

From: "Lisa Wright" <lisaw@nccusa.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: Another draft
Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 09:25:26 -0400
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)
X-MIMEOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.2106.4
Importance: Normal

Looks much better! I'll send this up to Bob to look at, and hopefully will have a sign on for you.

Lisa

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Monday, July 09, 2001 8:10 AM
To: lisaw@nccusa.org
Subject: Another draft

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.

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, 06 Jul 2001 13:56:16 -0700
From: Diana Winston <dwinston@bpf.org>
Reply-To: dwinston@bpf.org
Organization: Buddhist Peace Fellowship
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.72 (Macintosh; I; PPC)
X-Accept-Language: en
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Council for a Livable World analysis: The Bipartisan Budget Dilemma

Dear Howard,

I have been receiving your email postings for some time. I am interested in the work you do and I think it's wonderful but generally I don't have time to follow it too closely. I think it makes sense for me not to receive the postings. However, if you think something could require the collaboration of Buddhist Peace Fellowship in the future, please feel free to contact me.

All the best with your work,
Diana Winston
Associate Director, BPF

"Howard W. Hallman" wrote:

> To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament
>
> Dear Colleagues:
>
> You may be interested in this analysis. Among other things it reports that
> Senator Kent Conrad, as chair of the Senate Budget Committee, as authority
> to approve or disapprove the latest Bush proposal to increase defense
> spending.
>
> 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

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

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

To: gpowers@nccbuscc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Funding for national missile defense
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Jerry,

In a separate communication I have sent you a sign-on letter on funding for national missile defense. I know you are unlikely to sign, but I urge you to give this issue attention.

National missile defense is a justice issue as much as a peace issue because of the huge amounts of funds requested. If granted, it would draw resources heavily away from social justice endeavors supported by the National Conference of Catholic Bishops. Furthermore, the way missile defense is developing in the Bush Administration it is taking on some Star Wars characteristics, such as seeking control of outer space, which the Catholic Bishops opposed in their 1988 statement.

Whatever the rationale, I urge you to activate your diocesan justice and peace networks to oppose the budget increase for national missile defense.

Call me if you would like to discuss this further.

Shalom,
Howard

To: rlabush@rac.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Sign-on letter on NMD funding
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Rachel:

With a separate communication I have sent you a sign-on letter on funding for national missile defense. I urge you to circulate it to other Jewish organizations for signing.

Shalom,
Howard

To: ccosby@dhm.disciples.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Sign-on letter on NMC funding
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Carol,

Through a separate communication I have sent you a sign-on letter on national missile defense funding. In addition to getting a signer from the Disciples Peace Fellowship, would it be possible to ask Dr. Hamm or some other top officials of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) to sign?

Shalom,
Howard

To: bishopmel@netzero.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Sign-on letter on NMD funding
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Bishop Talbert:

Funding for national missile defense, a major concern of the United Methodist Council of Bishops, is coming to focus in congressional committees within the next four weeks. Therefore, I invite you to sign the following letter as ecumenical officer of the Council of Bishops. We are also inviting Jim Winkler to sign for the General Board of Church and Society.

Would you also be willing to communicate with the appropriate officers of the AME, AMEZ, and CME Churches and invite them to sign? Although they haven't been active on this issue, it is coming into focus as a social justice issue because of the vast funds it would draw away from endeavors that meet human and community needs.

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. You can reply by e-mail at mupj@igc.org or by fax at 301 896-0013.

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: 76622.637@compuserve.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Sign-on letter on NMD funding
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Lonnie,

With a separate communication I have sent you a sign-on letter on funding for national missile defense and invited you to sign. In addition, would you be willing to contact other Baptist entities that might sign. I have sent it to the American Baptist Washington Office and the Alliance of Baptists. You may know of some others.

Through the National Council of Churches we are seeking signers from state councils of churches. Perhaps it would be appropriate to ask state Baptist Conventions with moderate leadership to sign, which I have heard includes Virginia, North Carolina, and Texas.

I will appreciate whatever you can do.

