

To: rlabush@rac.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Cosponsorship of Lugar reception
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

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

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.

To: egbertl4pj@yahoo.org, "Teresa Kashin" <uuawo@aol.com>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Cosponsorship of Lugar reception
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Larry and Teresa,

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 Unitarian Universalist office. I presume the letter went to Meg Riley.

We're running behind on getting out the invitations. Therefore, we would like to know by 12 noon today, June 7, whether the Unitarian Universalist Association Washington Office can be listed as a cosponsor. If this is so, please call me at 301 896-0013.

Thanks,

Howard

Date: Thu, 7 Jun 2001 08:47:49 -0700 (PDT)
From: Egbert Lawrence <egbertl4pj@yahoo.com>
Subject: Reply from Larry re Cosponsorship of Lugar reception
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Cc: UUAWO@aol.com

Howard,

Please put the Unitarian Universalist Association down as a cosponsor. Thanks. Note that I have copied this to Theresa.

PEACE! Larry

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

> Larry,

>
> Here is a communication I sent earlier today and
> made an error on your
> address.

>
> Howard

>
> ###

>
> Dear Larry and Teresa,
>
> 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 Unitarian Universalist
> office. I presume the
> letter went to Meg Riley.

>
> We're running behind on getting out the invitations.
> Therefore, we would
> like to know by 12 noon today, June 7, whether the
> Unitarian Universalist
> Association Washington Office 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.

Do You Yahoo!?

Get personalized email addresses from Yahoo! Mail - only \$35
a year! <http://personal.mail.yahoo.com/>

To: mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Two items regarding missile defense
Cc:
Bcc: icnd
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Here are a couple of items on missile defense: (1) results of a Republican poll and (2) what Senate leaders are saying about missile defense.

Howard

###

>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

###

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

X-Lotus-FromDomain: UCC
From: stiefr@ucc.org
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
cc: damicon@ucc.org
Date: Fri, 1 Jun 2001 11:45:41 -0400
Subject: NMD Material

Howard,
The UCC would like to work with you in getting NMD materials posted up on our website. We are not able to cover this issue to our satisfaction right now, although Rev. Noelle Damico and I are keeping our UCC network informed of activities and legislative timelines. So keep me in mind on the website materials. What is the timeline? Is there anything we can do in the next 8-10 weeks that could help keep us plugged in?

Ron

Date: Fri, 01 Jun 2001 08:43:44 -0700
Subject: room transfer at Comfort Inn
To: mupj@igc.org
Cc: EAABurns@aol.com
From: "Carol Pepper" <cpepper@towerhill.org>

Howard:

Just wanted to let you know that my husband called the Comfort Inn last night and transfered one of our room to your reservation (we canceled our other room). They gave him a cancelation # for our reservation (it is #104871). We gave them your confirmation number to add the room to your reservation. You might want to give them a call (828-669-9950) to make sure the transfer is correct.

We'll miss seeing everyone this summer. We head to cancel to see Dad on the Saturday of the reunion. Our boys, Graham and Hudson, are already talking about seeing Grandpa. They will meet their Hallman relative at the next reunion in DC (an easy drive from Wilmington).

Good luck. Let me know if you have any questions.

Carol Pepper

To: bhallman@slb.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: My mother's obituary
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\hwh.420.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Brian,

As you requested, I am sending you an obituary on my mother. It is transmitted as a Word attachment. If you can't handle that, let me know and I'll send it as text.

Thanks for what you do as family documentarian. We'll see you in North Carolina.

Howard

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

Dear Janet,

Please send me a copy of the invitation to the Lugar reception. I want to adapt it for supplemental invitations to certain senators.

I'll be out this morning until nearly noon. After that I'll call you to find out where we stand and what I should do next.

Shalom,
Howard

To: ronfoster
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Peace with justice offering
Cc: dosmith6@juno.com
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Ron,

On the United Methodist calendar June 10 was Peace with Justice Sunday and the occasion for the special offering. Maybe you did this on June 3 when I was out of town. If not, can we schedule it for some time in the fall? Perhaps that would be a good occasion to publicize volunteer opportunities with programs sponsored and supported by the Outreach Committee.

Shalom,
Howard

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

Dear Ed,

I met our needs for an extra room for Friday and Saturday night of the reunion through one released by Carol Pepper. In the course of juggling and arranging our collective schedules, some of our party will arrive on Wednesday and some not until Friday. This leaves me with two extra rooms for Thursday night, June 28. If anybody needs these rooms, please have them get in touch with me. Otherwise, I'll cancel them several days in advance.

We're all looking forward to a great Hallman 2001 reunion.

Howard

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

Phil,

I notice our balance creeping downward. There is a Peace Leaf in the works. Is there a possibility that the Foundry Peace with Justice Mission could make its annual contribution? Also, I need to go to the Baltimore/Washington Conference with a request.

We work on faith, but we need to need to get some fundraising in the works. I need to get in touch with some of the annual conference peace with justice coordinators and with some of the churches in the Baltimore/Washington Conference.

Howard

Date: Tue, 05 Jun 2001 14:50:44 -0700
From: "James R. Bennett" <jbennet@uark.edu>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.73 [en] (Win98; I)
X-Accept-Language: en
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: peace

Howard Hallman, Chair
Methodists United for Peace and Justice

Please send me your brochure or other materials about MUPJ.
Thanks, Dick Bennett
2582 Jimmie
Fayetteville, AR 72703

X-Sender: johnburroughs@mail.lcnp.org
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0.1
Date: Fri, 08 Jun 2001 17:29:11 -0400
To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
From: John Burroughs <johnburroughs@lcnp.org>
Subject: (abolition-usa) nuclear review - letter to Rumsfeld
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

In anticipation of the June 11-12 congressional education days, I am posting FYI a letter the Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy sent to Rumsfeld regarding the review of nuclear posture. The review reportedly will now not be done until "late fall", so there is still time to attempt to affect the review, or more plausibly, congressional reception of the review.

May 10, 2001
Donald H. Rumsfeld
Secretary of Defense
1000 Defense Pentagon
Washington, DC 20301-1000

Re: Nuclear posture review

Dear Secretary Rumsfeld:

We write concerning the present review of United States nuclear weapons policy ordered by President Bush, as well as the congressionally mandated nuclear posture review. We also request a meeting with you or persons responsible for these reviews. Indeed, the Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy believes that civil society groups should have a formal role in this process, which after all deals with issues essential to the future of this country and the world.

The Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy is a non-profit group based in New York which for twenty years has engaged in research and education concerning the international law framework for nuclear weapons policy as well as security more generally.

Enclosed is an article we authored in the spring 2001 World Policy Journal which sets out a range of factors that must be considered in reviewing U.S. nuclear policy. Foremost among them are commitments made by the United States at the 2000 Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) Review Conference, including:

- “An unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear-weapon States to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals leading to nuclear disarmament to which all States parties are committed under Article VI”
- “A diminishing role for nuclear weapons in security policies to minimize

the risk that the weapons ever be used and to facilitate the process of

their total elimination”

- “Concrete agreed measures to further reduce the operational status of nuclear weapons systems”
- “Further efforts by the nuclear-weapon States to reduce their nuclear arsenals unilaterally”
- “The 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 and as a basis for further reductions of strategic offensive weapons, in accordance with its provisions”
- "The further reduction of non-strategic nuclear weapons, based on unilateral initiatives and as an integral part of the nuclear arms reduction and disarmament process"
- “The necessity of establishing in the Conference on Disarmament an appropriate subsidiary body with a mandate to deal with nuclear disarmament”

For further discussion of these and other commitments, we refer you to the enclosed article. Here we wish to focus on unilateral reductions and missile defense.

Unilateral reductions in US deployed or deployable strategic warheads would be welcome as a means of overcoming the current disarmament logjam. However, they and parallel Russian reductions should be accompanied by transparency, accounting, and verification measures, which are subsequently codified by treaty. Nothing less is called for by the principle of irreversibility set forth in the 2000 NPT Review Conference agenda ("The principle of irreversibility to apply to nuclear disarmament, nuclear and other related arms control and reduction measures."), as well as the expectation that reductions would be implemented through the START process.

Regarding missile defense, from a narrowly “strategic” point of view, it defies comprehension how increasing U.S. “freedom of action” with respect to North Korea, Iraq, etc. by deploying anti-missile systems (assuming they are ever workable) could outweigh the negative consequences of such deployment. These include impeding further Russian arms reductions; stimulating or reinforcing a Chinese buildup of its arsenal, with attendant ripple effects on India and Pakistan and perhaps even Japan; and at a minimum making dealing much more difficult to implement.

>From a broader policy and legal perspective, the above highly foreseeable consequences would cause at least the United States, Russia, and China to be in a state of apparently permanent breach of their Article VI disarmament obligation under the NPT. This in turn would seriously erode the nonproliferation regime.

We also think the withdrawal provision in the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty deserves serious attention. It provides for withdrawal upon six months notice to the other party of “extraordinary events” that the withdrawing

state “regards as having jeopardizing its supreme national interests”. There are no such extraordinary events. For example, especially against the background of the risks faced by the United States during the nuclear age, a speculative future threat from North Korea comes nowhere close to making the grade. Should the United States nonetheless invoke this provision, it would act in a contemptuous manner towards obligations it solemnly assumed, and set a precedent for itself and other states to cite parallel provisions in other important security treaties, among them the NPT, the Biological Weapons Convention, the Chemical Weapons Convention, and (should it enter into force) the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. Nobody likes the condition of mutual vulnerability to annihilation assumed by the ABM Treaty. The way to get beyond this condition is not to withdraw from the treaty, but rather to proceed expeditiously with reduction, dealerting, and elimination of nuclear forces.

Very truly yours,
John Burroughs
Executive Director
Jim Wurst
Program Director

cc: Colin L. Powell, Secretary of State
Condoleeza Rice, National Security Advisor
Paul D. Wolfowitz, Deputy Secretary of Defense
Richard Armitage, Deputy Secretary of State
John Bolton, Undersecretary of State for International Security and Arms

Control

Stephen Cambone, nominee, Deputy Undersecretary of Defense for Policy
Daniel J. Dell'Orto, Acting General Counsel, Department of Defense

Avis T. Bohlen, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Arms Control,
Department of State
Robert J. Einhorn, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Nonproliferation,
Department of State
William Taft, Legal Advisor, Secretary of State
Stephen J. Hadley, Deputy National Security Advisor
Robert Joseph, staff member for nuclear weapons and arms control,
National Security Council
Senator Charles Schumer
Senator Hillary Clinton

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@lcn.org
website: www.lcn.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.

X-Sender: lisa.l@pop.mindspring.com
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.0.2
Date: Fri, 08 Jun 2001 16:52:22 -0500
To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com, bananas@lists.speakeasy.org
From: Lisa Ledwidge / IEER
Subject: (abolition-usa) some missile defense resources from IEER
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com Reply-
To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

To those of you participating in the June 11-12 Star Wars congressional education days, I wish you success.

One argument against BMD that I don't see mentioned often in news articles is: BMD can be used by the US as a key part of a first-strike strategy. "Nuclear Defense and Offense: An Analysis of US Policy," at http://www.ieer.org/sdfiles/vol_8/8-2/defoff.html , presents this argument. While it was published in February 2000, it is still relevant today, perhaps even more so. I hope it will be useful to you in your efforts.

Here are two other IEER resources relevant to missile defense/ABM issues that may also be of use:

Nuclear Weapons and the Rule of Law (Science for Democratic Action Volume 8, Number 2, February 2000):

http://www.ieer.org/sdfiles/vol_8/8-2/index.html

Law and the Nuclear Establishment (Science for Democratic Action Volume 9, Number 3, May 2001):

http://www.ieer.org/sdfiles/vol_9/9-3/index.html

Lisa Ledwidge
Outreach Coordinator and Editor, Science for Democratic Action
Institute for Energy and Environmental Research (IEER)
2104 Stevens Ave. South | Minneapolis, MN 55404 USA
phone: (612) 879-7517 | fax: (612) 879-7518
ieer@ieer.org | <http://www.ieer.org>

Date: Sat, 09 Jun 2001 16:59:06 -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 , Gene Vincent , pbritner@communityministrymc.org

Subject: Mintues from the Outreach Meeting of June 7, 2001 Greetings,

Please find attached as text the minutes from our meeting on Thursday noon. Hope I caught everything and we'll see you all on Thursday, the 28th of June for our follow-up meeting.

Take care,

Kerri

Minutes of the Meeting of the Outreach Committee

A special lunch meeting of the Outreach Committee of BUMC met on June 7, 2001 to discuss ideas for a poverty forum hosted by BUMC and in conjunction with the Community Ministry of Montgomery County (CMMC). Paul Britner, the Director of Education and Advocacy for CMMC joined us. The following people were in attendance: Dwight Smith, Haven and Jeanne North, Howard Hallman, Gene Vincent and Kerri Platais.

Direction and Planning. Paul gave us a short synopsis of CMMC's work and said that his group focused on advocacy issues as they pertained to helping make recommendations for the general assembly and Council on issues affecting the poor in Montgomery County. During the past year CMMC had worked on: (i) Earned Income Tax Credit; (ii) Mental Health Issues; (iii) Affordable Housing and, (iv) Delaying the Death Penalty in Support of the Moratorium.

Paul suggested that a general education program would consist of a forum open to the public and would focus on issues specific to social justice concerns. We discussed the various options for holding a forum of this nature, and Paul said we could either have strictly an education focus, or tie in some advocacy and "next steps" actions at the end.

Poverty in Montgomery County. After further discussion, the general consensus was to hold an evening forum for discussion of Poverty in Montgomery County and learn more about the factors behind it and what we could do to help alleviate it. Some "next steps" legislative action could also be made available at the end of the night, where we could receive information regarding whom we could write or call with our concerns.

By focusing on the barriers to self-sufficiency, Paul said he could tie in issues regarding language, diversity and employment from an educational standpoint.

Participation. We then discussed whom to partner with for the event and to what extent BUMC should co-host with other churches, or host solo and invite others to participate. We decided it would be easier to organize if we left it as an evening hosted by BUMC and sponsored by CMMC. Paul would provide the Outreach Committee with a list of churches who participate in CMMC, and we would target invite several of the congregations in the immediate surroundings of BUMC, including the Latino Congregation that shares the BUMC building.

In addition, Paul would advertise the event as a community forum in the CMMC newsletter and work with his staff to ensure diversity was well-represented.

We agreed to decide on the exact title for the evening at the next meeting, but would follow something along the lines of “Barriers to Self-Sufficiency in Montgomery County: What are they and can they be eliminated?”

We agreed to shoot for Tuesday, October 23rd to hold the event from 7:30 to 9:00 and serve refreshments at the end, for those who might want a shorter evening.

Next Steps. The Committee will meet again with Paul on June 28, 2001 for a lunch meeting at BUMC. At that time we will discuss further the agenda, special invitees, and format for the evening. Howard will not be able to attend, but offered to make some targeted phone calls, once the evening plans are confirmed.

Submitted by: Kerri Wright Platais, Outreach

Scribe

Date: Mon, 11 Jun 2001 10:31:53 -0400 (EDT)
To: nuclearcalendar@lists.his.com
Subject: Nuclear Calendar
From: "FCNL Nuclear Calendar"
X-Mailer: Html Mime Mail Class
Sender: owner-nuclearcalendar@fcnl.org
Reply-To: nuclearcalendar@fcnl.org
StylizedDove

FCNLblock
Friends Committee on National Legislation

Nuclear Calendar

- June 11-12 Star Wars and Nuclear Weapons Abolition congressional education days
Week of June 11 House Appropriations Committee, markup of the supplemental appropriations bill (estimate)
- June 12 10:15 a.m., House International Relations Subcommittee on East Asia and the Pacific, hearing on U.S. Foreign Policy in the East Asia and the Pacific: Challenges and Priorities for the Bush Administration, 2172 Rayburn
- June 12 11:30 a.m.-1 p.m., "Challenge of Regional Nuclear Arsenals" (brown-bag lunch), with Dr. Samina Ahmed, Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government and Dr. Avner Cohen, U. of Maryland's Center for International Security Studies, sponsored by Security for a New Century, 2325 Rayburn. Contact Lorelei Kelly, (202) 225-5161.
- June 12 2:30 p.m., House International Relations Committee, hearing on the Export Administration Act: The Case for Renewal (Part II), 2172 Rayburn
- June 12 House Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water, markup of energy and water appropriations bill (tentative)
- June 13 President Bush attends NATO summit, Brussels, Belgium
- June 14 10 a.m., House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Research and Development, hearing on Ballistic Missile Defense testing, with Lt. Gen. Ronald Kadish, director, Ballistic Missile Defense Organization, Defense Department, 2118 Rayburn
- June 14-15 President Bush attends U.S.-European Union summit, Stockholm and Göteborg, Sweden
- June 14-15 Institute for Science and International Security, "Understanding the Lessons of Nuclear Inspections and Monitoring in Iraq: A Ten-Year Review," at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. (Registration deadline was June 8.)
- June 15 "NATO-U.S. Relations Regarding Missile Proliferation and Defenses: Concepts, Architectures, and Perspectives," Center for Nonproliferation Studies, Monterey Institute of International Studies. Contact Kristin Thompson.
- June 16 Bush-Putin summit, Ljubljana, Slovenia
- June 18-19 Carnegie International Non-Proliferation Conference, Ronald Reagan Building and International Trade Center

The Nuclear Calendar is published every Monday when Congress is in session. To subscribe click [here](#), or send an e-mail to majordomo@fcnl.org with "subscribe NuclearCalendar" (without the quotation marks) in the message body. To unsubscribe click [here](#), or send an e-mail to majordomo@fcnl.org with "unsubscribe NuclearCalendar" (without the quotation marks) in the message body.

Published by the Friends Committee on National Legislation (FCNL) and the FCNL Education Fund. Address: 245 Second Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002-5795. Phone: (202) 547-6000. Fax: (202) 547-6019. E-mail: fcnl@fcnl.org. Web site: <http://www.fcnl.org>.

Editor is David Culp. Publication is made possible by contributions from the Ploughshares Fund, W. Alton Jones Foundation Fund of the Rockefeller Family Fund, Town Creek Foundation, and the contributors and supporters of the Friends Committee on National Legislation and the FCNL Education Fund.

We encourage readers to copy and distribute the Nuclear Calendar. When doing so, please include the following credit: "Reprinted from the Nuclear Calendar, published by the Friends Committee on National Legislation and the FCNL Education Fund."

To: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: goodbye and hello; job opening
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <3.0.32.20010604183937.00735054@[63.106.26.66]>
References:

Daryl,

Congratulations for your appointment as executive director of the Arms Control Association. I look forward to working with you in your new assignment as I have in your work with the Coalition to reduce nuclear dangers.

Howard

From: HolRonFost@aol.com
Date: Mon, 11 Jun 2001 16:33:51 EDT
Subject: Re: Peace with justice offering
To: mupj@igc.org
X-Mailer: AOL 6.0 for Windows US sub 10520

I was holding the offering for a Sunday when we could give it more attention and with Conference and the direction John was taking the service, this week didn't seem to be the best time. I'd love to have the Outreach area come up with a Sunday when we could highlight the work of the PWJ ministries at the local, Conference, and National level. Do you want to follow up with Dwight on this, or should I?

Be God's,

Ron

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

Date: Tue, 12 Jun 2001 08:19:01 -0400

Subject: FW: Motel rooms

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>

Need room? contact Howard. edb

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

Date: Mon, 11 Jun 2001 18:37:34 -0400

To: EDBruegge@mediaone.net

Subject: Motel rooms

Dear Ed,

I met our needs for an extra room for Friday and Saturday night of the reunion through one released by Carol Pepper. In the course of juggling and arranging our collective schedules, some of our party will arrive on Wednesday and some not until Friday. This leaves me with two extra rooms for Thursday night, June 28. If anybody needs these rooms, please have them get in touch with me. Otherwise, I'll cancel them several days in advance.

We're all looking forward to a great Hallman 2001 reunion.

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: dosmith6@juno.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Peace with justice offering
Cc: ronfoster
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dwight,

Here is Ron's reply to my query about the Peace with Justice offering. Could we discuss this at the July meeting of the Outreach Committee?

Howard

>From: HolRonFost@aol.com
>Date: Mon, 11 Jun 2001 16:33:51 EDT
>Subject: Re: Peace with justice offering
>To: mupj@igc.org
>X-Mailer: AOL 6.0 for Windows US sub 10520
>
>I was holding the offering for a Sunday when we could give it more attention
>and with Conference and the direction John was taking the service, this week
>I'd love to have the Outreach area come up
>with a Sunday when we could highlight the work of the PWJ ministries at the
>Do you want to follow up with Dwight
>on this, or should I?
>
>Be God's,
>Ron

To: mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Reminder of two events
Cc:
Bcc: icnd
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

A reminder of two events:

Tuesday, June 19 from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. -- Monthly meeting of Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament in Room 4, Methodist Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, D.C.

Wednesday, June 20 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. -- Reception to honor Senator Richard Lugar, sponsored by United Methodist General Board of Church and Society with several co-hosts in Methodist Building lobby, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, D.C.

I hope that you will be able to attend both of these events.

Shalom,
Howard

X-Sender: dkimball@[63.106.26.66]
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)
Date: Mon, 11 Jun 2001 18:19:23 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: NMD press conf. @ 12 noon, 6/12

June 11, 2001

TO: Coalition members and friends

FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: press conference tomorrow at noon at Capitol on NMD - FYI

Several organizations working with the Coalition and the NMD/Deep Cuts working group have scheduled a press conference for Tuesday, June 12 at the "House Triangle" outside the Capitol Building with several members of Congress.

You are invited to observe if you wish.

Attached below are the news advisories related to the event.

- Daryl

Opposition to Missile Defenses Growing Vocal in Washington
U.S. Newswire
11 Jun 14:21

Opposition To Missile Defenses Growing Vocal In Washington As
Bush Departs For Meetings With European, Russian Leaders
To: Assignment Desk, Daybook Editor
Contacts: Steve Kent, 845-424-8382,
or 914-589-5988 (cell phone, in Washington)
or Alistair Millar, 202-393-5201

News Advisory:

WHAT: June 12 Capitol Hill press conference highlighting Congressional opposition to the Bush administration's push for missile defenses features members of Congress who oppose it, and have just heard from their constituents that they do, too. Part of a three-day series of events organized by national citizens' groups to voice broad-based public opposition to the Bush administration's missile defense plans, the press conference is the culmination of two days of meetings between constituents from 40 states opposing missile defenses and their representatives in Congress.

WHO: Participants available for interviews at the June 12

press conference include, among others:

Confirmed:

- Rep. Bob Filner, 50th district, California
- Rep. Barney Frank, 4th district, Massachusetts
- Rep. Rush Holt, 12th district, New Jersey
- Rep. Janice Shakowski, 9th district, Illinois
- Rep. John Tierney, 6th district, Massachusetts
- Jonathan Granoff, Arms Control Advisor, American Bar Association
- Tracy Moavero, program director, Peace Action
- Susan Shaer, executive director, Women's Action for New Directions
- Dr. Peter Wilk, former president of Physicians for Social Responsibility
- Frank von Hippel, chairman of Federation of American Scientists, Princeton professor, former Assistant Director for National Security at the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy

Unconfirmed:

- Sen. Tom Harkin (D-Iowa)
- Sen. John Kerry (D-Mass.)

WHEN & WHERE: 12 noon, Tuesday, June 12, outdoors in the SE triangle, located behind the House side of the Capitol building.

BACKGROUND:

The press conference illustrates growing resolve in Congress and in the electorate not to allow the White House to ram through its missile defense agenda either at home or abroad, just at the moment Democrats who are skeptical of NMD assume leadership of key Senate committees.

Opponents say missile defenses would be monumentally costly, unworkable, and damaging to US national security and strategic relationships. Friday Senate majority leader Tom Daschle said, "every aspect of the debate and the consideration given to this whole program is troubling to me."

New legislation is pending in Congress to move ahead with nuclear weapons reductions and reaffirm U.S. commitment to the arms control treaty regime that missile defenses would abrogate.

In recent days some 40,000 e-mails, 6,000 signatures and over 10,000 snail-mailed messages opposing NMD have poured into Washington, and continue to arrive at the rate of over 1000 a day. The messages will be presented to members of Congress at the press conference.

Polls show the more Americans learn about NMD, the more strongly they oppose it. A new ABC/Washington Post poll also

shows a slipping 55 percent approval rating for President as he departs for meetings with the EU, NATO and Russian President Putin, where he will confront strong NMD opposition, and where he cannot legitimately argue missile defenses have broad-based support from the majority of Americans.

The June 12 press conference takes place on the first day of Bush's trip. It is also the anniversary of the largest demonstration in U.S. history: a 1982 rally in Central Park where over a million protestors opposed the nuclear arms race and galvanized a national movement against Reagan's Star Wars initiative.

For more information or interviews, call Kent Communications via DC cell phone: 914-589-5988.

/U.S. Newswire 202-347-2770/
06/11 14:22

PSR to Present Petition Against Missile Defense: Updated
U.S. Newswire
11 Jun 15:47

PSR to Present Petitions Urging Congress to Oppose National Missile Defense; Updated Information
To: Assignment Desk, Daybook Editor
Contact: Tarek Rizk of Physicians for Social Responsibility, 202-667-4260, ext. 215

News Advisory:

What: Press Conference Presenting 50,000 Voices Urging Congress to Oppose National Missile Defense

When: 12 Noon, Tuesday, June 12th

Where: House Triangle

Who: Physicians for Social Responsibility (PSR), represented by Past President Dr. Peter Wilk, will be presenting members of Congress with a petition representing the 10,000 signatures gathered by PSR in opposition to the wasteful, dangerous National Missile Defense. Wilk will present a blow-up of the petition, which calls the NMD system 'a prescription for disaster.' Expected to attend are Wilk's own member of Congress Tom Allen (D-ME), as well as US Representatives Barney Frank (D-MA), Bob Filner (D-CA), Rush Holt (D-NJ) and Jan Schakowsky (D-IL).

The petition continues, "(NMD) is costly, technologically

unproven and would violate the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty. Rather than addressing an existing threat, it will increase tensions with other nuclear powers."

PSR gathered the signatures from members and others in response to the Bush Administration's plans to forge ahead with NMD despite countless failed tests and opposition from allies and adversaries alike. PSR is a member of Project Abolition and the Nuclear Disarmament Partnership, whose other members will be presenting 40,000 more signatures opposing the National Missile Defense program. Also presented at the press conference will be a letter signed by more than 600 non-governmental organizations from around the world opposing the system and calling on President Bush and other world leaders to turn away from the Missile Defense boondoggle.

The press conference represents the culmination of three days of action, kicked off Sunday with a rally in Lafayette Park and continuing Monday and Tuesday with Congressional Education meetings featuring activists from around the country.

Interviews are available.

PSR represents more than 20,000 physicians and other health professionals and is dedicated to the abolition of nuclear weapons, the safety of our environment and the end of violence and its causes. PSR is the US affiliate of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, and shares in IPPNW's 1985 Nobel Prize for Peace.

/U.S. Newswire 202-347-2770/
06/11 15:47

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 x136 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.5.3
Date: Tue, 12 Jun 2001 09:31:56 -0400
From: "Catherine Gordon" <cgordon@ctr.pcusa.org>
To: <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Reminder of two events

Howard,

Unfortunately, I will be out of town that week and will not be able to attend either the meeting or the reception.

I believe Elenora will be representing the Presbyterian at the reception for Senator Lugar.

Regards,
Catherine

<<< "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> 6/12 8:33a >>>
To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

A reminder of two events:

Tuesday, June 19 from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. -- Monthly meeting of Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament in Room 4, Methodist Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, D.C.

Wednesday, June 20 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. -- Reception to honor Senator Richard Lugar, sponsored by United Methodist General Board of Church and Society with several co-hosts in Methodist Building lobby, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, D.C.

I hope that you will be able to attend both of these events.

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: Rachel Labush <rlabush@rac.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: Reminder of two events
Date: Tue, 12 Jun 2001 09:44:08 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

I am sorry about co-sponsorship of the event - nobody was around to approve co-sponsoring, and Rabbi Saperstein later claimed he hadn't received any letters about it. I think they must have just gotten lost in the shuffle.

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Tuesday, June 12, 2001 8:20 AM
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: Reminder of two events

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

A reminder of two events:

Tuesday, June 19 from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. -- Monthly meeting of Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament in Room 4, Methodist Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, D.C.

Wednesday, June 20 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. -- Reception to honor Senator Richard Lugar, sponsored by United Methodist General Board of Church and Society with several co-hosts in Methodist Building lobby, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, D.C.

I hope that you will be able to attend both of these events.

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: Tue, 12 Jun 2001 15:08:57 -0400
From: William J Price <WorldPeaceMakers@compuserve.com>
Subject: Reminder of two events
Sender: William J Price <WorldPeaceMakers@compuserve.com>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>

Dear Howard.

Two wondrefful events. Wish I were your age, with your Spirit and ingenuity. Your Partner Bill

From: Janet Horman <JHorman@UMC-GBCS.ORG>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: Invitation to Lugar event
Date: Tue, 12 Jun 2001 10:05:05 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Howard,

Here is the text of the invite letter. The letters were mailed yeasterday.
Let me know if you need anything else.

Janet

June 11, 2001

Dear Friends:

The General Board of Church and Society of the United Methodist Church cordially invites you to attend a reception honoring Senator Richard Lugar of Indiana on June 20, 2001 from 6:00 PM to 8:00 PM. During this reception, Senator Lugar will be recognized for his legislative and diplomatic efforts to reduce the threat of nuclear destruction. Among other efforts, Senator Lugar helped to initiate the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program that provides assistance to Russia in its weapons dismantlement and provided Senate leadership for the START II Treaty ratification.

The reception will be held on the first floor of The United Methodist Building; the United Methodist building is located at 100 Maryland Ave NE, Washington, D.C. 20002. The presentation of a General Board of Church and Society award to Senator Lugar will take place at approximately 6:45 PM.

Joining the General Board of Church and Society as co-sponsors of this event are the following:

The Episcopal Church
Friends Committee on National Legislation
The Mennonite Central Committee, Washington Office
National Council of Churches, Washington office
The Presbyterian Church, Washington office
Unitarian Universalist Association, Washington Office

For more information, please call (202)488-5647 or email ablack@umc-gbcs.org

We hope that you will be able to join us for this special event.

Cordially,

Jim Winkler,
General Secretary

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Tuesday, June 12, 2001 8:20 AM
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: Reminder of two events

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

A reminder of two events:

Tuesday, June 19 from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. -- Monthly meeting of Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament in Room 4, Methodist Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, D.C.

Wednesday, June 20 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. -- Reception to honor Senator Richard Lugar, sponsored by United Methodist General Board of Church and Society with several co-hosts in Methodist Building lobby, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, D.C.

I hope that you will be able to attend both of these events.

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: jhorman@umc-gbcs.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Letters to five senators
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\iclt.136.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Janet,

Ken Myers, Senator Lugar's defense aide, suggests five senators in particular that we should urge to attend the reception. Therefore, I have drafted special letters to them, sent as a Word attachment. They are addressed to the attention of the schedulers.

I would appreciate having these delivered to their offices. I will follow up by calling the schedulers.

If Word attachment doesn't work for you, please let me know.

Howard

Date: Wed, 13 Jun 2001 07:59:07 -0700 (PDT)
From: hipkins james <debate44646@yahoo.com>
To: Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.apc.org>

How many copies of PL do you want? I want to get to a printer today if possible, June 13.

Jim

Do You Yahoo!?
Get personalized email addresses from Yahoo! Mail - only \$35 a year! <http://personal.mail.yahoo.com/>

To: hipkins james <debate44646@yahoo.com>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re:
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <20010613145907.85196.qmail@web10702.mail.yahoo.com>
References:

At 07:59 AM 6/13/01 -0700, you wrote:

>How many copies of PL do you want? I want to get to a
>printer today if possible, June 13.

Jim,

I can use 500 extra of the four pages that contain my letter to Bush without the inside two pages.

For the complete issue, I have lists of the 50 resident UM bishops, 60-70 conference peace with justice coordinators, 50-60 conference church and society chairs. You may already have some or all of these. Let me know and I'll give you the ones you don't have. Beyond that you can use your usually lists and determine the total from that.

We enjoyed your stay at your house and appreciate your hospitality. We took the scenic route through Cadiz and enjoyed seeing Tappan Lake, then on through Wheeling, around Washington, PA, and around Morgantown. I'm sure your usually route via the Pennsylvania Turnpike is faster.

Shalom,
Howard

Date: Wed, 13 Jun 2001 12:33:24 -0700 (PDT)
From: hipkins james <debate44646@yahoo.com>
To: Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.apc.org>

Send changes you have an additions. I have ordered your copies. The copy is now at the printer. I got everything on the four pages. Ordered you and extra 500. Thanks !

Jim

Do You Yahoo!?
Get personalized email addresses from Yahoo! Mail - only \$35
a year! <http://personal.mail.yahoo.com/>

From: HALLEDEE@aol.com
Date: Wed, 13 Jun 2001 22:53:10 EDT
Subject: reunion
To: mupj@igc.apc.org
CC: edbruegge@mediaone.net, MMBruegg@aol.com
X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 120

Howard,

Do you still have two room at the Comfort Inn for Thursday evening June 28th?

J. Edgar and I just returned from a three day trip out to western Kansas, kind of a trial run to see how he fared and then we can make a final decision on whether to attend the family reunion or not. He is very tired, but otherwise it would appear that he may just be able to do the reunion. If you still have the Thursday rooms (2) could you hold them until we can finalize our plans? Our daughter Elisha, her husband Paul and two little boys (Henry and Hudson) may be able to come with us and if so we would need both rooms. This arrangement will only be possible if Ed can get his chemo treatment rescheduled for another day. It is scheduled for the 29th. We will let you know as soon as we know definitely. Thanks.

Ernestene and J. Edgar

To: HALLEDEE@aol.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: reunion
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <92.16034b79.28598116@aol.com>
References:

At 10:53 PM 6/13/01 EDT, you wrote:

>Howard,

>

>Do you still have two room at the Comfort Inn for Thursday evening June 28th?

Ernestine,

Yes, I'll save those two rooms for Thursday, June 28. I assume that you have rooms for the next two nights through a previous reservation.

It's good news that Ed and you may be able to attend the reunion.

Howard

To: mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Background on missile defense
Cc:
Bcc: icnd
X-Attachments: A:\icnd.097.doc; A:\icnd.095.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Dear Colleagues:

Of our concerns missile defense is the foremost issue now on the public agenda. Therefore, we will devote most of our time at the June 19 meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament on this issue. As background, I am attaching two items:

(1) Membership of the Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees, listed by states. With Democratic control of the Senate our best opportunity to make an impact will be with that body. These are the two committees where missile defense will get first airing. Thus, we might consider which committee members we might want to focus on. My own view is that we should be as broad as we think we are capable, possibly all Democrats and moderate Republicans. Others may have other views to offer at the meeting.

(2) A piece I wrote entitled "National Missile Defense as a Moral Issue". It builds on the three reasons for opposing missile defense offered in our March letter to President Bush.

I'll have a further communication prior to the meeting. If anyone else has something offer, please send it to me, and I'll forward it to our list.

Shalom,
Howard

X-Sender: johnburroughs@mail.lcnp.org
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0.1
Date: Thu, 14 Jun 2001 19:22:14 -0400
To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com,abolition-caucus@yahoogroups.com
From: John Burroughs <johnburroughs@lcnp.org>
Subject: (abolition-usa) NPT v. Bush - article in World Policy Journal
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

The spring 2001 issue of World Policy Journal includes an article that LCNP program director Jim Wurst and I did, "Ending the Nuclear Nightmare: A Strategy for the Bush Administration", available at www.worldpolicy.org. The article assesses emerging Bush policies against the disarmament agenda adopted at the 2000 Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty Review Conference. Also available online at the same location is an article by Bill Hartung, "Eisenhower's Warning: The Military-Industrial Complex Forty Years Later".

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.

To: mupj@igc.org
From: Global Security Institute <gsinstitute-unsubscribe@topica.com>
Subject: Welcome to gsinstitute@topica.com!
Date: Wed, 13 Jun 2001 14:33:39 -0700
Reply-To: gsinstitute-unsubscribe@topica.com
X-Topica-Id: <992468018.svcgdb001.15600.1001555>

Hello!

Global Security Institute has added you as a subscriber to GSI, an email list hosted at Topica. Please take a moment to read the information below and save it for future reference.

If you believe someone has used your email address without your consent, please contact Topica's Abuse Team at: abuse@get.topica.com

A WORD FROM GSI

=====

Welcome to the Global Security Institute's news list!

This list will contain periodic updates about the nuclear weapon abolition efforts of the Global Security Institute and other organizations our nuclear weapon abolition network.

Founded by the late U.S. Senator Alan Cranston, the GSI undertakes to lead citizens and policymakers to work for the only long-term solution to the threat of nuclear annihilation: the worldwide abolition of nuclear weapons.

We're glad you've joined us!

-Zachary Allen
Program Director
<http://www.gsinstitute.org>

A WORD FROM TOPICA

=====

Make the most of your subscription with My Topica, the easiest way to manage all of your email at Topica. Here's what you can do:

- * Manage all your subscriptions in one central location.
- * Quickly subscribe to and unsubscribe from any list at Topica.
- * Put messages on hold if you're on vacation.
- * Easily change between message digests and individual messages.

Sign up for a free My Topica account here:

<http://www.topica.com/partner/sysmes1/my>

HELP DESK

=====

If you do NOT wish to be added to this list, you can
unsubscribe by visiting:
<http://www.topica.com/sysmsg/?cid=2.NEiiTMGfi.MniMEMGe>

Still have questions? We're here to help. Check out Topica's
Help section at: <http://www.topica.com>

Or email Topica's Customer Support at: support@get.topica.com

Please include the email address of the list in question and
the email address you use to subscribe to the list.

Sincerely,
Topica Customer Support

From: "Shocket, Phyllis" <PShocket@NAPAWASH.ORG>
To:
Subject: Constituency Database Input Form
Date: Thu, 14 Jun 2001 20:50:06 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

The following message is sent at the request of Carl Stenberg, Chair, Board Committee on Membership:

For quite some time, the Academy's leadership has recognized that a new database addressing the broad range of information needs is critically important. With financial support from the Board of Directors through the Academy's endowment and substantive input by Fellows and staff, we are now ready for your help in establishing this new database.

Attached is the constituency database input form developed over several months of meetings and revisions, including suggestions from a focus group of Fellows.

Please complete this form electronically and send it to Phyllis Shocket. Her e-mail address is pshocket@napawash.org <mailto:pshocket@napawash.org>. (The focus group estimated that it should take no more than 30 minutes to complete the form.)

You may choose to print out the form (18 pages) and complete it manually. If so, please mail it to Phyllis at the Academy offices:

Phyllis Shocket
c/o NAPA
1120 G Street, NW
Suite 850
Washington, DC 20005

If you prefer, you may request a hardcopy from Phyllis, electronically or by telephone:

General telephone number: 202-347-3190, ext. 3038
Toll-free telephone number: 800-883-3190, ext. 3038
Direct dial telephone number: 202-383-7769

Please send your information to the Academy no later than July 15th.

Thank you.

Carl Stenberg,
Chair, Board Committee on Membership

<<Database Form FINAL FORM FOR ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION!!!!.doc>>

Phyllis Gail Shocket

Director of Academy Affairs
National Academy of Public Administration
General Number: 202-347-3190 / 800-883-3190
Direct Dial: 202-383-7769

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\Database Form FINAL FORM FOR ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION!!!!.doc"

May 2001

Regarding participation, I would like to get Fellow input regarding participation in project panels, advisory panels, testimony, seminar participation (not including the Academy Fall and Spring Meetings), and the standing panels.

~~[This was pasted in from your e-mail to remind me of what you needed done. And I can't delete it w/o abandoning the track changes settings.]~~

~~[Bill Gadsby has said that we don't need to ask about testimony for the Academy. As to testimony on one's own, the narrative paragraph at the end would provide a place to mention it, and the query about experience in testifying does not distinguish between that for the Academy and otherwise.]~~

**NATIONAL ACADEMY OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
CONSTITUENCY DATABASE
2001 DATA INPUT FORM**

PERSONAL INFORMATION

(Please note that items marked as confidential will not be available to anyone outside the Academy offices.)

Last Name: _____

First Name: _____

Middle Initial: _____

Legal Name (if different): _____

Name Prefix

Mr

Ms.

Dr.

Ambassador

Other _____

Name Suffix

Jr.

II

III

Other _____

Date of Birth (confidential) _____

Social Security Number (confidential) _____

Title: _____

Institution: _____

Business Address: _____

[please include zipcode
and country] _____



Office Telephone Number: _____

Office Facsimile Number: _____

Office E-Mail Address: _____



Home Address: _____

[please include zipcode] _____

Home Telephone Number: _____

Home Facsimile Number: _____

Home E-Mail Address: _____

Please indicate which information you want listed in the Academy Membership List. Please note that the Membership List is distributed to Academy Fellows only.

