>

>

>Howard W. Hallman, Chair

>Methodists United for Peace with Justice

>1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036

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

>

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

To: JamesHipkins <jameshipkn@sssnet.com>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Possible visit
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <5.0.0.25.0.20010523093252.009e8410@mail.sssnet.com>
References: <3.0.3.32.20010522150239.0068f56c@pop2.igc.org>

On Ohio turnpike eastbound.

Howard

X-Sender: jameshipkn@mail.sssnet.com
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.0
Date: Wed, 23 May 2001 17:03:37 -0400
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: JamesHipkins <jameshipkn@sssnet.com>
Subject: Re: Possible visit

There will be no problem. We are just south of it, perhaps 25 miles. I will send you directions. In the next couple of days.

Jim

At 02:59 PM 5/23/01 -0400, you wrote:

>On Ohio turnpike eastbound.

>

>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: jameshipkn@mail.sssnet.com (Unverified)
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.0
Date: Thu, 24 May 2001 10:15:10 -0400
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: JamesHipkins <jameshipkn@sssnet.com>
Subject: Re: Possible visit

Howard:

When you come on turnpike get off at Interstate 77. You will be north of Akron.

The easiest route is to stay on 77 until you get to Canton. The exit you look for is Eberhard-Belden Village. At that exit get off and at the light turn right onto Eberhard.

Go to the third light, which will be Fulton Road. Turn right, and you will have road construction but the traffic moves along. You go on Fulton quite a distance until you come to Wales Ave. I believe Wales is the fourth stop light. There is a BP Station on one corner, on the other is a gas station, use to be a shell but change and I forget the new name. The other two corners are vacant. Turn left on Wales. You will go by a private country club on the right, Continue until you see a gas station on your right-again it is a former shell and I cannot remember the new one, but that makes no difference. It is the only one. Just beyond the gas station on the left is a road marked OAKDALE. You want to turn left here. Continue straight on Oakdale to DARTMOUTH. At Dartmouth turn left, our house is 3894. You cannot miss it.

At 02:59 PM 5/23/01 -0400, you wrote:

>On Ohio turnpike eastbound.

>

>Howard

>Howard W. Hallman, Chair

>Methodists United for Peace with Justice

>1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036

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

>

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

From: Rob Cavanaugh <RCavanaugh@uua.org>
To: "mupj@igc.org" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: NMD targets
Date: Wed, 23 May 2001 16:44:44 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

Howard,

Could you share your target list with me?

I have a letter with about 15 UU ministers sign-ed on, but I want to do some more outreach before I send it to the hill.

thanks,

Rob Cavanaugh
Legislative Director
Unitarian Universalist Association of Congregations
Washington Office for Faith in Action
2026 P Street NW
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 296-4672 x15
(202) 296-4673 fax
rcavanaugh@uua.org
www.uua.org/uuawo

To: Rob Cavanaugh <RCavanaugh@uua.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: NMD targets
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <9B511FA7465ED411862700A0C9E1C51C013B54F4@mail.uua.org>
References:

At 04:44 PM 5/23/01 -0400, you wrote:
>Howard,
>
>Could you share your target list with me?

Rob,

We are targeting all members of the Senate Armed Services Committee. In addition here is a list of senators and representatives I wrote to recently because they have expressed concerns about missile defense.

Howard

###

Hill contacts on missile defense

Senators and defense aides

Tom Daschle 509 Hart Randy DeValk
Joseph Biden 439 Dirksen Edward Levine
Carl Levin 228 Russell Richard Fieldhouse
Jack Reed 320 Hart Elizabeth King
Ben Nelson 730 Hart Eric Pierce
Bill Nelson 716 Hart Bill Sutey
John Kerry 439 Dirksen Nancy Stetson
Dick Durbin 332 Dirksen Sue Hardesty
Paul Wellstone 136 Hart Charlotte Oldham-Moore
Mark Dayton 346 Russell Jason Van Wey
Bryon Dorgan 713 Hart Brian Moran
Max Cleland 461 Dirksen Andy Van LANDINGHAM

Representatives

Richard Gephardt 1236 Longworth
Ike Shelton 2206 Rayburn
John Spratt 1536 Longworth
John Tierney 120 Cannon
Tom Allen 1717 Longworth
Neil Abercrombie 1502 Longworth
Martin Meehan 2447 Rayburn

X-Sender: vsamson@63.106.26.66
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.0.2
Date: Wed, 23 May 2001 16:56:44 -0400
To: mupj@igc.org
From: Victoria Samson
Subject: quote you asked about

Hi Howard, found the quote that I think you were asking about. Hope you find it useful:

Statement for the Record to the Senate Subcommittee on International Security, Proliferation,
and Federal Services on The Ballistic Missile Threat to the United States

by Robert D Walpole, National Intelligence Officer for Strategic and Nuclear Programs, CIA
9 February 2000

"In fact, we project that in the coming years, US territory is probably more likely to be attacked with weapons of mass destruction from non-missile delivery means (most likely from non-state entities) than by missiles, primarily because non-missile delivery means are less costly and more reliable and accurate. They can also be used without attribution."

for the whole document:

http://www.cia.gov/cia/public_affairs/speeches/archives/2000/nio_speech_020900.html

Victoria Samson, Senior Policy Associate
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
ph: 202.546.0795 x102; fax: 202.546.7970
website: <<http://www.crnd.org>>

To: jhorman@umc-gbcs.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: website on NMD
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Janet,

Here is a copy of my communication.

Howard

Dear Colleagues:

I'm writing to those of you who may have a web site and would be interested in posting common information from the faith community on missile defense. Some of you have indicated that you are, but others I haven't heard from. If you are interested, please let me know.

The idea is that we would retain a consultant (unless somebody has an in-house expert) to help us design material that can be shared. Each organization would post this information on its own web site and would add what it wants to, such as denominational policy statements.

As a starter we can use the March letter to President Bush from representatives of 27 faith-based organizations. I am working on a piece that considers missile defense as a moral issue and expounds on the three reasons for opposition stated in the letter. I'll circulate it in draft form and ask whether it should be included with the common material. Does anybody else have anything to share?

What else should we include? A basic description of missile defense (borrowed from a civil sector organization)? A small selection of other material from civil sector organizations? We can also show linkages to these organizations. At the appropriate time we can post action alerts.

I would like to get something going before the month is over so that we can be prepared for grassroots outreach in the latter part of June into July when this issue heats up.

Shalom,
Howard

From: Janet Horman <JHorman@UMC-GBCS.ORG>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: website on NMD
Date: Fri, 25 May 2001 09:25:31 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Howard :

Jaydee will meet next week with a man who apparently knows how to put together the common e-mail/fax/action alert he was speaking about during our lunch together. He is interested in pricing the system and will let us know what he finds out. I think my interest in a common website is greater if it includes such a capacity (for people to fax their reps while on the common website).

I have also forward your request to our communications office since they do our website. I am awaiting a reply...but Gretchen-our web person-will not be back in the office until June 4th.

I'll let you know something as soon as I do.

Janet

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Thursday, May 24, 2001 11:41 AM
To: Janet Horman
Subject: website on NMD

Dear Janet,

Here is a copy of my communication.

Howard

Dear Colleagues:

I'm writing to those of you who may have a web site and would be interested in posting common information from the faith community on missile defense. Some of you have indicated that you are, but others I haven't heard from. If you are interested, please let me know.

The idea is that we would retain a consultant (unless somebody has an in-house expert) to help us design material that can be shared. Each organization would post this information on its own web site and would add what it wants to, such as denominational policy statements.

As a starter we can use the March letter to President Bush from representatives of 27 faith-based organizations. I am working on a piece that considers missile defense as a moral issue and expounds on the three reasons for opposition stated in the letter. I'll circulate it in draft form and ask whether it should be included with the common material. Does anybody else have anything to share?

What else should we include? A basic description of missile defense (borrowed from a civil sector organization)? A small selection of other material from civil sector organizations? We can also show linkages to these organizations. At the appropriate time we can post action alerts.

I would like to get something going before the month is over so that we can be prepared for grassroots outreach in the latter part of June into July when this issue heats up.

Shalom,
Howard

Date: Fri, 25 May 2001 07:31:08 -0700 (PDT)
From: Egbert Lawrence <egbertl4pj@yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: Web site on missile defense
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Cc: UUAWO@aol.com

Thanks, Howard,

The Unitarian Universalists have a web site and we have someone who does some posting of info on the web in our Office plus we occasionally use a consultant who, I think, is rather expensive.

We would definitely be interested in posting shared information if we have the opportunity to edit a bit and to post also our denomination pronouncements of the past.

PEACE! Larry

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

> Dear Colleagues:

>

> I'm writing to those of you who may have a web site
> and would be interested
> in posting common information from the faith
> community on missile defense.
> Some of you have indicated that you are, but others
> I haven't heard from.
> If you are interested, please let me know.