Shalom,
Howard

10709.10.txt

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 08:04:16 -0400 (EDT)
To: nuclearcalendar@lists.his.com
Subject: Nuclear Calendar
From: "FCNL Nuclear Calendar" <owner-nuclearcalendar@fcnl.org>
X-Mailer: Html Mime Mail Class
Sender: owner-nuclearcalendar@fcnl.org
Reply-To: nuclearcalendar@fcnl.org

```
<x-html>
<HTML>
<HEAD>
<title>FCNL Nuclear Calendar</title>
</head>
<body>

<table width='100%' border='0' cellspacing='0' cellpadding='0'>
  <tr>
    <td>
      <table width='99%' border='0' cellspacing='0' cellpadding='0'>
        <tr>
          <td width='6%'><img src='http://www.fcnl.org/images/fcnl_logos/dove94.gif'
width='61' height='94' alt='StylizedDove'><br></td>
          <td width='9%'><img
src='http://www.fcnl.org/images/fcnl_logos/fcnl94c.gif' width='87' height='94'
alt='FCNLblock'></td>
          <td colspan='2' width='85%' align='center'>
            <div align='center'><font face='Arial, Helvetica, sans-serif' size='5'
color='#000099'>
              <b>Friends Committee on National Legislation</b>
            </font></div>
          </td>
        </tr>
      </table>
    </td>
  </tr>
  <tr bgcolor='#000066'>
    <td><img src='http://www.fcnl.org/images/4-pixels.gif' width='4'
height='2'></td>
  </tr>
</table>
<table width='100%' border='0' cellspacing='0' cellpadding='0'>
  <tr>
    <td width='16%' valign='top' align='left'>
      <table border='0' cellspacing='0' cellpadding='0'>
        <tr>
          <td><a href='http://www.fcnl.org/index.htm'><img
src='http://www.fcnl.org/images/nuclear/nuclear_home.gif' width='150' height='50'
border='0'></a></td>
```

```

</tr>
<tr>
  <td><a href='http://www.fcnl.org/NuclearCalendar/index.htm'><img
src='http://www.fcnl.org/images/nuclear/nuclear_sixmonth.gif' width='150'
height='50' border='0'></a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
  <td><a href='mailto:david@fcn1.org?subject=Nuclear%20Calendar'><img
src='http://www.fcnl.org/images/nuclear/nuclear_items.gif' width='150' height='50'
border='0'></a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
  <td><a href='http://www.fcnl.org/listserv/quaker_issues.php'><img
src='http://www.fcnl.org/images/nuclear/nuclear_subscribe.gif' width='150'
height='50' border='0'></a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
  <td><a href='http://www.fcnl.org/listserv/nc_unsubscribe.php'><img
src='http://www.fcnl.org/images/nuclear/nuclear_unsubscribe.gif' width='150'
height='50' border='0'></a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
  <td><a href='http://www.fcnl.org/issues.htm'><img
src='http://www.fcnl.org/images/nuclear/nuclear_issues.gif' width='150' height='50'
border='0'></a></td>
</tr>
</table>
</td>
<td width='74%' align='left' valign='top'> <br>
  <div align='center'><center>
    <table width='92%' border='0' cellspacing='0' cellpadding='0'
align='center'>
      <tr>
        <td>
          <div align='center'><font face='Arial, Helvetica, sans-serif' size='4'>
            <b>Nuclear Calendar</b>
          </font></div>
          <br>
        </td>
      </tr>
    </table>
  </div>
</td>
</tr>
<tr valign='TOP'>
  <td width='20%'><font face='Times New Roman, Times, serif'
size='3'><b>July 9</b></font></td>
  <td width='80%'><font face='Times New Roman, Times, serif'
size='3'>2 p.m., House Government Reform Subcommittee on National Security, Veterans
Affairs and International Relations, hearing on the Biological Weapons Convention,
2154&nbsp;Rayburn</font></td>
</tr>
<tr valign='TOP'>
  <td width='20%'><font face='Times New Roman, Times, serif'