- Home address
- Home telephone number
- Home facsimile number
- Home e-mail addresss



Other Address: _____
[please include zipcode] _____

Other Telephone Number: _____

Other Facsimile Number: _____

Other E-Mail Address: _____

Indicate Months **at this address**
(if applicable): _____



Preferred Mailing Address (Please check one):

- Home
Office
Other



\ **REGION WHERE ~~WITH WHICH YOU WOULD LIKE TO BE IDENTIFIED~~ YOURSELF**
(Please select one)

- New England** (ME, NH, VT, MA, RI, CT)
- Midwest** (OH, IN, IL, MI, WI, MN, IA, MO, ND, SD, NE, KS)
- Southwest** (AR, LA, OK, TX)
- Mountain** (MT, ID, WY, CO, NM, AZ, UT, NV)
- Pacific** (WA, OR, CA, AL, HI)
- Washington, DC / National Capital Area**

- Mid-Atlantic** (NY, NJ, PA, DE, MD Counties, ~~except for the counties of Prince George's, Montgomery, Howard, Anne Arundel~~) **but not including the National Capital Area**)
- Southeast** (~~VA except for Arlington and Fairfax Counties, WV, NC, SC, FL, GA, KY, TN, AL, MS, VA, but not including the National Capital Area~~)
- Countries outside the U.S.**



GENDER

- Male
- Female



ETHNICITY

- African American
- American Indian/Alaskan Native
- Asian/Pacific Islander
- Caucasian
- Hispanic
- Mixed Race
- Other _____



HIGHEST DEGREE RECEIVED

Degree Received	Institution	Year Received	Major



RESEARCH INTEREST (please indicate your 3 areas of research interest)

◇

CERTIFICATIONS OR PROFESSIONAL LICENSES (please list licenses such as CPA, Bar, CPM, etc.)



NON-ENGLISH LANGUAGE: Please indicate if you have **some proficiency in a non-English language [I'd now vote to drop the third category.]**

Language	Reading	Writing	Speaking
	<input type="checkbox"/> Fluent <input type="checkbox"/> Limited <input type="checkbox"/> Weak	<input type="checkbox"/> Fluent <input type="checkbox"/> Limited <input type="checkbox"/> Weak	<input type="checkbox"/> Fluent <input type="checkbox"/> Limited <input type="checkbox"/> Weak
	<input type="checkbox"/> Fluent <input type="checkbox"/> Limited	<input type="checkbox"/> Fluent <input type="checkbox"/> Limited	<input type="checkbox"/> Fluent <input type="checkbox"/> Limited
	<input type="checkbox"/> Fluent <input type="checkbox"/> Limited	<input type="checkbox"/> Fluent <input type="checkbox"/> Limited	<input type="checkbox"/> Fluent <input type="checkbox"/> Limited
	<input type="checkbox"/> Fluent <input type="checkbox"/> Limited	<input type="checkbox"/> Fluent <input type="checkbox"/> Limited	<input type="checkbox"/> Fluent <input type="checkbox"/> Limited
	<input type="checkbox"/> Fluent <input type="checkbox"/> Limited	<input type="checkbox"/> Fluent <input type="checkbox"/> Limited	<input type="checkbox"/> Fluent <input type="checkbox"/> Limited
	<input type="checkbox"/> Fluent <input type="checkbox"/> Limited	<input type="checkbox"/> Fluent <input type="checkbox"/> Limited	<input type="checkbox"/> Fluent <input type="checkbox"/> Limited
	<input type="checkbox"/> Fluent <input type="checkbox"/> Limited	<input type="checkbox"/> Fluent <input type="checkbox"/> Limited	<input type="checkbox"/> Fluent <input type="checkbox"/> Limited



INTERNATIONAL EXPERIENCE: Please indicate the countries in which you have served or been a consultant in each of the following areas:

Area	Indicate Specific Country	Indicate Dates(s) of Service
Africa		
Asia/Pacific Islands		
Australia/New Zealand		
Central and Eastern Europe; and the former Soviet Union		
Europe – Western Europe		
Latin America		
Middle East		
Other (Specify _____)		
Other (Specify _____)		
Other (Specify _____)		

◇

PLEASE INDICATE TESTIMONY BEFORE GOVERNMENTAL BODIES SINCE 1991

Governmental Body	Indicate Approximate Number of Times	Indicate Subject Area(s) and Nature of Activity
Federal		
State		
Local		
International		
O t h e r (specify _____)		
O t h e r (specify _____)		

◇

CURRENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS (Please select only one)

Government Sector

- Federal Government -- Executive Branch
- Federal Government -- Judicial Branch
- Federal Government -- Legislative Branch
- State Government
- Local Government
- Regional Organization/Special Districts
- Government Corporation/Public Authority

Private Sector

- Attorney
- Business
- Media
- Other _____

Non-Profit

University

- Administration
- Faculty

International Organization or Government

- United Nations e.g.,
- World Bank
- OECD
- Other _____

Consulting

Retired



PREDOMINANT / SIGNIFICANT EXPERIENCE (please check as many as appropriate):

Government Sector

- Federal Government – Executive Branch
- Federal Government – Judicial Branch
- Federal Government – Legislative Branch
- State Government
- Local Government
- Regional Organizations/Special Districts
- Government Corporation/Public Authority

Private Sector

- Attorney
- Business
- Media
- Other _____

Non-Profit

University

- Administration
- Faculty

International Organizations

- United Nations e.g.,
- World Bank
- OECD
- Other _____

Consulting



WITH WHAT OTHER PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS ARE YOU AFFILIATED?

- American Society for Public Administration
- American Political Science Association
- Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management
- Committee for Economic Development
- Conference of Minority Public Administrators (COMPA)
- Council for Excellence in Government
- International City/County Management Association
- National Association of Regional Councils

- National Association of Schools of Public Administration and Affairs
- National Civic League
- National Forum of Black Public Administrators
- United Nations Association
- Other _____



CORPORATE OR FOUNDATION BOARD AFFILIATIONS

(Please indicate ~~corporation~~ **organization** name and whether service is current or past)

Name of Corporate or Foundation Board	Current Service	Past Service
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



NOTE: Please send an electronic copy of your current resume to psrocket@napawash.org.

AREAS OF EXPERTISE

Please note: This list is based on a revision and modest expansion of 70-some specialties that have long been used by the Academy. Further, the specialties have been for the first time grouped under 30-some general categories. The items are designed to elicit detailed information so that Fellows can be asked to serve on projects **participate in the Academy's work** that sometimes calls for fairly specific experience. ~~It is not necessary for you to discriminate among closely-related items.~~ Please simply choose all **subjects** that reflect expertise that you think is currently relevant. There is no limit to the number of items that you may choose.

Please indicate by checking the boxes in the right hand column if your experience was in elective or appointive office or otherwise at a senior level.

AERONAUTICS/SPACE

- Research
- Operations

AGRICULTURE

- Farm Programs
- Food and Nutrition Programs

- Forestry

ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT

- Contract Management
- Procurement

ARTS AND HUMANITIES

- Arts
- Humanities

BANKING

- Organization
- Regulation

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

- Independent Sector
- Engaging citizens' input via e-governance methods

- Lobbying
- Public Affairs
- Voluntarism
- Voting

COMMERCE

- Consumer Protection
- Economic Development
- Small Business

EDUCATION

- Elementary and Secondary
- Higher Education
- Student Loans

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

- Wartime Organization
- Emergency Preparedness
- Disaster Management

ENERGY

- Alternative Energy Sources (Nuclear, Solar, Wind)
- Conservation
- Conventional Energy Sources
- Regulation

ENVIRONMENT

- Air and Water
- Oceans and Atmosphere
- Waste Management

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

- Accounting
- Auditing
- Budgeting
- Finance

FOREIGN AFFAIRS/INTERNATIONAL

- Assistance and Development
- Comparative Administration
- Diplomacy, including Disarmament
- Finance
- International Organizations
- Trade

GOVERNANCE

- Executive-Legislative Relations
- Judicial Administration of Executive Agency Programs
- Presidency
- Chief Executive Role in Other Units of Government
- Separation of Powers
- Private Sector Not-for-Profit
- Public-Private Partnerships
- Governmental Consulting

GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION

- Federal, State or Local Executive Branch Organization
- Government Sponsored Enterprises
- Legislative Organization and Operations
- Public Authorities or Corporations, including the Postal Service
- White House and Executive Office of the President
- Governor's, Mayor's, City Manager's or County Executive's Office

HEALTH

- Addiction/Mental Health/Narcotics
- Medicare/Medicaid
- Medical Ethics
- Research

HOUSING

- Assistance Programs
- Financing

HUMAN RESOURCES/HUMAN CAPITAL

- Career-Political Relations
- Civil Service and Merit System
- Compensation
- Equal Opportunity
- Ethics
- Executive Development and Succession Planning
- Labor-Management Relations
- Senior Executive Service
- Staffing, Workforce Planning and Management
- Training and Organizational Development

HUMAN SERVICES

- Aging Services
- Family Services
- Handicapped Services
- Native Americans
- Social Security
- Welfare

INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

- Archives and Records
- GIS/GPS
- Information Technology
- Internet
- Privacy and Security
- Telecommunications

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

- Centralization / Decentralization
- Grants-In-Aid
- Regionalism
- Regulatory Federalism

LABOR

- Disability/Unemployment Insurance
- Employment and Training
- Labor-Management Relations
- Occupational Health and Safety
- Pensions

LAW AND JUSTICE

- Administrative Law
- Civil Rights/Liberties
- Court Administration
- Immigration/Naturalization
- Judicial Systems
- Law Enforcement
- Prisons/Corrections
- Rule of Law (Development of Civil and Criminal Procedures)

MANAGEMENT

- Administrative ~~Services~~ Management
- Archives and Records Management
- City Management and Organization
- County Management and Organization
- Divestiture (a.k.a. "Privatization"), including ~~G~~overnment-~~s~~Sponsored ~~e~~Enterprises
- E-government
- Grants Management
- Field Structure and Decentralization
- Inspectors General
- Logistics Management
- Managing Privatization
- Not-for-Profit
- Performance Management
- Program Evaluation and Policy Analysis
- Process Improvement
- Program Management
- Property Management
- Risk Management
- Science Management
- State Management and Organization
- Statistical Programs
- Strategic Planning

NATIONAL SECURITY

- Defense Management
- Intelligence

NATURAL RESOURCES

- Parks and Recreation
- Public Lands Management
- Water Resources
- Wildlife

PLANNING and DEVELOPMENT

- Regional
- Rural
- Urban

PUBLIC WORKS

- Corps of Engineers
- Interior Department
- Local and State Government

Other

REGULATORY MANAGEMENT/REFORM

- Coordination and Review
- Enforcement
- Rulemaking

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

- R&D Policy and Management
- Science Policy
- Technology Assessment

SECURITY

- Computer Security
- Personnel Security
- Physical Security

SOCIAL EQUITY

- Inter-jurisdictional and International
- Organizational and Managerial
- Service Delivery and Inter-generational

TAX

- Revenue Administration
- Tax Expenditures

TRANSPORTATION

- Aviation
- Highways and Motor Vehicles
- Intermodal
- Mass Transportation
- Rail
- Water

VETERANS AFFAIRS

- Education
- Employment and Training
- Health

OTHER

- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____



ACADEMY ACTIVITIES

Please list participation in project panels, advisory panels, and seminars that you regard as currently relevant, together with approximate dates (but not including Academy Fall and Spring Meetings and standing panel meetings). [Attach additional pages if necessary]

SUBJECTS	APPROXIMATE DATES
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

SPECIAL ~~PRINCIPAL~~ SKILLS, ~~AND~~ COMPETENCIES AND INTERESTS

Please ~~define~~ indicate your principal ~~your special~~ skills, ~~and~~ and competencies, and any special orientation that characterizes your approach to and interests in public administration. Please limit your paragraph to 100 words.

To: jhorman@umc-gbcs.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Lugar "certificate"
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\icnd.087.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Janet,

Attached is the resolution of appreciate for Senator Lugar

Howard

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

Janet,

Here is the address for Sam Nunn (different that what I sent earlier):

The Honorable Sam Nunn, Co-Chair
Nuclear Threat Initiative
1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20006

For the presentation you might consider asking retired Bishop James Mathews, who lives in nearby Bethesda, MD, if Bishop May isn't available.

Will you have Karen e-mail or fax me the names of persons from the Bush Administration that were invited.

Thanks for all your efforts.

Howard

From: Janet Horman <JHorman@UMC-GBCS.ORG>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: Reception
Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 13:58:55 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Howard:

Thanks for the Sam Nunn info. I put the letter to him in the mail. Jim thinks Bishop Mathews is a good-back up presenter. We are still awaiting word from Bishop May. Jim's Assistant, Jeanette, has been out and returns on Monday. Bishop May's office may have RSVP'd to her..so I'll check Monday and then follow up. Avis Boland(sp?) from the State Dept. is coming. Angie(Caron) is supposed to e-mail me the list you requested and I'll forward it to you. she said it was in her computer.

More later...
Janet

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Friday, June 15, 2001 7:58 AM
To: Janet Horman
Subject: Reception

Janet,

Here is the address for Sam Nunn (different that what I sent earlier):

The Honorable Sam Nunn, Co-Chair
Nuclear Threat Initiative
1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20006

For the presentation you might consider asking retired Bishop James Mathews, who lives in nearby Bethesda, MD, if Bishop May isn't available.

Will you have Karen e-mail or fax me the names of persons from the Bush Administration that were invited.

Thanks for all your efforts.

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: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 08:13:24 -0400
From: Carol Blythe and Rick Goodman <blythe-goodman@erols.com>
Reply-To: blythe-goodman@erols.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.01C-DH397 (Win95; I)
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Background on missile defense

Howard -- my old computer was unable to open these attachments. is it possible to send them pasted in as text? if not, maybe I could get hard copies from you on Tuesday (if I make it -- it is the Last Day of School!).

Thanks -- Carol Blythe

X-Sender: jdi@[63.106.26.66]
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)
Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 11:58:15 -0400
To: jdi@clw.org
From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>
Subject: Coyle: "NMD Development is Not Hostage to the ABM Treaty"

"NMD Development is Not Hostage to the ABM Treaty"

By Philip E. Coyle, Center for Defense Information, formerly Director of the Pentagon's Office of Operational Test and Evaluation

To prove he is serious about National Missile Defense, President George W. Bush must abrogate the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty now, according to the most strident critics of the treaty. The long-standing ABM accord with Russia, it is said, is thwarting the technology needed for missile defense.

To the contrary, the 1972 treaty is not holding back design and development of the technology needed for National Missile Defense (NMD), nor is the treaty slowing the testing of an NMD system. Development of NMD will take a decade or more for technical and budgetary reasons, but not due to impediments caused by the ABM treaty.

A premise of the ABM treaty widely considered to be the foundation stone for U.S-Russian nuclear arms control efforts is that the United States and Russia may elect to have strategic antiballistic missile defenses. In the early 1970s, Russia chose a system to protect Moscow; the United States chose a system to protect its deterrent force of landbased missiles deployed in North Dakota. After only four months of operation, the United States shut down its ABM system, called Safeguard, as cost ineffective, and has not deployed an intercontinental ABM system since. Nevertheless, the ABM treaty permits the United States to have such a system, and to develop and test it.

On the other hand, the ABM treaty restricts missile defense against intercontinental missiles to systems that protect a defined area, such as the area around Moscow or a large missile field. The ABM treaty prohibits any system that defends either side's entire national territory, and puts limits on the number of interceptors deployed at the permitted sites.

The ABM treaty also prohibits mobile defenses that would constitute a nationwide shield, including those deployed at sea or in space.

What the treaty does permit is development and testing of missile defenses against long-range intercontinental missiles, so long as the defenses are fixed systems (that is, not mobile) tested at approved test sites. The negotiators of the ABM treaty recognized that in early development, one could not necessarily determine through national technical means e.g., satellite imagery whether a particular test was of an NMD system, let alone whether it was of a system intended to be fixed or mobile. In fact, much of the work ultimately might be used in either fixed or mobile modes.

One way to understand the current situation is to examine each of the

conceptual approaches to defense against intercontinental-range ballistic missiles aimed at the territory of the United States. NMD systems can be designed to intercept enemy missiles in different phases of their flight trajectories. A system could try to shoot down enemy missiles during initial liftoff or boost phase; later during midcourse flight; or, finally, in the incoming, terminal phase, as the missiles approach and reenter the atmosphere over the United States.

Alternatively, a system could try to shoot down enemy missiles in all three phases, with a so-called layered defense, thus hoping to kill in each phase of flight those missiles that had been missed in earlier attempts.

Under any of these approaches, interceptors could be launched from land, sea, air, or space, and would require an integrating command and control system with a network of highpower tracking radars and/or satellites.

The new Bush administration has not yet explained exactly how its system, or system-of-systems, will be different from the landbased, midcourse NMD system planned by the administration of President Bill Clinton. Clinton's plan involved upgrading five existing early warning radars in the United States and abroad (the United Kingdom and Greenland); building a new Xband missile tracking radar in the Aleutian Islands off the Alaskan coast; and placing up to 250 midcourse, groundbased interceptors in Alaska and North Dakota.

However, it is expected that the Bush NMD architecture will involve new emphasis on boostphase missile defense, and be more complex and layered than the Clinton system.

In addition, the Bush administration has emphasized the importance of defending U.S. friends and allies, as well as the U.S. homeland. Adding the technical difficulties of defending U.S. friends and allies to the technical difficulty inherent in homeland defense makes for a very complex situation. Defending, say, South Korea from a North Korean threat is technically quite different from defending London, Paris or Rome from, say, Libya. All of these scenarios are quite different from the technical requirements necessary for a working system to defend the U.S. homeland. The distances, speeds and defended areas are different, the types of enemy rockets being defended against are different, and the operational configurations of search radars and other missile detection sensors would be different.

Further, the spending levels required to support all these developments are not affordable given the current U.S. budgetary environment—a downturn in the economy, a large tax cut, and strong competition in the discretionary portions of the federal budget, defense and nondefense.

One question that has dogged NMD is exactly who is the enemy? Is it North Korea? Is it China? Is it Iran, Iraq or Libya? Is it Russia? Is it all those countries? A year and a half ago, North Korea was emphasized as the threat. But thanks in good measure to the fine diplomatic efforts of former Secretary of Defense William Perry, North Korea no longer seems to be the same threat as before.

Some have joked that the real enemy of NMD is the ABM treaty itself. Indeed, the Bush administration and some members of Congress have been clear that they view the ABM treaty as an obstacle, even though it is not actually preventing the United States from conducting research and development on NMD, boostphase, midcourse or otherwise.

Until a few months ago, the Pentagon's Ballistic Missile Defense Office said the urgency, the "long pole in the tent," for NMD was starting construction on a missile tracking radar site in the Aleutians. This was misleading. There were then, as now, many obstacles to developing and deploying an effective NMD, and singling out the need to start construction in the Aleutians was to ignore all others some requiring even more time to overcome.

Now, some Bush administration officials and members of Congress are arguing that the ABM treaty is the "long pole in the tent." This is misleading also.

MidCourse NMD

NMD, that is, the midcourse NMD program underway at the Pentagon, has not had a successful flight intercept test since its first attempt in October 1999. That test was to demonstrate the basic elements of an NMD system, including the concept of "hittokill" that is, "hitting a bullet with a bullet." To help insure a successful hittokill, a beacon on the target missile, linked to the Global Positioning System satellite network, aided in achieving the successful intercept. Recognizing the scripted and unrealistic nature of that test, the plan then was that three more followon flight intercept tests would have been conducted by now, all successfully. That didn't happen. The next two flight intercept tests failed, and a fourth attempt has been delayed for months.

Some 20 or more flight intercept tests, and hundreds of component and subsystem tests, will be needed before the Pentagon will be ready to attempt realistic operational testing of such an NMD system.

Also, Pentagon plans at the time were that a new, higher acceleration, twostage booster needed for flight engagements that realistically could be expected on the battlefield would have been through three successful development tests by now. The first of those booster development tests, which was to have taken place over a year ago, is still a couple of months away, a year and a half delay. And that is simply a test of the booster rocket, not of the full interceptor. The first flight intercept test with the new booster is now not to take place before the summer of 2002, again about a year and a half delay in a year and a half of elapsed time.

Concepts for a fixed, landbased, midcourse intercept system have been lambasted by scientists as being vulnerable to countermeasures and decoys, and any system is years from being ready for realistic operational testing, let alone effective deployment. Nevertheless, the Bush administration will continue to support this approach. They have little choice. It is the farthest along developmentally of any of the NMD approaches, and a necessary part of any future layered defense.

And there is no reason the administration cannot continue, or even

accelerate, development of such a system. Development and testing of fixed, landbased, midcourse missile defense is permitted under the ABM treaty. In fact, the United States has been developing and testing a fixedsite, midcourse, missile defense system for at least a decade in compliance with the treaty.

Most flight testing is done at the Army's Kwajalein Missile Range in the Pacific Ocean, a test site that is specifically permitted under the ABM treaty. Targets are launched from Vandenberg AFB on the California coast towards Kwajalein, where the NMD interceptors are launched. So far, the intercepts have been attempted close to Kwajalein to maximize the time for search radars there to get a fix on the incoming target, and to limit the spread of rocket debris.

In due course, during development, intercepts will be attempted at greater and greater distances from Kwajalein to demonstrate more realistic engagements, but this also will be permissible under the ABM treaty. Such tests are permitted under the ABM treaty because they are being used to demonstrate an NMD system that is intended to operate from a fixed, landbased site, and because the tests are carried out at a permitted test range.

More importantly, a midcourse missile defense system will need to demonstrate that it can discriminate decoys, countermeasures, and rocket debris from the real target, the reentry vehicle of an incoming enemy missile. This will take many tests paced by time, money and other resources again, not by the ABM treaty.

After 20 or so developmental tests, and assuming they all were successful, the Pentagon would want to do more realistic operational tests. For example, these might include tests where the target missiles were launched from Kodiak Island in Alaska towards Kwajalein. This would help demonstrate that the early warning radars, interceptors, and command and control systems can do their job together in a more realistic geometry, something that the current testing arrangement misses. Even this type of test, however, would not require a modification of the ABM treaty.

Eventually, realistic operational tests should be conducted in which the system is operated by real soldiers, without prior knowledge or warning, and in realistic battlefield environments, such as bad weather. Such operational tests are many years away. Still, there is no reason such testing would require changes or abrogation of the ABM treaty, because those tests arguably could be aimed at future deployment of a site defense rather than a nationwide defense, something the ABM treaty specifically prohibits.

Another reason why operational tests late in development might not be a problem under the ABM treaty is that it is not unusual for complex military systems to do poorly in such tests, even after years of development. When this happens, many more years of development and testing are sometimes required before a system can become operational.

In any case, the language of the ABM treaty recognizes the potential need for amendments and new interpretations and such changes have been made

several times before. There is plenty of time for that, anyway.

Ironically, some members of Congress have said that NMD should be deployed without the benefit of well-planned development and operational tests, and, in fact, they have introduced legislation to that effect. While such legislation has never been enacted, one of its consequences would have been to eliminate a reason for modifying the ABM treaty.

BoostPhase NMD

What about boostphase missile defense? Under such a system, the interceptors could be launched from Navy ships, from land, or from aircraft. In any case, the interceptors must be close enough to the enemy missile launch site that the interceptors can catch up before the target has traveled too far and deployed its payload. The idea behind boostphase missile defense is to kill the enemy missile when it is most vulnerable, early during its launch or ascent phase, and before its payload can be dispersed and disguised among other objects, decoys, countermeasures, or rocket debris. In addition, any intercept likely would take place far from U.S. territory.

The advantages of boostphase defense are offset by a serious disadvantage: the reaction times are very short. The process of detection and classification of enemy missiles must begin within seconds, and intercept must occur within only a few minutes. In some scenarios, the reaction time to intercept can be less than 120 seconds. Since the response times are quite short, a boostphase system would need to be essentially autonomous, commanded by computers. In other words, in any type of boostphase NMD, there would be no time for the president, the national security adviser, the secretary of defense or foreign heads of state to be consulted.

Naturally, the United States would want to test such a system including the reliability of a fully computerized command and control network before deploying it. But, again, it is not the ABM treaty that is holding up such work. That work can be done at various U.S. testing centers, including Kwajalein, or the White Sands Missile Range in New Mexico.

Some have suggested that the Army or Navy theater missile defense programs could be adapted and expanded for boostphase NMD intercepts. Currently, these systems are intended to protect ships at sea or troops in the field, and such systems are not governed by the ABM treaty. However, if expanded to defend against longrange intercontinental missiles, these systems would fall under ABM treaty restrictions because they would then be defined as mobile NMD systems. The ABM treaty specifically prohibits mobile NMD systems, whether land, sea, air, or space based. Boostphase NMD systems have to be mobile simply so that they could be positioned close to enemy territory without becoming too vulnerable to attack themselves.

The question is how soon would development of mobile, boostphase NMD systems come to be in violation of the ABM treaty? For example, development of the components of such systems in the laboratory is not prohibited by the ABM treaty, nor is testing of those components at defense contractor or government test centers.

In reality, development of boostphase systems will take many years. For example, the Navy Theater Wide system is planning for theater-level deployment at sea in 2007. However, its booster rocket is too slow to adequately undertake NMD intercepts, and its radar is not capable of detecting NMD-class engagements. And, as with landbased boostphase systems, the reaction times are very short, requiring development of fast and highly accurate command and control processes. The latter development alone could take many, many years, as integrated command and control systems remain a major technical challenge to current theater missile defense efforts.

The Army theater system, the Theater High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) system, is scheduled for deployment in 2008. Since the fielding of Army and Navy theater systems is seven or eight years away, fielding of boostphase NMD based upon these theater systems will take even longer, unless development and spending are dramatically accelerated. At current rates of expenditure, development and testing of boostphase systems probably will take at least a decade.

Boostphase NMD systems, whether on land or aboard ship, also would require very fast rockets and high acceleration maneuvering. Such rockets would take years to develop and test. As noted earlier, the interceptor rocket for midcourse NMD has been under development and testing for many years, and within agreed interpretations of the ABM treaty. Similarly, still faster rockets for boostphase NMD could be tested in the United States in the same way.

With respect to the Airborne Laser and the Space Based Laser, each has its own special challenges. In the case of the Airborne Laser, there are important operational considerations. A Boeing 747 loaded with heavy laser apparatus, and flying close to an enemy makes an inviting target. To permit the 747 to stand back from the forward edge of battle, the airborne laser needs very high power to propagate through the atmosphere. In concept, the Airborne Laser could be used for either theater or National Missile Defense. Development of such a high-power laser is ongoing at contractor and government test facilities in full compliance with the ABM treaty. However, it will be many years before the system will have antiballistic missile capability and be ready to be tested in an ABM mode.

As for the Space Based Laser, no one has ever built and fielded a high-power laser in space, let alone maintained it in space. It takes teams of Ph.D. laser physicists, engineers and master technicians to maintain and operate high-power laser systems here on terra firma. In addition, the current prototype of the Space Based Laser is too heavy to be launched into space by existing U.S. booster rockets. Perhaps it can be made lighter and more powerful, but this will take time at least a dozen years and, again, the development and testing is not being held back by the ABM treaty. Years of development and testing will be needed in a fixed, landbased mode on the ground. Doing it in space won't be practical.

With any mobile NMD approach, whether sea or landbased, air or spacebased, at some point in time it will be essential to perform realistic operational tests with the system operated in its intended operational environment in an ABM mode. This would require modification of the ABM treaty, as would

deployment of mobile NMD systems. However, such tests will not be possible without first constructing new Navy ships in the case of a seabased defense or other large equipment in the case of land, air or spacebased systems which will take time to design, develop and build.

Of course, the United States can force the ABM treaty to become an issue sooner by attempting, before current systems are ready, advanced tests with mobile elements prohibited by the ABM treaty, and by boasting that the Pentagon knows how to build an NMD system now. This would confuse U.S. citizens and allies alike, and unnecessarily complicate longterm and difficult technical work with equally difficult domestic policy and international relations questions.

Perhaps the greatest challenge for NMD, whether boostphase, midcourse, or terminal, is building realistic simulators computer models, hardware-in-the-loop, and man-in-the-loop test and exercise facilities that capture how all the elements of an NMD system might work. Such facilities are needed because it will never be practical to test and exercise all of the possible scenarios an NMD system might encounter. While the Pentagon would certainly want to conduct tests that are as realistic as possible, and which define the edges of an NMD operational envelope, it would not be practical to test and exercise every single possible point within that envelope.

So far, developing such simulators has been a daunting task, equal in difficulty to developing NMD itself. The NMD program is years behind in this area, and has much work to do.

Nevertheless, there is nothing in the ABM treaty that prohibits the development of such simulators. The problem has been building simulations with realistic views or scenes for search radars, satellites, and interceptor seekers, with accurate motion of the missiles in multiaxis test chambers, and with realistic command and control elements. If the United States is serious about NMD, a great deal of work is needed in this area of computer modeling and simulation, and none of it is restricted by the ABM treaty.

Such simulations also will be used to explore systems-of-systems interoperability; i.e., the ability of all the elements of an NMD system to work together. NMD program officials themselves have admitted that this is one of the greatest challenges because of the complexity involved.

So, the United States faces a very complex and difficult set of NMD development problems involving combinations of different intercept approaches boost phase, midcourse, and terminal with different types of platforms landbased, seabased, aircraft or satellite based and different friendly countries to be defended from other unfriendly countries.

Executing these many options is not affordable without substantial increases in spending. The spending required to pursue these options is the real current issue, not the ABM treaty. Until the U.S. government learns whether the technical, budgetary, and operational problems that National Missile Defense presents can be solved, the ABM treaty is the least of President Bush's problems.

Philip E. Coyle, senior adviser at the Center for Defense Information, is the former director of Operational Test and Evaluation at the Pentagon, where he was responsible for overseeing NMD testing.

June 12, 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

From: HALLEDEE@aol.com
Date: Sat, 16 Jun 2001 23:37:06 EDT
Subject: Re: reunion
To: mupj@igc.org
X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 120

Howard,

Thanks for holding the two rooms for us on Thursday the 28th. Yes, we do have reservations for the Friday and Saturday evening at the Comfort Inn. They must be foreign managed as I can't get them to understand directives over the phone. Rather than try to change names on the hold over the phone, could you make the reservation change for us when you check in. (Changing the rooms you don't want to J. Edgar's name). I'm assuming that you might be arriving earlier than we will be. We have yet to make our flight plans but we are hoping to arrive in the late afternoon on Thursday. We will need a crib in one room.

I assume that both of your rooms have two beds. Right? Our daughter has two little boys (3 and 6 months) so needs the second bed.

Ernestene & Ed

To: HALLEDEE@aol.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: reunion
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <e4.168a8e09.285d7fe2@aol.com>
References:

Ernestine,

I'm glad you will be able to attend the reunion. We're arriving on Wednesday, so we'll take care of the name change then. The reserved rooms do have two double beds in each.

For Wednesday night we're taking two rooms reserved by Mary Hallman. It is complicated, but it will work out.

Howard

To: mail@alperngroup.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Query on screenplay
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\outline.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Friends:

Following up telephone contact with your office, I am sending you the outline of a screenplay entitled "Spring Chickens". It is sent as a Word attachment, but I can send it as e-mail text if that works better for you. I'll send the entire script if you would like to review it. Would the Alpern Group be interested in serving as my agent in marketing it?

In "Spring Chickens" the Old Couple meets the Bad News Bears. The "odd couple" is a pair of New Yorkers in their 70s who run off to Florida to escape going to the opera with their wives. I'm thinking of Clint Eastwood as the straight one, paired with Paul Newman as the slob. Other well-known, older actors might also be considered.

In Florida they become managers of competing senior (70+) softball teams (the "bad news bears"). This gives them a new arena to carry out their long-time rivalry. One of them brings in Mark McGwire to teach batting. The other counters with Sammy Sosa, sneaked into a game disguised as an old man.

The wives -- I'm thinking of Joanne Woodward and Debbie Reynolds or Jane Fonda -- borrow an idea from Cosi fan Tutte and go to Florida in disguise to check on their husbands. They are picked up by a pair of senior softball players and have their own adventure.

The senior softball players, the spring chickens, are full of antics and display remarkable skills for their age.

It's a fun piece. It would appeal to a general audience, like Space Cowboys did. It's a movie that grandfathers would take their grandchildren to.

My training for film writing includes a course in television production at American University, workshops sponsored by the Maryland Writers Association and the Writer's Center of Bethesda, Maryland (the most recent one taught by Adam Kulakow, a Hollywood screenwriter), reading books on screenwriting, watching movies analytically, and writing and re-writing this and four other screenplays (still available). For "Spring Chickens" I bring first-hand experience as a senior softball player!

If you would like to see the script, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,
Howard Hallman

6508 Wilmet Road
Bethesda, MD 20817
301 897-3668
muj@igc.org

To: "Harry Anderson" <agencyone@hotmail.com>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Query on screenplay
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\outline.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Harry,

Following up our telephone conversation, I am sending you the outline of a screenplay entitled "Spring Chickens". It is sent as a Word attachment, but I can send it as e-mail text if that works better for you. I'll send the entire script if you would like to review it. Would The Agency be interested in serving as my agent in marketing it?

In "Spring Chickens" the Old Couple meets the Bad News Bears. The "odd couple" is a pair of New Yorkers in their 70s who run off to Florida to escape going to the opera with their wives. I'm thinking of Clint Eastwood as the straight one, paired with Paul Newman as the slob. Other well-known, older actors might also be considered.

In Florida they become managers of competing senior (70+) softball teams (the "bad news bears"). This gives them a new arena to carry out their long-time rivalry. One of them brings in Mark McGwire to teach batting. The other counters with Sammy Sosa, sneaked into a game disguised as an old man.

The wives -- I'm thinking of Joanne Woodward and Debbie Reynolds or Jane Fonda -- borrow an idea from *Così fan tutte* and go to Florida in disguise to check on their husbands. They are picked up by a pair of senior softball players and have their own adventure.

The senior softball players, the spring chickens, are full of antics and display remarkable skills for their age.

It's a fun piece. It would appeal to a general audience, like *Space Cowboys* did. It's a movie that grandfathers would take their grandchildren to.

My training for film writing includes a course in television production at American University, workshops sponsored by the Maryland Writers Association and the Writer's Center of Bethesda, Maryland (the most recent one taught by Adam Kulakow, a Hollywood screenwriter), reading books on screenwriting, watching movies analytically, and writing and re-writing this and four other screenplays (still available). For "Spring Chickens" I bring first-hand experience as a senior softball player!

If you would like to see the script, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,
Howard Hallman

6508 Wilmett Road
Bethesda, MD 20817
301 897-3668
muj@igc.org

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

Dear Keith,

Would you please sent out the following query.

Last summer two television news stations had segments featuring senior softball. One of them included the Yellow Jackets and other teams. The other dealt with Super 70 teams. If anyone videotaped either or both of those newscasts, I would like to get a copy. For instance, I could borrow your tape and make a copy.

If you have such videotape, please call me at 301 897-3668 or reply by e-mail to mupj@igc.org.

Thanks,
Howard Hallman

Date: Mon, 18 Jun 2001 18:04:52 -0400 (EDT)
From: Keith Lentner <klentner@starburst.cbl.umces.edu>
To: MCSSA Distribution: ;
Subject: Television newscast (fwd)

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

Date: Mon, 18 Jun 2001 17:01:49 -0400
From: Howard W. Hallman <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Television newscast

Last summer two television news stations had segments featuring senior softball. One of them included the Yellow Jackets and other teams. The other dealt with Super 70 teams. If anyone videotaped either or both of those newscasts, I would like to get a copy. For instance, I could borrow your tape and make a copy.

If you have such videotape, please call me at 301 897-3668 or reply by e-mail to mupj@igc.org.

Thanks,
Howard Hallman

.From: No9essex@aol.com
Date: Mon, 18 Jun 2001 22:35:54 EDT
Subject: (no subject)
To: mupj@igc.org
X-Mailer: AOL 6.0 for Windows US sub 10520

Howard.....someone on theYellowjackets could probably tell you which local channel did the shooting....Then call them up and ask how to get a copy.

Good luck.....Pat Meagher

Date: Tue, 19 Jun 2001 14:05:59 -0400 (EDT)
From: Keith Lentner <klentner@starburst.cbl.umces.edu>
To: Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Television newscast (fwd)

FYI

--

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

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

Date: Tue, 19 Jun 2001 14:03:33 EDT
From: Swabby52@aol.com
To: klentner@starburst.cbl.umces.edu
Subject: Re: Television newscast (fwd)

Keith, Dick(Bucky)Beavers taped the TV newscast of the Jellow Jackets. His phone no is 301-933-0846. He will be coming back from vacation Wed. Give him a call.

Nancy Callan

To: fenn@hicapitol.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Booking space
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Ms. Fenn:

For the last week I have been trying to reach your sales department to discuss booking space for a Hallman family reunion in 2004. I had a preliminary conversation with Eric Roane in January and circulated information to my relatives. I received a positive response. Next week I go to the Hallman 2001 event. I need further information to help our decision-making. Therefore, I would like to talk with you within the next few days.

For 2004 we are considering either the two nights of Friday and Saturday, June 25 and 26 or the three nights of Friday through Sunday, July 2-4. In either case we will have a dinner at the hotel on Saturday evening. For this year's reunion we are expecting 50 adults and 25 children in 30 family units. I know of some who aren't coming this year but are interested in 2004 in Washington. Therefore, we would want 30 to 35 rooms. We need some kind of room or lobby space for a point of contact on Friday afternoon and evening as people check in.

Please call me at 301 897-3668 so that we can arrange a time for me to meet with you, such as on Thursday or Friday of this week.

Thanks,
Howard Hallman
Bethesda

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

Dear Colleagues:

Senator Lugar's office has requested that the presentation occur at 6:30 p.m. at the reception in his honor on June 20. He will arrive at 6:00. So please come on time.

Howard

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

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Dear Colleagues:

At our meeting today, June 19, we decided to make contact with staff of Senators Biden and Levin and offer suggestions of possible witnesses from the faith community to testify at public hearings on missile defense. Therefore, if you have suggestions, please let me know in the next few days. Among others think about Catholics, Evangelicals, African Americans, Hispanics.

Call me or e-mail your reply.

Thanks,
Howard

X-SMF-Message-ID: 9170D93001EA470F
X-SMF-Hop-Count: 1
Date: Tue, 19 Jun 2001 18:32:00 -0400
Sender: Cindy Fenn <fenn@hicapitol.com>
From: Cindy Fenn <fenn@hicapitol.com>
To: "Howard W.Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
X-EXP32-SerialNo: 00105466
Subject: RE: Booking space
X-Mailer: InterChange (Hydra) SMTP v3.61.01

=====
Original Message from mupj@INTERCHG (Howard W. Hallman) {mupj@igc.org}
at 6/19/01 3:46 pm

>Dear Ms. Fenn:

>

>For the last week I have been trying to reach your sales department to
>discuss booking space for a Hallman family reunion in 2004. I had a
>preliminary conversation with Eric Roane in January and circulated
>information to my relatives. I received a positive response. Next week I
>go to the Hallman 2001 event. I need further information to help our
>decision-making. Therefore, I would like to talk with you within the next
>few days.

>

>For 2004 we are considering either the two nights of Friday and Saturday,
>June 25 and 26 or the three nights of Friday through Sunday, July 2-4. In
>either case we will have a dinner at the hotel on Saturday evening. For
>this year's reunion we are expecting 50 adults and 25 children in 30 family
>units. I know of some who aren't coming this year but are interested in
>2004 in Washington. Therefore, we would want 30 to 35 rooms. We need some
>kind of room or lobby space for a point of contact on Friday afternoon and
>evening as people check in.

>

>Please call me at 301 897-3668 so that we can arrange a time for me to meet
>with you, such as on Thursday or Friday of this week.

>

>Thanks,

>Howard Hallman

>Bethesda

=====
Comments by fenn@HI-CAP (Cindy Fenn) at 6/19/01 6:29 pm

Mr. Hallman ... I started checking availability so I can give you two solid
price figures to take with you on your trip. If you come June 25 and 26, I
can offer you a rate of \$149 plus tax per room per night. If you come July
2-5, the rate would be \$169 plus tax per room per night. This rate is only
\$10 more than the lowest rate we are currently offering for this 3 and 4th
of July. Please let me know what your family decides and I hope you have a
great trip.

Cindy Fenn

Director of Sales

Holiday Inn Capitol

550 C Street SW

Washington, DC 20024

202-554-2780 x7159 Direct phone

202-479-4069 Sales fax
www.HolidayInnCapitol.com

From: David Robinson <dave@paxchristiusa.org>
To: "'Howard W. Hallman'" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: Hearing witnesses
Date: Tue, 19 Jun 2001 16:49:26 -0400

Hi Howard,

I got your phone message, but I am embroiled in a fiasco (can't go into it quite yet) and have not been able to get back to you. Sounds like you are making headway down in the beltway. I would certainly suggest Bishop Gumbleton for the missile defense hearing. I could even come up with someone else if you would rather, but a good strong Catholic bishop should voice the concerns over missile defense. Have you had any further contacts with Gerry Powers? The bishops' 1988 statement to which he referred (a previous email you sent me) is a very good statement and actually is even more appropriate in its criticisms to Bush's version of MND than Clinton's. Also, what do you know about Bob Bowman? Are you working with him?