>

> The idea is that we would retain a consultant
> (unless somebody has an
> in-house expert) to help us design material that can
> be shared. Each
> organization would post this information on its own
> web site and would add
> what it wants to, such as denominational policy
> statements.

>

> As a starter we can use the March letter to
> President Bush from
> representatives of 27 faith-based organizations. I
> am working on a piece
> that considers missile defense as a moral issue and
> expounds on the three
> reasons for opposition stated in the letter. I'll
> circulate it in draft
> form and ask whether it should be included with the
> common material. Does
> anybody else have anything to share?

>

> What else should we include? A basic description of
> missile defense
> (borrowed from a civil sector organization)? A
> small selection of other
> material from civil sector organizations? We can

- > also show linkages to
- > these organizations. At the appropriate time we
- > can post action alerts.
- >
- > I would like to get something going before the month
- > is over so that we can
- > be prepared for grassroots outreach in the latter
- > part of June into July
- > when this issue heats up.
- >
- > Shalom,
- > Howard
- >
- > Howard W. Hallman, Chair
- > Methodists United for Peace with Justice
- > 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036
- > Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail: mupj@igc.org
- >
- > Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a
- > membership association of
- > laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any
- > Methodist denomination.

Do You Yahoo!?

Yahoo! Auctions - buy the things you want at great prices

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

To: mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Missile Defense 'Shaky' 'On Life Support' 'Threatened' 'Serious Trouble'
Cc:
Bcc: icnd
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

The enclosed excerpts from news articles indicate that missile defense is in trouble with Senator Jeffords' switch giving Democrats control of the Senate. This suggestions that we should step up our opposition to missile defense.

Howard

>Date: Fri, 25 May 2001 12:00:49 -0400
>From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>
>Subject:
> Missile Defense 'Shaky' 'On Life Support'
> 'Threatened' 'Serious Trouble'
>
>Council for a Livable World Special Report
>May 25, 2001
>
>Missile Defense 'Shaky' 'On Life Support' 'Threatened' 'Serious Trouble':
>What Media, Experts Are Saying In Wake of Jeffords Switch
>
>
>"Proposals that had seemed to be dead under the Republican-controlled
>Senate — such as a patients bill of rights — were immediately back in play.
> Others — such as ballistic missile defense — now look shaky at best."
> Washington Post - May 25, 2001 - Greg Schneider
>
>"'Globally, the whole universe moves left and moderate,' said Hudson
>Institute political analyst Marshall Wittman. 'Conservation yes,
>exploration, no. Missile defense, Social Security privatization -- those
>now on life support."
> Newsday (New York, NY) - May 25, 2001
>
>"The sudden shift to Democratic control of the U.S. Senate could upset Bush
>administration plans to speed development of a controversial missile
>defense system, analysts told Reuters on Thursday. But only 'time will
>tell,' said Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld, a key proponent of an
>anti-missile defense program that is bitterly opposed by Russia and China
>and has raised major questions among U.S. allies."
> Reuters - May 24, 2001 - Charles Aldinger
>
>"Missile defense may have hit a wall."
> Tim Russert on WTOP News - May 25, 2001 (not from transcript)
>
>"Jeffords's shift signaled a far-reaching realignment in national politics,
>catapulting Senate Democratic leader Thomas A. Daschle (S.D.) into the

>majority leader's post occupied by Sen. Trent Lott (R-Miss.) and
>threatening many of Bush's initiatives, from
>boosting energy production to missile defense to filling federal judgeships
>with conservatives."
> Washington Post - May 25, 2001 - John Lancaster & Helen Dewar
>
>"A Senate suddenly controlled by Democrats could blunt President Bush's
>drive for national missile defense and might lead to more military bases
>being closed."
> Copley News Service - May 24, 2001 - Otto Kreisher
>
>"With their new majority, the Democratic opposition will have new ways to
>slow down the rest of Bush's agenda, including his energy policy and
>proposed missile defense shield, as well as appointments to federal
>judgeships."
> The Atlanta Journal and Constitution - May 25, 2001 - Julia Malone
>
>"They [the Administration] want missile defense, the whole military issue.
>That hasn't come up yet. Democrats don't like that. They think that it's a
>lot of wasted money on a program that has not been thoroughly tested. That
>program could be in very serious trouble."
> CNN Live Today - May 23, 2001 - William Schneider
>
>"The defection of Sen. Jim Jeffords from the Republican party spells
>trouble for most of President Bush's agenda. That is particularly true in
>one area: His commitment to defend the American people, their forces, and
>allies overseas against ballistic-missile attack."
> National Review Online - May 24, 2001 - Frank Gaffney OpEd
>
>"The soon-to-be chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee says he's
>wary of any move by President Bush to abrogate the Anti-Ballistic Missile
>Treaty to build a national missile defense system. Sen. Carl Levin,
>D-Mich., said he's no longer sure that's the administration's plan . . .
>The views of the ranking Democrat on the Armed Services Committee gained
>traction Thursday as Sen. James Jeffords turned the Senate topsy-turvy with
>the announcement he will quit the Republican Party and become an
>independent. That tosses the chamber's majority power to the Democrats and
>the Armed Services chairmanship to Levin."
> AP - May 24, 2001- Carolyn Skorneck
>
>"Democrats also now will control the committees, and that could cloud the
>outlook for many of the proposed Bush initiatives on energy and missile
>defense."
> The Kansas City Star - May 25, 2001 - David Goldstein
>
>"Like any party in opposition to the president, Senate Democrats are eager
>to slow -- if not block -- much of Bush's program, including proposals to
>allow oil drilling in sensitive areas, allow workers to divert Social
>Security taxes into private investments and develop a national missile
>defense system."
> Knight Ridder - May 25, 2001, Friday - Steven Thomma
>
>"Being in charge does mean you can block things -- like Bush's
>missile-defense proposal, something adamantly opposed by many Democrats."

> The Orange County Register - May 25, 2001, Friday - Dena Bunis
>
>"Bush will actually have to negotiate policy with Democrats, and do it
>early and often if he is to maintain the momentum built up in the heady,
>now-bygone days of Republican dominance on Capitol Hill. That should force
>him toward the political center on issues as varied as energy policy,
>environmental protection, the federal judiciary, campaign-finance reform,
>Medicare prescription-drug coverage and missile defense."
> Newsday (New York, NY) editorial - May 25, 2001
>
>"Meanwhile, another potential troublemaker for missile defense proponents
>is Sen. Joseph Biden (D-Del.) who becomes chairman of the Senate Foreign
>Relations Committee, replacing Sen. Jesse Helms (R-N.C.). Biden last year
>pushed former President Clinton to hold off in making any decision to
>deploy a missile defense by 2005 (Defense Daily, June 28). And, Biden is
>sure to try to thwart any attempts in Congress to do away with the ABM
>Treaty."
> Defense Daily - May 25, 2001 - By Kerry Gildea
>
>"Levin warned that if Bush proposes to spend money for the defense system
>'that constituted a breach of the ABM Treaty' he would strike it from the
>committee's defense bill. That would require the supporters to fight to
>get it included on the Senate floor, could make it subject to a
>jurisdiction claim by Biden and would make its approval harder."
> AP - May 24, 2001- Carolyn Skorneck
>
>"Levin will be a leading opponent of Bush's plan to deploy a missile
>defense system to protect the United States and its allies from ballistic
>missile attack. He has said that if Bush abrogates the 1972 ABM Treaty,
>which was negotiated with the former Soviet Union, it 'could result in more
>nuclear weapons on Russian soil, increase the risk of proliferation of
>these weapons, lead Russia and others to develop, deploy and even sell
>countermeasures to our defenses, (and) cause China to increase their
>nuclear arsenal.' All this, Levin argues, would make the United States less
>secure, not more secure."
> MSNBC - May 25, 2001 - Tom Curry
>
>"On issues from missile defense to creating a more conservative judiciary,
>President Bush's agenda suddenly faces rougher sledding . . . It elevates
>some of the strongest skeptics of the administration's drive for a missile
>defense system, putting Senator Carl Levin of Michigan in line to be
>chairman of the Armed Services Committee and Senator Joseph R. Biden Jr. in
>line to be chairman of Foreign Relations . . .The Senate changeover is
>likely to have a significant impact on President Bush's plans to build a
>ballistic missile shield. Mr. Daschle, Mr. Biden and Mr. Levin are all
>strong supporters of the 1972 Antiballistic Missile treaty, which
>administration officials contend must be modified or scrapped so the United
>States can proceed with the kind of system that Mr. Bush advocates.
> All three men have urged the administration to deploy a missile shield
>only once it has been proved to work — in contrast to Secretary of Defense
>Donald H. Rumsfeld, who has called for quick deployment, even if a system
>is only partly effective.
> Senator Jack Reed, a Rhode Island Democrat, said of the power shift, 'It
>will prompt serious and fundamental questions about the technological

>feasibility, the cost of the system, the reliability and whether or not it
>contributes to increased stability throughout the world."