```

size='3'>July 9</td>
 <td width='80%'><font face='Times New Roman, Times, serif'
 size='3'>Senate reconvenes from the Independence Day recess and completes floor
 action on the supplemental appropriations bill for FY 2001, S. 1077</td>
 </tr><tr valign='TOP'>
 <td width='20%'><font face='Times New Roman, Times, serif'
 size='3'>Week of July 9</td>
 <td width='80%'><font face='Times New Roman, Times, serif'
 size='3'>Senate Armed Services Committee, vote on the nomination of Jesse Roberson
 to be Assistant Secretary of Energy for Environmental Management
 (estimate)</td>
 </tr><tr valign='TOP'>
 <td width='20%'><font face='Times New Roman, Times, serif'
 size='3'>July 10</td>
 <td width='80%'><font face='Times New Roman, Times, serif'
 size='3'>9:30 a.m., Senate Armed Services Committee, hearing on the Defense
 Department's budget amendment for FY 2002, 216 Hart</td>
 </tr><tr valign='TOP'>
 <td width='20%'><font face='Times New Roman, Times, serif'
 size='3'>July 10</td>
 <td width='80%'><font face='Times New Roman, Times, serif'
 size='3'>5:30 p.m. House Appropriations Committee, markup of the Commerce, Justice,
 State appropriations bill and the foreign operations appropriations bill,
 2359 Rayburn</td>
 </tr><tr valign='TOP'>
 <td width='20%'><font face='Times New Roman, Times, serif'
 size='3'>July 10</td>
 <td width='80%'><font face='Times New Roman, Times, serif'
 size='3'>House of Representative reconvenes from the Independence Day
 recess</td>
 </tr><tr valign='TOP'>
 <td width='20%'><font face='Times New Roman, Times, serif'
 size='3'>July 11</td>
 <td width='80%'><font face='Times New Roman, Times, serif'
 size='3'>10 a.m., House Budget Committee, hearing on the Defense Department's budget
 priorities, with Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz, 210 Cannon</td>
 </tr><tr valign='TOP'>
 <td width='20%'><font face='Times New Roman, Times, serif'
 size='3'>July 11</td>
 <td width='80%'><font face='Times New Roman, Times, serif'
 size='3'>5 p.m., Senate Armed Services Committee, hearing with the British foreign
 minister, 236 Russell (closed)</td>
 </tr><tr valign='TOP'>
 <td width='20%'><font face='Times New Roman, Times, serif'
 size='3'>July 12</td>
 <td width='80%'><font face='Times New Roman, Times, serif'
 size='3'>9 a.m., Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water, markup of

the energy and water appropriations bill, S-128 Capitol</td>

</tr><tr valign='TOP'>

<td width='20%'><font face='Times New Roman, Times, serif'
size='3'>July 12</td>

<td width='80%'><font face='Times New Roman, Times, serif'
size='3'>9:30 a.m., House Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, hearing on the
Defense Department's FY 2002 budget, with Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld and
Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman Gen. Henry Shelton, 2359 Rayburn </td>

</tr><tr valign='TOP'>

<td width='20%'><font face='Times New Roman, Times, serif'
size='3'>July 12</td>

<td width='80%'><font face='Times New Roman, Times, serif'
size='3'>9:30 a.m., Senate Armed Services Committee, hearing on ballistic missile
defense, 216 Hart</td>

</tr><tr valign='TOP'>

<td width='20%'><font face='Times New Roman, Times, serif'
size='3'>July 12</td>

<td width='80%'><font face='Times New Roman, Times, serif'
size='3'>12:30 p.m., National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice addresses the National Press Club. (The event is sold out, but is
carried on National Public Radio.)</td>

</tr><tr valign='TOP'>

<td width='20%'><font face='Times New Roman, Times, serif'
size='3'>July 12</td>

<td width='80%'><font face='Times New Roman, Times, serif'
size='3'>2 p.m., Senate Appropriations Committee, markup of the energy and water
appropriations bill, S-128 Capitol</td>

</tr><tr valign='TOP'>

<td width='20%'><font face='Times New Roman, Times, serif'
size='3'>July 13</td>

<td width='80%'><font face='Times New Roman, Times, serif'
size='3'>Noon-1:30 p.m., "Russian Nuclear Security Decision-Making and Negotiating
Behavior," Russian American Nuclear Security
Advisory Council, B-339 Rayburn. Contact Bill
Hoehn, (202) 332-1412.</td>

</tr><tr valign='TOP'>

<td width='20%'><font face='Times New Roman, Times, serif'
size='3'>July 14</td>

<td width='80%'><font face='Times New Roman, Times, serif'
size='3'>9 p.m. EDT, Defense Department, fourth flight intercept test for the
ballistic missile defense system, Vandenberg Air Force Base, CA and Kwajalein
Missile Range, Marshall Islands</td>

</tr><tr valign='TOP'>

<td width='20%'><font face='Times New Roman, Times, serif'
size='3'>July 14-15</td>

<td width='80%'><font face='Times New Roman, Times, serif'
size='3'>Conference on nuclear issues, Star Wars, and weapons of mass destruction.
Peace Action New Mexico, Santa Fe, NM. Contact <a