Peace,
Dave

From: Howard W. Hallman [SMTP:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Tuesday, June 19, 2001 4:13 PM
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: Hearing witnesses

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Dear Colleagues:

At our meeting today, June 19, we decided to make contact with staff of Senators Biden and Levin and offer suggestions of possible witnesses from the faith community to testify at public hearings on missile defense. Therefore, if you have suggestions, please let me know in the next few days. Among others think about Catholics, Evangelicals, African Americans, Hispanics.

Call me or e-mail your reply.

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.

From: David Robinson <dave@paxchristiusa.org>
To: "'Howard W. Hallman'" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: Hearing witnesses
Date: Tue, 19 Jun 2001 17:40:19 -0400

Howard,

One more thought. The new President of the Leadership Conference of Women Religious, a Catholic body comprised of all the leaders of women's religious communities in the US (representing about 100,000 women religious) is a very good friend of mine and Pax Christi leader. She is a powerful presenter and was among those of us that went to Livermore a few years ago. She would be outstanding.

dave

From: Howard W. Hallman [SMTP:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Tuesday, June 19, 2001 4:13 PM
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: Hearing witnesses

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Dear Colleagues:

At our meeting today, June 19, we decided to make contact with staff of Senators Biden and Levin and offer suggestions of possible witnesses from the faith community to testify at public hearings on missile defense. Therefore, if you have suggestions, please let me know in the next few days. Among others think about Catholics, Evangelicals, African Americans, Hispanics.

Call me or e-mail your reply.

Thanks,
Howard

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

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

To: David Robinson <dave@paxchristiusa.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: Hearing witnesses
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <01C0F8E6.EB67F880@dave.paxchristiusa.org>
References:

At 05:40 PM 6/19/01 -0400, you wrote:

>Howard,

>

>One more thought. The new President of the Leadership Conference of Women Religious, a Catholic body comprised of all the leaders of women's religious communities in the US (representing about 100,000 women religious) is a very good friend of mine and Pax Christi leader. She is a powerful presenter and was among those of us that went to Livermore a few years ago. She would be outstanding.

Dave,

What's her name and contact information?

Howard

To: david@fcnl.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Lugar reception
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

David,

I'll be out this morning and will return home around 1:00 p.m.

I believe that the invitation went to the Monday Lobby list. I received one when I picked up my mail at Foundry UMC last Thursday. It probably came from this list because I'm not on the WISC list.

Would you please e-mail a reminder to the Monday Lobby, indicate that Senator Lugar intends to be there at 6:00, and urge them to be on time?

On Friday I called about 30 Senate offices. I talked with some foreign policy aides and schedulers, sent follow-up faxes to three who hadn't received the invitation, and left messages for more than half. This has produced a couple of acceptance, one declination, and the rest uncertain.

A couple of weeks ago you promised to call Democratic staff for the Foreign Relations Committee. I was surprised last Thursday when you pulled out. I don't know whether Janet was able to pick up on this. Since you know most of them personally, could you make a round of calls today?

If you want to discuss this further before the reception, call me after 1:00.

Howard

1. "How Real Is The 'Rogue' Threat?"

MSNBC.com - June 19, 2001 - By Robert Windrem, NBC News

U.S. intelligence details missiles that fall far short of U.S. shores

As President Bush, forging ahead with a plan to build a national missile shield, continues to trumpet the threat posed by missiles from so-called "rogue" nations, no missile currently deployed by countries hostile to the United States has the range to strike any of the 50 U.S. states. And only one missile system currently being developed by a foreign nation would have such a capability in the near future, according to intelligence and expert analysis.

Of the five "rogue" states usually mentioned in discussions of missile programs — Iran, Iraq, Libya, North Korea and Pakistan — only North Korea has what can be called an advanced missile development program. North Korea's Taepo-Dong 2 missile, still under development, would have the range to strike the United States — but likely only at Alaska's thinly populated western edge, or under the most optimistic assessments, the city of Anchorage. While it would be the first missile strike on U.S. soil, it would do little damage to U.S. strategic interests and would almost certainly be met by a devastating U.S. counterstrike, and that would do little damage to U.S. strategic interests, say U.S. officials.

Only two of the five "rogue" nations — North Korea and Pakistan — have nuclear weapons, and only Pakistan is believed to have successfully built nuclear warheads for its missiles. While U.S. intelligence believes North Korea has built one or two nuclear weapons, there is no evidence that it has built missile warheads, say U.S. intelligence sources, speaking on condition of anonymity.

Limited Programs

The five countries' missile development programs are hindered by other limitations, say U.S. officials and independent experts:

*None has fielded a missile with a solid rocket engine or even tested such an engine in flight. Each uses liquid fuel engines, which require hours and in some cases days to load and fire. A solid rocket engine can be lighted and fired within in minutes.

*None of the states have extensive missile-launch facilities or even missile-development facilities. North Korea's facility on the Sea of Japan is limited to a single, unprotected launch pad and nearby assembly building, connected by a dirt road.

*None have the industrial capability to build even moderately large numbers of missiles.

North Korea's Taepo Dong-2, the most advanced missile in development by any of the "rogue" states, has yet to be fired from the Koreans' rudimentary missile-test facility.

Under the most optimistic assessments, the missile would have a range of 3,600 miles when fielded, U.S. intelligence officials say. At that 3,600-mile range, it could strike as far east as Anchorage. If its range is at the low end of estimates — 2,400 miles — it could strike only the westernmost islands of Alaska's sparsely populated Aleutian chain.

The Taepo-Dong 2, named for the city where it is built, would need a range of more than 4,800 miles to strike the U.S. mainland, and somewhat less to hit Hawaii.

"North Korea has a very modest facility ... more of a missile proving ground, like White Sands out of 1946, not Vandenberg [Air Force Base] or the Kennedy Space Center," said Tim Brown, senior analyst for Globalsecurity.org. The White Sands Proving Ground was established in New Mexico at the tail end of World War II by the U.S. military to test new weapons' systems.

Short-Range Weapons

No other nation on the "rogue" list has fielded a missile with a range greater than 900 miles, according to U.S. officials. Pakistan has the Ghauri missile, which it bought from North Korea and renamed for a Muslim king who invaded Pakistan's archrival India. Iran has yet to test any missile with a range greater than 600 miles.

Libya has only Scud-B missiles with ranges of 180 miles, and Iraq is limited by U.N. sanctions to missiles with ranges no greater than 90 miles. Although Baghdad is believed to have hid Scud missiles from weapons inspectors, none have ranges greater than 540 miles. Development programs in each of those states is aimed at incremental increases in range, officials say.

Two of the missiles — the Pakistani Ghauri and the Iranian Shehab — are derivatives of North Korea's No-Dong missiles, which Pyongyang has sold and transported by both ship and cargo aircraft to buyer nations.

"One question is how reliable these systems would be," said Globalsecurity's Brown. "Putting a crude rudimentary system in operation without doing a lot of testing is risky. Military generals want a lot of testing. The question is, is this a serious military program or a terrorist program where you wouldn't necessarily have a lot of testing?"

The United States fears that North Korea could ultimately sell the longer range missiles it has under development as well. Still, because of

geography, even if the Pakistanis or Iranians bought a North Korean missile and wanted to aim at the United States instead of one of their neighbors, neither is close enough to to strike even Alaska.

'Rogue' threat? -- Missile ranges fall short of U.S. shores

Iran

Scud C: 300 miles, Status -- deployed

Shehab-3: 600 miles, Status -- tested

Shehab-4: 900 miles, Status -- in development

Distance to US -- 5,400 miles (Alaska), 7,200 miles (Mainland)

Libya

Scud B: 180 miles, Status -- deployed

Distance to US -- 7,200 miles (Alaska), 9,000 miles (Mainland)

Iraq

Ababil-100: 60 miles, Status -- deployed

al-Samoud: 90 miles, Status -- tested

al-Hussein: 360 miles, Status -- forbidden, possibly hidden

al-Abbas: 540 miles, Status -- forbidden, possibly hidden

Distance to US -- 5,400 miles (Alaska), 7,800 miles (Mainland)

North Korea

Scud B: 180 miles, Status -- deployed

Scud C: 300 miles, Status -- deployed

No Dong: 600 miles, Status -- tested

Taepo Dong 1: 900+ miles, Status -- tested

Taepo Dong2: 3,600 miles, Status -- in development

Distance to US -- 2,400 miles (Alaska), 4,800 miles (Mainland)

Pakistan

Shaheen: 180 miles, Status -- deployed

Tarmuk: 180 miles, Status -- deployed

Ghauri: 900 miles, Status -- deployed

Distance to US -- 4,800 miles (Alaska), 6,600 miles (Mainland)

Note: Distances to the US are calculated over the pole or west to east. Flying east to west, even though shorter in some cases, is inefficient since the missiles would be flying against the rotation of the earth, lengthening the flight.

Robert Windrem is an investigative producer for NBC News.

Reply-To: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
From: "Brink Campaign" <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
To: "Ira Shorr" <irashorr@hotmail.com>,
"Tracey Moavero" <tmoavero@peace-action.org>,
"Tim Barner" <kathytim@earthlink.net>,
"Sharon Pickett \ (PSR)" <sharonp@igc.org>,
"Natalie Hildt" <natalie@2020vision.org>,
"Martin Butcher" <mbutcher@psr.org>, "Kimberly Robson" <>wand@wand.org>,
"Kimberly Roberts" <kroberts@psr.org>,
"Kathy Guthrie" <kathy@fcn1.org>,
"Kathy Crandall" <kathycrandall@disarmament.org>,
"Joe Volk" <joe@fcn1.org>, "Jim Wyerman" <jwyerman@2020vision.org>,
"Jim Bridgman" <jcbridgman@earthlink.net>,
"Howard Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>,
"Gillian Gilhool" <ggilhool@ix.netcom.com>,
"Ellen Barfield" <wilpfdc@wilpf.org>,
"Deedie Runkel" <drunkel@peacelinks.org>,
"David Culp" <david@fcn1.org>, "Daryl Kimball" <dkimball@clw.org>,
"Carlean Ponder \ (WAND)" <nuclear@wand.org>,
"Arjun Makhijani" <arjun@ieer.org>, "Ann Gallivan" <agallivan@psr.org>,
"Esther Pank" <brinkprogram@backfromthebrink.net>

Subject: BRINK MEETING TOMORROW

Date: Tue, 19 Jun 2001 22:48:51 -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,

The Brink Legislative Meeting is scheduled for 10:30 to 11:30 tomorrow, Thursday, June 21, 2001 at the PSR, 1875 Connecticut Avenue,NW, Suite 1012. We'll brink bagels.

Unfortunately it was not possible to schedule the Allen meeting until Monday. You will be hearing from David about that soon.

The Agenda will include:

- Final language on the Markey bill on de-alerting
- Status report on the Senate companion bill
- Logistics of a Toaster Hill Drop
- Review Toast Card design
- Capital Hill Event
- Other

Please RSVP if you CAN'T come tomorrow. We 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

From: "Charlotte V. Davenport, csjp" <csjp@igc.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Cc: "Dick Ullrich" <DickUll@aol.com>, <oneilsp@netzero.net>
Subject: your e-mail list for Nuclear Arms information
Date: Wed, 20 Jun 2001 13:12:48 -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 V5.00.2615.200

Dear Howard,

I have really appreciated the information that you share on the nuclear disarmament information. Your last analysis on the morality of the missile defense shield was very helpful in my contacting my Senators. I have two other colleagues who are interested in getting the information you share. Could you add them to your list?

Their addresses are below:

Dick Ullrich
DickUll@aol.com

Steve O'Neil, SM

These gentlemen are involved with the Corporate Responsibility movement and are filing shareholder resolutions in regard to nuclear arms manufacturing by Boeing.

Thank you,

Charlotte Davenport, csjp
Sisters of St. Joseph of Peace

To: "Charlotte V. Davenport, csjp" <csjp@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: e-mail list for Nuclear Arms information
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <NDBBKABKLDBCPOOEJFMNAEIGCCAA.csjp@igc.org>
References:

At 01:12 PM 6/20/01 -0400, you wrote:

>Dear Howard,
>I have really appreciated the information that you share on the nuclear
>disarmament information. You last analysis on the morality of the missile
>defense shield was very helpful in my contacting my Senators. I have two
>other colleagues who are interested in getting the information you share.
>Could you add them to your list?
>
>Their addresses are below:
>
>Dick Ullrich
>DickUll@aol.com
>
>Steve O'Neil, SM
>

Charlotte,

I've added Dick Ullrich to my list. I'll add Steve O'Neil if you'll send me his e-address.

Howard

To: mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Dangers from "rogue" nations is overrated
Cc:
Bcc: icnd
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Colleagues:

I call to your attention the following information provided by MSNBC.

Howard

###

1. "How Real Is The 'Rogue' Threat?"
MSNBC.com - June 19, 2001 - By Robert Windrem, NBC News

U.S. intelligence details missiles that fall far short of U.S. shores

As President Bush, forging ahead with a plan to build a national missile shield, continues to trumpet the threat posed by missiles from so-called "rogue" nations, no missile currently deployed by countries hostile to the United States has the range to strike any of the 50 U.S. states. And only one missile system currently being developed by a foreign nation would have such a capability in the near future, according to intelligence and expert analysis.

Of the five "rogue" states usually mentioned in discussions of missile programs — Iran, Iraq, Libya, North Korea and Pakistan — only North Korea has what can be called an advanced missile development program. North Korea's Taepo-Dong 2 missile, still under development, would have the range to strike the United States — but likely only at Alaska's thinly populated western edge, or under the most optimistic assessments, the city of Anchorage. While it would be the first missile strike on U.S. soil, it would do little damage to U.S. strategic interests and would almost certainly be met by a devastating U.S. counterstrike, and that would do little damage to U.S. strategic interests, say U.S. officials.

Only two of the five "rogue" nations — North Korea and Pakistan — have nuclear weapons, and only Pakistan is believed to have successfully built nuclear warheads for its missiles. While U.S. intelligence believes North Korea has built one or two nuclear weapons, there is no evidence that it has built missile warheads, say U.S. intelligence sources, speaking on condition of anonymity.

Limited Programs

The five countries' missile development programs are hindered by other limitations, say U.S. officials and independent experts:

*None has fielded a missile with a solid rocket engine or even tested such an engine in flight. Each uses liquid fuel engines, which require hours and in some cases days to load and fire. A solid rocket engine can be lighted and fired within in minutes.

*None of the states have extensive missile-launch facilities or even missile-development facilities. North Korea's facility on the Sea of Japan is limited to a single, unprotected launch pad and nearby assembly building, connected by a dirt road.

*None have the industrial capability to build even moderately large numbers of missiles.

North Korea's Taepo Dong-2, the most advanced missile in development by any of the "rogue" states, has yet to be fired from the Koreans' rudimentary missile-test facility.

Under the most optimistic assessments, the missile would have a range of 3,600 miles when fielded, U.S. intelligence officials say. At that 3,600-mile range, it could strike as far east as Anchorage. If its range is at the low end of estimates — 2,400 miles — it could strike only the westernmost islands of Alaska's sparsely populated Aleutian chain.

The Taepo-Dong 2, named for the city where it is built, would need a range of more than 4,800 miles to strike the U.S. mainland, and somewhat less to hit Hawaii.

"North Korea has a very modest facility ... more of a missile proving ground, like White Sands out of 1946, not Vandenberg [Air Force Base] or the Kennedy Space Center," said Tim Brown, senior analyst for Globalsecurity.org. The White Sands Proving Ground was established in New Mexico at the tail end of World War II by the U.S. military to test new weapons' systems.

Short-Range Weapons

No other nation on the "rogue" list has fielded a missile with a range greater than 900 miles, according to U.S. officials. Pakistan has the Ghauri missile, which it bought from North Korea and renamed for a Muslim king who invaded Pakistan's archrival India. Iran has yet to test any missile with a range greater than 600 miles.

Libya has only Scud-B missiles with ranges of 180 miles, and Iraq is limited by U.N. sanctions to missiles with ranges no greater than 90 miles. Although Baghdad is believed to have hid Scud missiles from weapons inspectors, none have ranges greater than 540 miles. Development programs in each of those states is aimed at incremental increases in range, officials say.

Two of the missiles — the Pakistani Ghauri and the Iranian Shehab — are derivatives of North Korea's No-Dong missiles, which Pyongyang has sold and transported by both ship and cargo aircraft to buyer nations.

"One question is how reliable these systems would be," said

Globalsecurity's Brown. "Putting a crude rudimentary system in operation without doing a lot of testing is risky. Military generals want a lot of testing. The question is, is this a serious military program or a terrorist program where you wouldn't necessarily have a lot of testing?"

The United States fears that North Korea could ultimately sell the longer range missiles it has under development as well. Still, because of geography, even if the Pakistanis or Iranians bought a North Korean missile and wanted to aim at the United States instead of one of their neighbors, neither is close enough to to strike even Alaska.

'Rogue' threat? -- Missile ranges fall short of U.S. shores

Iran

Scud C: 300 miles, Status -- deployed

Shehab-3: 600 miles, Status -- tested

Shehab-4: 900 miles, Status -- in development

Distance to US -- 5,400 miles (Alaska), 7,200 miles (Mainland)

Libya

Scud B: 180 miles, Status -- deployed

Distance to US -- 7,200 miles (Alaska), 9,000 miles (Mainland)

Iraq

Ababil-100: 60 miles, Status -- deployed

al-Samoud: 90 miles, Status -- tested

al-Hussein: 360 miles, Status -- forbidden, possibly hidden

al-Abbas: 540 miles, Status -- forbidden, possibly hidden

Distance to US -- 5,400 miles (Alaska), 7,800 miles (Mainland)

North Korea

Scud B: 180 miles, Status -- deployed

Scud C: 300 miles, Status -- deployed

No Dong: 600 miles, Status -- tested

Taepo Dong 1: 900+ miles, Status -- tested

Taepo Dong2: 3,600 miles, Status -- in development

Distance to US -- 2,400 miles (Alaska), 4,800 miles (Mainland)

Pakistan

Shaheen: 180 miles, Status -- deployed

Tarmuk: 180 miles, Status -- deployed

Ghauri: 900 miles, Status -- deployed

Distance to US -- 4,800 miles (Alaska), 6,600 miles (Mainland)

Note: Distances to the US are calculated over the pole or west to east. Flying east to west, even though shorter in some cases, is inefficient since the missiles would be flying against the rotation of the earth, lengthening the flight.

Robert Windrem is an investigative producer for NBC News.

From: "CAROL Q. COSBY" <ccosby@dhm.disciples.org>
To: senator_lugar@lugar.senate.gov
Date: Wed, 20 Jun 2001 13:12:25 -0500
Subject: Congratulations
CC: mupj@igc.org
X-Confirm-Reading-To: "CAROL Q. COSBY" <ccosby@dhm.disciples.org>
X-pmrqc: 1
Priority: normal
X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Win32 (v3.12c)

Dear Senator Lugar,

As a constituent of yours, a resident of Indiana, and as staff person for the Disciples Peace Fellowship I am so delighted to know of the recognition you will receive tonight as you are honored for the work you have done to make this world less dangerous. I will not be able to attend the reception, but want you to know that I am proud of your efforts in this area and I will be pleased to support future endeavors in reduction of weapons.

Shalom,

Carol Q. Cosby
Homeland Ministries
Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)
P.O. Box 1986
Indianapolis, IN 46206

To: mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Common web site material
Cc:
Bcc: icnd
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Dear Colleagues:

At our meeting on June 19 we discussed two options for working together on web site material related to missile defense. (1) Develop common web site material and linkages that various organizations can post on their own web sites. (2) A more complex system that offers opportunities to send messages to members of Congress.

The United Methodist General Board of Church and Society (UMGBCS) is developing ideas for the latter and will share them with organizations in the faith community. Because this will take several months to mature, we concluded that we would move ahead with the first alternative at this time.

Plan of action

- (a) Staff of the UMGBCS is willing to take agreed upon common material and format it for web site usage. This will then be offered to participating organizations. Each organization will be able to adapt this material to the format on its own web site.
- (b) A subgroup of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament will decide what material to post and what linkages to suggest. At the May meeting and subsequently the following persons have indicated that they are willing to participate in this subgroup: Catherine Gordon (Presbyterian), Larry Egbert (Unitarian), David Culp (FCNL), Janet Horman (United Methodist), and Ben Bryant (Cooperative Baptist Fellowship). I will also participate. Does anyone else want to serve?
- (c) As a next step, the subgroup can confer via e-mail. I will suggest some original material for posting and some linkages. Other members of the subgroup can add their suggestions. Items we agree upon will go to UMGBCS for processing and then for offering to other organizations.
- (d) After this initial posting I'll offer everyone associated with the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament an opportunity to provide feedback on this beginning effort.

If you have any comments on these ideas, please reply to me, and I'll share them with others.

Shalom,
Howard

X-Authentication-Warning: red1.netwurx.net: Host 140-3.netwurx.net [216.138.140.3] claimed to be cc.edu
Date: Wed, 20 Jun 2001 15:19:26 -0500
From: "Joel J. Heim" <jheim@cc.edu>
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: Missile Defense Witnesses

Howard,

Carol Cosby forwarded the message below to me.

I will put myself forward for consideration.

I am Moderator of Disciples Peace Fellowship; an ordain Disciple Minister; an Assisstant Professor of Religion and Philosophy at Carroll College in Waukesha, Wisconsin (a Presbyterian related colleges); I completed my Ph.D.last summer in Religion and Social Ethics at the University of Southern California with my dissertation focused on the ethics of American nuclear policy. So this really is my area of specialty.

Not sure what time-table you think this might happen, and I may not be avaiable even if you or they are ineterested in me. But anyway consider me.

Joel Heim

----- Forwarded message follows -----

Date sent: Tue, 19 Jun 2001 16:13:28 -0400
To: mupj@igc.org <mailto:mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> <mailto:mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Hearing witnesses

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Dear Colleagues:

At our meeting today, June 19, we decided to make contact with staff of Senators Biden and Levin and offer suggestions of possible witnesses from the faith community to testify at public hearings on missile defense. Therefore, if you have suggestions, please let me know in the next few days. Among others think about Catholics, Evangelicals, African Americans, Hispanics.

Call me or e-mail your reply.

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 <mailto:mupj@igc.org>

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

----- End of forwarded message -----

From: UUAWO@aol.com
Date: Wed, 20 Jun 2001 17:04:20 EDT
Subject: Re: Common web site material
To: mupj@igc.org
X-Mailer: AOL 5.0 for Windows sub 125

Howard --

Just came to mind to make sure you know (in case Larry didn't get to it before he left) that Larry is doing a 6-week stint with Doctors Without Borders in Sri Lanka. He left last Thursday.

Our office is off to the UUA General Assembly. I'm the last to leave and first one back. I'll be out Thursday through Monday.

Peace,
Theresa Kashin
UUA Wash.Ofc.

To: UUAWO@aol.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Common web site material
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <18.e3275ef.286269d4@aol.com>
References:

At 05:04 PM 6/20/01 EDT, you wrote:

>Howard --

>Just came to mind to make sure you know (in case Larry didn't get to it
>before he left) that Larry is doing a 6-week stint with Doctors Without
>Borders in Sri Lanka. He left last Thursday.

Theresa,

I didn't know that Larry was going away. Thanks for letting me know.

Howard

From: "Charlotte V. Davenport, csjp" <csjp@igc.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: e-mail list for Nuclear Arms information
Date: Thu, 21 Jun 2001 09:33:45 -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 V5.00.2615.200

thanks for adding these people to your list:

Steve O'Neil, SM
oneilsp@netzero.net

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Wednesday, June 20, 2001 3:10 PM
To: Charlotte V. Davenport, csjp
Subject: Re: e-mail list for Nuclear Arms information

At 01:12 PM 6/20/01 -0400, you wrote:

>Dear Howard,
>I have really appreciated the information that you share on the nuclear
>disarmament information. You last analysis on the morality of the missile
>defense shield was very helpful in my contacting my Senators. I have two
>other colleagues who are interested in getting the information you share.
>Could you add them to your list?
>
>Their addresses are below:
>
>Dick Ullrich
>DickUll@aol.com
>
>Steve O'Neil, SM
>

Charlotte,

I've added Dick Ullrich to my list. I'll add Steve O'Neil if you'll send me his e-address.

Howard

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

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

X-Sender: dkimball@[63.106.26.66]
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.0.1
Date: Thu, 21 Jun 2001 10:26:54 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: sign-on letter on CTBT entry into force: REPLY by July 11

June 21, 2001

*apologies for cross-postings

TO: friends of the CTBT and nuclear disarmament
FR: Daryl Kimball, Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers and
Felicity Hill, Women's Int. League for Peace with Freedom
RE: Letter supporting action on CTBT entry into force; background
information

PLEASE REPLY TO: flick@igc.org

Five years after the completion of negotiations, the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty has not entered into force. The CTBT provides for periodic conferences to discuss the entry into force of the Treaty, and the second of these is coming up September 25-27, 2001.

The Coalition is working with other NGOs to collect the support of representatives from non-governmental organizations and prominent individuals for letters to key government leaders urging them to attend the CTBT conference and urge CTBT hold-out states to sign and/or ratify the Treaty.

One of the letters below is addressed to the 13 states that are required for the treaty to Enter Into Force but that have not yet signed. The other is to all those states that have signed the Treaty.

PLEASE LET US KNOW IF YOU WILL ADD YOUR GROUP'S NAME TO THESE LETTERS BY WEDNESDAY JULY 11TH !!

Simply respond to this email with your name and affiliation or send them to <wilpfun@igc.org>

- DK

THIS LETTER IS ADDRESSED TO THE CTBT SIGNERS:

Dear Head of State/Foreign Minister/Ambassador,

As you know, the Second Conference on Accelerating CTBT Entry into Force will be held in New York, September 25-27, 2001. We, the below signed representatives of non-governmental organisations and world civil society, urge you to use this opportunity to express your support for this vital

nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation tool and to take action to secure the ratifications necessary for CTBT entry into force.

Five years after it opened for signature, the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty has not entered into force. While 160 states have signed the Treaty and 76 have ratified, the Treaty specifies that the 44 nuclear capable states must ratify before the Treaty enters into force.

There are 13 states that must still sign and/or ratify, including: Algeria, China, Colombia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Pakistan, United States of America, Viet Nam.

We urge you to speak at the conference on behalf of your government and, at every appropriate opportunity, we respectfully urge you to call on the remaining CTBT hold-out states to take prompt action toward ratification. The political opportunity presented by the Conference should also be used to urge those states with active nuclear weapon research programmes and test sites to take actions that would reinforce the CTBT and support its goals, such as maintaining their existing test moratoria pending CTBT entry into force, refraining from activities at test sites that might be construed as CTBT violations, halting research, development and production of new nuclear warheads or modifying of existing bomb designs to give them new military capabilities.

The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Organisation in Vienna has made significant progress in setting up the International Monitoring System and International Data Center so that the CTBT's verification system is ready for the entry into force of the treaty. The IMS, together with national technical means and ten of thousands of civilian monitoring stations, will effectively detect and deter would-be testers, and therefore, will build confidence between all nations that nuclear testing has stopped.

Ms/r. _____, public opinion polls conducted around the world indicate overwhelming support for the CTBT and the total elimination of all nuclear weapons. Indeed, 182 non-nuclear weapon states parties to the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty welcomed the unequivocal commitment to this end by the nuclear weapon states at the 2000 NPT Review Conference. The CTBT has long been held as the first crucial step towards the nuclear disarmament goal. Should the CTBT not enter into force, all the enormous efforts on the part of governments and NGOs would be lost, and international security will be severely diminished.
Sincerely,

THIS LETTER IS ADDRESSED TO THE CTBT HOLD-OUTS:

Dear Head of State/Foreign Minister/Ambassador,

As you know, the Second Conference on Accelerating CTBT Entry into Force will be held in New York, September 25-27, 2001. We, the below signed representatives of non-governmental organisations and world civil society, urge you to use this opportunity to express your support for this vital nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation tool and to take action toward

ratification of this vital disarmament and non-proliferation tool.

Five years after it opened for signature, the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty has unfortunately not entered into force. While 160 states have signed the Treaty and 76 have ratified, the Treaty specifies that the 44 nuclear capable states must ratify before the Treaty enters into force. There are 13 states that must still sign and/or ratify including yours: Algeria, China, Colombia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Pakistan, United States of America, Viet Nam.

Prior to CTBT entry into force, states with active nuclear weapon research programmes and test sites to take actions that would reinforce the CTBT and support its goals, such as maintaining their existing test moratoria pending CTBT entry into force, refraining from activities at test sites that might be construed as CTBT violations, halting research, development and production of new nuclear warheads or modifying of existing bomb designs to give them new military capabilities.

The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Organisation in Vienna has made significant progress in setting up the International Monitoring System and International Data Center so that the CTBT's verification system is ready for the entry into force of the treaty. The IMS, together with national technical means and ten of thousands of civilian monitoring stations, will effectively detect and deter would-be testers, and therefore, will build confidence between all nations that nuclear testing has stopped.

Ms/r. _____, public opinion polls conducted around the world indicate overwhelming support for the CTBT and the total elimination of all nuclear weapons. Indeed, 182 non-nuclear weapon states parties to the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty welcomed the unequivocal commitment to this end by the nuclear weapon states at the 2000 NPT Review Conference. The CTBT has long been held as the first crucial step towards the nuclear disarmament goal. Should the CTBT not enter into force, all the enormous efforts on the part of governments and NGOs would be lost and international security will be diminished.

Sincerely,

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The second international conference aimed at speeding up entry into force of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) will be held from September 25-27, 2001 in New York.

Mexico's Foreign Minister, Mr. Jorge Castaneda is expected to chair this Conference, scheduled to take place in the opening week of the General Assembly. Almost all signatory states will attend and it is expected that many governments will send Foreign Ministers or Heads of State to show their support for this treaty.

All states, both signatories and non-signatories are invited to attend the

Conference.

NGOS SHOULD REGISTER FOR ACCREDITATION TO THIS CONFERENCE BEFORE 31ST AUGUST, 2001

Draft rule 43 provides for the participation of non-governmental organizations. Any NGO wishing to attend needs to apply in writing, with a letter from the organisation and a brief (max. 2 pages) explanation of its work relevant to the conference, to the Secretariat of the Conference Ms. Sari Nurro, Department for Disarmament Affairs, UN Plaza, 10017, New York, USA, Fax:1 212 963 8892 Ph: 1 212 963 9678 Email: nurro@un.org). Permission will be granted by a decision of the Conference.

According to Rule 43, "NGOs will be able to attend open meetings, receive documents of the Conference upon request and to make available at their own cost written contributions on matters under consideration by the Conference."

Further details on registration arrangements will be communicated later by the DDA.

One five-minute statement representing NGO views on Entry Into Force of the CTBT can be made. This statement is being coordinated by Merav Datan, of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War and Physicians for Social Responsibility, Tel: 1 646 865 1883, email: mdatan@ippnw.org

What is the CTBT?

- * The CTBT bans "all nuclear weapon test explosion or any other nuclear explosion" and establishes an extensive International Monitoring System and allows for short-notice on-site inspections.
- * The (CTBT) was negotiated in Geneva by the Conference on Disarmament and was adopted by the General Assembly as a resolution (A/RES/50/245) on 10 September 1996 and opened for signature in September 1996.
- * The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty has been signed by 160 countries and ratified by 76.
- * Under the terms of the treaty, all forty-four countries with nuclear power plants must sign and ratify before it becomes legally binding, or "enters into force". Thirteen of the forty-four have not yet ratified, three have not even signed.¹
- * Article 14 of the CTBT allows for a special conference on accelerating Entry Into Force if the treaty has not entered into force. ² The conference does not have the power to amend the treaty.
- * In October of 1999 the first such Conference on Facilitating the Entry Into Force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test Ban Treaty was held in Vienna. Ninety-two states unanimously adopted a Final Declaration at that meeting hearing over fifty statements examining measures consistent with international law to accelerate the Treaty's ratification.

* Since the 1999 conference, the Treaty has been ratified by twenty-five additional states, six which are in the group of forty-four states essential for the Entry Into Force of the Treaty.

Notes:

1. States that still have to ratify before the CTBT can enter into force: Algeria, China, Colombia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Pakistan, United States of America, Vietnam. India, North Korea and Pakistan have not even signed the Treaty.

2. Article XIV: "If this Treaty has not entered into force three years after the date of the anniversary of its opening for signature, the Depositary shall convene a Conference of the States that have already deposited their instruments of ratification upon the request of a majority of those States. This process shall be repeated at subsequent anniversaries of the opening for signature of this Treaty, until its entry into force."

Why is the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty important?

* The CTBT is an essential step toward nuclear disarmament for over four decades. It bans all nuclear tests, anytime, anywhere and comprehensively. Without the CTBT, the United States, Russia, China, France, the United Kingdom, India and Pakistan are not prohibited from conducting further underground test explosions. The effort to establish an international norm against nuclear testing must not be abandoned after the enormous effort on the part of governments and NGOs, especially when the ratifications of only thirteen states is required for Entry Into Force.

* The Treaty is intended to stop the qualitative nuclear arms race. The CTBT does not prohibit research on nuclear weapons, including subcritical tests. But it is very difficult, if not impossible, to develop new nuclear weapons without nuclear test explosions. This explains why all Nuclear Weapons States have resisted such a treaty for over four decades. Now that an agreement on the test ban has been reached and Entry Into Force is within reach, the effort to establish an international norm against nuclear testing must be actively pursued. Should the CTBT not enter into force, all the enormous effort on the part of governments and NGOs would be lost.

* The CTBT will prevent further health and environmental damage caused by nuclear test explosions once and for all.

* The CTBT will establish a wide-ranging monitoring and verification system, including an International Monitoring System and an International Data Centre, which together with national technical means and ten of thousands of civilian monitoring stations, will detect and deter would-be testers.

What can be achieved at this Second Conference to Facilitate the Entry Into Force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test Ban Treaty?

The second Article XIV Conference is an opportunity for:

- * announcing ratifications and signatures;
- * calling on those states that have not yet signed or ratified the CTBT to join the international consensus to end nuclear testing;
- * urging states with active nuclear weapon research programmes and test sites to take actions that would reinforce the CTBT and support its goals, such as refraining from activities at test sites that might be construed as CTBT violations, halting research, development and production of nuclear nuclear warheads based on modifications of existing designs, that give them new military capabilities;
- * examining ways and means of removing obstacles which delay Entry Into Force;
- * discussing and agreeing on specific measures to convince the last holdout states to support the test ban;
- * support for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Organisation in Vienna that has made significant progress in setting up the International Monitoring System and International Data Center, so that the CTBT's verification system is ready by the time the treaty enters into force;
- * condemning any future testing; and,
- * calling upon governments, businesses and peoples to take decisive action in reaction to any future testing.

What can NGOs do?

- * sign the letter below and send it to your Minister of Foreign Affairs or equivalent, cc it to your Ambassador in New York (see http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org/frames/Gov_Disarm_Contacts/Gov_Disarm_Dir_Frameset.html for a full listing)
- * make an appointment to speak with a representative at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs or equivalent and encourage the Foreign Minister to attend the conference to publicly urge the CTBT hold out states to promptly ratify the Treaty;
- * attend the September 25-27, 2001 Conference on Entry Into Force in New York
- * monitor the September 25-17 Conference on Entry Into Force through the Reaching Critical Will website and react to what your government does or does not say
- * publicize your views and your government's policies on the CTBT to the news media in your country.

For More Information on the 25-27 September 2001 Conference, see:

The Department for Disarmament Affairs
http://www.un.org/Depts/dda/WMD/ctbt/article_iv/index.html

The Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Organization
<http://pws.ctbto.org/>

The Acronym Institute: <http://www.acronym.org>

The Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers: <http://www.crnd.org>

International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War:
<http://www.ippnw.org>

Physicians for Social Responsibility: <http://www.psr.org>

WILPF/Reaching Critical Will: <http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org>

VERTIC: <http://www.vertic.org>

To: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: sign-on letter on CTBT entry into force
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <5.0.1.4.0.20010621102201.00a91a00@[63.106.26.66]>
References:

Daryl,

I'll sign the two letter.

Howard W. Hallman

From: David Robinson <dave@paxchristiusa.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: Hearing witnesses
Date: Thu, 21 Jun 2001 13:39:09 -0400

Sr. Kathleen Pruitt, CSJP
3514 E. Marion St. Seattle, WA 98122-5259
425-451-1770 (w) (She is the Provincial Leader of the Western Province of the Sisters of St. Joseph of Peace)
206-322-9339 (h)

I would like to approach her on this myself first, if its ok. Just give me a go ahead and details. Thanks. Keep it up!
Also, what do you know about Jonathan Granoffs plan with religious leaders?

From: Howard W. Hallman [SMTP:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Wednesday, June 20, 2001 7:35 AM
To: David Robinson
Subject: RE: Hearing witnesses

At 05:40 PM 6/19/01 -0400, you wrote:

>Howard,

>

>One more thought. The new President of the Leadership Conference of Women Religious, a Catholic body comprised of all the leaders of women's religious communities in the US (representing about 100,000 women religious) is a very good friend of mine and Pax Christi leader. She is a powerful presenter and was among those of us that went to Livermore a few years ago. She would be outstanding.

Dave,

What's her name and contact information?

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: David Robinson <dave@paxchristiusa.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: Hearing witnesses
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <01C0FA57.8F99E460@dave.paxchristiusa.org>
References:

At 01:39 PM 6/21/01 -0400, you wrote:

>Sr. Kathleen Pruitt, CSJP

>3514 E. Marion St. Seattle, WA 98122-5259

>425-451-1770 (w) (She is the Provincial Leader of the Western Province of the Sisters of St. Joseph of Peace)

>206-322-9339 (h)

>

>I would like to approach her on this myself first, if its ok. Just give me a go ahead and details.

Dave,

All we are doing is putting together a list of names to suggest to staff aides of Senator Biden and Senator Levin, chairs of the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committee. It is up to them to decide who to invited. So you can ask Sr. Kathleen if she would be willing to be included on such a list.

Q. Also, what do you know about Jonathan Granoffs plan with religious leaders?

A. Jonathan doesn't communicate with me, so I never know what he's up to until it occurs. What is his plan?

Howard

X-Lotus-FromDomain: UCC
From: conoverp@ucc.org
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Date: Thu, 21 Jun 2001 14:23:49 -0400
Subject: Re: Common web site material

Hi Howard,

Thanks for your ongoing faithfulness to this important work.

I've been pretty much out of action for the last two months with a severe fatigue condition. I'm hopeful that I'm coming back now. This is my fourth day in a row of almost regular work. I hope to reengage these issues but I am backed up in more ways than I can count.

Thanks again.

Pat

To: tstarnes@akllp.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Resurrection Prayer Worship Center
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Tom:

In 1998 Carlee and I invested \$10,000 in bonds issued by the Resurrection Prayer Worship Center. This came from our retirement funds. I had heard considerable praise for this congregation and its minister at Holy Boldness meetings that took place at Asbury United Methodist Church in Washington, D.C. The Resurrection children's choir sang at these events. When the bond offering appeared in the conference newspaper, we thought that this would be a worthy investment. Previously we had invested in bonds of the Mill Creek Parish United Methodist Church and were willing to invest in another church in the Baltimore-Washington Conference.

Now we are informed by the Colonial Trust Company that the church, shrunken in size because of the departure of the minister and most of the congregation, proposes to pay bondholders \$1,500,000 in full and final payment of bonds totaling \$4,837,588.69. This means that we would lose approximately \$6,800 of our investment.

Before we vote whether to accept the church's offer, I would like to obtain further information. I would greatly appreciate a reply by Tuesday, June 26 because we are leaving town for nine days on Wednesday morning, June 27 and our vote is due on July 6.

Assets

Your letter of May 29, 2001 to Gerald Morgan, counsel for Colonial Trust, states that if foreclosure occurs, "Resurrection Prayer's property would sell for far less than the \$1.5 million that the Congregation is offering the bondholders." However, the April 8, 1998 offering of bonds cites Stephen M. Sydnor, DRA, that "the 'as-proposed appraisal' market value of the property is \$6,583,000. The offering cautions "There is no assurance that the properties would sell for this amount in the event of default." But a shrinkage of over \$5 million suggests that the market value stated in the offering was vastly exaggerated. Is this the case?

Furthermore, the offering contains the church's balance sheet of December 31, 1997, certified by ESB Enterprises, Inc., showing that the church's asset in property, fixtures and equipment totaled \$3,371,469. Since then further improvements have been made. If this statement was true, what has happened to the assets? Or was this statement of assets also an exaggeration?

The bond offering indicates series "A" bond issue of \$1,939,616 and series "B" bond issue of \$2,700,000 for a total of \$4,639,515. What's happened to this money? Since the church is uncompleted, is some of this money still available? If not, what has it been spent for?