> New York Times, May 25, 2001 - Robin Toner

>

>"Today, Sen. Jack Reed (D-R.I.), who becomes chair of the Senate Armed
>Services Committee (SASC) strategic forces panel, will make a speech at the
>National War College outlining his views on missile defense. The strategic
>forces plan has jurisdiction over funding for the missile defense programs.

> While Reed to date has not outlined a clear alternative to the Bush plan,
>it is clear he is in step with Sen. Carl Levin (D-Mich.), who becomes the
>new SASC chairman. Like Levin, Reed has been opposed to a rapid deployment
>of a missile defense system and is expected to push to keep the ABM Treaty
>and other arms control measures intact. Sen. Wayne Allard (R-Colo.), who
>moves to the ranking slot on the strategic forces panel, has been an ardent
>supporter of a robust missile defense, with land, sea and space components
>and replacing the ABM Treaty with a new framework."

> Defense Daily - May 25, 2001 - By Kerry Gildea

>

>"Larry Korb, a former assistant defense secretary and now with the Council
>on Foreign Relations in New York, said the change would 'make a very big
>difference.'

>'If the administration decides that it wants to start digging holes in
>Alaska to plant missile defense weapons before those weapons work, you will
>hear quickly and decisively from Levin,' Korb said."

> Reuters - May 24, 2001 - Charles Aldinger

>

>"Jesse Helms will lose the chairmanship of the Foreign Relations Committee
>to Joseph Biden, who will be less hostile to the United Nations and less
>receptive to missile defence. Michigan's Carl Levin is likely to become
>chairman of the Armed Services Committee, enabling him to scale back
>presidential plans for a national missile defence."

> The Times (London) - May 25, 2001, Friday - Martin Fletcher

>

>"Among the controversial Bush plans that could now be at risk are his 'Son
>of Star Wars' strategy for missile defence, and policies that would allow
>more oil drilling in sensitive areas and the abolition of environmental
>safeguards."

> Daily Mail (London) - May 25, 2001 - William Lowther

>

>"The areas where Democrats will hit the president hardest are on his power
>to appoint conservative judges and on his more controversial legislation on
>energy, the environment and missile defence."

> The Daily Telegraph (London) - May 25, 2001 - Ben Fenton

>

>"On a host of President George W. Bush's core issues - from energy to
>deregulation to

>missile defence to trade - the loss of the Senate will make it considerably
>more difficult for the White House to push its agenda."

> Financial Times (London) - May 25, 2001 - Edward Alden

>

>"Mr Bush and Dick Cheney, the vice-president, have laid out plans for a new
>missile defence programme but now face an uphill battle in gaining approval."

> Financial Times (London) - May 25, 2001 - Deborah McGregor

>

>"Plans to appoint unrepresentatively ultra-conservative judges to the
>federal bench and the Supreme Court, when vacancies occur, should be one
>casualty. Another may be Pentagon chief Donald Rumsfeld's ambitious,
>unfocused and dangerous missile, space and conventional weapons-building
>schemes."

> The Guardian (London) - May 25, 2001

>
>"Political analysts predicted that the change would block President Bush's
>controversial programme, from his plans to build a missile defence system
>to his producer-friendly energy policies."

> The Guardian (London) - May 25, 2001 - Julian Borger

>
>"Mr Biden will bring with him renewed commitment to Europe and the
>transatlantic alliance, and some searching questions about the cost of Mr
>Bush's pet missile defence programme. The chances of the massive spending
>needed for the programme being adopted very soon will be diminished further
>by the arrival at armed services of Mr Levin, a sceptic on missile defence."

> The Independent (London) - May 25, 2001- Mary Dejevsky

>
>"As a result, Democrats' ability to challenge Bush's policies in such
>controversial areas as national missile defense and China will be enhanced,
>but not guaranteed as senators -- now divided 49-50-1 -- are not obliged to
>vote down party lines."

> Agence France Presse - May 25, 2001, Friday - Sharon Behn

>
>"This will make it difficult for Mr Bush to get key points of his
>conservative programme through Congress. These include plans to drill oil
>in areas such as the Arctic wildlife refuge in Alaska, appointment of
>conservative judges to the Supreme Court to replace retiring members, the
>controversial education voucher system providing public funding for private
>education, the missile defence system, and confirmation of appointments to
>top positions in government, of which only 11 percent so far have been
>approved."

> Channel NewsAsia - May 25, 2001

>
>"The future of his administration's recently unveiled energy plan, aimed at
>encouraging more oil drilling, coal mining and nuclear plants, has been
>cast into serious doubt. So has Bush's plan to build a controversial
>anti-ballistic shield against missile attack."

> The Gazette (Montreal) - May 25, 2001 - Robert Russo

>
>"President George W. Bush could soon find many of his top priorities, such
>as an energy policy which calls for more drilling and pipelines, judicial
>appointments for more right-wing thinkers and a costly and untested missile
>defence plan, falling by the wayside."

> The Toronto Star - May 25, 2001 - William Walker

>
>"They will be able to block conservative judicial appointments, stop the
>regulatory dismemberment of workplace and environmental laws, and temper
>the national missile defence plan."

> The Ottawa Citizen - May 25, 2001 - Hilary Mackenzie

>
>"A Democrat-held Senate may also assert the concern of many in the party
>about the impact of missile defence on relations with other emerging powers

>and on the Anti-Ballistic Missile treaty signed with the Soviet Union in
>1972 - which the administration wants to rewrite or tear up."

> South China Morning Post - May 25, 2001 - Greg Torode

>

>

>

>

>

>

>John Isaacs

>Council for a Livable World

>110 Maryland Avenue, NE - Room 409

>Washington, D.C. 20002

>(202) 543-4100 x.131

>www.clw.org

>

To: matureyears@umpublishing.org
From: "Carlee L. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Submission of exercises
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\SPIR501.25.doc; A:\SERV501.24.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

To: Marvin W. Cropsey, Mature Years editor

With this I am sending the two exercises for "Maturing in Faith" as Word attachments: "Empowered by the Spirit" on Lesson 2, March 11, 2001 (approx. 310 words); and "Empowered for Service" on Lesson 3, March 18, 2001 (approx 320 words). The word count for "Maturing in Faith" seemed to me to be closer to 300 words. Cutting is easier than adding?

My husband Howard and I will be leaving on Wednesday, May 30, to attend my 50th college reunion in Galesburg, IL, and expect to return on the evening of June 5.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,
Carlee

(301) 897-3668
6508 Wilmett Rd.
Bethesda, MD 20817-2318

Social Security # 336-20-4652

From: "Cropsey, Marvin" <Mcropsey@umpublishing.org>
To: "Carlee L. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: Submission of exercises
Date: Tue, 29 May 2001 11:53:36 -0500
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Good morning, Carlee. Thank you for your amazingly prompt response to my request for samples. I expected to be pleased with your work. And I am. I offer you the position of writer for "Maturing in Faith" column for Mature Years magazine.

You are getting ready to leave town for a few days. And I am leaving now for an important doctor's appointment. I will call you next week.

My father's family is from Galesburg and nearby small communities. None remain in the area. Their name was Baer. I spent many wonderful family weekends in the area. My own home was Rock Falls, where I will be heading for a class reunion in two weeks.

Travel safely. Marvin Cropsey

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

From: Carlee L. Hallman [SMTP:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Monday, May 28, 2001 6:20 PM
To: matureyears@umpublishing.org
Subject: Submission of exercises

To: Marvin W. Cropsey, Mature Years editor

With this I am sending the two exercises for "Maturing in Faith" as
Word
attachments: "Empowered by the Spirit" on Lesson 2, March 11, 2001
(approx. 310 words); and "Empowered for Service" on Lesson 3, March
18,
2001 (approx 320 words). The word count for "Maturing in Faith"
seemed to
me to be closer to 300 words. Cutting is easier than adding?

My husband Howard and I will be leaving on Wednesday, May 30, to
attend my
50th college reunion in Galesburg, IL, and expect to return on the
evening
of June 5.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,
Carlee

(301) 897-3668
6508 Wilmett Rd.
Bethesda, MD 20817-2318

Social Security # 336-20-4652 << File: SPIR501.25.doc >> << File:
SERV501.24.doc >>

To: david@fcl.org, jwinkler@umc-gbcs.org, jhanson@umc-gbcs.org, jhorman@umc-gbcs.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Lugar reception
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Colleagues:

We are three weeks and a day from the reception for Senator Lugar. There is lots to be done. I'm not sure who is doing what. I'm going out of town from Wednesday, May 30 through Tuesday, June 5, so I hope you folks will do what is necessary. I'll be in my office all day today, Tuesday, from 11:00 a.m. on if anyone wants to call me to discuss things.