10709.10.txt

```
href="mailto:LANLaction@aol.com">LANLaction@aol.com</a>, (505) 989-4812.</font></td>
</tr><tr valign='TOP'>
  <td width='20%'><font face='Times New Roman, Times, serif'
size='3'><b>July 16</b></font></td>
  <td width='80%'><font face='Times New Roman, Times, serif'
size='3'>Rally and protest on the anniversary of the Trinity atomic bomb explosion.
Peace Action New Mexico, Santa&nbsp;Fe, NM. Contact <a
href="mailto:LANLaction@aol.com">LANLaction@aol.com</a>, (505) 989-4812.</font></td>
</tr><tr valign='TOP'>
  <td width='20%'><font face='Times New Roman, Times, serif'
size='3'><b>Week of July&nbsp;16</b></font></td>
  <td width='80%'><font face='Times New Roman, Times, serif'
size='3'>House floor action on the Commerce-Justice-State appropriations bill
(estimate)</font></td>
</tr></table>
</td>
</tr>
</table>
</center></div>
</td>
<td width='10%'>&nbsp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td width='16%'>&nbsp;</td>
<td width='74%'>
  <table width='92%' border='0' cellspacing='0' cellpadding='0'
align='center'>
    <tr><td>
<font face='Arial, Helvetica, sans-serif' size='2'>
<br><p>The <i>Nuclear Calendar</i> is published every Monday when Congress is in
session.
To subscribe <a href='http://www.fcnl.org/listserv/quaker_issues.php'>click
here</a>, or send an e-mail to
<a
href='mailto:majordomo@fcnl.org?Body=subscribe%20NuclearCalendar'>majordomo@fcnl.org
</a>
with "subscribe NuclearCalendar" (without the quotation marks) in the message body.

To unsubscribe <a href='http://www.fcnl.org/listserv/nc_unsubscribe.php'>click
here</a>, or send an e-mail to
<a
href='mailto:majordomo@fcnl.org?Body=unsubscribe%20NuclearCalendar'>majordomo@fcnl.o
rg</a>
with "unsubscribe NuclearCalendar" (without the quotation marks) in the message
body.</p>

<p>Published by the <a href='http://www.fcnl.org/whatis.htm'>Friends Committee on
National Legislation</a>
```

10709.10.txt

(FCNL) and the [>FCNL Education Fund.](http://www.fcnl.org/whatis.htm#fun)

Address: 245 Second Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002-5795.

Phone: (202) 547-6000. Fax: (202) 547-6019.

E-mail: [>fcnl@fcnl.org.](mailto:fcnl@fcnl.org)

Web site: [>http://www.fcnl.org.</p>](http://www.fcnl.org/index.htm)

<p>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 \[>Friends Committee on National Legislation and the \\[>FCNL Education Fund.</p>\\]\\(http://www.fcnl.org/whatis.htm#fun\\)\]\(http://www.fcnl.org/whatis.htm\)](mailto:david@fcnl.org)

<p>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."</p>

</td></tr>

</table>

</td>

<td width='10%'> </td>

</tr>

</table>

</body>

</html></x-html>

X-Sender: dkimball@[63.106.26.66]
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. (See article and excerpts, below.)

Russian Ambassador Visits Nevada Test Site:

At the invitation of Senator Harry Reid (D-NV), Russia's ambassador to the

United States made a visit to the United States' Nevada Test site, including a tour of the U-1a facility where U.S. subcritical experiments are conducted. Russian Ambassador Yuri Ushakov also toured other areas of NTS, including "Icecap," the site of the nuclear test that was to be conducted in 1992 but for the nuclear test moratorium legislation of that year. Senator Reid expressed "embarrassment" about the U.S. Senate's failure to approve the CTBT in 1999.

The visit may help open the way for further exchanges at the test sites that could lead to additional confidence building measures, though Russia may not agree to many such exchanges if they are not done without U.S. CTBT ratification and within the context of the CTBT, which specifically encourages such exchanges. (See article below.)

Report on Chinese Subcritical Experiment:

Last week, Washington Times reporter/editorialist Bill Gertz wrote that China conducted the subcritical experiment that he alleged might be a full-blown nuclear weapon test explosion in an earlier story published on April 9.

The State Department has recently said that: "China is not likely to rely on weapons incorporating information obtained through espionage without first conducting nuclear explosive tests," and that "... it would continue to evaluate the safety and reliability of its nuclear weapons.... We believe that China has initiated such a program at its Lop Nur test site."

Obviously, for those of us who actually do wish to permanently end nuclear testing and improve nuclear test monitoring and verification, ratification and entry into force of the CTBT -- with the option of short-notice, on-site inspections -- is the logical policy choice.