In the Book of Discipline of the United Methodist Church 2542 states that proceeds of a mortgage shall not be used for current expenses. Has this occurred with the bond money? If so, what steps have been taken to recover such misused funds? If this occurs, will they be paid to bondholders now or in the future?

I have heard that the Rev. Dr. C. Anthony Muse and members of the congregation who withdrew in November 1999 took with them assets of the Resurrection Prayer Worship Center. Is this true? If so, what steps have been taken to recover such assets? Will such recovered funds be made available to bondholders now or in the future?

Conference Responsibility

139 and 2501 of the Discipline indicates that titles of local church properties are held in trust by the annual conferences. 2540.3 states that district superintendent shall provide written consent to a mortgage of a local church and that prior to such approval the district superintendent and the district board of church location and building shall review the plan of action. This responsibility is further stated in 2543. Did this occur?

In view of this involvement what is the responsibility of the Baltimore-Washington Conference for the indebtedness of the Resurrection Prayer Worship Center? I realize that the conference has made strong efforts to raise funds to help this local church out of a bad situation. But if the conference holds title in trust, does it have responsibility for the indebtedness?

Beyond any legal obligation there is an ethical responsibility to bondholders. The fact conference officials were presumably involved in review the church's proposal was reassuring. Furthermore, I understand that many investors in church bonds are retirees like ourselves or are persons setting up retirement funds. It's an attractive investment and risks were noted in the offering. But if you can't trust churches, who can you trust?

We will greatly appreciate your response to these questions. It will help us decide whether to accept the church's offer.

With best regards,
Howard W. Hallman

P.S. I am also faxing you a copy of this message to be sure that one of them reaches you promptly.

To: mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Grassroots organization on missile defense
Cc:
Bcc: icnd
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Dear Colleagues:

At the meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament on June 19 we decided to work together on grassroots lobbying on missile defense in several states. We will concentrate on members of the Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees. This will not preclude general alerts to broader networks.

The Friends Committee on National Legislation (FCNL) is in the process of organizing grassroots efforts in Maine to influence Senator Collins from the Armed Services Committee and in Rhode Island to influence Senator Chafee from the Foreign Relations Committee. If any of you have an effective base in either state, please get in touch with David Culp at 202 547-6000, x. 146 or david@fncnl.org and discuss with him how your network can tie into the FCNL-led effort.

We decided to focus on four other states where we have worked in CTBT and de-alerting campaigns. The states and senators are:

Indiana Senator Lugar (Foreign Relations)
Nebraska Senator Hagel (Foreign Relations), Senator Ben Nelson (Armed Services)
Kansas Senator Roberts (Armed Services), Senator Brownback (Foreign Relations)
Oregon Senator Smith (Foreign Relations)

If you are interested in involving your grassroots networks in any of these states, please get in touch with me at 301 896-0013 or reply by e-mail to mupj@igc.org.

If you are willing to take the lead in coordinating this effort in any state, especially in getting someone from your network to take the lead within the state, please let me know.

A major resource will be the common web site material which I discussed in a previous communication.

Our opposition to missile defense is likely to be a long, drawn out effort. We can build our campaign piece by piece, starting in these states and adding others as we are able.

Shalom,
Howard

To: david@fcnl.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Rhode Island contacts
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

David,

In March I was in touch with Sharon Key, interim executive director of the Rhode Island State Council of Churches on de-alerting. They took the FCNL de-alerting to Bush, modified for state use, and converted it to an action alert. The State Council has an Advocay/Justice/Service Department. So this would be a good contact for your missile defense efforts in Rhode Island if you are not already in contact with them. The phone number is 401 861-1700; e-mail is ricouncil@aol.com.

Ron Stief of the UCC office says they have a strong base in Rhode Island (but not much in Maine).

During the CTBT campaign an interfaith delegation met with Senator John Chafee. I have some names from that delegation in case Kathy Guthrie doesn't have them.

Methodists aren't very strong in New England compared to elsewhere in the United States, but I might be able to locate somebody if you want me to.

Howard

To: webctte
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Proposed web site material
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\icnd.095.doc; C:\My Documents\icnd.069.doc; C:\My Documents\10620.02.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Colleagues:

It is time to move ahead with common web site material on missile defense. The above-named addressees have agreed to serve as a committee to select material. The United Methodist General Board of Church and Society has agreed to format it for web posting and to make it available to other faith-based organizations for their use.

As a beginning I propose three items. I am leaving town Wednesday morning, June 27 for nine days. Therefore, I would appreciate your reply by Tuesday afternoon, June 26 so that I can forward approved items to the UMGBCS for process.

(1) Letter of March 5, 2001 from representatives of 27 faith-based organizations to President Bush, including list of signers. If (2) is agreed to, add notation: "The three arguments against missile defense are elaborated in 'National Missile Defense as a Moral Issue' (see below)."

(2) "National Missile Defense as a Moral Issue" by Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice. It was suggested at the June 19 meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament that this should be posted under my name rather than trying to make it into a committee document.

(3) "How Real Is The 'Rogue' Threat?" by Robert Windrem, NBC News from MSNBC.com, June 19, 2001. This article shows that none of the so-called rogue states is even close to having a missile that can reach the U.S. homeland.

I have sent all three items to you previously, but I am sending them again as Word attachments for your convenience.

Please let me know your pleasure on these three items. On the second I have do desire to insist that it be included but will make it available if you think it is useful.

If you have other items to suggest, or other kind of material that should be developed, please reply to all.

Shalom,
Howard

To: mmbruegg@aol.com, EDBruegge@mediaone.net
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: A tally
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Mary and Ed,

In case you are making an early count of attendees at Hallman 2001, here is our tally, all staying at the Comfort Inn in Black Mountain.

Howard and Carlee Hallman, arriving Wednesday, June 27, leaving Sunday, July 1
Beth Johnson, arriving Thursday, June 28, leaving Monday, July 2
Joy Hallman and son Matthew (13); Joy's fiancé, Ken Hayden and children Weston (10), and Kendra (7), arriving midday, Friday, June 29 and leaving Monday, July 2.

Also, Mary Hurrel and Mary Hallman, arriving Wednesday, June 27, leaving Sunday, July 1
Lynette and Rick Mehall, arriving Thursday, June 28, leaving Sunday, July 1
Sara and Mike Vettrano, Nichole (16) and David (14) arriving Thursday, June 28, leaving Sunday, July 1

Edgar and Ernestine picked up my extra room for Thursday evening.

We're looking forward to a great event.

Howard

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

Dear John,

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament is developing common web site material on missile defense that various faith-based organizations can post on their web sites. The piece you wrote on May 8 entitled "'Fuzzy' Logic on Missile Defense" would be a useful item to post. May we use it? If so, would you modify the opening sentence that refers to President Bush's May 1 speech. This somewhat dates the article. We want to post it for continuing use. If you want to refer to this speech, you could strike "recent" and insert where the speech was given.

Please let me know.

Thanks,
Howard

X-Sender: jdi@[63.106.26.66]
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)
Date: Mon, 25 Jun 2001 08:36:22 -0400
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>
Subject: Re: Fuzzy logic piece

If you wait no more than 24 hours, we will have an update. John

At 08:01 AM 06/25/2001 -0400, you wrote:

>Dear John,

>

>The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament is developing common web
>site material on missile defense that various faith-based organizations can
>post on their web sites. The piece you wrote on May 8 entitled "Fuzzy'
>Logic on Missile Defense" would be a useful item to post. May we use it?
>If so, would you modify the opening sentence that refers to President
>Bush's May 1 speech. This somewhat dates the article. We want to post it
>for continuing use. If you want to refer to this speech, you could strike
>"recent" and insert where the speech was given.

>

>Please let me know.

>

>Thanks,

>Howard

>

>

>

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

From: "Paul Lansu" <paul@paxchristi.net>
To: <paul@paxchristi.net>
Subject: e-PRAXIS - An Enduring Factor
Date: Mon, 25 Jun 2001 11:09:26 +0200
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook CWS, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300
Importance: Normal
X-MDAemon-Deliver-To: mupj@igc.org
X-Return-Path: paul@paxchristi.net

e-PRAXIS - Engaging Faith & Society

WORLD CONFERENCE ON RELIGION AND PEACE STATEMENT ON MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS

The World Conference on Religion and Peace, an association of the world's religious communities, reaffirms that the use of nuclear weapons is contrary to the spiritual and moral convictions we share. The very existence of nuclear weapons presupposes the possibility of their use. Therefore, nuclear weapons must be progressively eliminated.

The debate over nuclear weapons is currently focused on the potential deployment of a missile defense system. This issue has profound moral and security implications for the future. It defines a turning point. We face a choice between, on the one hand, a world in which the existence of nuclear weapons and an expanding number of states with nuclear capability are accepted as facts of life, and, on the other, a world in which nuclear weapons are steadily decreased towards total elimination.

Development of missile defense systems can lead to renewed testing and deployment of nuclear weapons, as well as intensify resistance to further reductions in existing nuclear arsenals. It would also signal that nuclear weapons will remain an enduring factor in international relations and thus increase the incentives for additional states to develop nuclear capabilities of their own, resulting in greater horizontal nuclear proliferation.

The current debate also highlights the risks of abrogating the Antiballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty. The ABM Treaty is a cornerstone of the current nuclear arms control regime. Because it limits arms races and keeps open the possibility of eliminating nuclear weapons, its weakening could have grave consequences for the control and elimination of nuclear weapons.

Therefore, the World Conference on Religion and Peace:

- 1) Urges political leaders to exercise maximal restraint, in accord with the ABM Treaty, in developing missile defense systems;
- 2) Appeals to leaders of all states to actively join the search for alternative approaches that bring greater security to all;
- 3) Calls on leaders to fulfill their commitments under international treaties to bring about the elimination of nuclear weapons.

WORLD CONFERENCE ON RELIGION AND PEACE
URGES CAUTION ON MISSILE DEFENSE,
PRESERVATION OF ABM TREATY

Scrapping Treaty Might Lead to Weapons Proliferation,
New Arms Race, Secretary General Notes

New York, May 31, 2001 - Plans for developing and implementing a missile defense system may lead to a new arms race if they weaken the existing arms control framework, according to statements sent to hundreds of world leaders this month by the World Conference on Religion and Peace.

Dr. William F. Vendley, Secretary General of Religions for Peace, noted that a decision by the Bush administration to abrogate the Antiballistic Missile Treaty could endanger international security and lead to the further proliferation of nuclear weapons. Vendley sent personal letters to U.S. President George W. Bush, Russian President Vladimir Putin, Chinese President Jiang Zemin, and other heads of state as well as members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, urging them to take concrete steps toward creating a world free from the threat of nuclear annihilation.

The letters were accompanied by a Statement on Missile Defense that emerged from the most recent meeting of Religions for Peace's Standing Commission on Disarmament and Security and received the endorsement of the organization's International Governing Board, which is comprised of senior leaders of the world's religions.

"Given the pivotal role of the ABM Treaty in the current arms control regime, we are concerned that any weakening of the treaty could endanger the long-term prospects for limiting and eventually eliminating nuclear weapons," Vendley wrote in his letter to President Bush. "Religions for Peace urges the United States and other nations to exercise maximum restraint in considering any unilateral actions that might undermine the ABM Treaty and the recent advances in arms control."

As the largest international coalition of religious leaders dedicated to achieving peace, Religions for Peace has been a leader in disarmament advocacy throughout its 30-year history. "The world's religious communities, and the billions of religious people they represent, hope for a global peace that respects cultural differences while celebrating our common humanity," Vendley noted. "We must continue to pursue additional effective arms control measures that will bring greater security to all the world's citizens."

Dr. William F. Vendley
Secretary General

May 10, 2001

His Excellency Kofi Annan
Secretary General
The United Nations

Your Excellency:

On behalf of the Governing Board of the World Conference on Religion and Peace, the largest international coalition of religious leaders dedicated to achieving peace worldwide, I have the honor of submitting to you a statement of concern regarding the United States' development of a missile defense system and apparent desire to withdraw from the Antiballistic Missile Treaty.

Religions for Peace has long shared the widespread unease over the threat a missile shield may pose to the stability of the international arms control regime - specifically, that unless steps are taken to safeguard international compliance with current agreements, a missile defense system may result in a further proliferation of nuclear weapons. Given the pivotal role of the ABM Treaty in the current latticework of agreements, on a global level far beyond its original bilateral focus, we are concerned that America's withdrawal could endanger the long-term prospects for limiting and eventually eliminating nuclear weapons.

Fully appreciative of Your Excellency's commitment to disarmament, Religions for Peace respectfully requests Your Excellency's continued good offices in ensuring that international responses to the potential creation of missile defense systems will take into account the ABM Treaty's longstanding success in limiting the arms race, and will not result in further proliferation of missile technology around the globe. We recognize that the treaty includes provision for its amendment by the United States and Russia; this provision may provide a way to respond to new threats without undermining the treaty's strengths.

The world's religious communities, and the billions of religious people they represent, hope for a global peace that respects cultural differences while celebrating our common humanity. Your Excellency, your leadership is greatly needed in the pursuit of arms control measures that will bring greater security to all the world's citizens. Religions for Peace offers you its full support in your exercise of that leadership.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. William F. Vendley
Secretary General
World Conference on Religion and Peace (WCRP)
777 United Nations Plaza
New York, New York 10017 USA
Website: www.wcrp.org

Edited and compiled by Rev. Gary Leonard
teologie@bigfoot.com

This material is being reposted for wider distribution by e-PRAXIS
as a means to provide accessible information and analysis
thus promoting meaningful and informative engagement by religious
communities on issues that advance economic, political and social justice
and the full spectrum of human rights.

To be added to the distribution list please send a blank e-mail to
join-e-praxis@elist.co.za. For more information about reposted material,
please contact directly the source mentioned in the posting.

e-PRAXIS
Rev. Gary S D Leonard
14 Morrison Road, Ashley
Pinetown, 3610
KwaZulu-Natal South Africa
E-mail: teologie@bigfoot.com

11. "Anderson Anti-Nuke Resolution Challenges Bush, Putin," The Salt Lake Tribune, June 24, 2001, Sunday

by KEVIN CANTERA, THE SALT LAKE TRIBUNE

Salt Lake City Mayor Rocky Anderson -- known as a political maverick -- stepped up to the international soapbox Saturday when he challenged President Bush and his Russian counterpart to lead the world in eliminating nuclear weapons.

Home battling stomach flu, Anderson was unable to personally present his resolution, "The Elimination of Nuclear Weapons" to about 500 mayors from around the nation gathered in Detroit.

But Anderson's resolution was introduced to the U. S. Conference of Mayors, and will be voted on by the group Monday, the same day Bush is scheduled to address the meeting.

The president's support for an anti-missile defense initiative, designed to protect cities from nuclear attack, was a major issue when Bush held a summit with Russian President Vladimir Putin earlier this month.

"If nuclear weapons are ever used, it is virtually certain that one or more of our cities will be the target . . . We ask the American and Russian presidents to declare their firm commitment to the task of eliminating nuclear weapons from the face of the earth," reads the resolution, which resembles one recently passed by a group of 94 international mayors.

"This is an important issue for cities globally," said Josh Ewing, communications director for Anderson. "One of our own local political leaders is making a call for global action."

About 80 resolutions are passed every year at the mayor' conference.

A statement read to the conference in Anderson's behalf said: "We must speak out about the need to eliminate nuclear weapons from our world. This is an achievable goal. As mayors, we can help lead the way."

Anderson's illness also prevented him from personally accepting an award from his peers recognizing a program designed to make city streets safer for pedestrians.

To: mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: "Rogue" Threat Is Minimal"
Cc:
Bcc: mupjbd, umbishops, umconf, umcs, umgbcs, umpj
X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\10620.02.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Peace/Justice Alert #3
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
June 25, 2001

"ROGUE" THREAT' IS MINIMAL

President George W. Bush and other advocates of national missile claim that it's needed to protect the United States from long-range missile attack from "rouge" states, such as North Korean, Iran, and Iraq. However, a recently analysis by Robert Windrem, an investigative produce for NBC News, shows that this isn't a real threat.

Mr. Windrem's entire article is included below and is also sent as a Word attachment. Please forgive the length, but we want you to read the entire analysis.

We suggest that you print out copies and send them to your U.S senators and representatives. Ask them to read the analysis and tell you whether this information conforms with what they know about the threat from so-called "rogue" states. Ask them if the threat is so minimal, and will be for the foreseeable future, why spend so much to develop a missile defense. We are interested in receiving copies of their replies.

In your letter to members of Congress you can point out that the United Methodists General Conference opposes development and deployment of "strategic antimissile defense systems because they are illusory, unnecessary, and wasteful." Robert Windrem's article underscores that national missile defense is unnecessary.

On the matter wastefulness, you can quote the words of President Dwight D. Eisenhower, who said in 1953, "Every gun made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and not clothed." You can tell your senators and representatives that an enormous theft of the public treasury is occurring as vast funds are channeled to a few large defense contractors to deal with a threat that is minimal.

If you are in touch with action networks, please forward this alert to them.

Howard W. Hallman

###

"How Real Is The 'Rogue' Threat?"
MSNBC.com - June 19, 2001 - By Robert Windrem, NBC News

U.S. intelligence details missiles that fall far short of U.S. shores

As President Bush, forging ahead with a plan to build a national missile shield, continues to trumpet the threat posed by missiles from so-called "rogue" nations, no missile currently deployed by countries hostile to the United States has the range to strike any of the 50 U.S. states. And only one missile system currently being developed by a foreign nation would have

such a capability in the near future, according to intelligence and expert analysis.

Of the five "rogue" states usually mentioned in discussions of missile programs - Iran, Iraq, Libya, North Korea and Pakistan - only North Korea has what can be called an advanced missile development program. North Korea's Taepo-Dong 2 missile, still under development, would have the range to strike the United States - but likely only at Alaska's thinly populated western edge, or under the most optimistic assessments, the city of Anchorage. While it would be the first missile strike on U.S. soil, it would do little damage to U.S. strategic interests and would almost certainly be met by a devastating U.S. counterstrike, and that would do little damage to U.S. strategic interests, say U.S. officials.

Only two of the five "rogue" nations - North Korea and Pakistan - have nuclear weapons, and only Pakistan is believed to have successfully built nuclear warheads for its missiles. While U.S. intelligence believes North Korea has built one or two nuclear weapons, there is no evidence that it has built missile warheads, say U.S. intelligence sources, speaking on condition of anonymity.

Limited Programs

The five countries' missile development programs are hindered by other limitations, say U.S. officials and independent experts:

*None has fielded a missile with a solid rocket engine or even tested such an engine in flight. Each uses liquid fuel engines, which require hours and in some cases days to load and fire. A solid rocket engine can be lighted and fired within in minutes.

*None of the states have extensive missile-launch facilities or even missile-development facilities. North Korea's facility on the Sea of Japan is limited to a single, unprotected launch pad and nearby assembly building, connected by a dirt road.

*None have the industrial capability to build even moderately large numbers of missiles.

North Korea's Taepo Dong-2, the most advanced missile in development by any of the "rogue" states, has yet to be fired from the Koreans' rudimentary missile-test facility.

Under the most optimistic assessments, the missile would have a range of 3,600 miles when fielded, U.S. intelligence officials say. At that 3,600-mile range, it could strike as far east as Anchorage. If its range is at the low end of estimates - 2,400 miles - it could strike only the westernmost islands of Alaska's sparsely populated Aleutian chain.

The Taepo-Dong 2, named for the city where it is built, would need a range of more than 4,800 miles to strike the U.S. mainland, and somewhat less to hit Hawaii.

"North Korea has a very modest facility ... more of a missile proving

ground, like White Sands out of 1946, not Vandenberg [Air Force Base] or the Kennedy Space Center," said Tim Brown, senior analyst for Globalsecurity.org. The White Sands Proving Ground was established in New Mexico at the tail end of World War II by the U.S. military to test new weapons' systems.

Short-Range Weapons

No other nation on the "rogue" list has fielded a missile with a range greater than 900 miles, according to U.S. officials. Pakistan has the Ghauri missile, which it bought from North Korea and renamed for a Muslim king who invaded Pakistan's archrival India. Iran has yet to test any missile with a range greater than 600 miles.

Libya has only Scud-B missiles with ranges of 180 miles, and Iraq is limited by U.N. sanctions to missiles with ranges no greater than 90 miles. Although Baghdad is believed to have hid Scud missiles from weapons inspectors, none have ranges greater than 540 miles. Development programs in each of those states is aimed at incremental increases in range, officials say.

Two of the missiles - the Pakistani Ghauri and the Iranian Shehab - are derivatives of North Korea's No-Dong missiles, which Pyongyang has sold and transported by both ship and cargo aircraft to buyer nations.

"One question is how reliable these systems would be," said Globalsecurity's Brown. "Putting a crude rudimentary system in operation without doing a lot of testing is risky. Military generals want a lot of testing. The question is, is this a serious military program or a terrorist program where you wouldn't necessarily have a lot of testing?"

The United States fears that North Korea could ultimately sell the longer range missiles it has under development as well. Still, because of geography, even if the Pakistanis or Iranians bought a North Korean missile and wanted to aim at the United States instead of one of their neighbors, neither is close enough to to strike even Alaska.

'Rogue' threat? -- Missile ranges fall short of U.S. shores

Iran

Scud C: 300 miles, Status -- deployed

Shehab-3: 600 miles, Status -- tested

Shehab-4: 900 miles, Status -- in development

Distance to US -- 5,400 miles (Alaska), 7,200 miles (Mainland)

Libya

Scud B: 180 miles, Status -- deployed

Distance to US -- 7,200 miles (Alaska), 9,000 miles (Mainland)

Iraq

Ababil-100: 60 miles, Status -- deployed

al-Samoud: 90 miles, Status -- tested

al-Hussein: 360 miles, Status -- forbidden, possibly hidden

al-Abbas: 540 miles, Status -- forbidden, possibly hidden

Distance to US -- 5,400 miles (Alaska), 7,800 miles (Mainland)

North Korea

Scud B: 180 miles, Status -- deployed

Scud C: 300 miles, Status -- deployed

No Dong: 600 miles, Status -- tested

Taepo Dong 1: 900+ miles, Status -- tested

Taepo Dong2: 3,600 miles, Status -- in development

Distance to US -- 2,400 miles (Alaska), 4,800 miles (Mainland)

Pakistan

Shaheen: 180 miles, Status -- deployed

Tarmuk: 180 miles, Status -- deployed

Ghauri: 900 miles, Status -- deployed

Distance to US -- 4,800 miles (Alaska), 6,600 miles (Mainland)

Note: Distances to the US are calculated over the pole or west to east. Flying east to west, even though shorter in some cases, is inefficient since the missiles would be flying against the rotation of the earth, lengthening the flight.

Robert Windrem is an investigative producer for NBC News.

To: mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: "Rogue" Threat Is Minimal
Cc:
Bcc: icnd
X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\10620.02.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Dear Colleagues:

I want to share with you a Peace/Justice Alert that I have sent out to United Methodist contacts. It attaches the article "How Real Is The 'Rogue' Threat?" by Robert Windrem of NBC News. It's a longer alert than usual, but I want to get Windrem's article in broader circulation. You may want to do something like this for your networks.

Howard

###

Peace/Justice Alert #3
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
June 25, 2001

"ROGUE" THREAT' IS MINIMAL

President George W. Bush and other advocates of national missile claim that it's needed to protect the United States from long-range missile attack from "rouge" states, such as North Korean, Iran, and Iraq. However, a recently analysis by Robert Windrem, an investigative produce for NBC News, shows that this isn't a real threat.

Mr. Windrem's entire article is included below and is also sent as a Word attachment. Please forgive the length, but we want you to read the entire analysis.

We suggest that you print out copies and send them to your U.S senators and representatives. Ask them to read the analysis and tell you whether this information conforms with what they know about the threat from so-called "rogue" states. Ask them if the threat is so minimal, and will be for the foreseeable future, why spend so much to develop a missile defense. We are interested in receiving copies of their replies.

In your letter to members of Congress you can point out that the United Methodists General Conference opposes development and deployment of "strategic antimissile defense systems because they are illusory, unnecessary, and wasteful." Robert Windrem's article underscores that national missile defense is unnecessary.

On the matter wastefulness, you can quote the words of President Dwight D. Eisenhower, who said in 1953, "Every gun made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and not clothed." You can tell your senators and representatives that an enormous theft of the public treasury is occurring as vast funds are channeled to a few large defense contractors to deal with a threat that is minimal.

If you are in touch with action networks, please forward this alert to them.

Howard W. Hallman

###

"How Real Is The 'Rogue' Threat?"

MSNBC.com - June 19, 2001 - By Robert Windrem, NBC News

U.S. intelligence details missiles that fall far short of U.S. shores

As President Bush, forging ahead with a plan to build a national missile shield, continues to trumpet the threat posed by missiles from so-called "rogue" nations, no missile currently deployed by countries hostile to the United States has the range to strike any of the 50 U.S. states. And only one missile system currently being developed by a foreign nation would have such a capability in the near future, according to intelligence and expert analysis.

Of the five "rogue" states usually mentioned in discussions of missile programs - Iran, Iraq, Libya, North Korea and Pakistan - only North Korea has what can be called an advanced missile development program. North Korea's Taepo-Dong 2 missile, still under development, would have the range to strike the United States - but likely only at Alaska's thinly populated western edge, or under the most optimistic assessments, the city of Anchorage. While it would be the first missile strike on U.S. soil, it would do little damage to U.S. strategic interests and would almost certainly be met by a devastating U.S. counterstrike, and that would do little damage to U.S. strategic interests, say U.S. officials.

Only two of the five "rogue" nations - North Korea and Pakistan - have nuclear weapons, and only Pakistan is believed to have successfully built nuclear warheads for its missiles. While U.S. intelligence believes North Korea has built one or two nuclear weapons, there is no evidence that it has built missile warheads, say U.S. intelligence sources, speaking on condition of anonymity.

Limited Programs

The five countries' missile development programs are hindered by other limitations, say U.S. officials and independent experts:

*None has fielded a missile with a solid rocket engine or even tested such an engine in flight. Each uses liquid fuel engines, which require hours and in some cases days to load and fire. A solid rocket engine can be lighted and fired within in minutes.

*None of the states have extensive missile-launch facilities or even missile-development facilities. North Korea's facility on the Sea of Japan is limited to a single, unprotected launch pad and nearby assembly building, connected by a dirt road.

*None have the industrial capability to build even moderately large numbers of missiles.

North Korea's Taepo Dong-2, the most advanced missile in development by any of the "rogue" states, has yet to be fired from the Koreans' rudimentary missile-test facility.

Under the most optimistic assessments, the missile would have a range of 3,600 miles when fielded, U.S. intelligence officials say. At that 3,600-mile range, it could strike as far east as Anchorage. If its range is at the low end of estimates - 2,400 miles - it could strike only the westernmost islands of Alaska's sparsely populated Aleutian chain.

The Taepo-Dong 2, named for the city where it is built, would need a range of more than 4,800 miles to strike the U.S. mainland, and somewhat less to hit Hawaii.

"North Korea has a very modest facility ... more of a missile proving ground, like White Sands out of 1946, not Vandenberg [Air Force Base] or the Kennedy Space Center," said Tim Brown, senior analyst for Globalsecurity.org. The White Sands Proving Ground was established in New Mexico at the tail end of World War II by the U.S. military to test new weapons' systems.

Short-Range Weapons

No other nation on the "rogue" list has fielded a missile with a range greater than 900 miles, according to U.S. officials. Pakistan has the Ghauri missile, which it bought from North Korea and renamed for a Muslim king who invaded Pakistan's archrival India. Iran has yet to test any missile with a range greater than 600 miles.

Libya has only Scud-B missiles with ranges of 180 miles, and Iraq is limited by U.N. sanctions to missiles with ranges no greater than 90 miles. Although Baghdad is believed to have hid Scud missiles from weapons inspectors, none have ranges greater than 540 miles. Development programs in each of those states is aimed at incremental increases in range, officials say.

Two of the missiles - the Pakistani Ghauri and the Iranian Shehab - are derivatives of North Korea's No-Dong missiles, which Pyongyang has sold and transported by both ship and cargo aircraft to buyer nations.

"One question is how reliable these systems would be," said Globalsecurity's Brown. "Putting a crude rudimentary system in operation without doing a lot of testing is risky. Military generals want a lot of testing. The question is, is this a serious military program or a terrorist program where you wouldn't necessarily have a lot of testing?"

The United States fears that North Korea could ultimately sell the longer range missiles it has under development as well. Still, because of geography, even if the Pakistanis or Iranians bought a North Korean missile and wanted to aim at the United States instead of one of their neighbors, neither is close enough to strike even Alaska.

'Rogue' threat? -- Missile ranges fall short of U.S. shores

Iran

Scud C: 300 miles, Status -- deployed

Shehab-3: 600 miles, Status -- tested

Shehab-4: 900 miles, Status -- in development
Distance to US -- 5,400 miles (Alaska), 7,200 miles (Mainland)

Libya
Scud B: 180 miles, Status -- deployed
Distance to US -- 7,200 miles (Alaska), 9,000 miles (Mainland)

Iraq
Ababil-100: 60 miles, Status -- deployed
al-Samoud: 90 miles, Status -- tested
al-Hussein: 360 miles, Status -- forbidden, possibly hidden
al-Abbas: 540 miles, Status -- forbidden, possibly hidden
Distance to US -- 5,400 miles (Alaska), 7,800 miles (Mainland)

North Korea
Scud B: 180 miles, Status -- deployed
Scud C: 300 miles, Status -- deployed
No Dong: 600 miles, Status -- tested
Taepo Dong 1: 900+ miles, Status -- tested
Taepo Dong2: 3,600 miles, Status -- in development
Distance to US -- 2,400 miles (Alaska), 4,800 miles (Mainland)

Pakistan
Shaheen: 180 miles, Status -- deployed
Tarmuk: 180 miles, Status -- deployed
Ghauri: 900 miles, Status -- deployed
Distance to US -- 4,800 miles (Alaska), 6,600 miles (Mainland)

Note: Distances to the US are calculated over the pole or west to east.
Flying east to west, even though shorter in some cases, is inefficient
since the missiles would be flying against the rotation of the earth,
lengthening the flight.

Robert Windrem is an investigative producer for NBC News.

Reply-To: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
From: "Brink Campaign" <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
To: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
Subject: TOASTER AND TOAST CARDS TO CONGRESS!
Date: Mon, 25 Jun 2001 02:50:40 -0400
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)
Importance: Normal
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6600

Please pass this message on to your contacts and encourage them to use these resources over the summer and fall. Ask them to urge House and Senate members to take action to remove missiles from hair-trigger alert.

TOASTER AND TOAST CARDS TO CONGRESS!

Back from the Brink is launching a National Message and Media Campaign to run from July through November 2001.

THE THEME: "IN THE TIME IT TAKES TO MAKE TOAST—WE COULD ALL BE TOAST!"

TOASTERS TO CONGRESS—In September, every member of Congress will receive a box from the Brink Campaign. Inside will be a working toaster, with toast-shaped stickers on each side that say: "In the Time it Takes to Make Toast—We Could All be Toast!" (We will also include briefing material on de-alerting).

The toaster will have a red tab sticking out, labeled "Pull." Who could resist? When the tab is pulled, missiles pop out of the toast holders! We see these "de-alerting toasters" having a long shelf life in Congressional offices-- making toast and bagels, and continuing to send our message.

Toasters are available to you for the cost of shipping and handling, for conferences, workshops or speaking engagements. Along with the "Toast Cards" described below, they will make a great addition to your Hiroshima Day activities.

TOAST CARDS TO CONGRESS: From NOW through November, we want to flood the House and Senate with "Toast Cards" with the same slogan as the toasters. Each set of "Toast Cards" has a pre-addressed card for your Senators and Representative, and room for your personal message and return address.

The "Toast Cards" will be available July 1 for use at rallies, fairs, family gatherings, shopping malls, and concerts, with your friends and contacts.

MEDIA MATERIAL: We will have ad slicks, a newspaper ad and TV ad, web page and moving e-mail message as the campaign evolves.

ORDER YOUR SUPPLY OF TOAST CARDS AND A TOASTER TODAY.

Order up to 100 Toast Cards FREE! by returning this e-mail. For larger orders, and to order a toaster use the attached order form, which includes shipping and handling costs.

We look forward to getting your order soon. We already have orders for over 50,000 cards.

Ira and Esther

Attached is a PDF version of the toastcard for your info.

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\Toast order form.doc"

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\9270-014 Toast Cards Fin.pdf"

To: gsinstitute@topica.com
From: Global Security Institute
Subject: GSI: U.S. MAYORS ASK BUSH TO COMMIT TO ELIMINATING NUCLEAR WEAPONS
Date: Mon, 25 Jun 2001 12:04:19 -0700
Reply-To: zack@gsinstitute.org
X-Topica-Id: <993495828.inmta006.29113.1126014>
X-Topica-Loop: 1700001278
List-Help: List-Unsubscribe: List-Subscribe:
List-Archive: User-Agent: Microsoft-Outlook-Express-Macintosh-Edition/5.02.2022

GLOBAL SECURITY INSTITUTE NEWS RELEASE

Kent Communications
Box 431 Garrison NY 10524 tel 845/424-8382 fax 845/424-8382
skent@kentcom.com

NEWS RELEASE

Contacts: Stephen Kent cell: 914-589-5988, office: 845-424-8382
Tyler Stevenson, Global Security Institute 415-775-6760

U. S. MAYORS ASK BUSH TO COMMIT TO ELIMINATING NUCLEAR WEAPONS

[Detroit --June 25, 2001] As President Bush addressed the U.S. Conference of Mayors in Detroit today, a statement from mayors of major cities in the U. S. and abroad was released, calling on him to reduce and eliminate nuclear weapons "with all deliberate speed," and "to declare your firm commitment to the task of eliminating nuclear weapons from the face of the earth."

In addition, minutes before the President's arrival to address them today, the plenary meeting of the U. S. Mayor's Conference reaffirmed from the floor its policy in favor of eliminating nuclear weapons.

The mayors' interest in nuclear policy is significant in light of the Bush administration considering a proposal for deep cuts in U.S. arsenals down to 1000 warheads, the upcoming nuclear posture review, and the White House's interest in framing a new post-Cold War nuclear policy.

The mayors are concerned about the fact that the two most plausible nuclear threats against the U. S. today, a terrorist attack or an

accidental launch of Russian nuclear missiles, would be targeted to U. S. cities.

The possibility of a terrorist strike via boat or truck bomb or other form would not be mitigated by the Bush administration's proposed national missile defense. An accidental launch in which Russia's deteriorating early warning systems mistake a weather rocket or meteor for a ballistic missile, triggering a mistaken retaliatory strike, cannot be deterred by maintaining U. S. nuclear arsenals. In fact, they can only be prevented by nuclear disarmament and elimination of fissile material that might fall into terrorist hands.

According to such nuclear security experts as Ambassador Richard Butler, the former chief arms inspector in Iraq, the global, verifiable elimination of nuclear weapons is the only safeguard we have against the nuclear threat to U. S. cities. Russian command and control systems have deteriorated further and the danger of accidental launches has grown accordingly since the last documented close brush with a mistaken nuclear strike by Russia against the U.S. in 1995. Meanwhile, nuclear states' continued production of fissile material increases the likelihood of terrorist groups obtaining a nuclear weapon.

"Many cities represented by mayors at the U. S. Conference today are specifically targeted by nuclear weapons," said Salt Lake City Mayor Rocky Anderson. "No matter what the likelihood of the weapons actually falling on our cities, the catastrophic consequences of even one nuclear mishap are unacceptable and unnecessary."

"We believe it is our responsibility to speak out," says the mayors' statement released today, "for if nuclear weapons are ever again used, it is virtually certain that one or more of our cities will be the target and the people we represent will be the victims."

"What the mayors are essentially saying," said Tyler Stevenson of the Global Security Institute, "is that we have a fundamental choice before us. We can choose to maintain and modernize our arsenals, endlessly managing the dangers of nuclear deterrence, which perpetuates the targeting of our own cities. Or we can choose to get rid of the weapons, taking U.S. cities and their residents out of nuclear harm's way."

The new statement was spearheaded by the Global Security Institute (GSI) and its founder, the late Senator Alan Cranston, who died on December 31, 2000. The full text and list of signatories is available on the GSI website, www.gsainstitute.org.

http://www.gsainstitute.org/news_arch/mayors/Statement_Mayors.pdf
http://www.gsainstitute.org/news_arch/mayors/Signatories.pdf
http://www.gsainstitute.org/news_arch/mayors/Mayors_Background.pdf

Among the signers of statement are past and present mayors from 37 major U. S. cities, including:

Albuquerque Mayor Jim Baca
Ann Arbor Mayor Ingrid Sheldon
Atlanta Mayor Bill Campbell
Baltimore Mayor Martin O'Malley
Former Mayor Kurt Schmoke
Boston Mayor Thomas Menino
Chapel Hill Rosemary Waldorf
Chicago Mayor Richard M. Daley
Cincinnati Mayor Charlie Luken
Cleveland Mayor Michael White
Dallas Mayor Ronald Kirk
Denver Mayor Wellington Webb, chair of the 2001 U.S. Mayors'
Conference International Affairs Committee
Des Moines Mayor Preston Daniels
Detroit Mayor Dennis Archer, host of the 2001 U.S. Conference of
Mayors
Hartford Mayor Mike Peters
Honolulu Mayor Jeremy Harris
Little Rock Mayor Jim Dailey
Louisville Mayor David Armstrong
Madison Mayor Susan J. M. Bauman
Newark Mayor Sharpe James
New Orleans Mayor Marc Morial, incoming president of the U.S.
Conference of Mayors
Oakland Mayor Jerry Brown
Former Mayor Elihu Harris
Philadelphia Former Mayor Edward Rendell
Pittsburgh Mayor Tom Murphy
Portland (ME) Former Mayor Thomas Kane
Portland (OR) Mayor Vera Katz
Providence Mayor Vincent Cianci
Sacramento Mayor Jimmie Yee
Former Mayor Joe Serna, Jr.
Salem (OR) Mayor Mike Swaim
San Francisco Mayor Willie Brown
San Jose Mayor Ron Gonzales
Former Mayor Susan Hammer
San Juan, P.R. Alcadesa Sila Maria Calderon

Santa Cruz Mayor Keith Sugar
Seattle Mayor Paul Schell
Saint Louis Mayor Calrence Harmon
Salt Lake City Mayor Rocky Anderson
Former Mayor Deedee Corradini
Tucson Mayor George Miller
Washington, DC Mayor Anthony Williams

Several of these mayors are available to the media for comment on today's statement on eliminating nuclear weapons. In addition, others who can speak to the statement, including Bishop Thomas Gumbleton of the Detroit Archdiocese, several officials of the Global Security Institute and nationally recognized nuclear policy experts are also available for interviews. For more information and interviews, please call Stephen Kent in Detroit today at the U. S. Conference of Mayors at 914-589-5988. Thereafter, please call 845-424-8382.

#####

==^=====

EASY UNSUBSCRIBE click here: <http://topica.com/u/?b1db9C.b2zezs>
Or send an email To: gsinstitute-unsubscribe@topica.com
This email was sent to: mupj@igc.org

T O P I C A -- Register now to manage your mail!
<http://www.topica.com/partner/tag02/register>

==^=====

To: cpepper@towerhill.org, EAABurns@aol.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Hallman 2004
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Carol and Ellen,

When we gather at the Hallman 2001 Reunion in North Carolina, we will decide whether to have Hallman 2004 in Washington, D.C. and which dates to choose.

So that you can participate in this decision, will you please read the following information, fill out the form, and return it to me. I'm leaving Wednesday morning, June 27, so I would appreciate a quick reply.

We'll miss you in 2001 but hope to see you in 2004.

Cordially,
Howard

###

HALLMAN 2004 in Washington, D.C.

The Howard Hallman family invites you to observe the Hallman 2004 Reunion in Washington, D.C. This will give you an opportunity to visit sites in the nation's capitol: White House, U.S. Capitol, Supreme Court Building, major monuments, and the many branches of the Smithsonian Institution. For the latter you can get special access through Ben Spencer, who works there.

We propose two alternate dates encompassing the three nights of Thursday to Saturday, June 24 to 26 or Friday to Sunday, July 2 to 4. This would add an extra night to the reunion, a necessity to be there on the 4th of July and an advantage for the earlier date to give more time for sightseeing. In either case the reunion dinner would occur on Saturday night. There is a large folklife festival on the Mall that usually starts about ten days before July 4, so it would be going on either weekend. The later date would give you an opportunity to see the July 4th fireworks display.

The most convenient location is the Holiday Inn Capitol, situated two short blocks from the Air and Space Museum and the Mall. For June 24-26 the daily rate per room would be \$149 plus tax (now at 14%). Rooms contain either two double beds or one king size; one folding bed can be added. The daily rate for July 2-4 would be \$169 plus tax. The higher rate is because of greater demand around July 4th. The current price for a dinner buffet is \$30 to \$33 with taxes raising the price to around \$40; presumably there would be a lower rate for children.