A couple of weeks ago I provided Jim Winkler a draft of a letter inviting Lee Hamilton to give some special remarks and a draft letter to denominational offices, asking them to be co-sponsors. I'm assuming that these went out. If so, there will need to be follow up with denominational offices so that the names can be put on the invitation. If it didn't go, it's probably too late.

Presumably the UMGBCS will get the invitations printed. I'm assuming that David Culp has the names to invite. I'm hoping that your offices will have the capacity to get the envelopes addressed. When I get back, I'm willing to help with follow-up calls and will help get other volunteers for that task.

There is catering to arrange.

We've all done things on tight deadline, so I know we'll pull this off.

Thanks for all your efforts,
Howard

To: hipkins
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Peace Leaf article
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\abl.127.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Jim,

If you don't have the next issue of Peace Leaf planned, I offer the following open letter to President Bush on the U.S. nuclear posture. I sent it in April when it appeared that the nuclear posture review would be completed soon. Apparently it is taking longer than expected, so the letter could still be circulated through Peace Leaf. I'm also sending it as a Word attachment.

We appreciate your offer for a meal on arrival on Monday evening, June 4, but with our uncertain travel schedule we'll eat along the way. Thanks for your directions.

Howard

###

An Open Letter to

The Honorable George W. Bush
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. President:

We understand that the strategic review which your administration now has underway is encompassing a review of the U.S. nuclear posture. We note that Congress, in mandating a nuclear posture review, specified that consideration should be given to "the relationship among United States nuclear deterrence policy, targeting, and arms control objectives." We believe, therefore, that the final product should contain a multi-year plan for nuclear disarmament on equal terms with specification of deterrence policy and targeting.

The law of the land in the form of Article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) commits the United States and other nuclear-weapon states "to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament." President Lyndon Johnson and then President Richard Nixon signed this treaty, and the U.S. Senate ratified it in March 1969 by a bipartisan vote of 83 to 15. Affirmative votes were registered by Senate Minority Leader Everett Dirksen and by two future Senate Republican leaders, Senator Howard Baker and Senator Robert Dole.

The United States and other nuclear-weapon states recommitted themselves to Article VI when the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty was extended indefinitely in 1995. The United States concurred with the Final Document of the 2000 NPT Review Conference, which contains a commitment to "an unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear-weapon States to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals."

Voices of Religion

Numerous faith-based organizations and religious leaders join in the call for the total elimination of nuclear weapons. Thus, the Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1983 stated:

We believe that the time has come when the churches must unequivocally declare that the production and deployment as well as the use of nuclear weapons are a crime against humanity and that such activities must be condemned on ethical and theological grounds. Furthermore, we appeal for the institution of a universal covenant to this effect so that nuclear weapons and warfare are delegitimized and condemned as violation of international law.

Speaking for the Holy See at the United Nations in 1997, Archbishop Renato Martino, the Holy See's Permanent Observer at the UN, stated:

Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21st century. They cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation. The preservation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty demands an unequivocal commitment to their abolition....The world must move to the abolition of nuclear weapons through a universal, non-discriminatory ban with intensive inspection by a universal authority.

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

Many denominations in the United States have official policies calling for the elimination of nuclear weapons. For instance, the National Conference of Catholic Bishops in 1993 indicated that "today, the moral task is to proceed with deep cuts and ultimately to abolish these nuclear weapons entirely." They further stated, "The eventual elimination of nuclear weapons is more than a moral ideal; it should be a policy goal."

The United Methodist General Conference, the denomination's official governing body, in May 2000 stated the moral case against nuclear weapons.

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.

Therefore, we reaffirm the goal of total abolition of all nuclear weapons throughout Earth and space.

In June 2000 an interfaith group of 21 religious leaders joined 18 retired admirals and generals in a statement issued at the Washington National Cathedral in which they said:

We deeply believe that the long-term reliance on nuclear weapons in the arsenals of the nuclear powers, and the ever-present danger of their acquisition by others is morally untenable and militarily unjustifiable. They constitute a threat to the security of our nation, a peril to world peace, a danger to the whole human family.

They further stated:

It is...time for a great national and international discussion and examination of the true and full implications of reliance on nuclear weapons, to be followed by action leading to the international prohibition of these weapons."

Practical Steps

Thus, the voices of religion and the nations of the world as expressed in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty agree on the long-range goal of the total elimination of nuclear weapons. The question is: how do we achieve that goal in a practicable manner? The 2000 NPT Review Conference provided an answer by specifying in its Final Document a series of "practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to implement Article VI." These steps include:

- o Early entry into force of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT).

- o A moratorium on nuclear weapon test explosions or any other nuclear explosions pending entry into force of that treaty.
- o Negotiation of a multilateral treaty banning the production of fissile material.
- o Early entry into force and full implementation of START II and the conclusion of START III as soon as possible while preserving and strengthening the ABM Treaty as a cornerstone of strategic stability.
- o Further efforts by the nuclear-weapon states to reduce their nuclear arsenals unilaterally.
- o Further reduction of non-strategic nuclear weapons.
- o Concrete agreed measures to further reduce the operational status of nuclear weapons systems.
- o A diminishing role for nuclear weapons in security policies to minimize the risk that these weapons will ever be used and to facilitate the process of their total elimination.
- o The engagement as soon as appropriate of all the nuclear-weapon states in the process leading to the total elimination of their nuclear weapons.

Many of these practical steps were also recommended by the 2000 United Methodist General Conference in the attached resolution, "Saying No to Nuclear Deterrence".

Nuclear Posture Review

In the current nuclear posture review the United States now has an opportunity to translate its treaty commitment for the elimination of nuclear weapons into specific policies and a schedule of concrete steps. Although we share the view of the United Methodist Council of Bishops, who in 1986 said "No" to nuclear deterrence, we recognize that official U.S. policy is unlikely to immediately and totally reverse its 50-year commitment to nuclear deterrence. However, we ask that U.S. nuclear policy reaffirm the treaty commitment to nuclear disarmament and specify "a diminishing role for nuclear weapons in security policies". This diminishing role should include a no-first-use policy by the United States as a transitional measure on the way to total elimination.

With these basic commitments established the U.S. nuclear policy should outline a program of practical steps that will be carried out in the next four years and for another four year period beyond that. These should encompass (1) de-alerting the entire nuclear arsenal by removing weapons from hair-trigger alert, (2) deep cuts in the strategic arsenal through treaty negotiation and unilateral initiatives, (3) expanding the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program (Nunn-Lugar) to help Russia dismantle its nuclear weapons and achieve secure storage of fissile material, (4) vigorous international control of fissile material and ballistic missile technology, (5) use of diplomacy and financial incentives to curtail development of nuclear weapons and long-range missiles by small nations, (6) maintenance of the nuclear testing moratorium and ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, and (7) preservation of the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty because of its restraining influence on strategic missile deployment.

We believe that this agenda is a far superior way to achieve security of the United States from nuclear attack than national missile defense, which your administration is so vigorously pursuing. We agreed with the United Methodist General Conference which has issued a call to "halt all efforts to develop and deploy strategic antimissile defense systems because they are illusory, unnecessary, and wasteful."

Public Participation

Finally we recommend that there be full public participation in the nuclear posture review, including public hearings by the Department of Defense and by appropriate committees of Congress. We ask that a draft nuclear posture statement be published for widespread public discussion with provision for ample feedback before it is finally adopted.

With the United States leading the way the world can move away from outmoded, 20th century reliance on nuclear weapons and can free the 21st century from the curse of human existence threatened by these terrible instruments of mass destruction. This would constitute true moral progress for humankind. Mr. President, please use the opportunity of the nuclear posture review to provide global leadership for this worthy, achievable goal.

With best regards,

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

To: jmiddlesworth@umc-gbcs.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Forwarding letter to Jim Winkler
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

This was sent to Jim Winkler, Jaydee Hanson, Janet Horman, and David Culp at FCNL.

Dear Colleagues:

We are three weeks and a day from the reception for Senator Lugar. There is lots to be done. I'm not sure who is doing what. I'm going out of town from Wednesday, May 30 through Tuesday, June 5, so I hope you folks will do what is necessary. I'll be in my office all day today, Tuesday, from 11:00 a.m. on if anyone wants to call me to discuss things.

A couple of weeks ago I provided Jim Winkler a draft of a letter inviting Lee Hamilton to give some special remarks and a draft letter to denominational offices, asking them to be co-sponsors. I'm assuming that these went out. If so, there will need to be follow up with denominational offices so that the names can be put on the invitation. If it didn't go, it's probably too late.

Presumably the UMGBCS will get the invitations printed. I'm assuming that David Culp has the names to invite. I'm hoping that your offices will have the capacity to get the envelopes addressed. When I get back, I'm willing to help with follow-up calls and will help get other volunteers for that task.

There is catering to arrange.