- DK

NOTE: Further information and analysis 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>

IN THIS UPDATE:

1. "White House Wants to Bury Pact Banning Tests of Nuclear Arms," The New York Times, July 7, 2001
2. "Underground Test Speedup Barred: Congress Waiting For Rumsfeld to Finish Defense Study," Washington Post, July 6, 2001
3. Excerpt from interview with Sec. Abraham Sunday, July 1 on CNN
4. Excerpt from Radio Journalist interview with Paul Wolfowitz, Deputy

Secretary of Defense, June 29, 2001

5. "U.S. Studying Nuclear Test Site," AP, June 29, 2001

6. "Russian envoy hears nuke concerns," by Mary Manning, Las Vegas Sun, July 6, 2001

7. "Inside The Ring," By Bill Gertz and Rowan Scarborough, The Washington Times, July 6, 2001

8. "Nuclear Weapons Showing Age," Aviation Week & Space Technology, May 21, 2001,

1. "White House Wants to Bury Pact Banning Tests of Nuclear Arms"

The New York Times, July 7, 2001, Saturday, Page 1

By THOM SHANKER and DAVID E. SANGER

WASHINGTON, July 6 -- In its first six months, the Bush administration has been examining ways to escape permanently from an unratified international agreement banning nuclear tests, just as it has moved to scrap the Antiballistic Missile Treaty and has rebelled against a global warming pact that it believes would cripple American industry.

But State Department lawyers told the White House that a president cannot withdraw a treaty from the Senate once it has been presented for approval. So, administration officials said, President Bush has resolved to let the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty languish in the Senate, where its supporters concede they do not have the votes to revive it.

The decision puts the test ban in the same category as the Kyoto Protocol on global warming: by informing the pact's allies that it has no chance of ratification, Mr. Bush is essentially forcing his main European partners to find alternatives more to the administration's liking.

Mr. Bush has long opposed the treaty, which the Senate rejected 51 to 48 nearly two years ago in a major defeat for President Bill Clinton. Now, in the next two weeks, Mr. Bush hopes to go a step further and persuade the treaty's allies to acknowledge that the pact is effectively dead.

The issue may be discussed at the summit meeting of industrialized nations in Genoa, Italy, later this month. But a senior administration official said today that there was no mention of the treaty in current drafts of the group's final communique. Some Bush administration officials even said that the treaty itself might not even come up for discussion for the first time in many years.

During the Clinton years, Canada, the major European allies and Japan called on "all those states which have not yet done so to sign and ratify the treaty without delay." Mr. Bush's aides have worked to delete that wording from other international communiqués, while still calling on nations to abide by a nonbinding moratorium on nuclear testing.

Behind the arcane change in wording is part of a radical alteration of American arms control strategy. While rejecting the treaty, the Bush administration is pressing for deep, even unilateral, cuts in the nation's nuclear arsenal, deployment of missile defenses and a new framework to combat proliferation that builds on some current pacts but rejects others.

The test ban treaty "does not help our nonproliferation goals," said an administration official who discussed the president's emerging strategy on the condition that he not be identified.

He said the treaty "is cited as providing a new moral and legal barrier to proliferation."

He also said the treaty was also cited as preventing a potential nuclear power from developing a weapon in confidence. "It is presented as a treaty that is verifiable. And it is presented as something that, in fact, still allows us to maintain our nuclear stockpile in confidence. And I think you'll find that it's wrong on every count, that those contentions are wrong."

As of today, 161 nations have signed the treaty, and 77 of them have ratified it. Among those 77 nations are 31 of the 44 states required for the treaty to enter into force; among the remaining 13 are the United States, China, India, Pakistan, North Korea and Israel. In the absence of a treaty, nations are free to conduct nuclear tests, although a nonbinding moratorium is in place.

Administration officials studied the barriers to pulling the treaty from Senate consideration in order to bury it, as well as the potential outcry here and abroad should the United States abandon it.

Today, officials said, Mr. Bush "has no plans" to do anything with the treaty, but also "has no plans" to break from the moratorium on nuclear tests.

But treaties do not die at the adjournment of a Congress as bills do, and can be taken up again at any time by a subsequent Senate. Thus, once the test ban treaty was rejected by the Senate, it reverted to the legal property of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Although a Democrat who supports the treaty, Senator Joseph R. Biden Jr. of Delaware, became the committee chairman when Republicans lost their majority, Senate rules require a two-thirds vote to ratify the treaty, as its proponents desire, or send it back to Mr. Bush for disposal, as its opponents want.