Thus, the total cost would be more than we have been spending for hotel and the dinner at previous Hallman reunions. Even with this information our e-mail survey revealed a strong interest in going to Washington for Hallman 2004. The question is: which weekend. The weekend of July 4 would cost about \$70 per room more. The advantage would be an opportunity to observe Independence Day in the nation's capitol. (Some might think the larger crowds to be a disadvantage.)

Holiday Inn Capitol is holding both dates for us. To help us decide, please fill out the following form and send it to Howard. He can answer any questions you might have.

____ Yes, we would like to have Hallman 2004 in Washington, D.C.

Of the suggested dates, we prefer: ____ June 24-26 ____ July 2-4

We would need ____ room(s). ____ We would like to attend but would stay elsewhere.

List names of who might attend; provide ages of children in 2004.

Signed:

From: EAABurns@aol.com

Date: Tue, 26 Jun 2001 17:51:58 EDT

Subject: Re: Hallman 2004

To: mupj@igc.org X-Mailer: AOL 6.0 for Windows US sub 10519

We do not have a strong preference for either date but will put a vote in for July 2-4.

In 2004: Caitlin will be 15 years old
Brendan will be 13 years old
Christopher will be 11 years old

Ellen

From: EAABurns@aol.com
Date: Tue, 26 Jun 2001 17:53:33 EDT
Subject: Re: Hallman 2004
To: mupj@igc.org
X-Mailer: AOL 6.0 for Windows US sub 10519

Forgot - we will probably need two rooms.....

Thanks,
Ellen

To: mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: FY2002 budget for missile defense
Cc:
Bcc: icnd
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Dear Colleagues:

President Bush is finally submitting his FY2002 defense budget. A Pentagon spokesman says that \$7.5 billion will be proposed for missile defense, a considerable increase. We need to respond vigorously to state our opposition. Therefore, I have drafted the following letter addressed to members of the House and Senate Armed Services Committee and Appropriations Committees. It would be signed by representatives of faith-based organizations, such as heads of Washington offices, and be hand delivered to members of these committees. The text could then be adapted to alerts to action networks.

I'm leaving for a nine-day vacation on Wednesday morning, June 27 and will be back in my office on Friday, July 6. While I am away, I would like for you to review the draft letter, send me your comments, and indicate whether your office would be a potential signer. I will circulate all comments I receive. Then we can decide whether to move ahead with such a letter and what modifications to make in the text.

Shalom,
Howard

###

Proposed letter to members of House and Senate Armed Services Committees and Appropriation Committees from representatives of faith-based organizations

Dear Representative/Senator: (to be individualized)

President Dwight D. Eisenhower in an address before the American Society of Newspaper Editors on April 16, 1953 stated: "Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed." This statement is so important to the Eisenhower legacy that these words are engraved on the walls by his tomb in Abilene, Kansas.

A huge theft of this nature is contained in the defense authorization and appropriation bills for the 2002 fiscal year. It comes in the form of proposed \$7.5 billion in spending for national missile defense. This would steal money from efforts to "Leave No Child Behind", to provide adequate health care for millions of America, and to meet other urgent social needs. This is clearly wrong and immoral.

It is doubly wrong because there is no credible threat to the American homeland from long-range missiles. Only Russia, China, the United Kingdom, and France have missiles of that range, but they aren't on the danger list offered by missile defense proponents. Of the so-called "rogue" states that are said to be a danger, only North Korea has tried to develop a long-range missile. This program is under suspension and could be permanently terminated through diplomacy and selective financial assistance. Moreover, it isn't credible that North Korea would attack the United States because of the assurance of massive retaliation. No other potentially hostile state has an effective missile program that would endanger the United States. There are numerous nonproliferation measures that can prevent them from developing one.

The beneficiaries of the national missile defense program are not the American people but rather large defense contractors. They are spending millions every year in political campaign contributions and lobbying operations to promote missile defense. This calls to mind President Eisenhower's warning in his farewell address to the American people: "In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex." You who serve on authorization and appropriation committees should be our guardians.

For these reasons, we ask you to cut back on authorization and appropriations for national missile defense and to redirect these resources to programs that meet important human and community needs.

Sincerely yours,

Representatives of faith-based organizations

X-Sender: mupj@pop2.igc.org
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.3 (32)
Date: Tue, 26 Jun 2001 19:40:09 -0400
To: mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: FY2002 budget for missile defense

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Dear Colleagues:

President Bush is finally submitting his FY2002 defense budget. A Pentagon spokesman says that \$7.5 billion will be proposed for missile defense, a considerable increase. We need to respond vigorously to state our opposition. Therefore, I have drafted the following letter addressed to members of the House and Senate Armed Services Committee and Appropriations Committees. It would be signed by representatives of faith-based organizations, such as heads of Washington offices, and be hand delivered to members of these committees. The text could then be adapted to alerts to action networks.

I'm leaving for a nine-day vacation on Wednesday morning, June 27 and will be back in my office on Friday, July 6. While I am away, I would like for you to review the draft letter, send me your comments, and indicate whether your office would be a potential signer. I will circulate all comments I receive. Then we can decide whether to move ahead with such a letter and what modifications to make in the text.

Shalom,
Howard

###

Proposed letter to members of House and Senate Armed Services Committees and Appropriation Committees from representatives of faith-based organizations

Dear Representative/Senator: (to be individualized)

President Dwight D. Eisenhower in an address before the American Society of Newspaper Editors on April 16, 1953 stated: "Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed." This statement is so important to the Eisenhower legacy that these words are engraved on the walls by his tomb in Abilene, Kansas.

A huge theft of this nature is contained in the defense authorization and appropriation bills for the 2002 fiscal year. It comes in the form of proposed \$7.5 billion in spending for national missile defense. This would steal money from efforts to "Leave No Child Behind", to provide adequate health care for millions of America, and to meet other urgent social needs. This is clearly wrong and immoral.

It is doubly wrong because there is no credible threat to the American

homeland from long-range missiles. Only Russia, China, the United Kingdom, and France have missiles of that range, but they aren't on the danger list offered by missile defense proponents. Of the so-called "rogue" states that are said to be a danger, only North Korea has tried to develop a long-range missile. This program is under suspension and could be permanently terminated through diplomacy and selective financial assistance. Moreover, it isn't credible that North Korea would attack the United States because of the assurance of massive retaliation. No other potentially hostile state has an effective missile program that would endanger the United States. There are numerous nonproliferation measures that can prevent them from developing one.

The beneficiaries of the national missile defense program are not the American people but rather large defense contractors. They are spending millions every year in political campaign contributions and lobbying operations to promote missile defense. This calls to mind President Eisenhower's warning in his farewell address to the American people: "In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex." You who serve on authorization and appropriation committees should be our guardians.

For these reasons, we ask you to cut back on authorization and appropriations for national missile defense and to redirect these resources to programs that meet important human and community needs.

Sincerely yours,

Representatives of faith-based organizations

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: "Rogue" Threat Is Minimal"
Date: Tue, 26 Jun 2001 10:20:38 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Howard:

Thanks for forwarding this article. Since you are the best researcher on this issue I know...I wanted to pursue the issue of first strike capability that I raised at the interfaith meeting. My recollection is that there is a theory that even though the weapons themselves may be defensive..that the satellite systems that would be developed and deployed would also be capable of and put us in a better position to launch a first strike campaign, and not solely because we think we could catch the missiles fired in response. I think there is something in the satellites systems themselves-those systems developed under the guise of missile defense-that could and perhaps would be used for first strike. If this is so, I believe our opposition to missile defense should make that point loudly and repeatedly. I think there has to be a plan underneath the development of the missile defense system that has not been made visible yet...because the system and those pushing for it just does not make sense. I understand the profit motivations-and they are compelling..but I think there is more..I think that there is an underlying agenda to try to achieve military superiority(and therefore world domination). But I can't prove it..and I'd like to find the data to do so. In my mind, there has got to be more than the profit motive..and I think it's military strategy..but not the benevolent defensive strategy that's making the press. Until we unearth the ulterior motive..I think we will have a hard time convincing folks it's a bad idea. Any thoughts?

By the way, I think Sen. Lugar was genuinely touched by the reception and award and I thank you for your initiating the idea and all of your tireless efforts in helping to make it happen. I had to run off to Boston from the reception..so I didn't get time to thank you on Wednesday.

But many thanks,
Janet

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Monday, June 25, 2001 3:37 PM
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: "Rogue" Threat Is Minimal"

Peace/Justice Alert #3
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
June 25, 2001

"ROGUE" THREAT' IS MINIMAL

President George W. Bush and other advocates of national missile claim that it's needed to protect the United States from long-range missile attack

from "rouge" states, such as North Korean, Iran, and Iraq. However, a recently analysis by Robert Windrem, an investigative produce for NBC News, shows that this isn't a real threat.

Mr. Windrem's entire article is included below and is also sent as a Word attachment. Please forgive the length, but we want you to read the entire analysis.

We suggest that you print out copies and send them to your U.S senators and representatives. Ask them to read the analysis and tell you whether this information conforms with what they know about the threat from so-called "rogue" states. Ask them if the threat is so minimal, and will be for the foreseeable future, why spend so much to develop a missile defense. We are interested in receiving copies of their replies.

In your letter to members of Congress you can point out that the United Methodists General Conference opposes development and deployment of "strategic antimissile defense systems because they are illusory, unnecessary, and wasteful." Robert Windrem's article underscores that national missile defense is unnecessary.

On the matter wastefulness, you can quote the words of President Dwight D. Eisenhower, who said in 1953, "Every gun made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and not clothed." You can tell your senators and representatives that an enormous theft of the public treasury is occurring as vast funds are channeled to a few large defense contractors to deal with a threat that is minimal.

If you are in touch with action networks, please forward this alert to them.

Howard W. Hallman

###

"How Real Is The 'Rogue' Threat?"
MSNBC.com - June 19, 2001 - By Robert Windrem, NBC News

U.S. intelligence details missiles that fall far short of U.S. shores

As President Bush, forging ahead with a plan to build a national missile shield, continues to trumpet the threat posed by missiles from so-called "rogue" nations, no missile currently deployed by countries hostile to the United States has the range to strike any of the 50 U.S. states. And only one missile system currently being developed by a foreign nation would have such a capability in the near future, according to intelligence and expert analysis.

Of the five "rogue" states usually mentioned in discussions of missile programs - Iran, Iraq, Libya, North Korea and Pakistan - only North Korea has what can be called an advanced missile development program. North Korea's Taepo-Dong 2 missile, still under development, would have the range to strike the United States - but likely only at Alaska's thinly populated

western edge, or under the most optimistic assessments, the city of Anchorage. While it would be the first missile strike on U.S. soil, it would do little damage to U.S. strategic interests and would almost certainly be met by a devastating U.S. counterstrike, and that would do little damage to U.S. strategic interests, say U.S. officials.

Only two of the five "rogue" nations - North Korea and Pakistan - have nuclear weapons, and only Pakistan is believed to have successfully built nuclear warheads for its missiles. While U.S. intelligence believes North Korea has built one or two nuclear weapons, there is no evidence that it has built missile warheads, say U.S. intelligence sources, speaking on condition of anonymity.

Limited Programs

The five countries' missile development programs are hindered by other limitations, say U.S. officials and independent experts:

*None has fielded a missile with a solid rocket engine or even tested such an engine in flight. Each uses liquid fuel engines, which require hours and in some cases days to load and fire. A solid rocket engine can be lighted and fired within in minutes.

*None of the states have extensive missile-launch facilities or even missile-development facilities. North Korea's facility on the Sea of Japan is limited to a single, unprotected launch pad and nearby assembly building, connected by a dirt road.

*None have the industrial capability to build even moderately large numbers of missiles.

North Korea's Taepo Dong-2, the most advanced missile in development by any of the "rogue" states, has yet to be fired from the Koreans' rudimentary missile-test facility.

Under the most optimistic assessments, the missile would have a range of 3,600 miles when fielded, U.S. intelligence officials say. At that 3,600-mile range, it could strike as far east as Anchorage. If its range is at the low end of estimates - 2,400 miles - it could strike only the westernmost islands of Alaska's sparsely populated Aleutian chain.

The Taepo-Dong 2, named for the city where it is built, would need a range of more than 4,800 miles to strike the U.S. mainland, and somewhat less to hit Hawaii.

"North Korea has a very modest facility ... more of a missile proving ground, like White Sands out of 1946, not Vandenberg [Air Force Base] or the Kennedy Space Center," said Tim Brown, senior analyst for Globalsecurity.org. The White Sands Proving Ground was established in New Mexico at the tail end of World War II by the U.S. military to test new weapons' systems.

Short-Range Weapons

No other nation on the "rogue" list has fielded a missile with a range greater than 900 miles, according to U.S. officials. Pakistan has the Ghauri missile, which it bought from North Korea and renamed for a Muslim king who invaded Pakistan's archrival India. Iran has yet to test any missile with a range greater than 600 miles.

Libya has only Scud-B missiles with ranges of 180 miles, and Iraq is limited by U.N. sanctions to missiles with ranges no greater than 90 miles. Although Baghdad is believed to have hid Scud missiles from weapons inspectors, none have ranges greater than 540 miles. Development programs in each of those states is aimed at incremental increases in range, officials say.

Two of the missiles - the Pakistani Ghauri and the Iranian Shehab - are derivatives of North Korea's No-Dong missiles, which Pyongyang has sold and transported by both ship and cargo aircraft to buyer nations.

"One question is how reliable these systems would be," said Globalsecurity's Brown. "Putting a crude rudimentary system in operation without doing a lot of testing is risky. Military generals want a lot of testing. The question is, is this a serious military program or a terrorist program where you wouldn't necessarily have a lot of testing?"

The United States fears that North Korea could ultimately sell the longer range missiles it has under development as well. Still, because of geography, even if the Pakistanis or Iranians bought a North Korean missile and wanted to aim at the United States instead of one of their neighbors, neither is close enough to to strike even Alaska.

'Rogue' threat? -- Missile ranges fall short of U.S. shores

Iran

Scud C: 300 miles, Status -- deployed
Shehab-3: 600 miles, Status -- tested
Shehab-4: 900 miles, Status -- in development
Distance to US -- 5,400 miles (Alaska), 7,200 miles (Mainland)

Libya

Scud B: 180 miles, Status -- deployed
Distance to US -- 7,200 miles (Alaska), 9,000 miles (Mainland)

Iraq

Ababil-100: 60 miles, Status -- deployed
al-Samoud: 90 miles, Status -- tested
al-Hussein: 360 miles, Status -- forbidden, possibly hidden
al-Abbas: 540 miles, Status -- forbidden, possibly hidden
Distance to US -- 5,400 miles (Alaska), 7,800 miles (Mainland)

North Korea

Scud B: 180 miles, Status -- deployed
Scud C: 300 miles, Status -- deployed
No Dong: 600 miles, Status -- tested
Taepo Dong 1: 900+ miles, Status -- tested
Taepo Dong2: 3,600 miles, Status -- in development

Distance to US -- 2,400 miles (Alaska), 4,800 miles (Mainland)

Pakistan

Shaheen: 180 miles, Status -- deployed

Tarmuk: 180 miles, Status -- deployed

Ghauri: 900 miles, Status -- deployed

Distance to US -- 4,800 miles (Alaska), 6,600 miles (Mainland)

Note: Distances to the US are calculated over the pole or west to east.

Flying east to west, even though shorter in some cases, is inefficient since the missiles would be flying against the rotation of the earth, lengthening the flight.

Robert Windrem is an investigative producer for NBC News.

To: Janet Horman <JHorman@UMC-GBCS.ORG>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Deeper motives of national missile defense
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <619BD1E95646D311B69D0008C79FE32D54249D@CHURCH2>
References:

Janet,

I received your message as I am preparing to leave for a short vacation. Your questions are too complex to answer quickly, so I'll have to put off responding until the week of July 9.

Howard

From: Rina.Radov@CliffordChance.com
To: mupj@igc.org
Cc: rcavenaugh@uua.org
Subject: UU Clergy letter on NMD
Date: Tue, 26 Jun 2001 11:35:31 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

The UU clergy letter opposing NMD and the abrogation of the ABM Treaty will be going out shortly. Would it be possible for us to get a list of the moderate Republican Senators who were contacted on the issue by the Interfaith Coalition earlier this year?

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.

To: Rina.Radov@CliffordChance.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: UU Clergy letter on NMD
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <BFF9C681D030D411968500508BCFC72E04F2A350@nyc-msg-11.NY.RW.COM>
References:

At 11:35 AM 6/26/01 -0400, you wrote:

>
>The UU clergy letter opposing NMD and the abrogation of the ABM Treaty will
>be going out shortly. Would it be possible for us to get a list of the
>moderate Republican Senators who were contacted on the issue by the
>Interfaith Coalition earlier this year?
>
>Shalom,
>>Guy
>

Guy,

You might consider contacting the following senators: Collins (ME), Snowe (ME), Chafee (RI), Specter (PA), Frist (TN), Lugar (IN), Hagel (NE), Roberts (KS), Thomas (WY), McCain (AZ), Smith (OR). Most of them are on either the Senate Foreign Relations Committee or Armed Services Committee. If you don't have their full names and addresses, you can get this information at www.senate.gov.

Keep up the good work,

Howard

From: "Charlotte V. Davenport, csjp" <csjp@igc.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: FY2002 budget for missile defense
Date: Wed, 27 Jun 2001 11:07:02 -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 V5.00.2615.200

Dear Howard,
A great Letter.

We are interested in signing on.... it would be

Ann Rutan, csjp
President
Sisters of St. Joseph of Peace

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Tuesday, June 26, 2001 7:40 PM
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: FY2002 budget for missile defense

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Dear Colleagues:

President Bush is finally submitting his FY2002 defense budget. A Pentagon spokesman says that \$7.5 billion will be proposed for missile defense, a considerable increase. We need to respond vigorously to state our opposition. Therefore, I have drafted the following letter addressed to members of the House and Senate Armed Services Committee and Appropriations Committees. It would be signed by representatives of faith-based organizations, such as heads of Washington offices, and be hand delivered to members of these committees. The text could then be adapted to alerts to action networks.

I'm leaving for a nine-day vacation on Wednesday morning, June 27 and will be back in my office on Friday, July 6. While I am away, I would like for you to review the draft letter, send me your comments, and indicate whether your office would be a potential signer. I will circulate all comments I receive. Then we can decide whether to move ahead with such a letter and what modifications to make in the text.

Shalom,
Howard

###

Proposed letter to members of House and Senate Armed Services Committees

and Appropriation Committees from representatives of faith-based organizations

Dear Representative/Senator: (to be individualized)

President Dwight D. Eisenhower in an address before the American Society of Newspaper Editors on April 16, 1953 stated: "Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed." This statement is so important to the Eisenhower legacy that these words are engraved on the walls by his tomb in Abilene, Kansas.

A huge theft of this nature is contained in the defense authorization and appropriation bills for the 2002 fiscal year. It comes in the form of proposed \$7.5 billion in spending for national missile defense. This would steal money from efforts to "Leave No Child Behind", to provide adequate health care for millions of America, and to meet other urgent social needs. This is clearly wrong and immoral.

It is doubly wrong because there is no credible threat to the American homeland from long-range missiles. Only Russia, China, the United Kingdom, and France have missiles of that range, but they aren't on the danger list offered by missile defense proponents. Of the so-called "rogue" states that are said to be a danger, only North Korea has tried to develop a long-range missile. This program is under suspension and could be permanently terminated through diplomacy and selective financial assistance. Moreover, it isn't credible that North Korea would attack the United States because of the assurance of massive retaliation. No other potentially hostile state has an effective missile program that would endanger the United States. There are numerous nonproliferation measures that can prevent them from developing one.

The beneficiaries of the national missile defense program are not the American people but rather large defense contractors. They are spending millions every year in political campaign contributions and lobbying operations to promote missile defense. This calls to mind President Eisenhower's warning in his farewell address to the American people: "In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex." You who serve on authorization and appropriation committees should be our guardians.

For these reasons, we ask you to cut back on authorization and appropriations for national missile defense and to redirect these resources to programs that meet important human and community needs.

Sincerely yours,

Representatives of faith-based organizations

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.

Reply-To: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
From: "Brink Campaign" <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
To: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
Subject: WIIS/Brink Campaign July Forum --Missile Defense, De-alerting and the Nuclear Threat
Date: Wed, 27 Jun 2001 04:04:30 -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

Women in International Security and the Back From the Brink Campaign invite you to attend a particularly timely forum on Missile Defense, De-alerting and the Nuclear Threat.

The forum and reception is open to the public and will be held at the Carnegie Institute--1779 Massachusetts Avenue, NW WDC, near the Dupont Circle metro--on July 18th from 5:30 to 7:30 PM.

The attached flyer provides you with the bios of our distinguished panel of speakers: Chair, Janne Nolan, Director of the Century Foundation; Bruce Blair, President of Center for Defense Information; Lisbeth Gronlund, Senior Scientist, Union of Concerned Scientists and Elizabeth Turpen, Legislative Aide to Senator Pete Domenici (R-NM).

Please forward this notice to your network.

RSVP acceptances only to bradm@backfromthebrink.net by Monday, July 16, 2001.

We hope you can attend.

Ira and 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\WIIS FLYER FINAL.doc"

X-Sender: jdi@[63.106.26.66]
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)
Date: Wed, 27 Jun 2001 16:55:19 -0400
To: jdi@clw.org
From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>
Subject: \$33 BILLION INCREASE FOR THE MILITARY: MOUNTAIN OF MONEY,
MOLEHILL OF CHANGE

For immediate release:
Wednesday, June 27, 2001

Contact:
John Isaacs o (202) 543-4100 x.131
h (202) 387-6474

\$33 BILLION INCREASE FOR THE MILITARY: MOUNTAIN OF MONEY, MOLEHILL OF CHANGE

Washington, D.C. . .The Bush Administration formally released its new military budget of \$343.5 billion for the military, a whopping \$33 billion increase from the last fiscal year.

This total includes \$328.9 billion for the Pentagon, with most of the rest allocated for Department of Energy military programs. Secretary Rumsfeld said that the budget provided the largest increase since the 1980's, when the Cold War was still going strong.

The Bush Administration promised major reforms and initiated dozens of reviews covering every Pentagon program, but, according to John Isaacs, Council for a Livable World president, "Defense Secretary Rumsfeld has only discovered new ways to spend money."

"Rumsfeld tackled the mountain that is the Pentagon budget; after five months of study, he has produced only a molehill of change."

Not a single major Cold War weapon program will be terminated. The major accomplishment appears to be the retirement of 33 B-1 white elephants left over from the Reagan Administration.

Any weapons program cancellations will not take place until after October 2002 at the earliest.

The \$33 billion increase is more than twice the combined \$12.8 billion defense budget totals of all the so-called "rogue states" — Iran, Iraq, Libya, North Korea, Cuba, Sudan and Syria — that has led to a feverish push for a national missile defense.

In fact, missile defense funding has received one of the largest increases in the budget, from \$5.3 billion to \$8.3 billion, a 57% increase.

"Throwing money at missile defense in order to carry out a campaign pledge to deploy as soon as possible is a dangerous waste of money," argued Isaacs.

"Considering North Korea's Gross Domestic Product is \$14 billion, the U.S. could launch a hostile economic takeover of North Korea for two years of missile defense work," added Isaacs.

Some of the money will be used to allow for deployment of a national missile defense in Alaska by fiscal 2004 or 2005.

In one of the more positive elements of the new budget, the Administration has announced it will ask Congress to remove the restriction on reducing nuclear weapons, and plans to retire the MX missile and other nuclear weapons.

The new Administration also has gone in for name-changing. The BRAC (Base

Realignment and Closure) has now become the EFI (Efficient Facilities Initiative). Whatever the terminology, the Administration will prod Congress to permit further base closings.

In a sign of the dismal shape of the Pentagon's accounting system, the new budget includes \$100 million to straighten out its books. Senators Robert Byrd and Charles Grassley have charged that because of its shoddy bookkeeping, the Pentagon has little accurate information about what it is buying, what assets it holds and what it needs for the future.

"The \$33 billion increase is based on a house of cards accounting system that means there is no way to tell if the money will be spent for the purpose for which it is slated," concluded Isaacs

###

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: Wed, 27 Jun 2001 21:01:10 -0400
From: William J Price <WorldPeaceMakers@compuserve.com>
Subject: FY2002 budget for missile defense
Sender: William J Price <WorldPeaceMakers@compuserve.com>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>

Dear Howard, Have a great vacation. We would be honored to sign the letter just as you have it. Bill

Date: Wed, 27 Jun 2001 21:59:54 -0700
Subject: Re: Hallman 2004
To: mupj@igc.org
From: "Carol Pepper" <cpepper@towerhill.org>

Howard - sorry I didn't respond before now (I'm afraid you won't get this email until after the reunion).

Yes, we'd love for the Reunion to be in DC - either date is fine with us.

We would need 1 room: Attending would be: Jim, Carol, Graham (6 yrs in 2004), and Hudson (4.5 years in 2004)

let us know what the decision. It sounds wonderful!

Carol

From: "Rutledge, Philip"

To: Adam Herbert , "Agranoff, Robert" , Alvin Schexnider , Barbara Sabol , Barbara Wamsley , "Barnes, A James" , Bernart Martin , Beryl Radin , Bill Davis , "Bonser, Charles F." , Bruce McDowell , Carl Stenberg , Charles Bingman , Charles Washington , Cornelius Kerwin , Costis Toregas , Dale Krane , Daniel Skoler , David Garrison , David Mora , Deil Wright , Eddie Williams , Edward Perkins , 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 , "Henshel, Diane S." , Herbert Jasper , Howard Hallman , James Carroll , James Kunde , James Murley , James Norton , Jane Pisano , Jim Svava , Johathan Howes , John Kelly , Jose Bolton , Joseph Wholey , "Kirlin, John J" , Larry Terry , Mark Pisano , Mary Hamilton , Maurice Brice , "Merget, Astrid Elizabeth" , Mitchell Rice , Mortimer Downer , Nancy Tate , Norman Johnson , Norman King , Patricia Florestano , Philip Rutledge , Ralph Widner , Regina Williams , "Rhodes, Eduardo L." , Richard Monteilh , Robert Knox , "Rosemary O'Leary" , Royce Hanson , Steven Carter , Susan Tolchin , Sylvester Murray , Timothy Clark , Tobe Johnson , Valerie Lemmie , Walter Boadnax , "WILLBERN, YORK" , "William Hansell, Jr." , "Wise, Charles R." , Yvonne Burke

Subject: NAPA Mini-Conference Agenda

Date: Wed, 27 Jun 2001 16:48:52 -0500

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Colleagues:

This is the final call for the Social Equity Panel Meeting and Mini-Conference to be held in Indianapolis, July 20-21. So far, 36 members of the Panel have registered, as well as several other local officials who will take part in the discussions. A near final draft agenda is attached. Earlier today, my secretary, Carrie Docktor, sent each registrant an e-mail confirming your hotel arrangement at the University Conference Center and Hotel. If you requested a room registration and did not receive an e-mail from Carrie, please let me know at once. Since SPEA has guaranteed the Friday night room reservations, I remind you that it is important that you cancel with Carrie -- not the Hotel -- if your plans change and you cannot attend. If you have not indicated that you can attend, and would like to do so, please let me know by July 6.

The August monthly meeting of the Panel in Washington has been cancelled because of concentration on the July meeting and the contributing factor of NAPA just beginning to occupy its new quarters. At the Saturday evening dinner business meeting, we will decide what to do about a September meeting, since the NAPA Board will be meeting at the Academy on Friday, September 14, our normal meeting date. Also on the agenda for the business meeting will be plans for the "Public Administration Summit" meeting on Social Equity in governance to be held in Dallas, November 12-13. The new NAPA Environmental Justice Project, for which the Standing Panel is providing the project panel members, will be discussed, and other internal business will also be conducted. We will not have tele-conference participation arrangements for the business meeting.

If I don't see you in July, have a pleasant summer, and think ahead to the Fall.

Phil

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\Standing Panel on Social Equity in Governance.doc"

X-Sender: dkimball@[63.106.26.66]
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.0.1
Date: Thu, 28 Jun 2001 10:31:05 -0400
To: 'Daryl' <dkimball@clw.org>
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: N-Testing Update: increased U.S. test site readiness?

June 28, 2001

TO: Coalition members and friends

FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: Nuclear Testing Update: Bush Admin. seeking ways to increase test site readiness

According to an article published today by Knight-Ridder, the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) is examining "what it would take to do various kinds of tests on various time scales." The February 2001 "Foster Panel" report on "The Reliability, Safety, and Security of the United States Nuclear Stockpile" calls for a shorter test site readiness time scale and increases in funding for the Department of Energy's nuclear weapons research, development, and testing complex, which is managed by the NNSA.

The effort to shorten test site readiness -- which at its current 1-3 years is more than sufficient -- provides further evidence of a coordinated and stealthy campaign to erode the current nuclear test moratorium/CTBT policy of the United States in areas ranging from test site readiness, to pressure for new, low-yield nuclear weapons development, to efforts by the Senate's "Dr. Strangelove caucus" to end U.S. support for international test ban monitoring and to urge the Bush Administration to repudiate the U.S. signature of the CTBT, which -- despite the Senate's failure to approve ratification in 1999 -- obligates the United States not to take any action contrary to the "purpose or intent" of the CTBT (i.e. to ban nuclear test explosions).

The NNSA's test site readiness effort will unfortunately send exactly the wrong message to other would-be testers and Test Ban Treaty hold-out states, including India, Pakistan and China, and is likely to increase pressure from the United States' European and Asian allies for U.S. ratification of the CTBT.

The bottom line is that the CTBT remains vulnerable to the unilateralist, anti-treaty inclinations of the Bush team. Supporters of the CTBT -- especially Senate Democrats and moderate Republicans, as well as U.S. allies -- must be more vocal in questioning the Bush team on its test ban policy and more active in defense of the CTBT.

For further discussion on Bush Administration nuclear test ban policy options, see: "Nuclear Testing: Policy Options for the New President," February 16, 2001, which is on-line at
<<http://www.clw.org/coalition/kimball021601.htm>>

- DK

NOTE: Further information on the CTBT is available on the Coalition web site <http://www.crn.org>. For previous editions of the Coalition's "Nuclear Testing Update," see <http://www.clw.org/coalition/n-testing.htm>

"Knight Ridder/Tribune News Service"

June 28, 2001, Thursday

"Bush asks scientists for input on resumption of nuclear tests"

By Jonathan S. Landay

WASHINGTON -- The Bush administration has asked U.S. nuclear weapons scientists to examine ways that nuclear test explosions beneath the Nevada desert could resume more quickly if the government decides to end a nine-year moratorium on nuclear testing.

It would now take one to three years to prepare a test, and a recent study concluded that such long lead times could allow political opponents to block any resumption of nuclear testing.

Nuclear weapons scientists are looking at "what it would take to do various kinds of tests on various time scales," C. Bruce Tarter, the director of the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in California, said in an interview with Knight Ridder.

Tarter and others said the administration hasn't decided to resume testing. Nevertheless, the review is likely to add to fears that President Bush might end the nuclear testing moratorium and push for developing new "low yield" nuclear warheads that some weapons scientists and conservative lawmakers advocate. Bush has said he has no plans to end the U.S. moratorium. But Vice President Dick Cheney and Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld have argued that the safety and potency of the American arsenal can be assured only by periodically detonating randomly selected warheads underground.

"This is all part of a well-coordinated effort inside and outside the government to basically resume production of nuclear weapons," charged Stephen Schwartz, the publisher of the Chicago-based Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, an arms control journal. "If you are going to do that, you are going to need to test, and this is what this exercise is all about."

Schwartz said the readiness review of the Nevada Test Site could provide

"cover to China and Russia, and maybe even India and Pakistan," to begin preparations to resume their own nuclear tests if the United States abandons its self-imposed moratorium on testing.

Tarter dismissed such concerns. "Understanding the state of readiness, I think, is a non-provocative activity," he said.

The test site-readiness study comes as the Pentagon is conducting a separate review of U.S. nuclear strategy and forces ordered by Bush. The issues being examined include radical cuts in America's nuclear arsenal and the future of the testing moratorium.

Bush supported the Senate's 1999 rejection of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, saying a permanent global ban on nuclear testing would be unverifiable.

His refusal to call for a new Senate vote on the treaty provoked a rare diplomatic protest by the European Union.

Britain, France and Russia are among 76 nations that have ratified the 1996 treaty. Like the United States, China has signed but not ratified the pact, and is observing a test moratorium.

Many experts say returning to underground tests is unnecessary and could undermine the international nuclear arms-control system and provoke a new nuclear arms race.

These experts contend that the United States can continue to rely on the so-called Stockpile Stewardship Program to ensure that its estimated 10,500 warheads remain defect-free. The program uses experiments, computer simulations, warhead inspections and tests of non-nuclear components.

The Nevada Test Site readiness review was requested by retired Air Force Gen. John Gordon, the head of the National Nuclear Security Administration, the Energy Department agency that manages U.S. nuclear weapons programs.

"During this year, we will look hard again at improving test site readiness, and will review whether an appropriate level of resources is being applied to this vital element of Stockpile Stewardship," Gordon said Wednesday in testimony submitted to a House of Representatives subcommittee.

The Nevada Test Site is spread across 1,350 square miles of desert northwest of Las Vegas. The main U.S. nuclear proving ground, it conducted 100 atmospheric and 828 underground tests between 1951 and 1992. It still conducts "subcritical" tests of nuclear components, and must remain prepared to resume full-scale testing if required.

Darwin Morgan, a spokesman for the Nevada Test Site, said the thrust of the examination is determining the most valuable test to conduct if the United

States decides to resume testing.

"The question is . . . what information do you want back from the test?" he said. "If it were to rattle a sword, we could do that fairly quickly. If you need to get good diagnostic information . . . that's where you get the time." Tarter said the examination of the site's readiness to resume full-scale tests involves experts from the site, the Lawrence Livermore and Los Alamos national laboratories and a commission Congress appointed in 1999 to examine the nation's ability to maintain safe and reliable nuclear warheads without test explosions.

In a Feb. 1 report, the commission expressed grave concern about insufficient funding, crumbling infrastructure, low morale and other problems at the nuclear laboratories, nuclear weapons-production plants and the Nevada Test Site. The panel, headed by John S. Foster Jr., a former weapons designer, found that it would take the test site 12 to 36 months to prepare a test.

"It is the panel's view that such lead times are unacceptable," the report said. "It seems prudent to take cost-effective steps to reduce lead times for testing to give future presidents a practical set of options for sustaining confidence in the stockpile. The panel believes that the NNSA should investigate a range of options to reduce lead times to, say, three to four months from the president's making a decision to proceed."

"It seemed to us that three years kind of tied the president's hands," Foster said in an interview.

"Nation's nuclear stockpile needs revamp"

Tuesday, 26 June 2001 18:27 (ET)

"Nation's nuclear stockpile needs revamp"

By KELLY HEARN, UPI Technology Reporter

WASHINGTON, June 26 (UPI) -- Programs designed to maintain the nation's nuclear stockpile are being managed poorly and new tools and methods are needed to secure its safe future, a nuclear expert told lawmakers Tuesday.

John Foster, former head of Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory and chairman of a Congressionally-mandated panel to study the effectiveness of the National Nuclear Security Administration or NNSA, testified before a Congressional oversight panel.

Congress in 1999 established the NNSA to fix what were perceived as widespread problems within the Department of Energy, the agency tasked with maintaining the nation's nuclear stockpile.

Foster said he and four other nuclear experts on the panel saw in general

"a disconnect between the declared national policy and the current state of nuclear weapons facilities."

"It is our view that the programs for sustaining the stockpile are not being managed in a manner commensurate with their importance," he said.

Foster told lawmakers the nation's nuclear production complex "must be revitalized, regardless of stockpile size" and that new tools "will be needed to assess and maintain our aging stockpile, regardless of whether we [conduct nuclear tests]."

The DOE has long been accused of severe management problems. A 1997 study by the Institute for Defense Analysis, a nonprofit corporation offering scientific and technical expertise to the DOD, claimed that fractional infighting between DOE officials in Washington and the agency's Albuquerque Operations Office hampered oversight of weapons labs and facilities.

Another report in 1999, known as the Chiles Commission report, stated "the disorderly organization within DOE has a pervasive and negative impact on the working environment." And in 1999 the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board reported the agency was "a dysfunctional bureaucracy...incapable of reforming itself."

Foster's observations were similar in tone. While he was encouraged that officials had chosen to extend the life of certain warheads, "the weapons complex is not likely to be able to meet the approved milestones. In fact, the complex has been unable to meet the schedule for today's workload, which is modest compared to future plans," he said.

He cited "worrisome signs of deterioration" in the stockpile and noted that the design work for long-term storage facilities continues to be delayed."

Foster said he and his colleagues found that roles and responsibilities within NNSA needed to be "rationalized and enforced."

He called for eliminating DOE orders about how the nuclear complex is to be organized and said the NNSA "lines of authority and accountability also need to be streamlined and enforced."

Strengthening the nation's stewardship of nuclear warheads depends on building a competent workforce.

"Our panel recommends systematic plans and programs that would involve new stewards in the design of robust, alternative warheads that will provide a hedge if problems occur in the future with one or more types of devices within the current stockpile," he said.

From: Paul Britner <Pbritner@communityministrymc.org>
To: "dosmith6@juno.com" <dosmith6@juno.com>,
"mupj@igc.org"
<mupj@igc.org>
Subject: FW: Mark Your Calendar
Date: Fri, 29 Jun 2001 09:11:22 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

I'm resending a message that I sent yesterday to the elected officials with a bcc: to the outreach committee. Your two messages bounced back and, upon rechecking, I found that I had typos in your addresses. In any event, you're on the distribution list now.

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Paul Britner
> Sent: Thursday, June 28, 2001 3:06 PM
> To: Brian Frosh; Connie Morella; Howard Denis; Marilyn Goldwater; Nancy
> Kopp; William Bronrott
> Subject: Mark Your Calendar

>
> Community Ministry of Montgomery County and Bethesda United Methodist
> Church are pleased to invite you to attend a community forum entitled,
> "Poverty in Montgomery County: Overcoming Barriers to Self-Sufficiency".
> The program will be presented from 7 to 9 p.m. on Tuesday, October 23,
> 2001.

>
> This is a forum for education and advocacy for the faith community in and
> around Bethesda. CMMC will promote this program to its 118 congregations
> throughout the county. Special efforts, however, are being undertaken to
> attract participants from the 32 CMMC congregations in council district 1
> with an emphasis on achieving diversity in our audience.

>
> This invitation is being sent to the Honorable Connie Morella, the members
> of the District 16 General Assembly delegation, and the Honorable Howard
> Denis. A flyer with the date/time/address is attached. Elected officials
> will be introduced at the beginning of the program and given an opportunity
> to speak for 2 minutes and also will be invited at the end of the forum to
> offer brief remarks.

>
> Details of the program are being finalized. We expect to devote the first
> half hour to an invocation, welcome, and comments from elected officials.
> The next hour will feature a short presentation by CMMC providing an
> overview of poverty in Montgomery County, followed by an interactive panel
> discussion focused on specific topics, e.g., housing, health care, child
> care, transportation, diversity, etc. The final half hour will be set
> aside for advocacy -- identifying key measures at all levels of government
> in which the faith community should be engaged. The program will be
> followed by a reception with refreshments.

>
> Please set aside this date on your calendar. You will receive a formal
> invitation later this summer with further details of this program. In the
> meantime, if you have any questions, please call me at 301-315-1106.

>

> Paul Britner
> Education and Advocacy Director,
> Community Ministry of Montgomery County
>
> <<BUMC Save The Date.doc>>
>

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\BUMC Save The Date.doc"

Mark Your Calendars:

Tuesday, October 23, 2001, 7-9 p.m.

***Poverty in Montgomery County:
Overcoming Barriers to Self-Sufficiency***

A Forum for Education and Advocacy

sponsored by:

**Community Ministry of Montgomery
County**

hosted by:

Bethesda United Methodist Church

8300 Old Georgetown, Rd.

Bethesda, MD

This exciting community forum will feature presentations, discussion and opportunities to dialogue with elected leaders about how we can best help the friends, families and neighbors in our community who are struggling to achieve self-sufficiency.

X-Sender: vsamson@63.106.26.66
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.0.2
Date: Fri, 29 Jun 2001 14:57:23 -0400
To: vsamson@clw.org
From: Victoria Samson
Subject: Recap of today's NMD/Deep Cuts Mtg, updated NMD/NGO Workplan June 29, 2001

TO: NMD/Deep Cuts Working Group

FR: Victoria Samson & Daryl Kimball

RE: Recap of today's meeting, updated NMD/NGO Workplan

Thanks for attending today's NMD/Deep Cuts Working Group meeting. In this email is a short summary of issues discussed. Attached please find an updated copy of the NMD/NGO Workplan; contact Victoria Samson if you have any additions/news. The next NMD/Deep Cuts Working Group meeting is July 20, 9:30-11, at UCS. See you then...