We've all done things on tight deadline, so I know we'll pull this off.

Thanks for all your efforts,
Howard

Reply-To: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
From: "Brink Campaign" <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
To: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
Subject: Brink Legislative follow up
Date: Tue, 29 May 2001 02:16:48 -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

Hi folks,
We have reserved the Mott House for Thursday, May 31, 9:30 to 11:00 to
continue the legislative discussion begun at the NWWG meeting last Thursday.
We hope to arrive at a legislative decision at that meeting. An agenda will
follow soon.

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
www.backfromthebrink.org

To: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Brink Legislative follow up
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <NEBBKJHCMLACLOPKCPPBKEDKCDAA.pgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
References:

At 02:16 AM 5/29/01 -0400, you wrote:

>Hi folks,
>We have reserved the Mott House for Thursday, May 31, 9:30 to 11:00 to
>continue the legislative discussion begun at the NWWG meeting last Thursday.....

Esther,

I'll be out of town on Thursday. Please keep me informed.

Howard

To: jhanson@umc-gbcs.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Letters re Lugar reception
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\icnd.087.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Jaydee,

Here is my correspondence with Jim Winkler on letters to Lee Hamilton and WISC members. I'm all attaching my draft of the statement of appreciaaion for Lugar.

Please call me before the day is over to discuss where we stand. I'm leaving town tomorrow for seven days.

Howard

###

From: James Winkler <JWinkler@UMC-GBCS.ORG>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Cc: Janet Horman <JHorman@UMC-GBCS.ORG>, Jaydee Hanson <JHanson@UMC-GBCS.ORG>, Mark Harrison <MHarrison@UMC-GBCS.ORG>, "david@fcnl.org" <david@fcnl.org>
Subject: RE: Lugar reception
Date: Wed, 16 May 2001 16:45:00 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Howard:

The Hamilton letter looks good. I also agree with the denominational co-sponsor idea. I'm not sure either who the WISC members are but Mark and Jaydee can help there. Finally, yes, we also have thought of the lobby as the place for the reception.

Jim

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Wednesday, May 16, 2001 4:17 PM
To: James Winkler
Cc: david@fcnl.org
Subject: Lugar reception

Jim,

For the Lugar reception we would like to invite Lee Hamilton to come and give a few remarks. Therefore, I have drafted the following letter of invitation for you to send to him. Modify as you see fit.

We also want to invite other denominational offices to be cosponsors. I'm not certain who is a member of WISC these days, but probably that is the group to approach. My thought is that cosponsors should be primarily

denominational offices rather peace fellowships and other miscellaneous groups. Below is a draft letter for you to send to the heads of offices. You can modify it, too, if you want to.

As David Culp and I were leaving the Methodist Building yesterday, we stood in the lobby and envisioned it as the preferred site for the reception if the receptionist console could be removed. What is your experience with Methodist Building evening receptions? What do you prefer?

Shalom,
Howard

###

UMGBCS letterhead

Date

The Honorable Lee Hamilton, Director
Woodrow Wilson International
Center for Scholars
1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20005

Dear Mr. Hamilton:

On Wednesday, June 20, 2001 the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society is holding a reception to honor Senator Richard Lugar for his work over the years to contain, reduce, and eliminate weapons of mass destruction. One of our bishops and I will make a special presentation to Senator Lugar. We invite you, as a fellow United Methodist and a Hoosier, to join us and make a few remarks about the contributions of Senator Lugar and the importance of disarmament. We expect him to respond with his own remarks.

The reception will take place between 6:00 and 8:00 p.m. at the Methodist Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE. The presentation and remarks are likely to occur around 7:00 p.m.

If you are able to participate, we would like to include your name on the invitation, indicating that you will give "special remarks". To confirm you can reach me at 202 488-5623 or have your office call Jeanette Middlesworth, administrative assistant, at 202 488-5629.

With best regards,

James Winkler
General Secretary

###

To heads of WISC agencies

Dear Colleagues:

On Wednesday, June 20, 2001 the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society is holding a reception to honor Senator Richard Lugar for his work over the years to contain, reduce, and eliminate weapons of mass destruction. One of our bishops and I will make a special presentation to Senator Lugar. We have also invited former Representative Lee Hamilton, like Senator Lugar a prominent United Methodist from Indiana, to make a few remarks.

I cordially you and your staff to attend this reception, which will take place between 6:00 and 8:00 p.m. I also invite your office to be a co-sponsor of this event and to have your organization be listed on the invitation to the reception. The United Methodist General Board of Church and Society will handle the cost of the reception. By being a co-sponsor you can register your appreciation of Senator Lugar's work.

If you have any questions, please call me at 202 488-5623.

Sincerely yours,

James Winkler
General Secretary

U.S. Rethinks Nuclear Aid To Russia: Suspicions, Cost Spur A Review Of Program to Defuse Soviet-Era Arms

Stephen J. Hedges and James Warren

Baltimore Sun

29 May 2001

(for personal use only)

WASHINGTON -- Deep in the heart of Russia sits a nearly completed, \$640 million concrete and steel structure designed to store plutonium from Russia's dismantled nuclear weapons. But the Russians didn't pay for the high-tech building at Mayak, a city devoted to nuclear weapons production during the Cold War.

American taxpayers did.

And while some cite the structure as a shining example of helping Russia reduce its dangerous nuclear stockpile, others contend the U.S. is being hoodwinked into financing an upgrade of Russia's weapons complex, one that may make the world even less safe.

Indeed, Mayak's rising expense -- government auditors say it may end up costing the United States \$1.3 billion -- is a key element of a Bush administration review of all U.S.-Russia nuclear, biological and chemical non-proliferation initiatives that have blossomed during 10 years of post-Cold War diplomacy. The programs have cost the U.S. nearly \$5 billion.

The aim is to reduce weapons of mass destruction and make them more secure, a vital task that Russia clearly cannot do without financial and technical aid. But now, Bush administration officials say, some such initiatives may be cut back or eliminated.

The reappraisal is overseen by the National Security Council, where weekly meetings are held with the Defense, Energy and State Departments, which run the programs. The results of the study are soon expected to go to President Bush.

The review comes as the administration charts a new course in U.S.-Russian relations, moving from rapprochement and financial assistance to one of harder bargains and arms-length diplomacy.

"We need to be aware of the fact that Russia, in particular, claims to lack the financial resources to eliminate weapons of mass destruction but continues to invest scarce resources in the development of newer, more sophisticated [intercontinental ballistic missiles] and other weapons," Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld recently told the U.S. Senate.

The collapse of the Soviet Union left nearly 30,000 nuclear weapons spread mostly across the four new nations of Russia, Ukraine, Kazakstan and Belarus. U.S. diplomacy and money persuaded Kazakstan, Belarus and Ukraine to ship hundreds of missiles and warheads back to Russia, where they could be disposed of more readily.

Even before the reassessment, the administration's tentative budget for fiscal 2002 cut at least \$100 million from non-proliferation programs. The move upset influential Republican senators, including Pete Domenici of New Mexico, now head of the Budget Committee; Ted Stevens of Alaska, now chairman of the Appropriations Committee; and Richard Lugar of Indiana, a member of the Foreign Relations Committee and a longtime proponent of aiding Russian disarmament. The three will remain potent forces even with the upcoming switch to Democratic control of the Senate.

Businesses and federal agencies in 26 states benefit from the Russian nuclear salvage operations, including two national laboratories in Domenici's state.

Lugar acknowledges that "the Russians are not very cooperative in some of these places at all" and that some programs might have to go. But he says the destruction of weapons has been an unheralded success and should continue at a faster pace.

"We should have deactivated more warheads each year," Lugar said. "From the beginning, I would have spent more. The Russians still have thousands of warheads and hundreds of ICBMs, and that is the reality of the world."

The programs, initially focused on deactivating nuclear weapons, now include converting Russian nuclear sites to peaceful uses, retraining and finding work for an estimated 7,000 scientists and other workers, and tightening security around hundreds of often poorly guarded facilities.

Among those initiatives, the storage facility at Mayak, a central Russian city in the Ural Mountains, is a favorite of critics. Mayak was one of the Soviet Union's 10 "secret" nuclear cities, places that couldn't be found on a map but where nuclear weapons were built. Mayak's main mission was to produce plutonium for each weapon's critical core.

When the Cold War ended, Russia asked the U.S. for help in building a storage facility at Mayak for the plutonium and uranium that would be removed from weapons. The cost of such a specialized structure was estimated at \$500 million. The two nations agreed to split the cost.

But by 1996, the U.S. already had spent \$20 million on the building when the Russians changed their minds about the method for storing the containers of plutonium.

Kremlin's '11th-hour' change

"At the 11th hour, the Russians said, 'We want to store it vertically,' which would have required redesigning the whole building, which we did," said F. James Shafer of the U.S. General Accounting Office, which reviewed the Mayak project. "At the time, we were still negotiating with the Russians for access. We never got the transparency. The Russians wouldn't provide it, but we went ahead and built the facility."