Until then, please keep in mind the significance of the Administration proposal to build a "testing" facility in Alaska: Unless the United States seeks and Russia agrees to a third ABM Treaty permitted test site, testing from Alaska would lead to a quick and unilateral abrogation of the ABM Treaty. Second, the Administration is trying to blur the line between development and deployment by allowing construction of a test facility for a handful of ground-based missile interceptors which could serve as a prototype or even a full deployment of an NMD system with very short notice.

Legislative strategies in response to FY02 DoD budget requests were discussed at the meeting. Potential action includes asking legislators to bar spending for activities related to NMD deployment or for activities that could abrogate the ABM Treaty. The Senate Armed Services Committee will likely markup the DoD budget request before the August recess. The SASC under Levin will be extremely reluctant to approve funding for deployment of unproven NMD systems that would abrogate the ABM Treaty, but it will be important to reinforce public and Congressional opposition to an accelerated NMD deployment. Senators who need to hear from us the most are: Susan Collins (R-ME), Mary Landrieu (D-LA), Joseph Lieberman (D-CT), Daniel Akaka (D-HI), Bill Nelson (D-FL), Ben Nelson (D-NB), Jean Carnahan (D-MO).

The NMD working group agreed that it is important to emphasize that the Administration should not get funding for deployment of NMD under the guise of a test facility and that the Pentagon should be required to follow existing defense procurement law by fully testing and certifying weapons systems, including missile defense, before deploying them.

A short, bulleted legislative options paper will be written and distributed by July 9 for the use of the NMD/Deep Cuts Working Group. Contact John Isaacs, Tom Collina, Bob Sherman, Carlean Ponder, or Victoria Samson if you have suggestions.

- VS & DK

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>>

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

Updated: June 29, 2001

NGO NMD WORK

_ Happening or happened

■ Needs to be done

RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS --

Overall:

_ NMD Brochure (CRND, others)

■ American Physical Society panel to review NMD issues (boost-phase intercept - this fall)

■ LAWS revising NMD White Paper

Operational Effectiveness of Missile Defense Technology:

■ sea-, space-, and ground-based (incl. boost phase)

■ U.S.-NATO NMD options

■ appropriate testing program (UCS plans to do a report on this later this year)

■ accelerated testing schedule for a 2004 deployment?

_ testing allowed under the ABM Treaty (CDI)

_ circumvention of NMD; strengths and weaknesses of various technologies; survivability of NMD components (FAS, UCS)

_ boost-phase intercept technologies (APS - study coming out in 2002)

Cost and Cost-Effectiveness:

_ Congressional request for cost estimate from Congressional Budget Office for layered NMD options

_ Bill Hartung is undertaking a study on contractors involved in NMD (TBD)

■ NGO study on historical NMD costs and future projections (Alise Frye, TCS)

■ Analysis of FY02 budget request (CDI or CLW?)

The Ballistic Missile Threat:

■ critique next official threat analysis of Bush administration

■ monitor progress/developments relating to diplomacy w/N. Korea

■ describe diplomatic/arms control options for curbing missile proliferation

Impact on Arms Control and International Security:

■ Assessment of Russia's possible responses to a U.S. deployment (i.e. withdrawal from treaties; MIRVing; tactical deployments; NMD countermeasures)

■ Assessment of China's possible responses to a U.S. deployment (i.e. MIRVing; faster modernization; countermeasures)

_ Maintain up-to-date summary of quotes and statements from foreign officials on NMD (BASIC - ongoing)

_ Relevance of the ABM Treaty (CRND - Rhineland)

_ Interplay between unilateral reductions and NMD (Gottemoeller article in Sep 01 ACT)

INTERNATIONAL WORK

- Support development of European NGO strategy and actions on NMD
- NGO delegations to Europe: 1 or 2 small delegations of Coalition NMD experts to visit European capitals and the CD in Geneva to brief foreign/defense ministry officials, diplomats, reporters, and parliamentarians on NMD technical issues, US NMD politics, and to discuss alternatives to NMD (BASIC)
- Meet with officials at embassies in Washington on regular basis

MEDIA WORK

- _ Editorial advisories, op-eds, meet with editorial boards, and follow-up calls to U.S. and European newspapers (on-going amongst Coalition members and friends)
- _ Fax-blast distribution of timely issue briefs on the subject (CRND, CDI, others)
- _ Develop capability for rapid response to pro-natl. missile defense deployment opeds, stmts, etc.
- _ Press briefing on next NMD flight test (CRND, CLW, ACA, UCS, CDI)
- Arrange meetings between our experts and columnists and key reporters in the U.S. and Europe
- Arrange for placement of experts on radio talk shows on subject (mainstream media project)
- Paid advertising campaign in select markets and at select times (CLW?)
- Conduct further public opinion research to dispel the notion that the U.S. public supports NMD deployment (CLW, CRND)
- Arrange for exchange and placement of op-ed pieces between U.S. and European papers
- _ Media guide listing NMD, nuclear experts (CRND)
- _ July 18: forum on missile defense, de-alerting, and the nuclear threat (Back from the Brink, WIIS)

PUBLIC OPINION POLLING

- conduct further public opinion research to dispel the notion that the U.S. public supports NMD deployment (CLW and CRND)
- _ conduct public opinion research in the UK; will be done by mid-July (BASIC)

LEGISLATIVE/CONGRESSIONAL TACTICS

- _ Meetings arranged with key Senate and House staff on NMD strategy (CRND)
- _ Congressional briefings on key NMD topics (FCNL)

- _ Brief Senators on the NMD issue (WAND, UCS, CLW, others)
- Compile list of Congressional offices to contact (Stephen Young, John Isaacs, David Culpe)
- Encourage Congresspeople to write a letter to the President or give speeches on the floor expressing their concern (WAND, others)
- _ Work with key members of the House and Senate on bills/amendments (FCNL, the Justice Project, Back from the Brink, UCS, CRND, CLW, others)
- Work with key members on House and Senate oversight hearings on NMD/TMD testing program
- Help NMD-concerned members of Congress connect with concerned European parliamentarians
- _ Coordinating district visits to Congressional members (20/20 Vision)
- _ Action messages to legislators nationwide on NMD; signatures of female state legislatures will have been gathered by the end of July (WAND)
- _ Circulate petitions opposing NMD to be delivered to the Executive and Legislative Branches (PSR)

OUTREACH/BUILDING SUPPORT FOR OUR MESSAGE:

- _ Develop expert list for press interviews, OpEds, speeches (CRND)
- Conduct outreach to unusual allies, including labor, business
- Scientists letter
- Nobel laureates
- Taxpayers groups raising cost and effectiveness issues
- Send speakers to debates at Committee on Foreign Relations chapters, Commonwealth Clubs, City Clubs, etc.
- Get validators - establish an outreach committee (Spurgeon Keeny, Ira Schorr)
- _ Document/maintain list of persons and organizations who are skeptical or who oppose NMD (CRND)
- _ WILL-WAND National Conference: 22-25 September 2001, WDC (training, lobbying)
- _ Intern brown-bags (IPS, CRND, FCNL)

COMMUNICATIONS AND COORDINATION

- _ Regular Coalition "NMD Working Group" meetings (CRND)
- _ Regular e-mail bulletins on NMD issues to NGOs and experts (CRND)

- _ BASIC has established “North Atlantic Network” to keep NGOs in U.K., Denmark, Greenland and Western Europe in touch and coordinated
- _ Postcards on de-alerting, NMD (20/20 Vision, Back from the Brink)
- _ NWWG (next one is July 12)

REPORTS

- _ Short history of NMD (BASIC)
- _ Study of unilateral cuts that’s geared for a European audience; August (BASIC)
- _ Jonathan Newhouse article in *Foreign Affairs* (CDI)
- _ Analysis of different NMD technologies under consideration - their stages of development, ABM complications; out this fall? (UCS)

GRASSROOTS & GENERAL PUBLIC EDUCATION WORK - GENERAL

- Individual membership based organizations should urge members and chapters to take action on NMD at key times throughout the year
- _ Create basic informational pamphlet (CRND)
- Develop a coordinated, web-based cybercampaign for fast information and instant messages to the President and Members of Congress (20/20 Vision, DontBlowIt.org)
- Grassroots organizations and contacts in key states should reach out to “unusual” suspects and communicate their views to Congressional representatives and the President
- _ Bring citizens and scientific experts into DC to meet with their Congressional reps (UCS, Nuclear Disarmament Partnership, Project Abolition, WAND)
- _ Grass-roots organizing - Maine and Rhode Island (FCNL)
- _ Establish email list (FCNL, DontBlowIt.org)
- _ Letters to the editor campaign (20/20 Vision)
- _ Women’s leadership workshops, membership kits include actions on NMD (WAND)

From: "Lisa Wright" <lisaw@nccusa.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: FY2002 budget for missile defense
Date: Sat, 30 Jun 2001 12:12:39 -0400
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4133.2400
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400
X-Apparently-From: Timothydhoyt@cs.com

Howard, I think this is an excellent letter! I only have a few suggestions:

One would be to take advantage of the current momentum around HIV/AIDS, and add that to the list of programs that it would hinder in terms of providing an adequate response. Also, I think if you include that, you might broaden the community who might sign this.

In the paragraph about rogue states, you might want to rephrase the sentence: "Of the so-called "rogue" states that are said to be a danger..." by replacing "danger" with "threat" - otherwise you've got a lot of "dangers" in a row.

I'd also suggest the formality of not using contractions (so spell out "is not" for example).

I'll run through my list of statements related to defense spending too to see if I can't find some common point of theology - we might want to try to reference something that would have interfaith commonality, and not just cite Eisenhower.

When we've got a final draft, I'd also like to send it along to a new colleague who's just begun working for us in NY on "Religious Leaders for Sensible Priorities", so he can share it with his contacts. Also, I'd be happy to send this to State and Local contacts, and since you reference the "Leave No Child Behind" piece too, I'll share this with another colleague who's working jointly for us and for CDF to see if they have contacts too.

Best,

Lisa

To: lisaw@nccusa.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Letter on NMD
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Lisa,

Thanks for your comments on the draft letter on national missile defense. I agree that we should provide a religious basis for our concern.

While on vacation I thought of a way to do this by invoking two religious tenets: you shall not steal, and you shall not bear false witness. I have done this in the following redraft.

Maybe it is too blunt, but perhaps we should be speaking forthrightly. What do you think? Let me know as soon as possible so that I can get the letter into circulation for signatures.

Howard

###

Proposed letter to members of House and Senate Armed Services Committees and Appropriation Committees from representatives of faith-based organizations

Dear Representative/Senator: (to be individualized)

As you consider authorization and appropriations measures for national missile defense, we the undersigned representatives of faith-based organizations would like to offer you our perspective. We believe that pouring vast public funds into development and deployment of national defense transgresses a fundamental principle of all religions: you shall not steal. We believe that advocates of missile defense violate another religious tenet: you shall not bear false witness.

On the matter of stealing we recall the wisdom of President Dwight D. Eisenhower. In an address before the American Society of Newspaper Editors on April 16, 1953 he stated: "Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed." This statement is so important to the Eisenhower legacy that these words are engraved on the walls of his tomb in Abilene, Kansas.

A huge theft of this nature is contained in the defense authorization and appropriation bills for the 2002 fiscal year. It comes in the form of proposed \$8.3 billion in spending for national missile defense. This would steal money from efforts to "Leave No Child Behind", to provide adequate health care for millions of America, to deal with the global HIV/AIDS crisis, and to meet other urgent social needs. This is clearly wrong and immoral.

On the matter of false witness, we believe that advocates of national missile defense are stirring up fears over a danger that realistically does not exist. There is no credible threat to the American homeland from long-range missiles. Only Russia, China, the United Kingdom, and France have missiles of that range, but they are not on the danger list offered by missile defense proponents. Of the so-called "rogue" states that are said to be a threat, only North Korea has tried to develop a long-range missile. This program is under suspension and could be permanently terminated through diplomacy and selective financial assistance. Moreover, it is not credible that North Korea would attack the United States because of the assurance of massive retaliation. No other potentially hostile state has an effective missile

program that would endanger the United States. There are a variety of nonproliferation measures that can prevent them from developing one. If there it is a danger, it comes from weapons of mass destruction smuggled into the United States or delivered by other means than long-range missiles.

The beneficiaries of the national missile defense program are not the American people but rather large defense contractors. They are spending millions every year in political campaign contributions and lobbying operations to promote missile defense. This calls to mind President Eisenhower's warning in his farewell address to the American people: "In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex." You who serve on authorization and appropriation committees should be our guardians.

For these reasons, we ask you to cut back on authorization and appropriations for national missile defense and to redirect these resources to programs that meet important human and community needs.

Sincerely yours,

Representatives of faith-based organizations.

From: "Rutledge, Philip"
To: "Howard Hallman"
Subject: NAPA Mini-Conference Agenda
Date: Sat, 30 Jun 2001 13:28:22 -0500
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Howard:

I understand we heard from you that you would not be able to make the July 20-21 meeting outlined in the attachment. But you have been such an integral part of our thinking regarding the NAPA Standing Panel on Social Equity in Governance that I thought I would give it one more shot. As you know, IU/SPEA is picking up hotel and meal costs. If I could also arrange coverage of your travel costs, would that make a difference? I am anxious to have you attend.

Phil

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\Standing Panel on Social Equity in Governancel.doc"

To: "Rutledge, Philip" <rutledge@indiana.edu>

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

Subject: Re: NAPA Mini-Conference Agenda

Cc:

Bcc:

X-Attachments:

In-Reply-To: <875F4BFEEB4CD21192D300805F65BBC00A533519@pennsylvania.exchange.indiana.edu>

References:

Phil,

Another cause -- nuclear disarmament -- will absorb my time in July. The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair, is trying to block national missile defense. The issue will be before the Armed Services and Appropriations Committee during July, so we are trying to generate grassroots opposition from the faith community.

I hope you have a successful meeting

Cordially,

Howard

X-Sender: jdi@[63.106.26.66]
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)
Date: Mon, 02 Jul 2001 11:53:42 -0400
To: jdi@clw.org
From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>
Subject: Council for a Livable World analysis: The Bipartisan Budget
Dilemma

An Analysis by Council for a Livable World
July 2, 2001

The Bipartisan Budget Dilemma:
Defense Increase Conflicts With Other Key Goals

The Administration's recent announcement that it is adding \$18.4 billion to the defense budget has created a dilemma for Democrats and Republicans alike.

Many Democrats support a higher military budget and greater spending for health programs, education and other non-defense programs, all while protecting the Social Security and Medicare surpluses.

Most Republicans, even more enthusiastically, support increasing the military budget, but are wary of being accused of eroding the budget surplus that President Clinton claimed as one of his greatest accomplishments.

For both parties, these goals are in conflict.

The \$18 billion increase has led to differing calculations of the defense budget increase from fiscal 2001 to 2002. The latest increase is on top of the \$15 billion boost requested earlier this year by the Bush Administration and already provided for in the fiscal 2002 Budget Resolution. That means the Administration has really requested a total increase of \$33 billion in defense spending for next year.

Moreover, while the Department of Defense uses one figure for overall spending, the defense budget number written into the budget resolution now tops \$343 billion, a figure that includes both Pentagon budget authority as well as Department of Energy military programs.

Further, on June 28, Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld testified to the House and Senate Armed Services Committee that an additional \$18 billion increase beyond the \$343 billion will be required in fiscal 2003 just to sustain the proposed fiscal 2002 budget level. That additional \$18 billion for fiscal 2003 does not include any new weapons requests which are expected to result from the Pentagon's Quadrennial Defense Review.

In a classic case of the "law of unintended consequences," Congressional Republicans, who earlier this year adopted the fiscal 2002 Budget Resolution while they controlled both houses of Congress, included a provision (Section 217 for the Senate chairman) to allow the two Budget Chairmen — Pete Domenici (R-NM) in the Senate and Jim Nussle (R-IA) in the House — on their own to approve or disapprove whatever defense increase the Administration requested after completion of a series of policy reviews.

But Domenici is no longer the Senate Budget Committee chairman. Once the Democrats took control of the Senate in early June, Sen. Kent Conrad (D-ND) became chairman. The Republican Party unwittingly provided Conrad with an enormous club over the level of military spending. As a result, it is no

longer clear that all or part of the \$18 billion increase will be approved.

Chairman Conrad supports increasing the military budget, but he is also committed to the other Democratic Party goals of domestic spending and protecting the surplus. Earlier this year, he and all but three Senate Democrats supported an amendment to the Budget Resolution offered by Sens. Mary Landrieu (D-LA) and Jean Carnahan (D-MO) to cut the tax cut by \$100 billion over 10 years, with the savings to be plowed into military spending.

After losing that and other votes, most Democrats opposed the \$1.3 trillion tax cut as excessive, arguing that it will deprive both defense and domestic programs of vital funds.

Conrad is concerned that, while the additional funds for fiscal 2002 may be squeezed in without dipping into the budget surplus (depending on revised economic estimates later this year), the tax cut will erode the surplus in fiscal 2003 and beyond and will leave no room for the Pentagon's planned level of spending for those years.

In a June 26 letter to President Bush, Conrad raised the dilemma the Congress faces: "I would also like to know how the Administration believes the additional defense spending can be paid for if the economic outlook deteriorates and the non-Social Security, non-Medicare surplus for 2002 is wiped out. Even if the economy does not worsen, the Administration still needs to explain how the outyear effects of a defense increase in 2002 can be accommodated without further raiding the Medicare H.I. Trust Fund in 2003 and 2004 and perhaps causing a raid in subsequent years."

Conrad is clear that he will question, and possibly oppose, the additional \$18 billion increase: "Congress needs to have full information about the long-term spending implications of the Administration's 2002 defense budget amendment . . . Congress cannot make an informed decision about 2002 funding for defense without information about how this year's decisions will affect future defense spending and how that spending fits into a fiscally-constrained long-range budget."

Republican approval of the defense spending increase also is not automatic. On June 27 National Journal reported: "A clearly frustrated House Budget Chairman Jim Nussle today told OMB [Office of Management and Budget] Director Daniels he does not intend to adjust the budget to accommodate the additional \$18.4 billion in FY02 defense funding the administration is requesting until the Budget Committee hears directly from Defense Secretary Rumsfeld on the particulars of the request." Nussle added, "I do not intend to move on any request from the Pentagon until it is reviewed by this committee."

Other members of Congress also have expressed concern about the implications of such a large increase in spending. National Journal also reported Rep. Mac Collins (R-GA) told Daniels, "I suggest you go back down to the other end of the street and come back to us with \$18 billion in rescissions [other program cutbacks] " to pay for the increase.

Even if Democrats are able to say "I told you so" about the impact of tax cuts, there is no easy way for either party to solve its dilemma. Chairmen Conrad and Nussle now must confront the problem and make the difficult decision on whether or not to permit the defense budget increases, decisions that can be overridden only by extraordinary parliamentary majorities of both houses. Moreover, while both chairmen may find ways to skirt their conflicts this year, the task will become even more difficult next year and beyond.

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: Mon, 02 Jul 2001 11:53:42 -0400
To: jdi@clw.org
From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>
Subject: Council for a Livable World analysis: The Bipartisan Budget
Dilemma

An Analysis by Council for a Livable World
July 2, 2001

The Bipartisan Budget Dilemma:
Defense Increase Conflicts With Other Key Goals

The Administration's recent announcement that it is adding \$18.4 billion to the defense budget has created a dilemma for Democrats and Republicans alike.

Many Democrats support a higher military budget and greater spending for health programs, education and other non-defense programs, all while protecting the Social Security and Medicare surpluses.

Most Republicans, even more enthusiastically, support increasing the military budget, but are wary of being accused of eroding the budget surplus that President Clinton claimed as one of his greatest accomplishments.

For both parties, these goals are in conflict.

The \$18 billion increase has led to differing calculations of the defense budget increase from fiscal 2001 to 2002. The latest increase is on top of the \$15 billion boost requested earlier this year by the Bush Administration and already provided for in the fiscal 2002 Budget Resolution. That means the Administration has really requested a total increase of \$33 billion in defense spending for next year.

Moreover, while the Department of Defense uses one figure for overall spending, the defense budget number written into the budget resolution now tops \$343 billion, a figure that includes both Pentagon budget authority as well as Department of Energy military programs.

Further, on June 28, Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld testified to the House and Senate Armed Services Committee that an additional \$18 billion increase beyond the \$343 billion will be required in fiscal 2003 just to sustain the proposed fiscal 2002 budget level. That additional \$18 billion for fiscal 2003 does not include any new weapons requests which are expected to result from the Pentagon's Quadrennial Defense Review.

In a classic case of the "law of unintended consequences," Congressional Republicans, who earlier this year adopted the fiscal 2002 Budget Resolution while they controlled both houses of Congress, included a provision (Section 217 for the Senate chairman) to allow the two Budget Chairmen — Pete Domenici (R-NM) in the Senate and Jim Nussle (R-IA) in the House — on their own to approve or disapprove whatever defense increase the Administration requested after completion of a series of policy reviews.

But Domenici is no longer the Senate Budget Committee chairman. Once the Democrats took control of the Senate in early June, Sen. Kent Conrad (D-ND) became chairman. The Republican Party unwittingly provided Conrad with an enormous club over the level of military spending. As a result, it is no

longer clear that all or part of the \$18 billion increase will be approved.

Chairman Conrad supports increasing the military budget, but he is also committed to the other Democratic Party goals of domestic spending and protecting the surplus. Earlier this year, he and all but three Senate Democrats supported an amendment to the Budget Resolution offered by Sens. Mary Landrieu (D-LA) and Jean Carnahan (D-MO) to cut the tax cut by \$100 billion over 10 years, with the savings to be plowed into military spending.

After losing that and other votes, most Democrats opposed the \$1.3 trillion tax cut as excessive, arguing that it will deprive both defense and domestic programs of vital funds.

Conrad is concerned that, while the additional funds for fiscal 2002 may be squeezed in without dipping into the budget surplus (depending on revised economic estimates later this year), the tax cut will erode the surplus in fiscal 2003 and beyond and will leave no room for the Pentagon's planned level of spending for those years.

In a June 26 letter to President Bush, Conrad raised the dilemma the Congress faces: "I would also like to know how the Administration believes the additional defense spending can be paid for if the economic outlook deteriorates and the non-Social Security, non-Medicare surplus for 2002 is wiped out. Even if the economy does not worsen, the Administration still needs to explain how the outyear effects of a defense increase in 2002 can be accommodated without further raiding the Medicare H.I. Trust Fund in 2003 and 2004 and perhaps causing a raid in subsequent years."

Conrad is clear that he will question, and possibly oppose, the additional \$18 billion increase: "Congress needs to have full information about the long-term spending implications of the Administration's 2002 defense budget amendment . . . Congress cannot make an informed decision about 2002 funding for defense without information about how this year's decisions will affect future defense spending and how that spending fits into a fiscally-constrained long-range budget."

Republican approval of the defense spending increase also is not automatic. On June 27 National Journal reported: "A clearly frustrated House Budget Chairman Jim Nussle today told OMB [Office of Management and Budget] Director Daniels he does not intend to adjust the budget to accommodate the additional \$18.4 billion in FY02 defense funding the administration is requesting until the Budget Committee hears directly from Defense Secretary Rumsfeld on the particulars of the request." Nussle added, "I do not intend to move on any request from the Pentagon until it is reviewed by this committee."

Other members of Congress also have expressed concern about the implications of such a large increase in spending. National Journal also reported Rep. Mac Collins (R-GA) told Daniels, "I suggest you go back down to the other end of the street and come back to us with \$18 billion in rescissions [other program cutbacks] " to pay for the increase.

Even if Democrats are able to say "I told you so" about the impact of tax cuts, there is no easy way for either party to solve its dilemma. Chairmen Conrad and Nussle now must confront the problem and make the difficult decision on whether or not to permit the defense budget increases, decisions that can be overridden only by extraordinary parliamentary majorities of both houses. Moreover, while both chairmen may find ways to skirt their conflicts this year, the task will become even more difficult next year and beyond.

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

Reply-To: <ronsider@esa-online.org>
From: "Ron Sider" <ronsider@esa-online.org>
To: "'Howard W. Hallman'" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: FY2002 budget for missile defense
Date: Tue, 3 Jul 2001 14:13:52 -0400
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook CWS, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300
Importance: Normal
X-SLUIDL: 004FCA1B-69C411D5-B54A0090-27B0F6E1

Dear Howard,

I am glad to add my signature to this letter.

Ronald J. Sider
President, ESA

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Tuesday, June 26, 2001 7:40 PM
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: FY2002 budget for missile defense

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Dear Colleagues:

President Bush is finally submitting his FY2002 defense budget. A Pentagon spokesman says that \$7.5 billion will be proposed for missile defense, a considerable increase. We need to respond vigorously to state our opposition. Therefore, I have drafted the following letter addressed to members of the House and Senate Armed Services Committee and Appropriations Committees. It would be signed by representatives of faith-based organizations, such as heads of Washington offices, and be hand delivered to members of these committees. The text could then be adapted to alerts to action networks.

I'm leaving for a nine-day vacation on Wednesday morning, June 27 and will be back in my office on Friday, July 6. While I am away, I would like for you to review the draft letter, send me your comments, and indicate whether your office would be a potential signer. I will circulate all comments I receive. Then we can decide whether to move ahead with such a letter and what modifications to make in the text.

Shalom,
Howard

###

Proposed letter to members of House and Senate Armed Services Committees and Appropriation Committees from representatives of faith-based

organizations

Dear Representative/Senator: (to be individualized)

President Dwight D. Eisenhower in an address before the American Society of Newspaper Editors on April 16, 1953 stated: "Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed." This statement is so important to the Eisenhower legacy that these words are engraved on the walls by his tomb in Abilene, Kansas.

A huge theft of this nature is contained in the defense authorization and appropriation bills for the 2002 fiscal year. It comes in the form of proposed \$7.5 billion in spending for national missile defense. This would steal money from efforts to "Leave No Child Behind", to provide adequate health care for millions of America, and to meet other urgent social needs. This is clearly wrong and immoral.

It is doubly wrong because there is no credible threat to the American homeland from long-range missiles. Only Russia, China, the United Kingdom, and France have missiles of that range, but they aren't on the danger list offered by missile defense proponents. Of the so-called "rogue" states that are said to be a danger, only North Korea has tried to develop a long-range missile. This program is under suspension and could be permanently terminated through diplomacy and selective financial assistance. Moreover, it isn't credible that North Korea would attack the United States because of the assurance of massive retaliation. No other potentially hostile state has an effective missile program that would endanger the United States. There are numerous nonproliferation measures that can prevent them from developing one.

The beneficiaries of the national missile defense program are not the American people but rather large defense contractors. They are spending millions every year in political campaign contributions and lobbying operations to promote missile defense. This calls to mind President Eisenhower's warning in his farewell address to the American people: "In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex." You who serve on authorization and appropriation committees should be our guardians.

For these reasons, we ask you to cut back on authorization and appropriations for national missile defense and to redirect these resources to programs that meet important human and community needs.

Sincerely yours,

Representatives of faith-based organizations

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

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

X-eGroups-Return: sentto-1606632-22-994191071-mupj=igc.apc.org@returns.onelist.com
X-Sender: research@napf.org
X-Apparently-To: sunflower-napf@yahoogroups.com
X-Sender: napf10@mail.wagingpeace.org (Unverified)
To: sunflower-napf@yahoogroups.com
From: Carah Lynn Ong
X-eGroups-Approved-By: info@abolition2000.org via email; 3 Jul 2001 20:10:09 -0000
Mailing-List: list sunflower-napf@yahoogroups.com; contact
sunflower-napf-owner@yahoogroups.com
Delivered-To: mailing list sunflower-napf@yahoogroups.com List-Unsubscribe:
Date: Tue, 3 Jul 2001 12:57:36 -0600
Subject: [sunflower] The Sunflower July 2001 (No. 50)
Yahoo! Groups
My Groups | sunflower-napf Main Page

The Sunflower

Online monthly newsletter of the
Nuclear Age Peace Foundation
July 2001 (No. 50)

The Sunflower is a monthly e-newsletter providing educational information on nuclear weapons abolition and other issues relating to global security. Back issues are available at <http://www.wagingpeace.org/sf/backissues.html>

IN THIS ISSUE

PERSPECTIVE
BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS
STAR WARRIORS
NUCLEAR ENERGY
MILITARY COLONIALISM
NUCLEAR MATTERS
NUCLEAR INSANITY
NAPF HAPPENINGS
ACTIONS YOU CAN TAKE
BOOK REVIEWS
RESOURCES

PERSPECTIVE

Good Quote, Bad Quote
By Carah Ong

"Russia is no longer our enemy, and therefore we shouldn't be locked into a Cold War mentality that says we keep the peace by blowing each other up. In my attitude, that's old, that's tired, that's stale."

-President George W. Bush
8 June 2001
Associated Press

On a tour of European countries in June, US President George W. Bush attempted to convince allies and other countries of the need for the US to deploy a national missile defense. Just before meeting with Russian President Vladimir Putin for the first time on 16 June, Bush stated in a speech at the Warsaw University Library that "the basis for our mutual security must move beyond Cold War doctrines." Bush also stated that it is time for a new approach to global security, one that would discard the notion of ensuring "peace" by threatening the use of nuclear weapons.

Unfortunately, Bush was using the rhetoric to justify US plans to abrogate the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty in order to deploy ballistic missile defense (BMD) systems. Many countries, including Russia, China and even US allies oppose US plans to abrogate the ABM Treaty and to deploy BMD systems, arguing that proceeding with the plans could decrease security and initiate new arms races. The Bush administration argues that the intention of the controversial national missile defense system is to counter incoming intercontinental ballistic missiles launched by "rogue" states or terrorists groups. Russian Defense Minister Sergei Ivanov made a valid point on 8 June when he stated that this threat is "entirely hypothetical."

Bush was correct in saying that it is time for the US, and all other nuclear weapons states for that matter, to move beyond Cold War thinking and basing national security on the destabilizing and dangerous theory of deterrence.

BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS

"If you have a shield, it is easier to use a sword." -Richard M. Nixon
US Will Abandon ABM Treaty

US Secretary of State Colin Powell announced on 17 June that the US will abandon the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty when the government decides that the curbs on missile defense are blocking US technology. Powell stated, "If there is no ABM Treaty tomorrow, there is no nation that's going to run out and start making nuclear weapons. We are going to move forward with missile defense." Powell also stated that the US can not allow the constraints of the treaty to bind American technology.
(source: AP, 17 June 2001)

Conditional Nuclear Arsenal Cuts

Russian President Vladimir Putin repeated an offer to the US on 2 July to reduce its nuclear arsenal from some 6,000 warheads to 1,500 provided there is a controlled process of elimination and provided the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) treaty remains intact. Putin reiterated the offer while meeting with French President Jacques Chirac. The two leaders issued a joint statement on 2 July on international strategic issues. The statement notes that destruction of the ABM Treaty could lead to a new arms race and also that an international conference on nuclear proliferation would be useful. Both Russia and France oppose US plans to build a national missile defense (NMD) system, which they believe will be harmful to the future of international security.

(source: AP, 2 July 2001)

Another Round of Russian Roulette?

Although missile tests are uncommon in Russia, the country test-fired a 26-year-old ballistic missile on 27 June. The test was a signal to the US that the weapon could regain life as a "hydra-headed" or MIRVed countermeasure if the US proceeds with plans for a national missile defense (NMD). The Stiletto missile, built between the mid-1970s and 80s, can carry a payload of more than four tons. An official in the Russian Rocket Forces stated that the Stiletto could be re-equipped to carry as many as six warheads.

The Topol-M, the most modern Russian strategic missile, is more mobile than older generations of missiles, but it can only carry a payload of about one ton. According to the official source, because of its larger payload, "compared to (the Topol-M, the Stiletto) has a considerably higher chance of overcoming the [Anti-Ballistic Missile] ABM system of the likely enemy." Under START II, the US and Russia agreed to eliminate "hydra-headed" multiple-warhead missiles. However, Russian President Vladimir Putin has repeatedly stated that START II would be void if the US abrogates the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty in order to build the controversial NMD system. Putin, restating the warning on 26 June, also noted that no missile defense system would be technologically able to counter multiple-warhead missiles for decades.

(source: Reuters, 27 June 2001)

STAR WARRIORS

The Nuclear Emperor Strikes Again

The US Air Force Space Command continues to map plans for space-based weapons which would exceed the so-called defensive systems currently under proposal by the Bush

administration. According to Captain Adriane Craig, the Space Command spends \$12 million to \$15 million out of its \$8.8 billion dollar annual budget to research space warfare concepts. Lt. Col. Dan Ziegler, Chief of Strategy, Policy and Doctrine for the Space Command, stated, "Thinking is not a violation of any treaty."

The Space Command's plans for control and domination to, from, in and through outer space are outlined in a series of military documents demonstrating how components of ballistic missile defense systems will be incorporated into future space weapons. The documents include the "Vision for 2020" and "The Long Range Plan." Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld headed the most recent commission and released "The Report of the Commission to Assess United States National Security Space Management and Organization," on 11 January 2001. The report outlined the importance of Space in strategic planning and in May, Rumsfeld announced a reorganization of Pentagon Space Programs to catalyze space warfare plans.

According to internal Pentagon budget documents for Fiscal Year 2002 obtained by Space News, the US military plans to request an additional \$700 million for space and information warfare. The overall defense budget request for FY 2002 is \$345 billion. Additionally, the same documents report that the Pentagon will add \$50 million to the US Air Force budget to continue development on space-based radar satellites that will provide global surveillance. (sources: Reuters, 26 June 2001; Space News, 25 June 2001)

NUCLEAR ENERGY

Germany Moves Forward With Nuclear Power Phase-out

German Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder and the nation's leading energy companies formally signed an agreement on 11 June to shut down the country's 19 civilian nuclear power reactors. The agreement will limit nuclear plants to an average of 32 years of operation and the power plants will be phased out over the next two decades with the most modern plants likely closing around 2021. The Cabinet and the Parliament still must approve the agreement. Nuclear power currently provides about one third of the nation's energy supply.

At the pact signing ceremony, Schroeder pledged that Germany will meet its responsibilities for climate protection. He also said that Germany will be responsible in establishing environmentally benign power sources and will uphold this position during the upcoming UN Climate Conference in Bonn, Germany. (source: ENN, 12 June 2001)

New Report on Long-term Radioactive Waste Burial

The National Academy of Sciences released a report on 6 June stating that after four decades of study, deep underground burial is the only scientifically credible, long-term solution for safely

isolating radioactive waste without having to rely on active management. The Academy initiated the study entitled, "Disposition of High-Level Waste and Spent Nuclear Fuel: The Continuing Societal and Technical Challenges," after discovering that many countries were experiencing difficulties and delays in plans for geological disposal of nuclear waste.

The study noted that the amount of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste is increasing because of the continued use of nuclear energy and the dismantling of nuclear weapons. There is a crucial need to secure the materials in a manner that protects people and the environment from radiation and in a manner that prevents the material from falling into the wrong hands. The Research Council stated that waste management programs should emphasize public participation in the decision making process and increase international collaboration on the issue.

According to the research committee, spent nuclear fuel and high-level waste have been stored at facilities on or near the Earth's surface since the beginning of the nuclear age. However, the amount of existing waste exceeds the current capacity at existing facilities in many countries and some storage sites do not have acceptable standards. Committee chair Charles McCombie stated, "Although there are still some technical challenges, the broad consensus within the scientific and technical communities is that enough is known for countries to move forward with geological disposal."

(source: ENN, 13 June 2001)

NUCLEAR TESTING

US May Resume Full Nuclear Tests

The Bush administration has asked US nuclear weapons scientists how quickly nuclear test explosions could resume at the Nevada Test Site if the government decides to end a nine-year moratorium on full nuclear testing. A recent study concluded that it currently would take three years to prepare a test, allowing political opponents to block any resumption of full nuclear tests. Although the Bush administration has not yet decided to resume full nuclear testing, the new study demonstrates the push to develop the B61-11, a new "low-yield, earth-penetrating" gravity bomb.

Currently, the US conducts subcritical nuclear tests at the Nevada Test Site. The tests are not considered full nuclear tests as, in theory, no nuclear chain reaction occurs. Vice President Dick Cheney and Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld have argued that the US needs to resume full testing in order to test the safety and reliability of current stockpiles.

Retired Air Force General John Gordon, head of the National Nuclear Security Administration that manages US nuclear weapons under the Department of Energy, requested the

study. The review to assess Nevada Test Site readiness will be headed by experts from the Nevada Test Site and Lawrence Livermore and Los Alamos National Laboratories. Many experts say that returning to full nuclear testing will undermine international arms control efforts and provoke new arms races. However, the same experts also state the US can circumvent such consequences by continuing to rely on subcritical nuclear testing and computer simulations to test weapons.

In 1999, the US Senate rejected ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), arguing that a global ban would be unverifiable. President Bush supported the Senate's rejection of the CTBT and refuses to call for a new vote.
(source: Knight Ridder/Tribune News Service, 28 June 2001)

Pakistan Declares Conditional End to Nuclear Testing

Abdul Sattar, Foreign Minister of Pakistan, assured US Secretary of State Colin Powell that his country will not conduct any further nuclear weapons tests provided India demonstrates the same restraint. India and Pakistan conducted underground nuclear tests in May 1998. Sattar was visiting the US as part of attempts to restore Pakistan-US relations and argue for the removal of sanctions imposed on the country because of its nuclear weapons activities.

During his US visit, Sattar also spoke at a conference held by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Sattar stated that over the last year, Pakistan has strengthened its control of strategic weapons. He also stated that Pakistan would not be the first to resume nuclear testing in the region.

General Pervez Musharraf, Pakistan's military ruler, is scheduled to visit India from 14-16 July for summit talks with India's Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee. The summit will break a two-year deadlock on the peace process in the South Asian region.

US Lifts Sanctions on India

On 15 June, the Bush administration decided to lift sanctions imposed on India after it conducted nuclear weapons tests in May 1998. By lifting the sanctions imposed by former US President Bill Clinton, the Bush administration hopes to expand military and economic ties to the world's most populous democracy. The US action also acknowledges that India does not intend to give up its nuclear arsenal.
(source: Mercury News Washington Bureau, 15 June 2001)

MILITARY COLONIALISM

Babies and Stillborns Used in Nuclear Experiments

British newspapers reported that some 6,000 stillborn babies and dead infants were sent from hospitals in Australia, Canada, Hong Kong, South America, the UK and the US between the 1950s and 1970s without the permission of parents for use in nuclear experiments. According to the reports, the US Department of Energy used the bodies and some body parts for tests to monitor radioactivity levels of the element Strontium 90 in humans. University of Chicago physician Willard Libby started "Project Sunshine" in 1955, appealing for bodies, preferably stillborn or newly-born babies, to test the impact of an atomic bomb fallout. Libby later received a Nobel prize for his research in carbon dating.

In response to the reports, the Australian government launched an investigation into the claims on 5 June. The Observer, a British newspaper, also stated that British scientists also conducted tests on babies sent from Hong Kong and the research did not end until the 1970s. A government spokesman for Hong Kong announced that his country will investigate further into the reports.

(source: Reuters, 6 June 2001)

Doctor Claims Disabled People Used as Human Guinea Pigs in Nuclear Experiments

Suspicious that people with severe disabilities were used as human guinea pigs during British nuclear tests at the Maralinga Test Site in Australia in the 1950s were revived in June. According to the allegations, a control group was flown to the British test site as part of an experiment on the effects of radiation on humans. The group died after being exposed to the radioactive fallout.

The allegations were dismissed as unsubstantiated in a final report of a royal commission into British nuclear tests in Australia in December 1985. However, Dr. Robert Jackson, Director of the Center for Disability Research and Development at Edith Cowan University in Australia, is concerned that the Royal Commission did not hear testimonials from pilots. Dr. Jackson first discovered the story in the 1980s when he was the Regional Director for the Western Australia Disability Commission. In June, he was approached by a man who claimed to be a pilot and had flown a planeload of disabled people from the UK to Maralinga Test Site. The pilot told Dr. Jackson, "We didn't fly them out again." Former servicemen, who are also fighting for compensation for radiation exposure at the British nuclear tests in South Australia and Monte Bello islands, will further investigate the story.

(source: Western Australian Newspapers Limited, 12 June 2001)

NUCLEAR MATTERS

Bush Shocked by Nuclear Numbers

Newsweek magazine reported in its 25 June edition that US President George W. Bush was stunned when he learned of the extent of the US nuclear arsenal. According to the report, Bush stated, "I had no idea we had so many weapons. What do we need them for?"

After taking office, Bush commissioned Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld to prepare an assessment of the nuclear arsenal and make recommendations to streamline and downsize it. Rumsfeld has called upon retired General George Lee Butler, the former head of Strategic Command, and Richard Perle, a security adviser to former US President Ronald Reagan, to make recommendations on reducing the arsenal to "safer, more manageable and more cost efficient levels."

Currently, the United States has 7,300 suspected strategic nuclear weapons and between 4,700 and 11,700 suspected non-strategic nuclear weapons for a suspected total of 10,500-12,000 nuclear weapons.

Perle was quoted in Newsweek Magazine as stating, "I see no reason why we can't go below 1,000 warheads. I want the lowest number possible under the tightest control. The truth is, we are never going to use them. The Russians aren't going to use theirs either."

For more information on the US nuclear arsenal and global nuclear stockpiles, visit the Nuclear Files at <http://www.nuclearfiles.org>
(source: Newsweek Magazine, 25 June 2001; Reuters, 17 June 2001)

North Korea Refuses Nuclear Inspection

According to an official news report, North Korea will not allow UN monitors to inspect its nuclear program until the US expedites construction of two nuclear power plants. In a 1994 agreement, North Korea agreed to freeze its nuclear program and, in exchange, the US agreed to provide the country with two nuclear reactors. North Korea claims that it does not have the ability to build atomic weapons and its nuclear program was for "peaceful" purposes only. The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) wants to assess that claim before construction can begin and says that it could take two to three years to verify the claim. North Korea is a member state of Non-Proliferation Treaty, which contains a provision allowing the IAEA to verify that nuclear technology in a non-nuclear weapon state member is used only for "peaceful" purposes.

The construction of the reactors has also been delayed by funding shortages and political tensions. According to US officials, the program is now five years behind schedule and construction completion is not expected until 2008. The Bush administration wants verification that North Korea was not building atomic bombs before reactor construction can continue. North Korea accused the IAEA of acting at the command of the US.
(source: AP, 21 June 2001)

Nuclear Explosion in Russian Factory Leaves Four Dead and Three Injured

According to a report from the Russian Ministry released on 22 June, a nuclear explosion on 21 June caused four deaths and three injuries. A previous report stated that there was only one death and seven injuries. The explosion, which was reportedly self-generated, occurred in the calcium reprocessing area of the Tchepetski factory in Glazov, Russia. The factory specializes in manufacturing zirconium alloys and enriched uranium.

(source: AFP, 22 June)

NUCLEAR INSANITY

"If you set aside Three Mile Island and Chernobyl, the safety record of nuclear is really very good."

Paul O'Neill
US Secretary of Treasury
13 June 2001, New York Times

The Radioactive Boy Scout

On 26 June 1995, in Golf Manor, Michigan (some 25 miles outside of Detroit), neighbors watched nervously as employees of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), donned in white moon suits and carrying respirators, dismantled a shed and stuffed the pieces into large steel drums with radioactive warning signs. Although the EPA employees told the neighborhood there was nothing to worry about, the shed was dangerously irradiated and according to the EPA, up to 40,000 residents in the area could have been at risk. David Hahn, a teenager who attempted to build a nuclear reactor in his mother's shed, caused the incident.

An ambitious, curious and intelligent young boy, David's father encouraged him to become an Eagle Scout, which requires earning 21 merit badges. After earning his merit badge in Atomic Energy in May 1991, David became determined to build a neutron "gun." Using concocted identities, David was able to obtain information from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission on isolating and obtaining radioactive elements as well as the characteristics of some isotopes that can sustain nuclear reactions after being bombarded with electrons.

After many experiments, David was able to produce his "gun" and at the age of 17 had the idea of building a model breeder reactor, a nuclear reactor that not only produces electricity, but new fuel as well. One night, David mixed radium and americium with beryllium and aluminum, all wrapped in aluminum foil as a makeshift reactor core. He placed small foil-wrapped cubes of thorium ash and uranium powder around the radioactive ball and bonded them together with duct tape. He began to realize that the "reactor" was too radioactive and thought that he was putting himself and others in danger. David then decided to disassemble the "reactor" and discard the elements in various places. He put most of the materials in the trunk of his car.

Responding to a call concerning a young man stealing tires, Clinton Township police discovered David in his car at 2:30 am on 31 August 1994. Although David told the police he was meeting a friend, they were suspicious and decided to search his car. It was then that they discovered a toolbox containing radioactive materials, which at the time they feared was an atomic bomb. The discovery eventually triggered involvement by the Federal Radiological Emergency Response Plan and state officials in consultation with the EPA and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. At the shed, officials found materials contaminated up to 1,000 times the normal levels of background radiation. The dismantled shed and its contents filled 39 barrels that were trucked to a disposal site in the Utah Desert.

(source: Harper's Magazine. The full story is available at:
<http://www.dangerouslaboratories.org/radscout.html>)

NAPF HAPPENINGS

New Book from NAPF

A Maginot Line in the Sky: International Perspectives on Ballistic Missile Defense, edited by David Krieger and Carah Ong, brings together the views of eighteen contributors of different nationalities, including Americans, on the proposed US Ballistic Missile Defense plans. These perspectives should be included in any intelligent discussion of whether or not the US should proceed with development and deployment of missile defense systems. The book is available at \$14.95 per copy plus shipping and handling (\$4.00 US/\$7.00 International). To order a copy, please send an email to research@napf.org or call the Foundation at +1 (805) 965-3443. Please allow 2-3 weeks for delivery.

Annual Awards Dinner

Since 1984 the Foundation has honored some of the great peace leaders of our time with its Distinguished Peace Leadership Award. This year the Foundation will honor Craig Kielburger and Hafsat Abiola, two of the most courageous young leaders of the 21st century, in order to highlight the extraordinary contributions made by youth in shaping humanity's future. Craig is an 18-year-old Toronto. He is founder of Free the Children and has traveled the world on behalf of children's rights. Hafsat Abiola is a 25-year-old woman from Lagos, Nigeria and founder of Kudirat Initiative for Democracy (KIND). Hafsat has been a tireless advocate for human rights, women and children throughout the African continent.

The awards will be presented at a dinner and ceremony on Friday, November 9th in Santa Barbara, CA. For more information about the recipients or the event, please contact Chris Pizzinat at the Foundation's offices at (805) 965-3443 or by e-mail at cpizzinat@napf.org.

ACTIONS YOU CAN TAKE

Sadako Peace Day

August 6th is the anniversary date of the first use of atomic weapons. Each year the Foundation commemorates this event in order to reflect on the past and offer hope for the future. If you live on the California Central Coast, join us for the 7th Annual Sadako Peace Day on Monday, August 6th at Sadako Peace Garden located at La Casa de Maria Retreat Center in Montecito, CA. The focus for this year's program will be on the next generation and will include music, poetry and reflection. For more information, contact the Foundation at (805) 965-3443.

Would you like to learn more about the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki? Visit the Foundation's website at <http://www.wagingpeace.org> to view our extensive online photograph exhibit. How will you commemorate the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki? Send an email to Carah Ong at research@napf.org with the details of your event. We will list the events being held throughout the world on our website.

International Day of Protest to Stop the Militarization of Space

The second annual International Day of Protest to Stop the Militarization of Space will be held on 13 October 2001. The annual day is coordinated by the Global Network Against Weapons and Nuclear Power in Space. Organizations and individuals all around the world are encouraged to organize an event in their community and join the list of endorsers. For more information, please visit the Global Network's website at <http://www.space4peace.org> or contact Bruce Gagnon, GN Coordinator, by email at globalnet@mindspring.com.

BOOK REVIEWS

For the Sake of Peace

By Daisaku Ikeda

"Human hands produced nuclear weapons and weaponry systems, and human hands should be able to reduce and eliminate them. If we stand idle and fail in this, we will rob future generations of their dreams. But even more horrendous, given the total-destruction capabilities of contemporary weapons, we could rob future generations not only of their dreams but also of their very existence."

-Daisaku Ikeda, pp. 199-200

For the Sake of Peace, by Daisaku Ikeda, is a book based on more than 25 years of university

lectures and proposals to the United Nations addressing the issues of peace from a Buddhist perspective. Mr. Ikeda is the president of Soka Gakai International, one of the most dynamic Buddhist movements in the world today with 12 million members in 163 countries. Mr. Ikeda is a peace activist and has traveled to more than 50 countries to spread the peaceful and compassionate teachings of Buddhism. He has held many dialogues with people, including political and intellectual leaders, applying his conviction that international understanding and the realization of peace begins with people-to-people contacts. For his work, Mr. Ikeda received the United Nations Peace Award in 1983. He has written over 200 books, many of which have been translated into foreign languages.

For the Sake of Peace invites readers to dialogue with Mr. Ikeda on the seven paths to peace presented in the book, including self-mastery, global awareness and disarmament. The book is an invaluable tool for those seeking new answers to the issues of our day. For the Sake of Peace inspires hope that a more peaceful world can be created, beginning with the individual and spreading throughout all society.

To order a copy of For the Sake of Peace, visit your favorite bookstore or order a copy online at <http://www.middlewaypress.com>. ISBN0-9674697-2-4

Mission Mururoa: An Adventure Novel Set In Tahiti

This entertaining but provocative and timely novel can complement existing Anti-Nuclear Weapons Testing Literature by adding the versatility of Adventure Fiction. The novel is timely, highlighting leaking radionucleides from the Moruroa Atoll.

In this novel, the scene is set when Lazarus Tretiak, a Physics Instructor and four of his students at the French University of the Pacific in Tahiti, decide to hijack an advanced deep-ocean submersible and its research vessel. The activists are determined to use the submersible to photograph the Mururoa Atoll near Tahiti to prove to the world that dangerous radionucleides from previous atomic testing are leaking into the South Pacific.

To force the commander of the submersible tender, Admiral Alain Gagnon, to travel to the Mururoa Atoll the activists involve the Admiral's stepdaughter, Terri'i. The result is a fast-pitched adventure matching Jacques L'Amareau, Head of the French equivalent of the CIA, against the ringleader of the nuclear protestors.

The novel is also available in paperback (\$18.00) and hardback (\$25.00) at <http://www1.Xlibris.com/bookstore> or from Xlibris Corporation, 436 Walnut St., 11th. Floor, Philadelphia PA 19106, U.S.A.; 1-888-795-4274, or from Barnes & Noble.com, Amazon.com and Borders.com. ISBN07388-6399-8

RESOURCES

Visit the ever-evolving website of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation at
[Http://www.wagingpeace.org](http://www.wagingpeace.org)

Order a Nuclear Age Peace Foundation T-shirt! Visit
<http://napf.org/secure/tshirts.html>

Take a journey through the Nuclear Age. Visit the Nuclear Files at <Http://www.nuclearfiles.org>

"The New Nuclear Danger" by Jonathan Schell, printed in the June 25, 2001 edition of The Nation Magazine is available online at:
<http://www.thenation.com/doc.mhtml?i=20010625&s=schell>

"Strengthening the Non-Proliferation Regime: The Challenge of Regional Nuclear Arsenals" is a new policy bulletin from The Stanley Foundation. The full report is available online at:
<http://reports.stanleyfdn.org>

The spring 2001 issue of World Policy Journal includes an article by Jim Wurst and John Burroughs of the Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy entitled, "Ending the Nuclear Nightmare: A Strategy for the Bush Administration." The article is available online at
<http://www.worldpolicy.org>

The new edition of Disarmament Diplomacy (No. 57, May 2001), the monthly newsletter of the Acronym Institute is now available online at: <http://www.acronym.org.uk/dd/dd57/index.htm>

EDITORS

Carah Ong
David Krieger

--

Carah Lynn Ong
Research and Publications

The Nuclear Age Peace Foundation
PMB 121, 1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 1
Santa Barbara, California 93108-2794 USA

Tel: 805-965-3443
Fax: 805-568-0466
Email: research@napf.org
[Http://www.wagingpeace.org](http://www.wagingpeace.org)
[Http://www.nuclearfiles.org](http://www.nuclearfiles.org)

[Http://www.abolition2000.org](http://www.abolition2000.org)

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

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

To Unsubscribe, send a blank message to: sunflower-napf-unsubscribe@eGroups.com

Your use of Yahoo! Groups is subject to the [Yahoo! Terms of Service](#).

X-Sender: abolition2000@mail.abolition2000.org
Date: Tue, 3 Jul 2001 14:36:14 -0600
To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com, abolition-caucus@yahoogroups.com
From: Carah Lynn Ong
Subject: (abolition-usa) New to the Abolition 2000 website
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

New to the Abolition 2000 website:

Stop the New Arms Race! White House Rally Speech by Jackie Cabasso
<http://www.abolition2000.org/testimony/cabasso61001.html>

Ballistic Missile Defense Fact Sheet Produced by the Indian Coalition for Nuclear Disarmament and Peace (CNDP)
<http://www.abolition2000.org/issues/bmd-fact-sheet.html>

Review and Strategy Meeting Report from Nagasaki, Japan
<http://www.abolition2000.org/reports/nagasakireview.html>

**Abolition 2000: A Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons
ANNUAL REPORT 2000**
<http://www.abolition2000.org/reports/annualreport2000.html>

Nagasaki Appeal
<http://www.abolition2000.org/resolutions/NagasakiAppeal.html>

Saffron Walden Declaration
<http://www.abolition2000.org/resolutions/saffronwalden.html>

International Earth Charter Summit
September 29, 2001
<http://www.abolition2000.org/Earth%20Charter/index.html>

The Corporate-Security State
An international teach-in on the use of global police and militaries to protect corporate globalization against people and democratic dissent.

<http://www.abolition2000.org/Events/ottawateachin.html>

--

Carah Lynn Ong
Coordinator

Abolition 2000 Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons
PMB 121, 1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 1
Santa Barbara, California 93108-2794 USA

Tel: 805-965-3443

Fax: 805-568-0466

Email: abolition2000@napf.org

[Http://www.abolition2000.org](http://www.abolition2000.org)

Join the Abolition Global Caucus, send a message to abolition-caucus-subscribe@egroups.com

User-Agent: Microsoft-Outlook-Express-Macintosh-Edition/5.02.2022
Date: Thu, 05 Jul 2001 15:54:35 -0400
Subject: Hallman addresses
From: Edward Brueggemann <edbruegge@mediaone.net>
To: Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.org>

Howard:

Well, let's try this. I am attempting to attach to this note the addresses of all of the clan. Let me know whether or not you can open it and the format is one you can read. If not, we will try it another way. After I hear an affirmative, I will send along a few other items that may be of assistance to you in planning for 2004. edb

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\Hallman addresses"

To: Edward Brueggemann <edbruegge@mediaone.net>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Hallman addresses
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <B76A3E3B.E4C%edbruegge@mediaone.net>
References:

Ed,

It didn't work. All I got was symbols. Try sending it as text in an e-mail message. If it comes through, I can work on the formatting.

We arrived home last night after spending four days at Lake Junaluska with day trips into the Smokies. It was very enjoyable, including music and fireworks on the lake on the 4th.

The reunion was great. Thanks to the Bruegemann's for all the effort.

Howard

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

Date: Fri, 06 Jul 2001 08:50:00 -0400

Subject: addresses

From: Edward Brueggemann

To: Howard Hallman Howard:

Let me know what comes through. If this comes through in good shape will will send you copies of letter sent and a financial summary. edb

Last Name; First Names; Linage; address; Email

Anderson Howard / Fran (Hugo, Virginia) 1707 Pembroke, Ln.; Topeka, KS 66604-3258
howardfran@yahoo.com

Briggs Lisa / David : Tyler, Haleigh (Boots, Gordon) 9759 Edgepine Dr.; Dallas TX 75238
lisahbriggs@msn.com

Brueggemann Edward / LuAnn (Hilda) 149 East Side Dr. #155; Concord, NH 03301-5475
edbruegge@mediaone.net

Brueggemann Walter / Mary (Hilda) 4 Downshire Lane; Decatur, GA 30033-1414
mmbruegg@aol.com

Brueggemann Donald / Marjorie Waters : Erin Waters (Hilda, Edward) 595D East Deering Rd.;
Deering NH 03244-9313 none

Brueggemann Barbara / David Sanborn : Quinn Brueggemann (Hilda, Edward) P. O. Box 332;
Durham NH 03824-0332 bdq@mediaone.net

Brueggemann James / Lisa : Christiana, James August (Hilda, Walter) 1121 Hudson Pl.;
Davidson NC 28036 jbruegg@aol.com

Brueggemann John / Christina McHugh (Hilda, Walter) 38 Second St.; Saratoga Springs NY 12866
jbruegge@skidmore.edu

Burns Ellen / Brian : Caitlin, Brendon, Christopher (Hugo, Virginia) 6363 South Walden Ct;
Aurora CO 80016 eaaburns@aol.com

Churchill Elisha / Paul : Henry, Hudson (Hugo, Edgar) 7633 Santa fe Dr.; Overland Park, KS 66204
paulnlish@aol.com

Gniadek Diane / Pete : Deanna, Nicole, Tyler (Boots, Stan) 6270 Lemonwood Dr.;
Colorado Springs, CO 80918 pgni@aol.com

Guarino Deborah / Michael : Caitlin, Tyler (Hilda, Edward) 7 Hobbs Rd.; Lee, NH
03824-6436 guari@mediaone.net

Hallman Katrina (Boots, Gordon) 5810 Grassmere Ln. #51; Dallas TX 75205
katrinaeh@yahoo.com

Hallman Gordon / Joan (Boots) 10515 Yorkshire Dr.; Dallas, TX 75238
joanhallman@hotmail.com

Hallman Stanley / Nancy (Boots) 3978 Jasmine; Denver, CO 80237 none

Hallman Howard / Carlee (Herb) 6508 Wilmilt Rd; Bethesda, MD 20817-2318
mupj@igc.org

Hallman Joy : Matthew (Herb, Howard) 10013 Montauk Ave.; Bethesda, MD 20817
jlhallman@aol.com

Hallman Jeanette (Hugo, Victor) 110 Downing; Hutchinson, KS 67502-4453
vhall110@southwind.net

Hallman Brian / Rhonda : Samantha, Brittany, Christian (Hugo, Victor) 931 Bayhill Dr.;
Sugarland, TX 77479 bhallman@slb.com

Hallman Mary (Herb, Bob) 171 Fairfield; Elmhurst, IL 60126-3231 none

Hallman Edgar / Ernestene (Hugo) 6925 Santa Fe; Overland Park, KS 66204-1357
halledee@aol.com

Hallman Eric / Mitzi : Alexis, Hunter, Chrissy (Hugo, Edgar) 12860 South Gallery; Olathe,
KS 66062 jems0615@aol.com

Hallman David / Linda : Derek, Alec (Boots, Stan) 29106 Histead Dr.; Evergreen, CO
80439 dhall29106@aol.com

Hallman Bruce / Kellie : Levi, Nisi, Bekah, Dena, Gideon (Boots, Stan) 521 Redwood
Circle;
Berthold, CO 80513 hallman7@juno.com

Hurrel Mary (Herb) 2812 Huntoon; Topeka, KS 66604-1614 none

Johnson Beth / Ken Hayden: Weston, Kendra (Herb, Howard) 9426 Collette Way;
Gaithersburg MD 20886 bahj666@aol.com

Knutson Marjorie / Don (Boots) 15201 North 8th Ave.; Phoenix, AZ 85023
DKNUTSONR@aol.com

Knutson Suzanne : Dakota (Boots, Marjorie) 110 E. Greenway Parkway #1108; Phoenix AZ 85022 sknutsone@aol.com

Knutson John / Corine : David (Boots, Marjorie) 6225 Mariposa Ave; 29 Palms CA 92277 knutson6@juno.com

McQueen Terri / Mike : Max, Lillie (Hugo, Victor) 1319 E. 153rd Terrace; Olathe, KS 66062 maxandlil@yahoo.com

Mehall Lynette / Richard ³Rick² (Herb, Bob) 24665 Iroquois Ln.; Hudson, IL 61748-9761 lmehall@attglobal.net

Mehall Luke (Herb, Bob, Lynette) 24665 Iroquois Ln.; Hudson, IL 61748-9761 lmehall@attglobal.net

Mehall Clint (Herb, Bob, Lynette) 24665 Iroquois Ln.; Hudson, IL 61748-9761 lmehall@attglobal.net

Moore Jennifer / Jeff : Preston, Trevor (Boots, Gordon) 2114 JJ Pearce Dr.; Richardson TX jenhallman_moore@yahoo.com

Pepper Carol / James : Graham, Hudson (Hugo, Virginia) 2319 Lighthouse Lane; Wilmington, DE 19810 cpepper@towerhill.org

Prull Denise / Dwayne (Hugo, Victor) 18933 Timber Rd.; Monticello, IA 52310 prulld@crossnet.org

Reaves Sarah / Nate : Lana (Boots, Jeanette) 7801 W. 64th; Overland Park KS 66202

Sherard Marjorie / Jackson : Dana, Spencer (Boots, Jeanette) 4905 W. 72nd; Prairie Village KS 66208

Spencer Jeanette / Ken (Boots) 6234 Reinhardt; Fairway, KS 66205 SPENCERSAGE@aol.com

Spencer Leslee (Boots, Jeanette) 6234 Reinhardt; Fairway, KS 66205 SPENCERSAGE@aol.com

Spencer Ben (Boots, Jeanette) 6702 Tower D Apt #10; Alexandria, VA 22303 spencbe@opp.51.edu

Vettraino Sara / Michael : Nicole, David (Herb, Bob) 1886 Jahns Dr.; Wheaton, IL 60187-8479 mvettraino@aol.com

Walaitis Karen / Gregory : Megan, Derek (Boots, Marjorie) 5868 W. Harrison St.; Chandler

AZ 85226 walaitis@uswest.net

To: Edward Brueggemann <edbruegge@mediaone.net>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: addresses
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <B76B2C38.E50%edbruegge@mediaone.net>
References:

Ed,

I came through without a problem.

Thanks,
Howard

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

Date: Fri, 06 Jul 2001 12:18:03 -0400

Subject: Initial letter

From: Edward Brueggemann

To: Howard Hallman Howard:

In separate Emails I am sending you a copy of the several letters used to get folk to the reunion. Discard them as you see fit. The financial summary will follow when Mary sends me her notes. It may tak a few weeks because they have a big wedding next week. Below is the Initial letter.
edb

Hallman2001

Montreat/Black Mountain, N.C.

June 29-July 1, 2001

Sept. 23, 1998

It's less than 3 months since since the Hallmans were together in Austin. And in less than 33 months we will gather in Montreat, NC from June 29 to July 1, 2001. Mark the date down now and send copies of this memo to your children.

Walter and Mary's summer home is just 20 miles east of Asheville and near Mt. Mitchell and the Blue Ridge Parkway. If you will be flying, Asheville will be your destination. You can enjoy the area before, during and after we gather June 29-July 1.

At a later time we will send maps, information on area motels, campgrounds and attractions. Montreat features hiking trails, large swimming pool, outdoor basketball and tennis. In nearby Black Mountain are craft shops and a golf course which features a par 6 on the back 9.

Right now just hold the dates and get your clan on board.

Co-hosts: Walter and Mary Brueggemann; Edward and LuAnn Brueggemann
Address all correspondence to: 60 Winding Pond Road; Londonderry, New Hampshire
03053-3371
e-mail: EDBruegge@aol.com 603-434-4725

User-Agent: Microsoft-Outlook-Express-Macintosh-Edition/5.02.2022
Date: Fri, 06 Jul 2001 12:22:10 -0400
Subject: May 2001
From: Edward Brueggemann <edbruegge@mediaone.net>
To: Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.org>

Hallman2001
Montreat/Black Mountain, N.C.
June 29-July 1, 2001

May 1, 2001

Dear Cousins:

Less than 2 months! This will be the last mailing before we see each other in Montreat, NC. We expect 50 adults & 25 children from 28 family units. Let us know if your plans change.

There will be a welcome packet for your family when you check in at your selected Inn which you have previously indicated to us. (Ask for it.) This will include directions to Walter and Mary's summer home 439 Kentucky Rd. in Montreat, about 2 miles from the Comfort Inn. In case you get lost, their phone in Montreat is 828-669-2736. Your packet will also include a listing of all who are expected to attend, where they are staying as well as a map of the area & interesting things to do.

For your convenience we remind you that you can secure maps and tourist information from:

N. C. Travel/Tourist Division: 1-800-847-4862; and Black Mt.
Chamber of Commerce 1-800-669-2301

Outline of the weekend

Friday beginning at 3:30 PM, June 29, 2001

Wine and cheese on the deck of Walter and Mary's summer home in Montreat.
Small groups will gather on their own for dining and entertainment.
We will have a list of choices for your perusal during wine and cheese.

Saturday, June 30, 2001

Morning and afternoon are free time for a variety of activities including mountain hiking, visiting, swimming, visiting, golf (with a 700 yard par 6), shopping (don't miss the Folk Art Center), visiting, and touring. Some activities require advance reservations such as touring the Biltmore Estate (see enclosure) and white water rafting (see enclosure) Carl Sandburg's home is nearby. So plan ahead.

At 6:30 PM we will gather at the Black Mountain Presbyterian Church for a catered dinner. Brian Hallman will be the MC. Bring family stories and any memorabilia.

Cost for dinner is: Adults: \$19 (including all 9 yrs. and older;
Children 4 to 8 years of age \$9
Children 3 and under are free

Terri McQueen will distribute Hallman cookbooks to those who ordered them.

(Please be prepared to pay for dinner by check or cash and for the cookbooks if you ordered them.)

Sunday, July 1, 2001 10 AM to noon---Brunch on the deck of Walter and Mary's home

We are looking forward to seeing each of you at this 2001 Hallman Reunion. Do let us know of ways we can be of help in your planning your trip. We do hope you will bring old family pictures for all to see. If you have any questions, please write, call or E-mail.

Sincerely,

The Brueggemanns

Walter and Mary Brueggemann

LuAnn Brueggemann

#4 Downshire Lane
Decatur, GA 30033-1414
03301-5475

E-mail: mmbruegg@al.com
voice mail: 404-327-9159

Co-hosts Edward and

149 East Side Dr. #155;
Concord, NH

E-mail: EDBruegge@mediaone.net
voice mail: 603-225-2460

User-Agent: Microsoft-Outlook-Express-Macintosh-Edition/5.02.2022
Date: Fri, 06 Jul 2001 12:23:36 -0400
Subject: Welcome letter in packet
From: Edward Brueggemann <edbruegge@mediaone.net>
To: Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.org>

Welcome to Hallman2001

Welcome Hallman Cousins:

Please review this welcome packet so you can ask additional questions over wine and cheese at Walter and Mary Brueggemann's cottage at 439 Kentucky Rd. in Montreat, about 2 miles from the Comfort Inn. In case you get lost, their phone is 828-669-2736. (There is limited parking at the cottage. Plan to car pool as much as possible. Drivers may have to let passengers out and park down at the bottom of Kentucky Road. There will be folks ³curbside² to help with this.)

Your packet includes a large ³Hudson Cream² button for each member of your family. Please wear these so other Hallmans will know you are one of us. Name tags are also provided at the Comfort Inn and at the cottage.

Friday beginning at 3:30 PM, June 29, 2001

Wine and cheese on the deck of Walter and Mary's summer home in Montreat. Dress is casual. Directions to their home are in this packet. For dinner small groups will gather on their own for dining and entertainment. There is a list of dining choices in your packet.

During the Saturday evening dinner, there will be child care at the Brueggemann cottage for babies or small children. Please let us know on Friday if you want to use this service.

For those with children there is a wonderful creek back of the cottage. Bring a change of clothing whenever you come to the cottage. There is no way to hop rocks and not get wet! And there is no way to keep children away from the creek! Old tennis shoes, etc. are helpful.

Saturday, June 30, 2001

Morning and afternoon are free time for a variety of activities including visiting, shopping in Black Mountain, the Folk Art Center on the Blue Ridge Parkway, Biltmore Villages, touring the many sights in the Swannanoa Valley, swimming (see map, cost is \$2.00), golf (with a 700 yard par 6, the longest municipal course in the US; \$35. green fee with cart) & rafting. John Brueggemann and Christina McHugh have agreed to take anyone who wants to on a mountain hike (speak with them about it over wine and cheese). Also, sitting in a rocker at the Brueggemann cottage is an excellent choice!

There will be four identical red notebooks available that have many suggestions for activities and things to do. Two are at the Comfort Inn & two at the

Brueggemann cottage.

At 6:30 PM we will gather at the Black Mountain Presbyterian Church for a catered dinner. The church is on the road up to Montreat and will be easy to find. Brian Hallman will be the MC. Bring family stories and any memorabilia. Remember, it will be new to the children! Dress casual.

Cost for dinner is: Adults: \$19 (9 yrs. and older;)

Children: \$9 (4 to 8 years of age)

Children 3 and under: free

Terri McQueen will distribute Hallman2001 Cookbooks to those who ordered them. (Please be prepared to pay for dinner and cookbooks by check or cash)

Sunday, July 1, 2001, 10 AM to noon

Brunch on the deck of the Brueggemann cottage and creek wading for the children (see Fri.)

See you in Washington, DC in 2004

To: Edward Brueggemann <edbruegge@mediaone.net>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: A correction
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <B76B5E48.E57%edbruegge@mediaone.net>
References:

Dear Ed,

All of your letters arrived okay.

In going through the roster of names, I noticed that you put Joy's fiance, Ken Hayden and children, with Beth's name. I didn't catch this error on the list you put in the packet. I'll make the correction. You can, also. By the way, it's a great list and very useful tool for Hallman 2004.

Howard

John Isaacs

The \$33 billion increase is more than twice the combined \$12.8 billion defense budget totals of all the so-called "rogue states" — Iran, Iraq, Libya, North Korea, Cuba, Sudan and Syria — that has led to a feverish push for a national missile defense.

In fact, missile defense funding has received one of the largest increases in the budget, from \$5.3 billion to \$8.3 billion, a 57% increase.

From: "Lisa Wright" <lisaw@nccusa.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: Letter on NMD
Date: Fri, 6 Jul 2001 16:23:26 -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

Howard - I think this probably won't get many signatures, unfortunately. It reads just harshly enough, and there are many who don't see funding the Dept. of Defense as theft, that I think we'll need to modify that principle. I was actually thinking we should go back to some of the language from the statement on disarmament, regarding the integrity of creation, and about peace. Or else speak in terms of weighted benefits, and our concern for those with the least. Same goes for the "false witness" piece. They both give the letter a very negative tone, rather than affirming our concerns for hope, justice, peace, etc... Maybe even citing some of the language from Isaiah would be a good alternative. I'll see what else I can come across.

Lisa

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Friday, July 06, 2001 10:31 AM
To: lisaw@nccusa.org
Subject: Letter on NMD

Dear Lisa,

Thanks for your comments on the draft letter on national missile defense. I agree that we should provide a religious basis for our concern.

While on vacation I thought of a way to do this by invoking two religious tenets: you shall not steal, and you shall not bear false witness. I have done this in the following redraft.

Maybe it is too blunt, but perhaps we should be speaking forthrightly. What do you think? Let me know as soon as possible so that I can get the letter into circulation for signatures.

Howard

###

Proposed letter to members of House and Senate Armed Services Committees and Appropriation Committees from representatives of faith-based organizations

Dear Representative/Senator: (to be individualized)

As you consider authorization and appropriations measures for national missile defense, we the undersigned representatives of faith-based organizations would like to offer you our perspective. We believe that pouring vast public funds into development and deployment of national defense transgresses a fundamental principle of all religions: you shall not steal. We believe that advocates of missile defense violate another religious tenet: you shall not bear false witness.

On the matter of stealing we recall the wisdom of President Dwight D. Eisenhower. In an address before the American Society of Newspaper Editors on April 16, 1953 he stated: "Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed." This statement is so important to the Eisenhower legacy that these words are engraved on the walls of his tomb in Abilene, Kansas.

A huge theft of this nature is contained in the defense authorization and appropriation bills for the 2002 fiscal year. It comes in the form of proposed \$8.3 billion in spending for national missile defense. This would steal money from efforts to "Leave No Child Behind", to provide adequate health care for millions of America, to deal with the global HIV/AIDS crisis, and to meet other urgent social needs. This is clearly wrong and immoral.

On the matter of false witness, we believe that advocates of national missile defense are stirring up fears over a danger that realistically does not exist. There is no credible threat to the American homeland from long-range missiles. Only Russia, China, the United Kingdom, and France have missiles of that range, but they are not on the danger list offered by missile defense proponents. Of the so-called "rogue" states that are said to be a threat, only North Korea has tried to develop a long-range missile. This program is under suspension and could be permanently terminated through diplomacy and selective financial assistance. Moreover, it is not credible that North Korea would attack the United States because of the assurance of massive retaliation. No other potentially hostile state has an effective missile program that would endanger the United States. There are a variety of nonproliferation measures that can prevent them from developing one. If there is a danger, it comes from weapons of mass destruction smuggled into the United States or delivered by other means than long-range missiles.

The beneficiaries of the national missile defense program are not the American people but rather large defense contractors. They are spending millions every year in political campaign contributions and lobbying operations to promote missile defense. This calls to mind President Eisenhower's warning in his farewell address to the American people: "In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex." You who serve on authorization and appropriation committees should be our guardians.

For these reasons, we ask you to cut back on authorization and appropriations for national missile defense and to redirect these resources

to programs that meet important human and community needs.

Sincerely yours,

Representatives of faith-based organizations.

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: "Lisa Wright" <lisaw@nccusa.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: Letter on NMD
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <NDBBIPMPILLJDFNEEBCOMELODMAA.lisaw@nccusa.org>
References: <3.0.3.32.20010706103118.00693358@pop2.igc.org>

Lisa,

I don't quarrel with your concern about "false witness". I'm not sure it's the right way to go. However, I would like to keep in the Eisenhower quote, but not necessarily approaching it through "you shall not steal". Perhaps we can start with the kind of language you are searching for, such as the integrity of creation, or through a social justice theme.

I will appreciate it if you can come up with something by mid-day on Monday, July 11. It's a hot issue, and I would like to get a new version out on Monday afternoon.

On the present draft I got three signers and no comments other than yours.

Howard

**Russian American Nuclear Security Advisory Council
Congressional Strategic Stability and Security Seminar**

Seminar 2: Cooperative Nuclear Threat Reduction Activities in Russia

May 18, 2001

Prepared by Bill Hoehn

On May 18, the Russian American Nuclear Security Advisory Council (RANSAC) held the second briefing in a series of non-partisan seminars for Congressional staff on key issues in the U.S.-Russian nuclear relationship. The May seminar focused on issues related to U.S.-funded nuclear threat reduction programs in Russia, and featured three expert speakers. The following is a summary of their remarks.

Remarks by **Kenneth A. Myers, III**, Legislative Assistant for National Security and Foreign Affairs for Senator Richard G. Lugar

Myers opened by distinguishing between “Cooperative Threat Reduction” programs and other U.S. activities to reduce nuclear dangers in Russia. He noted that a strict definition of Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) refers to the program led by the Department of Defense, based on the “Nunn-Lugar” legislation of 1991. Some efforts have been split off from, or built on, the original CTR program. These complementary efforts are administered by a variety of other agencies – most notably the Department of Energy and the Department of State, but also including contributions from the Departments of Agriculture and Health and Human Services, and other agencies.

For example, the largest “threat reduction” program supported by the State Department is the International Science and Technology Center (ISTC). U.S. contributions represent 30-70% of the Center’s budget, depending on the year. The ISTC uses this funding, as well as contributions from other countries, to provide short-term grants and contracts to Russian weapons of mass destruction (WMD) scientists, which allow them to apply their skills to peaceful, civilian-oriented research. The U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO) recently conducted an assessment of ISTC project selection processes and criteria, and declared that the Center is generally “doing a good job.”

Myers also touched on four “threat reduction style” efforts led by the Department of Energy. The first, the Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention (IPP) program, is a “cousin of the ISTC” which seeks to employ ex-WMD scientists by partnering them with Western industry. Despite criticisms of the program raised by a GAO report two years ago, the IPP now seems to be on a much stronger footing.

Second is the Materials Protection, Control and Accounting (MPC&A) program, which Myers regarded as “one of the most important efforts” to reduce the proliferation threat by establishing security systems around the hundreds of buildings and facilities housing

weapons-usable nuclear materials in Russia. A recent GAO study of this program was fairly positive, although it did make a point that Russia has been hesitant to provide wide-ranging U.S. access to a number of sensitive facilities. The DOE has denied MPC&A assistance to those facilities where access has not been permitted, but it is working with the Russian Ministry of Atomic Energy on a draft access agreement that would give the United States assurances without physical access and intrusive inspections that MPC&A upgrades are being installed and maintained. Myers hoped that this agreement would be completed soon as it is important that the United States be able to verify that MPC&A funds are being used for the intended purposes.

Third is the Nuclear Cities Initiative, which is attempting to facilitate the elimination of Russian nuclear weapons production capacity by creating new jobs for the weapons scientists and workers that will be unemployed as a result of the downsizing. The program has achieved mixed results, and has faced a number of criticisms regarding its management, implementation, and allocation of funding. Myers believed that “reasonable people can argue” about these criticisms and seek solutions. However, he observed that it is difficult to quibble with the program’s goal, and noted that the United States must have a “tool to turn these cities around.”

Fourth is the plutonium disposition program which is working to transform weapons-grade plutonium excess to defense needs in the United States and Russia into forms that make it permanently unavailable for weapons. Critics have argued about the size and the cost of this effort, and it will no doubt take large appropriations in the coming years to complete the necessary facilities and begin actual disposition.

The Department of Defense runs the Cooperative Threat Reduction program. It is a multifaceted effort. Its primary objective is to assist in the elimination of excess offensive weapons in the former Soviet Union, including ICBMs, ICBM silos, SLBMs, SLBM launchers, and strategic bombers. The program has enabled Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazakhstan to become non-nuclear weapons states, and the efforts are continuing in Russia to help bring Russian strategic forces into compliance with existing arms reductions agreements.

The CTR program is also facilitating the elimination of biological weapons production infrastructure in the former Soviet Union, and is cooperating with other cooperative nonproliferation programs to identify alternative forms of employment for unemployed BW scientists by engaging them with western commercial partners.

The Cooperative Threat Reduction program has made demonstrable progress in most of its missions, but two program activities have encountered opposition. The first is the effort to construct a chemical weapons destruction facility in Russia. There have been concerns that Russia is not contributing a fair share of support for construction of the facility, and that contributions from the rest of the international community have been insufficient. These and other issues have limited recent CTR funding to research and design of the facility. Myers believed that a good deal of progress has been made over

the past two years in resolving these concerns, and he anticipated a major debate this year in the Congress on allowing use of U.S. funds for construction of the facility to proceed.

The second activity is an effort to phase out production of weapons-grade plutonium at Russia's last three remaining production reactors. These reactors continue to operate in order to provide heat and electricity to the surrounding cities. For a number of years, CTR had been involved in attempting to convert the cores of the reactors, so that they could continue operating without creating weapons-grade plutonium. Consideration is now being given to shutting down the reactors altogether and replacing them with fossil fuel power plants. The Defense Department is currently evaluating how to proceed with this project, though the current law prohibits use of FY 2001 CTR funds to be used for construction of a fossil fuel replacement plant.

Overall, Myers asserted that the mood in Congress toward the Cooperative Threat Reduction program is good, and that there is fairly solid recognition of the threat posed by weak controls over WMD in the former Soviet Union. If there is disagreement over the program, it is on where threat reduction-style activities should rank relative to other national security programs. Myers reasoned that CTR is simply one part of a multilayered defense that also incorporates programs to intercept nuclear and other WMD materials at Russian and other FSU borders; tighter customs and security controls at U.S. borders; enhanced domestic preparedness to respond to a WMD attack on U.S. soil; and steps forward in the area of missile defenses.

Finally, Myers applauded the Bush Administration's review of U.S.-sponsored nonproliferation activities in Russia, arguing that a nuts and bolts assessment of the programs was overdue. He believed it was important to take a fair look at all of these programs, discern what they have accomplished, evaluate whether they continue to serve national interests, and examine whether there are redundancies that could be reduced through consolidation of efforts. Myers hoped that the review would result in a comprehensive plan for dealing with the WMD threats.

As for the status of the review, Myers indicated that few details have trickled out of the White House, and that all rumors regarding the review should be treated as highly speculative. But Myers felt that it was fair to say that the review is taking a hard look at what programs are working, which activities have encountered problems, and what, if any, new programs should be initiated to deal with the proliferation risks emanating from Russia.

In the end, however, Myers predicted that it would be a fairly "normal" year for all the threat reduction-style programs on Capitol Hill. Programs that have demonstrated results well will fare well in the Congressional authorization and appropriations processes, while other programs where it has been harder to quantify achievements will continue to be scrutinized.

Remarks by **Ken Luongo**, Executive Director, Russian-American Nuclear Security Advisory Council (RANSAC)

Luongo opened by recalling the Congressional origins of the Nunn-Lugar agenda, and the fact that it was not initially popular with the first Bush Administration. There was a serious budget deficit at the time and the funds for working with countries that were enemies of the United States just months before were coming from the defense budget. But ultimately, the Administration embraced the concept.

During the past decade the United States has learned much about Russia's nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons infrastructure, and has done much to reduce proliferation risks emanating from Russia and the other former Soviet states. Luongo maintained that the list of accomplishments is quite substantial when one examines the number of missiles and silos destroyed, warheads dismantled, and nuclear material placed under improved protection.

More important than the quantifiable achievements, Luongo asserted that this process has fueled a relationship of trust between both countries that was unimaginable during the Cold War. These relationships are an intangible benefit that is hard to quantify in GAO reports or other audits, but they are a completely unique result of this work. And these relationships have proven to be important in influencing decision-making in Russia and other countries.