There may be more costs. The U.S. already has spent \$37 million for containers that will be used at Mayak and it expects to spend another \$650 million to help Russia prepare its uranium and plutonium for storage.

Nonetheless, the Russians are balking at earlier pledges to allow U.S. officials access to the facility when it is completed. Without such access, U.S. officials can't be sure just what is being stored at Mayak. Still unanswered is who will pay Mayak's \$10 million annual operating costs once it opens. Proliferation experts also complain that Mayak only warehouses, and doesn't reduce, Russia's weapons capability.

"Mayak is a big pyramid that you cram valuable stuff into," said Henry Sokolski, director of the Nonproliferation Education Policy Center in Washington. "But how does that solve your problem?"

Champions of the storage center hold up Mayak as an example of the progress that has been made in helping Russia reduce its nuclear weapons stockpile. In 10 years, they note, Russia has dismantled more than 5,500 nuclear weapons, 1,100 missiles, 85 bombers and other arms. The only alternative, these experts say, is doing nothing, and getting nothing in return.

"I'm hoping that, over time, people will come to understand that it's within the United States' national interest to have warhead plants shut down," said Rose Gottemoeller, formerly the undersecretary for nuclear non-proliferation in the Department of Energy.

Gottemoeller said that while working with the Russians is often frustrating and expensive, the projects have given American scientists and military officials a rare window onto Russia's "holiest of holies," its nuclear complex.

A decade ago, Lugar and then-Sen. Sam Nunn (D-Ga.) put the notion of disarming Russia into legislation, crafting a law in 1991 that

authorized the Office of Cooperative Threat Reduction, or CTR, within the Pentagon.

Since then, the CTR has carried out a plan that, by 2007, calls for the elimination of nearly 9,900 Russian nuclear warheads, more than 2,000 missiles, 1,400 launchers and silos, 93 bombers, and 41 nuclear submarines. Along the way, though, the Pentagon agency has strayed into several projects, some of them mandated by Congress, that by many accounts became fiascos.

The agency lost \$65 million, for example, on the Defense Enterprise Fund, a private investment initiative to convert Russian defense industries into high-tech manufacturing.

In 1995, the CTR transferred a portion of its work to the U.S. Energy Department, whose national laboratories had 50 years of experience in making and securing nuclear weapons. The department launched the Material Protection Control and Accounting program, which has helped the Russians keep track of its weapons material and better secure it.

Since then, Energy Department contractors have installed everything from security fences to cameras to steel doors at nuclear sites. They have provided guard training and handheld devices that measure radioactive material. Computers have replaced pencil and paper as Russia's means of tracking its nuclear inventory.

"We have a much better understanding than we did in 1994 and 1995," Gottemoeller said. "The Russians are beginning to trust us. They know us better."

Along the way, however, Russia has failed to pay its promised share on Mayak and several other projects, even for minimal expenses. At one point, Energy officials say, the U.S. paid for food and winter clothing for guards at a Russian nuclear center where security had been beefed up at American expense.

U.S. scientists denied access

Russia also has been stingy about granting U.S. scientists access to projects where American equipment is being installed. In 1999 alone, the Russians denied visits by U.S. officials 25 times, according to the Energy Department.

That lack of access makes it difficult to know just how effective the new security measures are. And the upgrades made so far affect just 7 percent of the estimated 650 million tons of weapons material in Russia, according to the GAO.

"Although the United States has spent \$481 million to upgrade security systems at Russian laboratories with weapons-grade nuclear materials, because of access problems we may not know if some of these systems are being used as intended and properly maintained," GAO Associate Director Harold Johnson told the Senate a year ago.

A program to dilute 500 million tons of Russia's highly enriched uranium and sell it to the U.S. Enrichment Corp. is finally under way after years of haggling. But while that arrangement takes uranium out of Russia, critics note that it will eventually pay \$12 billion to Russia's Ministry of Atomic Energy, known as Minatom, which is still designing atomic weapons.

"We have no idea where that money's going," said Sokolski. "If we're lucky, it's going to finance dachas or Bermuda vacations [for corrupt Russian officials]."

Some Russians also are concerned about that money, and what Minatom might do with it.

"We have very big doubts that the profits from the transactions will really be spent on the lofty aims proclaimed by Minatom," said Sergei Mitrokhin of the liberal Yabloko faction in the Duma, Russia's lower house of parliament.

"But we have even more doubts that any of this money is going to be spent on something socially useful."

With the U.S. policy review under way, each government agency is waiting to see how much of its programs will remain, and just how they will fit in to what will be a decidedly different approach to Russia's potential threat.

A task force organized by Clinton administration Energy Secretary Bill Richardson issued a report in January that described the security of Russian nuclear weapons as "the most urgent, unmet national security threat to the United States today." The 18-member task force, half of whose members are retired senators and members of Congress, recommended spending another \$30 billion over the next 8 to 10 years.

Bush is not likely to buy into that strategy. Although the White House will not make its results known for several more weeks, administration officials have already signaled that changes are in the wind, well beyond the \$100 million in cuts they already have targeted.

"I suspect there will be other cuts," said one administration official involved in the review. "And frankly, some of these programs should be cut."

To: "Denise Britti" <denisebritti@prodigy.net>
From: "Carlee L. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: 6/12 session
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <00b601c0ee2f\$2e7ea820\$d7339cd1@net>
References: <OE90D1PIje6n0ssrAX0000192ef@hotmail.com>

Dear Denise, Here are the old addresses:

Carol M. Purcell (301) 926-2410 Birthday May 10
17517 White Grounds Rd.
Boyd's, MD 20841
carolmpurcell@dellnet.com

Mary Rose Janya (703) 451-8541 Birthday Jan. 11
6133 Bardu Ave.
Springfield, VA 22152
kheller@erols.com

Carlee Hallman (301) 897-3668 Birthday Mar. 8
6508 Wilmet Rd.
Bethesda, MD 20817-2318
FAX301-896-0031
muj@igc.org

Stephanie Lawson (301) 320-2471 Birthday Ap. 17
5405 Duvall Dr.
Bethesda, MD 20816
srglawson@aol.com

Denise Britti 6930 Seven Locks Road Cabin Birthday May 21
>John, MD 20818 301.263.0511 denisebritti@prodigy.net

Ann Philips P.O. Box>1248 403 McCauley St. Washington Grove MD 20880 (301) 963-5781
>aphilips@igc.org

Shirley Hahn 3940 Fordham Road NW Washington DC 20016
>202-686-3940 rhsh@earthlink.net

"The Hard Sell Gets Even Harder"

MSNBC.com - June 5, 2001 - By Michael Moran, MSNBC

Tax cut, Senate flip imperil Bush missile defense system

NEW YORK — Russia is trying to outflank it. China warns it will spark a new arms race. Europe worries it will leave them defenseless. And skeptics in America point out that, so far, it doesn't actually work. Now, add two more challenges to the deployment of a national missile defense system: a Democratic Senate and an American military that can find a lot of more productive ways to spend \$60 billion.

"The best defense is a good offense." that sums up an argument many in the U.S. military are making against national missile defense. "Against," you ask? Absolutely. In fact, one of the best kept secrets of the long debate on missile defense is the fact that a large body of American military officers — from one-third to half, by various estimates — believe the huge expenditures now being discussed to field a limited missile defense system would serve the nation's defense better elsewhere.

One senior Marine officer put it this way: "What a lot of us wonder is this: does it make sense to spend an entire year's worth of national defense funds on a system that might protect us from an unsophisticated rogue missile attack sometime in the future, but which does nothing to prevent a terrorist from sneaking a warhead into the country via Canada?"

A Simple Plan

The current Bush Administration plan for a national missile defense grew out of the Reagan-era Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) — "Star Wars" to its critics. The Bush plan is far less ambitious than Reagan's vision of a system that would prevent nuclear missiles from ever being used; instead, it seeks to create a network of land, ship and space-based radars that could identify small-scale missile launches and direct anti-missile weapons to destroy them before they have time to reach their targets. Among the obvious scenarios: a North Korean or Iranian launch against U.S. bases, American allies or even the U.S. West Coast; an accidental or renegade launch by an established power like Russia or China.

This seemingly simple idea is politically attractive, as well. What politician doesn't want to make America invulnerable to "rogue states" or terrorist groups who obtain missile-borne nuclear weapons?

But the simplicity quickly evaporates. Technically, successive tests by the Air Force meant to prove the feasibility of intercepting an ICBM in flight have been failures. This even though the tests are skewed for success in that they lack the decoys and other feints that would invariably be part of a real launch against the United States or its overseas bases.