However, despite all that has been achieved over the past decade under the "Nunn-Lugar" banner, this collaboration is now coming under greater scrutiny in both countries and the political support for sustaining this collaboration is being tested.

Luongo highlighted financial support as one of the primary tests of this collaboration. The financial aspect of the U.S.-Russian collaboration is very important because it allows projects to be implemented and it provides some financial sustenance to impoverished weapons scientists and institutes. However, the Bush Administration's planned FY 2002 budget is the first in a decade makes significant cuts in major U.S.-Russian nuclear security programs. There have been times in the past when the Congress has reduced the funding for certain programs, but cuts in continuing programs have not been initiated by a sitting administration.

Luongo respected the Bush Administration's desire to conduct a review of the many programs that constitute the cooperative nuclear security agenda with Russia. The problem, according to Luongo, is that the Administration seems to have put the cart before the horse, by telegraphing diminished support for this work before the review was even initiated.

Luongo noted that the only budget cuts that have been made public are those to the DOE programs, which focus primarily on nuclear security work. The budget for the DOD's Cooperative Threat Reduction program is not yet known and will be revealed with the defense budget details later this summer. State Department non-proliferation efforts

seem to have been increased – including a slight increase in support of the ISTC – but it is very difficult to know at this point how much of the requested increase will be devoted to Nunn-Lugar type activities.

Luongo complained that a major part of the problem with the proposed cuts to the DOE budget is that they lack a cohesive theme or strategy. The most significant cuts came in some of the most important programs. For example, the effort to ensure that Russia's bomb grade material and some portion of its warheads are adequately protected was cut by almost 20%. Similarly, funding to assist the disposal of Russian plutonium from retired warheads was significantly decreased.

Perhaps even more distressing, Luongo continued, is that the budget eliminated a \$500,000 effort to convince Russia to prepare a comprehensive inventory of its weapon plutonium holdings. Without knowing how much plutonium is there, it is impossible to know how much excess must ultimately be eliminated. The U.S. has published its plutonium inventory and it should be encouraging Russia to do the same.

Finally, Luongo criticized the budget request for decimating the Nuclear Cities Initiative that is designed to help Russia shrink its massively oversized nuclear weapons complex and help create jobs for the excess weapons scientists and workers. Luongo noted that the program has had problems in part because its mission is very difficult. But by placing the program on a trajectory for elimination, the budget not only leaves an important national security objective inadequately funded, it also jeopardizes European contributions to this nuclear cities process, which are beginning to materialize for the first time in a decade.

Luongo acknowledged that there are implementation problems with some of the programs. Milestones have been missed. Promises have been made and then not kept. Access to sensitive facilities has emerged as a roadblock that has not yet been overcome. Russian cooperation with Iran is an enduring cloud over this cooperation that could become worse. The political atmosphere on both sides is less friendly.

Under these circumstances, Luongo remarked that it is appropriate to ask whether the approaches undertaken ten years ago are still effectively increasing nuclear security in Russia. But Luongo feared that instead of seeking to strengthen the agenda, the review process may be looking to identify flaws and problems with the possible focus on eliminating programs, rather than identifying new ideas to treat the problems. In any case, Luongo explained, it is hard to know what exactly is occurring in the review process because the Administration has not invited input from outside experts.

Luongo argued against abandoning cooperative nuclear security work with Russia due to "political annoyances" or implementation problems. Through this cooperation, the United States now knows much more about the operation of weapons facilities that were the Soviet crown jewels of the Cold War. Cooperation occurs on topics that were once unfathomable. The collaborators on the Russian side were among the most secretive

scientists of the Soviet Union. In short, there is a much different relationship with Russia on this agenda than existed even five years ago.

Because of these multiple benefits, the United States should not be deterred from expanding its nonproliferation cooperation with Russia, and Luongo called on Congress to renew its commitment to the Nunn-Lugar agenda that it created. He stressed that while there will be moments of tough sledding with Russia on many threat reduction projects and programs, the obstacles are not insurmountable. Moreover, there is simply too much at stake to allow this agenda to crumble in order to save a few hundred million dollars, which represents less than one percent of overall annual U.S. defense spending.

Remarks by **Anatoli Diakov**, Director, Center for Arms Control, Energy, and Environmental Studies, Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology

Diakov highlighted the importance of threat reduction efforts and the value that Russian officials have placed in cooperating with the United States in eliminating weapons of mass destruction and preventing their proliferation.

Diakov enumerated some of the major threat reduction achievements of the past ten years:

Withdrawal of nuclear weapons from non-Russian Soviet successor states.

Following the break-up of the Soviet Union there was a great concern that the approximately 3,000 nuclear warheads inherited by Ukraine, Belarus and Kazakhstan would be retained by those countries, leading to the emergence of three new nuclear weapons states. Fortunately, both Russia and the U.S. succeeded in persuading all three to return their nuclear “inheritance” to Russia. Under the auspices of CTR, the United States provided armored blankets, supercontainers, security enhancements for railcars, emergency support equipment, and other forms of assistance which helped the Russian Ministry of Defense withdraw all nuclear weapons from Ukraine, Kazakhstan and Belarus, and consolidate the weapons at storage facilities on Russian soil.

Assisting Russia in accelerating strategic arms reduction. The CTR program has helped Russia destroy its excess strategic arms including ballistic missile submarines, submarine launched ballistic missile, land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles, ICBM silos, and heavy bombers. By the end of 2000, the program contributed to the deactivation of 5,288 nuclear warheads, destruction of 419 ICBMs, elimination of 366 ICBM silos, elimination of 174 SLBMs and 260 SLBM launchers, and destruction of 21 SSBNs.

Securing and controlling nuclear warheads and nuclear materials. U.S. threat reduction assistance has also enhanced the safety, security, control, and centralization of nuclear weapons and nuclear materials to prevent their loss, theft, or diversion. The Soviet Union had a highly effective security system designed for its nuclear weapons and nuclear materials – but it was designed for a

world that no longer exists. The U.S. DOD and the Russian Ministry of Defense (MOD) have been cooperating to improve security at the sites belonging to the 12th Main Department of the MOD. With the U.S. assistance, the security systems have been upgraded at about half of its 123 nuclear weapons storage buildings and facilities. A Security Assessment and Training Center has been established at Sergiev Posad (outside Moscow) to evaluate new physical security equipment and technologies, and to conduct training of warhead security personnel.

Mayak fissile material storage facility. A major obstacle to warhead dismantlement is the limited available storage space for plutonium and highly-enriched uranium (HEU) recovered from dismantled weapons. The U.S. is providing assistance to the Russian Ministry of Atomic Power (Minatom) to construct a new high-security storage facility at Mayak. The first module of the facility is expected to open next year to store fissile material from approximately 8,000 Russian warheads.

Despite these and other success stories, Diakov indicated that there are Russian critics of certain aspects of this cooperation with the United States. Some of the common complaints on the Russian side are that the United States has provided insufficient funding or support for threat reduction projects, or that the hidden agenda of U.S. assistance is intelligence collection on Russian military activities. Diakov remarked that there should be no surprise that Russia is as concerned about the secrecy of its weapons facilities and personnel as much as the United States is as concerned about protecting its nuclear weapons secrets. But in some cases Diakov felt that it has been difficult to justify the scale of secrecy in Russia, and he noted that some Russian officials have complained that excessive secrecy requirements have hindered cooperation with the U.S. on threat reduction programs.

Another potential problem, according to Diakov, is the potential linkage between future U.S. threat reduction assistance and actions and decisions by Russia on other unrelated issues. This artificial political linkage is incomprehensible and disappointing to many in the Russian MOD, Ministry of Atomic Energy, and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and it strengthens the parts of the Russian bureaucracy that object to cooperation with the United States. To Diakov, the Nunn-Lugar program has developed into a self-sufficient element of the U.S.-Russian bilateral relations, and it is desirable that the future of this cooperative agenda not be endangered by disagreements between both countries on broader domestic or international political issues. While the disagreements between the United States and Russia on other issues are important, these differences should not interfere with the strategy and efforts of the Nunn-Lugar agenda. In any case, pressure from the United States to link threat reduction assistance to other political issues would surely be counterproductive, and would cause the Russian parliament (Duma) to block any further implementation of threat reduction programs and activities by refusing to ratify the 1999 protocol extending the Nunn-Lugar umbrella agreement, as required under Russian law.

On the whole, however, Diakov believed that threat reduction efforts have promoted a close and effective working relationship between the Russian nuclear establishment – both the Ministries of Atomic Energy and Defense – and their counterparts at the U.S. Departments of Defense and Energy. It was difficult to imagine ten years ago that the United States and Russia would be working together on such sensitive nuclear security issues. This collaboration is a big achievement in and of itself because it facilitates a dialogue on very sensitive questions and creates trust needed to overcome the vestiges of mutual suspicion that have not fully dissipated since the end of the Cold War.

The CTR program is highly respected by the participating Russian governmental agencies and other senior Russian officials. These positive attitudes have proven to be quite resilient in Russia. Even during a deterioration of the broader U.S.-Russian relationship over the bombing of Yugoslavia, Nunn-Lugar projects continued largely without interruption.

Diakov also addressed the “unfinished business” of threat reduction efforts in Russia. In Diakov’s judgment, there is still much to be done. For example, in the next several years the Russian Strategic Rocket Forces are planning to deactivate about of 8,000 warheads, destroy more than 1,000 ICBMs, and eliminate 495 ICBMs silos. Similarly, the Russian Navy is planning to eliminate 420 SLBM Launchers and 674 SLBMs. U.S. assistance will be instrumental in facilitating the elimination of these systems.

One of the big problems facing Russia is the dismantlement and disposal of multi-purpose nuclear submarines (SSNs). To date, 146 Russian SSNs have been retired but only 53 have been partially dismantled. Most of these submarines are in very deteriorated condition, and represent huge ticking time bombs for the environment and public safety. As an example of the worsening situation surrounding Russian SSNs, Diakov stated that last year two retired nuclear submarines sank near the pier where they were moored at the Petropavlovsk-Kamshatskii Navy base.

Another major challenge on the horizon is the disposition of weapon-grade plutonium. The United States and Russia completed an agreement on excess military plutonium disposition last September that commits both countries to convert 34 tons of its excess weapons plutonium into forms unusable for nuclear weapons. The cost of disposition activities in Russia is estimated at approximately \$2 billion. Russia will not be able to finance the disposition of its excess plutonium alone, and will require assistance from the United States and other countries to implement its disposition program.

In closing, Diakov commented that the political changes in the United States over the past six months has spawned questions in Russia about the future of cooperative threat reduction and nonproliferation activities with the United States. While the United States is questioning the future of these cooperative programs, it is the clear majority view in Russia that the overall Nunn-Lugar agenda has served Russian national (and global) interests and helped preserve a solid U.S.-Russian relationship.

To: lisaw@nccusa.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Another draft
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Lisa,

I've kept working on the letter on national missile defense. Here is my latest version, which emphasizes the justice theme. This may bring in more signers.

What do you think of this version? I want you to be comfortable so that NNC will sign and you will circulate to state councils, etc.

I'm playing senior softball this morning. I would like to get the letter into circulation this afternoon so that it can reach members of the key committees before they make their decision on missile defense. So if possible, please reply by 1:00 p.m. or so.

Thanks,
Howard

###

Proposed letter to members of House and Senate Armed Services Committees and Appropriation Committees from representatives of faith-based organizations

Dear Representative/Senator: (to be individualized)

In the defense authorization [appropriation] bill for the 2002 fiscal year, President Bush is asking for \$8.3 billion for national missile defense, a 57 percent increase over the current fiscal year. We the undersigned representatives of faith-based organizations ask you to consider this request not only as a budgetary issue but also as a matter of justice and peace.

Over the centuries prophets of religion have posed the question: what does justice require? In this instance, one of the clearest answers comes from a five-star general who rose to the highest civilian office of the land, President Dwight D. Eisenhower. In an address before the American Society of Newspaper Editors on April 16, 1953 he stated: "Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed." This statement is so important to the Eisenhower legacy that these words are engraved on the walls by his tomb in Abilene, Kansas.

The vast spending increase now proposed for national missile constitutes a theft of this nature. Since 1983 the United States has spent \$63 billion on this endeavor without technological success. Pouring more funds into this venture would in effect steal money from efforts to "Leave No Child Behind", to provide adequate health care for millions of America, to deal with the global HIV/AIDS crisis, and to meet other urgent social needs. This is clearly wrong and immoral.

It is doubly wrong because there is no credible threat to the American homeland from long-range missiles. Only Russia, China, the United Kingdom, and France have missiles of that range, but they are not on the danger list offered by missile defense proponents. Of the so-called "rogue" states that are said to be a threat, only North Korea has tried to develop a long-range missile. Flight testing is now suspended, and the program could be permanently terminated through diplomacy and selective financial assistance. Moreover, it is not credible that North Korea would attack the

United States because of the assurance of massive retaliation. No other potentially hostile state has an effective missile program that would endanger the United States. There are numerous nonproliferation measures that can prevent them from developing one.

The beneficiaries of the national missile defense program are not the American people but rather large defense contractors. They are spending millions every year in political campaign contributions and lobbying operations to promote missile defense. This calls to mind President Eisenhower's warning in his farewell address to the American people: "In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex." You who serve on authorization and appropriation committees should be our guardians.

For these reasons, we ask you to cut back on authorization and appropriations for national missile defense and to redirect these resources to programs that meet important human and community needs.

Sincerely yours,

Representatives of faith-based organizations.

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

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

You may be interested in the following items from Daryl Kimball's N-Testing Update. I am not forwarding the complete message, but you may see it at <http://www.clw.org/coalition/n-testing.htm>

Howard

###

>X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.0.1
>Date: Sun, 08 Jul 2001 18:37:35 -0400
>To: dkimball@clw.org
>From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
>Subject: N-Testing Update -- Bush trying to kill CTBT says NYT report;
> Russian Amb. visits NTS
>
>July 8, 2001
>
>TO: Coalition members and friends
>
>FR: Daryl Kimball
>
>RE: Nuclear Testing Update: early outcomes of Bush review of test ban
>policy; Russian Amb. visits subcritical facility
>
>A front-page article published in The New York Times on July 7 (see below)
>reports that according to unnamed administration officials, the Bush
>administration has already undertaken a review of certain aspects of its
>policy on nuclear testing and the CTBT and determined that while it has no
>immediate intention to seek Senate approval for ratification of the Treaty,
>the President cannot unilaterally withdraw the Treaty from the Senate. The
>CTBT is still before the Senate, where it still remains two years after the
>Senate failed to approve its ratification in a highly-partisan vote.
>According to the report, a analysis prepared at the request of the State
>Department's top arms control official, John Bolton, says that once the
>President transmits a treaty to the Senate, only the Senate has the
>authority either to approve ratification (by a two-thirds majority) or to
>send the treaty back to the President through a resolution (which requires
>a simple-majority).
>
>It is unclear at what level the review has been conducted thus far -- that
>is: whether this determination was made by mid-level bureaucrats at the NSC
>(such as Bob Joseph and Franklin Miller at the NSC and John Bolton at
>State); or whether it has been approved by national security deputies (such

>as Deputy NSC Advisor Steve Hadley, Dep. Sec. of State Armitage) or
>principals (such as Powell, Rice and Rumsfeld). Even if the deliberations
>have been at a fairly low-level, the reviews underway were most certainly
>conducted with the knowledge of superiors.

>
>The New York Times also reports that the Bush Administration will try to
>persuade U.S. allies at the upcoming G-8 Economic Summit that the CTBT is a
>dead letter. However, there remains strong support for the CTBT at home and
>abroad and the CTBT will be around long after George W. Bush leaves
>office. As Senator Pete Domenici (R-NM) wrote in a press release
>immediately following the vote: "Treaties never die, even when defeated and
>returned to the Executive Calendar of the Senate. Therefore, we will have
>another chance to debate the CTBT."

>
>In recent weeks the European Union states have delivered a strong message
>to the U.S. and other CTBT hold-outs urging signature and/or ratification
>of the CTBT. The differences between the U.S. and its closest Western allies
>became clear last month when the U.S. and its NATO partners could only
>agree that: "As long as the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty has not entered
>into force, we urge all states to maintain existing moratoria on nuclear
>testing."

>
>The Bush administration should also be mindful of the fact that 62 of
>Senators wrote a letter <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/senltr101399.htm>> the
>day before the Senate vote on the CTBT in which they suggested "...
>putting off final consideration until the next Congress...", and recognized
>"that throughout history the Senate has had the power, the duty to
>reconsider prior decisions..." That letter did not include current
>Majority Leader Daschle (D-SD) or the 5 additional Democratic Senators
>elected since 1999. Also, since the 1999 vote, some Republican Senators who
>voted against the Treaty in 1999, including John McCain (R-AZ) and Chuck
>Hagel (R-NE), have publicly suggested that the Senate might reconsider the
>CTBT at some point in the future.

>
>In addition to having to deal with the CTBT in the context of the upcoming
>G-8 meeting, the Bush unilateralist crowd will have to figure out how to
>deal with the upcoming Conference on Accelerating the Entry Into Force of
>the CTBT, which will take place in New York on September 25-27 of this
>year. The Conference will be attended by a large number of states and will
>most certainly encourage CTBT hold-out states, including the U.S., to sign
>and/or ratify the CTBT. The Bush administration will have to soon decide
>whether to attend the Conference or not Failure to attend would only
>highlight that the U.S. is, under Bush, not a leader on behalf of nuclear
>non-proliferation and is very much out of step with international opinion
>on nuclear testing.

>
>It is also possible that in the coming weeks, the Bush administration may
>revisit the issue of whether it will continue to fund and participate in
>activities relating the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Organization,
>including the establishment of the International Monitoring System to
>detect and deter possible nuclear test explosions, and the negotiation of
>detailed rules for the short-notice, on-site inspections that the CTBT
>would allow.

>

>More on Test Site Readiness Study:

>

>Meanwhile an earlier Knight-Ridder News Service report (see "N-Testing
>Update," June 28 <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/n-testing062801.htm>>) on DOE
>plans to study how to shorten test site readiness also signals that the
>Bush administration is nostalgic for Cold War-era nuclear testing. In the
>last several days, top administration officials have been asked whether
>there are plans for the resumption of nuclear testing, to which they have
>answered: no, not now. Even if the study recommends that the DOE should
>shorten the time needed to resume nuclear testing (now 12-36 months) to as
>little as 3-4, it is unclear if the DOE would want to spend the additional
>money to do so, and it is unclear whether the Congress would allow the
>readiness period to be shortened.

To: mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Sign-on letter on funding for national missile defense
Cc:
Bcc: icnd
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Dear Colleagues:

Here is a revised sign-on letter on the Bush Administration's request for national missile defense funding. It places particular emphasis on this matter as a justice issue because of the resources it draws away from other important endeavors.

We would like your office or organization to sign. You may choose who the appropriate signer will be. For denominational offices it might be the head of your Washington office, but that is up to you.

The deadline for signing is 12 noon, Friday, July 20. This will enable us to have the letters ready for delivery to members' offices on Monday, July 23. Let me know the name and title of the signer. You can reply by e-mail at mupj@igc.org or by fax at 301 896-0013.

If you know of other national and regional offices that might sign, please forward the letter to them.

Shalom,
Howard

###

Sign-on letter to members of House and Senate Armed Services Committees and Appropriation Committees from representatives of faith-based organizations. Deadline for signing: 12 noon, Friday, July 20. Send name and title of signer to Howard Hallman at mupj@igc.org or by fax to 301 896-0013.

Dear Representative/Senator: (to be individualized)

In the defense authorization [appropriation] bill for the 2002 fiscal year, President Bush is asking for \$8.3 billion for national missile defense, a 57 percent increase over the current fiscal year. We the undersigned representatives of faith-based organizations ask you to consider this request not only as a budgetary issue but also as a matter of justice and peace.

Over the centuries prophets of religion have posed the question: what does justice require? In this instance, one of the clearest answers comes from a five-star general who rose to the highest civilian office of the land, President Dwight D. Eisenhower. In an address before the American Society of Newspaper Editors on April 16, 1953 he stated: "Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed." This statement is so important to the Eisenhower legacy that these words are engraved on the walls by his tomb in Abilene, Kansas.

The vast spending increase now proposed for national missile constitutes a theft of this nature. Since 1983 the United States has spent \$63 billion on this endeavor without technological success. Pouring more funds into this venture would in effect steal money from efforts to "Leave No Child Behind", to provide adequate health care for millions of America, to deal with the global HIV/AIDS crisis, and to meet other urgent social needs. This is clearly wrong and immoral.

It is doubly wrong because there is no credible threat to the American homeland from long-range missiles. Only Russia, China, the United Kingdom, and France have missiles of that range, but they are not on the danger list offered by missile defense proponents. Of the so-called "rogue" states that are said to be a threat, only North Korea has tried to develop a long-range missile. Flight testing is now suspended, and the program could be permanently terminated through diplomacy and selective financial assistance. Moreover, it is not credible that North Korea would attack the United States because of the assurance of massive retaliation. No other potentially hostile state has an effective missile program that would endanger the United States. There are numerous nonproliferation measures that can prevent them from developing one.

The beneficiaries of the national missile defense program are not the American people but rather large defense contractors. They are spending millions every year in political campaign contributions and lobbying operations to promote missile defense. This calls to mind President Eisenhower's warning in his farewell address to the American people: "In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex." You who serve on authorization and appropriation committees should be our guardians.

For these reasons, we ask you to cut back on authorization and appropriations for national missile defense and to redirect these resources to programs that meet important human and community needs.

Sincerely yours,

Representatives of faith-based organizations.

To: Buddhist
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Sign-on letter on funding for national missile defense
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Diana,

I have taken your name off our e-mail list for general communications to the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. However, I am sending you the following request to sign-on to a letter on funding for national missile defense, which you may want to sign.

With best regards,
Howard

###

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Dear Colleagues:

Here is a revised sign-on letter on the Bush Administration's request for national missile defense funding. It places particular emphasis on this matter as a justice issue because of the resources it draws away from other important endeavors.

We would like your office or organization to sign. You may choose who the appropriate signer will be. For denominational offices it might be the head of your Washington office, but that is up to you.

The deadline for signing is 12 noon, Friday, July 20. This will enable us to have the letters ready for delivery to members' offices on Monday, July 23. Let me know the name and title of the signer. You can reply by e-mail at mupj@igc.org or by fax at 301 896-0013.

If you know of other national and regional offices that might sign, please forward the letter to them.

Shalom,
Howard

###

Sign-on letter to members of House and Senate Armed Services Committees and Appropriation Committees from representatives of faith-based organizations. Deadline for signing: 12 noon, Friday, July 20. Send name and title of signer to Howard Hallman at mupj@igc.org or by fax to 301 896-0013.

Dear Representative/Senator: (to be individualized)

In the defense authorization [appropriation] bill for the 2002 fiscal year, President Bush is asking for \$8.3 billion for national missile defense, a 57 percent increase over the current fiscal year. We the undersigned representatives of faith-based organizations ask you to consider this request not only as a budgetary issue but also as a matter of justice and peace.

Over the centuries prophets of religion have posed the question: what does justice require? In this instance, one of the clearest answers comes from a five-star general who rose to the highest civilian office of the land, President Dwight D. Eisenhower. In an address before the American Society of Newspaper Editors on April 16, 1953 he stated: "Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed." This statement is so important to the Eisenhower legacy that these words are engraved on the walls by his tomb in Abilene, Kansas.

The vast spending increase now proposed for national missile constitutes a theft of this nature. Since 1983 the United States has spent \$63 billion on this endeavor without technological success. Pouring more funds into this venture would in effect steal money from efforts to "Leave No Child Behind", to provide adequate health care for millions of America, to deal with the global HIV/AIDS crisis, and to meet other urgent social needs. This is clearly wrong and immoral.

It is doubly wrong because there is no credible threat to the American homeland from long-range missiles. Only Russia, China, the United Kingdom, and France have missiles of that range, but they are not on the danger list offered by missile defense proponents. Of the so-called "rogue" states that are said to be a threat, only North Korea has tried to develop a long-range missile. Flight testing is now suspended, and the program could be permanently terminated through diplomacy and selective financial assistance. Moreover, it is not credible that North Korea would attack the United States because of the assurance of massive retaliation. No other potentially hostile state has an effective missile program that would endanger the United States. There are numerous nonproliferation measures that can prevent them from developing one.

The beneficiaries of the national missile defense program are not the American people but rather large defense contractors. They are spending millions every year in political campaign contributions and lobbying operations to promote missile defense. This calls to mind President Eisenhower's warning in his farewell address to the American people: "In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex." You who serve on authorization and appropriation committees should be our guardians.

For these reasons, we ask you to cut back on authorization and appropriations for national missile defense and to redirect these resources to programs that meet important human and community needs.

Sincerely yours,

Representatives of faith-based organizations.

X-Sender: prc@nwu.org X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.0.2
Date: Fri, 22 Jun 2001 17:39:39 -0400
To: (Recipient list suppressed)
From: Publication Rights Clearinghouse
Subject: Important information for SCBWI members form the PRC

Protect Your Rights and Make More Money via the Publication Rights Clearinghouse

Similar to BMI and ASCAP that make royalty payments to musicians each time a song plays on the radio, the Publication Rights Clearinghouse facilitates royalty payments to writers for secondary use of their work. In addition to putting more money in your pocket, the PRC helps to protect your rights---by giving publishers a legal way to use your work and pay you fairly for it.

Did You Know...

- Recently, the PRC more than doubled its recommended rates for royalties received via the Copyright Clearance Center---you can now get \$0.50 to \$1 per page for photocopied use of your work.
- Via our agreement with SIRS Mandarin, you receive \$250.00 for every article of yours they use in their databases or cd-roms.
- The PRC has a new deal with Contentville.com. For every article of yours that Contentville sells, you get 30% of the royalties.

The Society of Children's Book Writers and Illustrators is an associate sponsor of the Publication Rights Clearinghouse. But if you choose to join the PRC, you need to register. Joining the PRC is FREE and open to all writers. To register, you must complete and sign the Collective Rights Agreement, the Title Clearance Form, and the Copyright Clearance Center Rightsholder Agreement.

For this and more information about the PRC and our partners---including Copyright Clearance Center, Contentville.com, Carl/UnCover, and SIRS/Mandarin, go to the PRC link pages off the NWU website www.nwu.org. You can also email any questions you have about the PRC to prc@nwu.org or speak to a PRC administrator by phoning 212.254.0279 ext.21.

Help yourself and other writers---Join the PRC today!

Publication Rights Clearinghouse Staff
National Writers Union, UAW Local 1981/AFL-CIO

User-Agent: Microsoft-Outlook-Express-Macintosh-Edition/5.02.2022
Date: Fri, 06 Jul 2001 12:20:31 -0400
Subject: Oct. 2000
From: Edward Brueggemann <edbruegge@mediaone.net>
To: Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.org>

Howard: Few people returned the registration form. Now that you have a complete mailing list you probably do not need a registration form like the one I used. edb

Hallman2001
Montreat/Black Mountain, N.C.
June 29-July 1, 2001

Oct. 4, 2000

It is time to make plans for participation in the next family reunion. It is incumbent upon the grandchildren of Bertha and Wilhelm to share this letter and enclosed information with each of their children as we do not have a current list. Once registration forms are returned we will communicate directly with each family. Your help is needed to secure the registrations.

If traveling by air, be sure to make early reservations for air and car rental. The Asheville airport is not large; therefore flights and rentals may be in short supply. The weekend of our reunion is a very busy one in Montreat and Black Mountain so early reservations for housing are advisable. The enclosures will assist you.

If traveling by auto you can secure maps and tourist information from:
N. C. Travel/Tourist Division: 1-800-847-4862
Black Mt. Chamber of Commerce 1-800-669-2301

While a later mailing directly to each family unit will provide many more details, here is an outline of the weekend:

afternoon of Friday, June 29, 2001--- wine and cheese on the deck of Walter and Mary's summer home in Montreat.

Small groups will gather on their own for dining and entertainment.

We will have a list of choices for your perusal during wine and cheese.

Saturday, June 30, 2001---morning and afternoon are free time for mountain hiking, visiting, swimming, visiting, golf, visiting, shopping, visiting, touring, etc.

Evening is the catered dinner in Black Mountain. Plan to bring family stories and any memorabilia you have.

Sunday, July 1, 2001---Brunch on the deck of Walter and Mary's home

Terri Hallman McQueen has agreed to edit a Hallman Recipe Book that will be ready for us when we gather. But that will take your help. Begin thinking

about 2 or 3 favorite recipes that you would like to include. Especially think of recipes our parents gave us. (Does someone have Hilda Hallman Brueggemann's recipe for cucumber/onion salad?) Terri will give more direction on this project later in the year.

Brian Hallman will update family records (see enclosure so you can inform Brian of changes).

Please circulate the registration form and housing information to all branches of your family and assist us in having them returned as soon as possible.

Co-hosts: Walter and Mary Brueggemann; Edward and LuAnn Brueggemann
Address correspondence to: 149 East Side Dr. #155; Concord, New
Hampshire 03301-5475
e-mail: EDBruegge@aol.com 603-225-2460

To: blythe-goodman@erols.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Background on missile defense
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <3B29FBE4.669C@erols.com>
References: <3.0.3.32.20010614104049.0068fe34@pop2.igc.org>

At 08:13 AM 6/15/01 -0400, you wrote:
>Howard -- my old computer was unable to open these attachments. is it
>possible to send them pasted in as text?

Carol,

Here they are.

Howard

###

Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees
Membership, by States *

State	Democrats	Republicans
Maine		Collins - AS
New Hampshire		Smith - AS
Massachusetts	Kennedy - AS, Kerry - FR	
Rhode Island	Reed - AS	Chafee - FR
Connecticut	Dodd - FR, Lieberman - AS	
New Jersey	Torricelli - FR	
Pennsylvania		Santorum - AS
Delaware	Biden - FR	
Maryland	Sarbanes - FR	
West Virginia	Byrd - AS	
Virginia		Allen - FR, Warner - AS
North Carolina		Helms - FR
South Carolina		Thurmond - AS
Georgia	Cleland - AS	
Florida	Nelson - AS, FR	
Alabama		Sessions - AS
Tennessee		Frist - FR
Kentucky		Bunning - AS
Michigan	Levin - AS	
Indiana		Lugar - FR
Wisconsin	Feingold - FR	
Minnesota	Dayton - AS, Wellstone - FR	
Missouri	Carnahan - AS	

Nebraska Nelson - AS Hagel - FR
Kansas Brownback - FR, Roberts - AS

Arkansas Hutchinson - AS
Louisiana Landrieu - AS
Oklahoma Inhofe - AS

Wyoming Thomas - FR
Colorado Allard - AS
Arizona McCain - AS

California Boxer - FR
Oregon Smith - FR
Hawaii Akaka - AS

* Based upon membership prior to Senator Jeffords switching from Republican to Independent. The Senate hasn't reconstituted committee membership as of June 14, 2001.

###

National Missile Defense as a Moral Issue

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

We are in the midst of a great national debate on whether the United States should develop and deploy national missile defense. There are strong views on both sides.

In my denomination the United Methodist General Conference, the official governing body, has called for a halt in "all efforts to develop and deploy strategic antimissile defense systems because they are illusory, unnecessary, and wasteful." In March 2001 representatives of 27 faith-based organizations wrote President George W. Bush and urged him "to pull back from the dangerous rush to a premature decision on national missile defense and withdrawal from the ABM Treaty."

The faith community is speaking out because the deployment of missile defense is a moral issue.

At first glance missile defense serves a moral purpose by protecting people from attack by long-range missiles delivering weapons of mass destruction: nuclear, biological, and chemical. The technologies under consideration would destroy missiles in flight without harming civilians or military personnel.

Deeper analysis, however, reveals other moral consideration that must be taken into account. First, development of missile defense to thwart a hypothetical future enemy would seriously impede the ability to cope with real and present danger from attack by existing nuclear weapons. Second, the enormous cost of missile defense, unsuccessful after 50 years of research and development, takes substantial resources away from greater societal and global needs. Third, there are alternative ways to deal with the possible proliferation of nuclear weapons that are superior to and far more cost effective than missile defense.

Therefore, higher morality would be served by concentrating on elimination of the threat from existing nuclear weapons and by shifting resources from missile defense to other methods of nuclear non-proliferation.

Real and Present Dangers

Advocates of national missile defense claim that its intent is to protect the United States from attack by small nations, who they define as "rogue" states. North Korea, Iran, and Iraq are commonly cited as primary examples, with the

possibility that in the future other states and terrorist organizations might be added. Although the Bush Administration does not openly place China on this list, some congressional and civilian advocates of missile defense believe that the systems under development would protect the United States from Chinese attack.

Except for China none of these nations possess nuclear weapons or have long-range missiles capable of reaching the U.S. homeland. Although North Korea has tested a multi-stage rocket, so far North Korean missiles do not have the range to reach the United States. The North Korea missile development program is currently suspended. Even if re-started, it would take five years or longer to achieve the needed range. None of the other "rogue" states are that far along in development of long-range missiles. Even if they had such missiles, it is highly doubtful that they would use them to attack the United States because of the expectation of U.S. retaliation.

Instead of the hypothetical danger posed by the "rogue" states some time in the undefined future, the real and present danger to the United States occurs from Russia missiles, Russian warheads and fissile material falling in wrong hands, and surreptitious attack by terrorist organizations. Higher morality requires giving first priority to protection from these immediate dangers.

Russia. The Russian Federation now actively deploys approximately 6,000 strategic warheads on missiles capable of reaching the United States. About 2,000 of these are on hair-trigger alert, ready for immediate launching. (In comparison the United States actively deploys 7,300 strategic warheads, mostly targeted on Russia, with about 2,000 on hair-trigger alert.) Most analysts believe that the present Russian government has no intent to initiate a first strike against the United States because they have no desire or incentive to do so and because they are deterred by the threat of retaliation. However, many recognize that Russian missiles could be fired against the United States by accident, misinterpretation of early warning data, or by action of a rogue commander.

The United States uses three methods for protection from Russian attack. The first is deterrence under the Cold War doctrine of mutually assured destruction (MAD). The second is arms reduction through bilateral agreements and reciprocal executive initiatives. The third is provision of funds and technical assistance for dismantlement of Russian weapons and secure storage of fissile material. President Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative (known popularly as "Star Wars") would have added a fourth, but it failed to develop a workable system.

Numerous religious organizations believe that the second and third methods represent the correct moral approach for dealing with Russian missiles. They believe that the MAD doctrine is immoral because it holds innocent citizens as hostage of national security policy. However, religious leaders recognize that this doctrine is part of the present international security structure and affects the thinking of national leaders. For that reason they support the continuance of the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty, which restricts deployment of missile defense and relies on mutual deterrence as a safeguard.

Although in theory U.S. deployment of limited missile defense could occur alongside arms reduction initiatives and support for dismantlement of Russian weapons, in the real world still dominated by Cold War doctrine, Russia perceives U.S. missile defense as a threat. While the moderate-size missile defense system that is envisioned would not protect the United States from a massive first strike by Russia, the United States could strike first and have sufficient protection from a Russian second strike by its diminished forces.

Accordingly, U.S. missile defense serves as a disincentive to Russia to participate in mutual de-alerting and arms reduction through treaties and reciprocal initiatives. It encourages Russia to retain multi-warhead missiles now scheduled for elimination under START II and even to deploy new multi-warhead missiles.

Furthermore, if U.S./Russian relations sour because of missile defense and U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty, there is a distinct possibility that the Nunn-Lugar-Domenici programs would collapse. These are a series of programs that provide assistance to Russia for dismantlement of nuclear weapons and safe storage of fissile material. Termination or reduction of these programs would increase the danger of Russian warheads and fissile material falling into the hands of terrorist organizations and "rogue" states. These new possessors could then smuggle nuclear weapons into the United States, bring them by boat into U.S. harbors, or launch them off-shore with low-flying cruise missiles. Missile defense systems would be helpless to block any of these means of delivery.

China. At present China poses no threat to the U.S. homeland, for its 290 strategic warheads are off-alert for immediate launching. Of these only 20 are capable of reaching the United States. China, however, can easily conceive that U.S. missile defense, while ostensibly directed toward North Korea, would protect the U.S. from attack by Chinese missiles. In the event of war over Taiwan, for example, the United States could attack the Chinese homeland with nuclear weapons without fear of retaliatory attack.

Deployment of U.S. missile defense would therefore encourage China to increase its nuclear arsenal. This would alarm India, which might then deploy more nuclear weapons to deal with an enlarged Chinese threat. This in turn would alarm Pakistan, which would increase its nuclear arsenal. The accelerated nuclear arms would make Asia a more dangerous place.

Therefore, in the moral choice between (a) missile defense that at best won't be deployed for five years or longer, then only partially, and may never be successful and (b) de-alerting, arms reduction, and Nunn-Lugar-Domenici programs to cope with today's real and present dangers, the second approach is by far superior.

Theft of Resources

The second moral concern about missile defense was well stated in a 1953 address by President Dwight D. Eisenhower in words memorialized on the wall of his tomb in Abilene, Kansas:

Every gun made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and not clothed....This is not a way of life at all....Under the cloud of threatening war, it is humanity hanging from a cross of iron.

Nearly fifty years later in the first decade of the 21st century expenditures for developing missile defense represents a huge, huge theft from the hungry, the homeless, the sick, the uneducated. Since the 1980s the United States has spent \$69 billion on national missile defense without producing a workable system. Estimates for the total cost of the layered approach that President Bush advocates run from \$100 to \$200 billion. Yet, none of the component systems have proven effective.

With the Bush tax cut placing limits on federal revenue, spending this much for missile defense will inevitably require cutbacks in other programs and will seriously inhibit new initiatives to meet urgent human needs. For instance, President Bush campaigned on the slogan "Leave No Child Behind", but millions of children will indeed be left behind if resources are stolen for missile defense. It would be impossible to respond to the nation's unmet housing needs and to provide adequate health care for all.

As Eisenhower also said in his 1953 address, "The world in arms is not spending money alone. It is spending the sweat of its laborers, the genius of its scientists, the hopes of its children." Accordingly, the superior moral choice would be to respond to urgent community and human needs rather than to divert vast amounts of taxpayers dollars to unproven, and most likely unworkable, missile defense.

The main beneficiaries of missile defense research and development are defense contractors. The largest ones are Boeing, Lockheed Martin, Raytheon, and TRW. Every year they spend millions of dollars to lobby for defense spending beneficial to their companies. They also contribute to the budgets of think-tanks that advocate missile defense. During election campaigns these companies and their employees channel millions of dollars to candidates and political parties. Other defense contractors are likewise deeply involved in lobbying and electoral politics.

This mixture of business and politics calls to mind President Eisenhower's warning in his farewell radio and television address to the American people: "In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex." This is a warning we should heed in the defense-contractor-driven push for missile defense. The theft of resources is organized and promoted by those with vested economic interests.

Superior Alternatives for Non-Proliferation

Not only is the push for missile defense morally wrong because of its theft of resources and its impediment to dealing with real and present dangers, but also there are better ways of dealing with the dangers of nuclear proliferation. If handled comprehensively, they will offer far greater protection for the U.S. homeland now and in the future than missile defense can provide. Even if proven workable (and that is yet to be determined) the first component of missile defense are likely to come into use only five to eight years from now, and other components much further into the future. But the threat of nuclear proliferation is now before us.

Elements of a comprehensive approach to nuclear non-proliferation include:

- Ratification of Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty by the United States and other nations so that international monitoring of nuclear test explosion can be carried out.
- Increased funding of Nunn-Lugar-Domenici programs that help Russia dismantle nuclear weapons and achieve secure storage of fissile material.
- A rigorous international system of fissile material control.
- Equally stringent international control of missile technology.
- Creative diplomacy to deal with states with nuclear weapon ambitions.
- Financial assistance and other incentives for nations cooperating in nuclear non-proliferation.
- Selective use of sanctions.
- Keeping track of terrorist groups that seek or acquire weapons of mass destruction.
- Countering social, economic, and political instability that provides the breeding ground for terrorists groups.

These activities should occur side-by-side with steps by the nuclear-weapon states to take the entire global nuclear arsenal off hair-trigger alert, remove all nuclear weapons from active service, and dismantle them with proper verification. This would fulfill the commitment to "an unequivocal undertaken by the nuclear-weapon states to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals", made in the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). The entire nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament agenda could be achieved for less than the amount that the Bush Administration wants to spend on missile defense research and development.

Faith in Human Capacity, Nor Technology

Achieving a world free of nuclear weapons is within the interest of all nations on Earth. Rather than placing our faith in technology we should put our faith and trust in our human capacity to achieve sound public policy decisions and carry out sensible actions in the affairs of nations. This is the correct moral choice. It is a wiser choice rather than continuing to develop missile defense systems which, quoting the United Methodist General Conference again, are "illusory, unnecessary, and wasteful".

June 8, 2001

Methodists United for Peace with Justice
1500 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20016

Phone: 301 896-0013
E-mail: mupj@igc.org