NIMBY: Not In My Budget Year

Not surprisingly, the strong opposition to national missile defense, or NMD, resides outside the Air Force, the service which benefits most from the research and development spending and which would control much of the program if deployed. (The surface warfare branch of the Navy, whose Aegis-radar equipped cruisers and destroyers would play a key role in the early stages of deployment, also is enthusiastic. After all, it's been a long time since surface warships were at the top of anyone's spending priorities.)

Conversations with a range of military officers and defense analysts — all of whom requested anonymity — suggest that opposition to NMD only grows if, as some in the services fear, the huge and unpredictable costs of the program get integrated into the annual defense budget.

"The debate right now is animated, but there still is a lot of uncertainty about the impact of this proposal because no one has said firmly whether this will be paid for by the budget surplus," said a Defense Department official. "Frankly, if you start asking the Army, the Marines or the Navy to give up tanks, helicopters or carriers for this thing, they'll pull out the stops to kill it."

The original plan called for National Missile Defense to be a "surplus item;" that is, a program to be paid for outside the annual service budgets as a one-time use of budget surplus funds. Ironically, the Bush administration's success in pushing through the \$1.35 trillion tax cut it wanted may mean that is impossible. The budget surplus both parties were confidently predicting as a windfall last year now looks much diminished. It now appears — due to a slowed economy and revenues lost to the tax cut — that there will be nothing like the \$60 billion lying around to fund the Bush missile shield.

Enter Carl Levin, Michigan Democrat and new chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee. Levin was the featured guest at the National Defense University a few weeks ago, and his talk focused on missile defense. His remarks, published on his Web site, stressed the potential of such a system, but also pointed out nothing approaching a workable missile shield appears within reach. Further, he said, "the Intelligence Community tells us that the use of ships, planes, trucks or even suitcases to deliver weapons of mass destruction against us is far more likely than the use of ballistic missiles is because these unconventional means are cheaper, more reliable, more accurate, more stealthy and harder to detect and retaliate against." It's hard to imagine such a man approving \$60 billion for deployment of NMD.

Dominoes Revisited

Pentagon dissent and the Democratic Senate are only the newest obstacles to a quick missile shield deployment. Even more complex are the strategic and diplomatic arguments. Deployment of such a system would violate a treaty the U.S. signed in 1972 — the Anti-Ballistic Missile treaty, meant to ensure missile defenses didn't make either the United States or the Soviet Union so insecure that they felt compelled to launch a pre-emptive strike. This ABM treaty made "deterrence" the great stabilizing force of the Cold War, many argue, and it remains the only proven defense against nuclear war. The Bush Administration is working to convince all sides the ABM treaty — and the "stability" it engendered — no longer apply to current realities.

Russia and American allies in Europe disagree, for different reasons. Both argue that deterrence has worked for 50 years and it shouldn't be tampered with. Russia's real concern is more selfish: ensuring the missile defense remains limited — i.e., that it never becomes so large that it negates Moscow's own huge nuclear arsenal — the last real vestige of the great power once wielded by the Soviet Union.

European NATO nations, however, appear to be more stubbornly opposed to ditching ABM than the Bush administration had hoped. In late May, Secretary of State Colin Powell met with European foreign ministers in an effort to convince them that the American position would lead to a more stable world, not a destabilized one. They don't buy it. Europe's position is that supporters of the missile shield are deliberately overstating the risk of a terrorist group or rogue state launching a nuclear attack on America. "It's less likely, frankly, than the chances of a meteor impact that destroys life on earth," quipped one European defense official attached to NATO's headquarters in Brussels. "Will we have a shield for that, too?"

Then there is China. For once, Beijing has been unequivocal about its intentions: China officials has stated that deployment of an American nuclear shield will compel it to mount a major increase in the number of nuclear missiles in its arsenal. China currently fields less than 20 missiles capable of reaching the United States — a number carefully chosen to be "relevant," but not threatening. The number could easily be 2,000 if Washington insists.

Even more worrying is the fact that nothing China does would occur in a vacuum, either. A kind of nuclear domino effect would result from any Chinese missile expansion, as first China, then its rival, India, and then India's rival, Pakistan, all seek to build a nuclear missile forces larger than their foes — all predicated on China's efforts to have a force large enough to escape nullification by the American missile shield. Of course, China's concerns will not play too well in America right now, given the state of relations. But the consequences of Beijing's actions can't be ruled out. And because of that, it may be that even supporters of missile defense will come to appreciate the value of more time to perfect the a

missile shield before it is rushed into the field.

Michael Moran, senior producer for special reports at MSNBC, is a specialist in national security and international affairs.

X-Sender: jdi@[63.106.26.66]
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)
Date: Tue, 05 Jun 2001 17:30:51 -0400
To: jdi@clw.org
From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>
Subject: Republican poll: Privacy Ranks As Top Issue, Missile Defense
at the Bottom

Poll conducted by a Republican firm, Public Opinion Strategies:
Privacy Ranks As Top Issue, Missile Defense at the Bottom

Conducted 5/5-7/01; surveyed 800 registered voters; margin of error +/-
3.5% (release, 6/4).

Using A 10 Point Scale, With 10 Being Very Important And 1 Being Not
Important At All, Please Tell Me How Important The Issues Discussed In The
Following Statements Are To You Personally:

(number indicating those responding "10")

67% Strengthening privacy laws to assure your computerized medical,
financial, or personal records are kept private

62% Making sure doctors and patients, not the HMOs, control health care
decisions about medical treatments

55% Protecting Social Security

55% Fighting crime and illegal drugs

53% Providing health care coverage for every uninsured child

50% Strengthening and improving Medicare

47% Working to maintain a strong national economy

47% Making sure seniors receive prescription drug coverage

38% Developing a national energy policy to assure reasonable electric rates

36% Funding efforts to make more progress in cleaning up environmental
problems

34% Cutting federal taxes

32% Increasing federal education funding

22% Developing a nuclear missile shield to defend American against rogue
nations and terrorists

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: jdi@[63.106.26.66]
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)
Date: Wed, 30 May 2001 13:50:26 -0400
To: jdi@clw.org
From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>
Subject: Missile Defense Reconsidered in Light of Jeffords Switch:
What Four Senators Are Saying

Missile Defense Reconsidered in Light of Jeffords Switch:
What Four Senators Are Saying

"The president has said he wants to deploy, and I think that is a premature decision and we certainly wouldn't be prepared to do that."

Sen. Tom Daschle, from "Meet the Press" quoted in New York Times - May 28, 2001

"The reality is that the Democrats will control the committee agendas, so when you take an issue like missile defense where there are significant differences between the Democratic Senate leadership and the President, it changes the dynamics considerably."

Sen. Chuck Hagel, New York Times, May 28, 2001

"The pros and cons of that [missile defense], I think, are now going to be more considered by this administration than they were during the campaign when the president just made a statement, we're going to deploy and pull out of the ABM treaty, because he's heard plenty from our allies as well as from the Russians and the Chinese as to what the likely response would be."

Sen. Carl Levin, CNN Late Edition, May 27, 2001

"I intend to have the Committee begin a broader national discussion of significant foreign policy issues, including the Administration's objectives for a national missile defense. The decisions we will make on this one issue alone promises to be the most important national security debate and decision in our lifetime, and it will have profound consequences for our children and generations to come."

Sen. Joseph Biden, press statement, May 29, 2001

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

Strategic Arms Flexibility Act of 2001, H.R. 2013 (Introduced in the House, May 25, 2001)

To provide the President with flexibility to set strategic nuclear delivery system levels to meet United States national security goals.

Introduced by Mr. ALLEN (for himself, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Andrews, Mr. Brady of Pennsylvania, Mr. Evans, Ms. Baldwin, Mr. Markey, Mr. Stark, Mr. Frank, Mr. Tierney, Mr. Doggett, Mr. Blumenauer, Mr. Snyder, Mr. Kucinich, and Mr. Berman) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services

A BILL

To provide the President with flexibility to set strategic nuclear delivery system levels to meet United States national security goals.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION. 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the 'Strategic Arms Flexibility Act of 2001'.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress makes the following findings:

- (1) Reducing the levels of strategic nuclear weapons around the world is in the national security interest of the United States.
- (2) The strategic arms reduction treaty referred to as the START I Treaty, signed in 1991 and entered into force in 1994, commits the United States and Russia to a limitation of approximately 6,000 strategic nuclear weapons each.
- (3) The strategic arms reduction treaty referred to as the START II Treaty, signed in 1993, ratified by the United States in 1996 and by Russia in 2000, and scheduled to be implemented by 2007, limits each country to 3,000-3,500 strategic nuclear weapons.
- (4) The nuclear force levels permitted the United States under the START II Treaty are sufficient to allow the United States to meet its strategic requirements as determined by the most recent Nuclear Posture Review and the Single Integrated Operating Plan.
- (5) Section 1302 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85), enacted on November 18, 1997, prohibits the

retirement or dismantlement of United States strategic nuclear delivery systems below the START I levels until the START II Treaty enters into force.

(6) The original purpose of the prohibition under section 1302, to encourage Russia to ratify the START II Treaty, was achieved when the Russian Duma approved it on April 2000.

(7) In 1999, Congress amended section 1302 to allow the President flexibility to retire four Trident ballistic missile submarines as provided by the START II Treaty, but not other strategic nuclear delivery systems such as missiles and bombers, before that treaty enters into force.

(8) Unless additional flexibility is granted the President, the Department of Defense will spend more than \$700,000,000 through 2007, when the START II Treaty is implemented, to retain 50 Peacekeeper missiles that have been determined to be superfluous to maintenance of the United States nuclear deterrent.

(9) President George W. Bush has called for reductions in the United States strategic arsenal below the START II levels and for removing nuclear weapons from high alert status.

(10) Repeal of the limitation under section 1302 would give the President the flexibility to set strategic nuclear weapons delivery system levels to meet overall national security goals and the requirements of the next Nuclear Posture Review.

SEC. 3. REPEAL OF LIMITATION ON RETIREMENT OR DISMANTLEMENT OF STRATEGIC NUCLEAR DELIVERY SYSTEMS.

Section 1302 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85) is repealed.

FAS-NRDC-FAS RELEASE REPORT ON U.S. NUCLEAR WEAPONS POLICY

A report released yesterday by 16 top scientists and security experts recommends new US nuclear policies to address real and immediate dangers posed by the mistaken launch of nuclear missiles from Russia and to help prevent the further spread of nuclear weapons. The experts also warn that key policies proposed by President Bush might actually threaten our national security.

The new report, "Toward True Security: A US Nuclear Posture for the Next Decade," finds that thousands of nuclear weapons in Russia on hair-trigger alert, combined with Russia's decaying early-warning system, pose an immediate risk of mistaken Russian attack against the US. The panel says that "missile programs in developing states are a cause for concern, but they pale in comparison to the dangers from Russia nuclear weapons. The president's focus on the so-called rogue threat not only leaves the greater dangers from Russia unsolved, it makes them worse."

The report supports the Bush administration on two points. The first is a proposal made by the president during his election campaign to take US nuclear forces off hair-trigger alert, thus providing incentives for Moscow to do the same. The report also agrees with the Bush administration on the need to move ahead with US-Russian arsenal reductions, though the panel believes that such reductions should be followed by bilateral agreements to ensure verifiability and irreversibility. Both of these proposals would require the passage of legislation similar to H.R. 2013 (see below).

"Toward True Security" authors are: Dr. Richard L. Garwin, Council on Foreign Relations and UCS; Dr. Frank N. von Hippel, Princeton University and FAS; Bruce Blair, CDI; Robert Sherman, FAS; Steve Fetter, University of Maryland; Dr. Kurt Gottfried, Cornell University and UCS; Dr. Henry Kelly, FAS; Dr. Lisbeth Gronlund, UCS and MIT; Tom Collina, UCS; Dr. David Wright, UCS and MIT; Amb. Jonathan Dean, UCS; Dr. Thomas B. Cochran, NRDC; Dr. Adam Segal, UCS; Dr. Matthew G. McKinzie, NRDC; Stephen Young, UCS; and Dr. Robert S. Norris, NRDC.

See attached news articles below. For a PDF version of the full report, see <http://www.ucsusa.org/index.html>

From: Janet Horman <JHorman@UMC-GBCS.ORG>
To: "mupj@igc.org" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: FW: Help for web site material
Date: Tue, 5 Jun 2001 09:59:22 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Howard:

Gretchen..our web expert..is now back in town. Attached is her response to my inquiry. We can apparently format web material for use by other denominations. Is that what you had in mind? Do you want to meet sometime before the 19th to talk about particular content? Jaydee and I will be talking on Friday about a fax/e-mail attachment to a web-site allowing folks to respond with a notice to their congressperson..as he mentioned during our lunch.

Janet..I'll see you on the 6th.

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

From: Gretchen Hakola
Sent: Monday, June 04, 2001 4:39 PM
To: Janet Horman
Cc: Jaydee Hanson; Erik Alsgaard
Subject: RE: Help for web site material

Janet: Let me see if I can break down what he is asking:

1. We do have the ability via Bernie to take any content on the subject, design and format web pages that can then be transmitted to other denominational webmasters.
2. It would be up to you and/or MUPJ to develop the content (think about what you would put in a booklet, for instance, where page limitation was not a problem). What images? What documents to download?
3. No we don't have a budget or consultant. If the desire is to develop a separate website for the group or more complex content (chat abilities, etc.) then I'd suggest contacting Barbara Nissen at the Conference Resourcing Committee (part of UMCOM) for any ideas about who to go to.

Hope that helps.

Gretchen

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

From: Janet Horman
Sent: Friday, May 25, 2001 9:18 AM
To: Jaydee Hanson; Erik Alsgaard; Gretchen Hakola
Subject: FW: Help for web site material

Dear Jaydee, Eric and Gretchen:

Howard Hallman from Methodists United for Peace and Justice has raised the following question to us? Any thought on whether we have the capacityand/or

interest to assist on something like this web project? I know that I don't have the skills it takes...so if we wanted to participate(and receive financial support from other groups as necessary), I'd need someone else to take the lead.

Thanks, Janet

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

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

Sent: Wednesday, May 16, 2001 9:33 AM

To: Janet Horman

Subject: Help for web site material

Janet,

In my report on the May 15 meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament I indicated the desire to develop common material for use on denominational web sites. Would you be willing to help on this? Could you tap Jaydee's ideas based on his experience with the environmental web site?

Do you have an in-house expert or a consultant who could help? If we need to hire a consultant, other offices could share the cost. I'll call you about this.

The next meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament will take place on Tuesday, June 19. Subsequent meetings will occur on the third Tuesday of the month except for August.

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.

Incoming mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).
Version: 6.0.251 / Virus Database: 124 - Release Date: 4/26/01

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).
Version: 6.0.251 / Virus Database: 124 - Release Date: 4/26/01

X-Sender: johnburroughs@mail.earthlink.net
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0.1
Date: Wed, 06 Jun 2001 07:18:17 -0400
To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
From: John Burroughs <johnburroughs@earthlink.net>
Subject: (abolition-usa) June 10 open meeting on disarmament campaign activities
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

On Sunday June 10, from 5-7 pm, in Washington, following the rally from 2-4 pm at Lafayette Park, the US Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons will host an open meeting to discuss groups' plans for campaigning against missile defense and the weaponization of space and for the dealerting, reduction, and elimination of nuclear forces. The agenda is still being formed, but at a minimum the intent is to exchange information about upcoming events, actions, and campaigns, and to explore how to coordinate campaign activities.

The meeting will be held at the Methodist Building, 100 Maryland Ave., NE, directly across the street from the Supreme Court. From the rally, take the red line from Farragut North to Union Station, exit onto Massachusetts, and head up 1st St. The building will be on your left just before you get to the Supreme Court.

Contact John Burroughs (separate msg to johnburroughs@lcnp.org, not by reply to this msg, or call 212 818 1861) for more information or to provide input into the meeting agenda.

The meeting is being held in connection with the rally and congressional education days, June 10-12, organized by the Nuclear Disarmament Partnership and Project Abolition. For more information regarding June 10-12 activities (not the meeting), see www.projectabolition.org or contact Kathy Crandall, Nuclear Disarmament Partnership, at kcrandall@disarmament.org.

John Burroughs, Executive Director
Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy
211 E. 43d St., Suite 1204
New York, New York 10017 USA
tel: +1 212 818 1861 fax: 818 1857
e-mail: johnburroughs@lcnp.org
website: www.lcnp.org
Part of the Abolition 2000 Global
Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons

-
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: Rachel Labush <rlabush@rac.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: Cosponsorship of Lugar reception
Date: Thu, 7 Jun 2001 09:09:00 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Thanks for letting me know. Sometimes important things do not get through and down to me! Rabbi Saperstein is off testifying in Congress this morning on Charitable Choice, but if he makes it back before noon I will corner him and ask about it. In the meantime, I'll try getting the other senior staff whether we can co-sponsor. Is there a financial commitment? I'll get back to you as soon as I can.

Thanks,
Rachel

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Thursday, June 07, 2001 9:02 AM
To: rlabush@rac.org
Subject: Cosponsorship of Lugar reception

Dear Rachel,

Jim Winkler, General Secretary of the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society, has invited Washington denominational offices to be co-sponsors of the June 20 reception honoring Senator Lugar. So far there has been no response from the Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism. I presume the letter went to Rabbi Saperstein..

We're running behind on getting out the invitations. Therefore, we would like to know by 12 noon today, June 7, whether the Religious Action Center can be listed as a cosponsor. If this is so, please call me at 301 896-0013.

Thanks,

Howard

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

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