The math of the Senate split renders either action nearly impossible.

"There is no excuse for our failure to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty," Mr. Biden said last month. While agreeing that there are "legitimate concerns" regarding the nation's long-term ability to maintain the nuclear stockpile without nuclear tests and with verification, he said those problems could be resolved before Senate approval.

Mr. Bush expressed unwavering criticism of the treaty during the campaign,

saying it did not further the nation's nonproliferation policy or strengthen national security, and his administration conducted a review of test-ban issues.

In the most explicit inquiry into the president's options, John R. Bolton, the undersecretary of state for arms control and international security, asked the State Department's legal office to determine whether a president had the power to unilaterally withdraw a treaty pending before the Senate, officials said.

The legal office reported that the answer was "no," officials said. Once a treaty is sent to the Senate, there is little a president or a successor can do to dispose of it.

Supporters of the treaty criticized the administration's approach, saying the test ban is a cornerstone of nonproliferation efforts and has overwhelming domestic and international support.

"Continued U.S. failure to follow through on its C.T.B.T. commitments leaves the door open to a global chain reaction of nuclear testing, instability and confrontation in the future," said Daryl G. Kimball, executive director of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers.

Mr. Kimball said efforts to delete support for the treaty from multilateral documents "demonstrate that the U.S. is clearly out of step with the rest of the international community on the subject of ending nuclear testing and curbing nuclear proliferation."

He said administration statements "leave open the option to test in the future, and I think that their current approach of rejecting the C.T.B.T. and continuing the moratorium is simply the most politically convenient approach given the overwhelming domestic and international support for a test ban and opposition to a resumption of testing."

The administration's first major success in altering the allies' publicly stated policy -- though not necessarily their belief -- on the test ban treaty was at the most recent meeting of NATO foreign ministers, this past May in Budapest.

The ministers' final communique said, "As long as the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (C.T.B.T.) has not entered into force, we urge all states to maintain existing moratoria on nuclear testing."

The language of that compromise statement was in stark contrast to the previous meeting, in Brussels in December, when the ministers stated, "We remain committed to an early entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty and, in the meanwhile, urge all states to refrain from any acts which would defeat its object and purpose."

2. "Underground Test Speedup Barred: Congress Waiting For Rumsfeld to Finish Defense Study,"

Washington Post, July 6, 2001

By Walter Pincus, Washington Post Staff Writer

The House has moved to block plans by the Energy Department to shorten from three years to 18 months the time it needs to be able to resume underground nuclear weapons tests.

Gen. John A. Gordon, director of the department's National Nuclear Security Administration, made clear to the House Armed Services Committee last month that there were no immediate plans to resume nuclear testing. But he said he requested funds to accelerate preparations of testing facilities because he was "not comfortable" with a three-year turnaround time.

The prohibition, which was contained in the Energy Department's fiscal 2002 appropriations bill that the House passed June 28, goes to the Senate for consideration.

One reason lawmakers gave for blocking Gordon's test initiative was their desire to first hear the results of Defense Secretary Donald F. Rumsfeld's study of strategic nuclear deterrence in the post-Cold War era. That study, among several initiated by the defense secretary to redo defense policies, was originally to be completed by now but has taken more time than Rumsfeld expected.

The deterrence study is a key part of President Bush's plan to introduce missile defense and at the same time reduce the size of the U.S. strategic nuclear force, unilaterally if necessary.

"I had no idea when I started this process at the president's request several months ago," Rumsfeld told the House Armed Services Committee on June 21, "that I would still be with it." He said the president "is anxious for me to complete this . . . but I simply am not going to finish it until I finish it."

President Bush, who during the 2000 campaign said he opposed Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, has more recently said he will maintain for the present the U.S. moratorium on underground nuclear tests that was initiated in 1992 by his father, President George Bush, and continued by President Bill Clinton. However, Bush said he has not ruled out testing in the future, echoing his father's 1992 position that testing might be needed to maintain the reliability of the nation's nuclear stockpile.

Asked about the Energy Department testing proposal last month, White House press secretary Ari Fleischer said only, "The president is going to continue the moratorium."

Rumsfeld visited the headquarters of the U.S. Strategic Command in Omaha twice in June on nuclear deterrence, and on five other Saturdays discussed the issue with the chairman or vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, civilian advisers and National Security Council staff members.

The House Appropriations Committee report on funding the Energy

Department's nuclear weapons complex in fiscal 2002 said specifically that nuclear-test readiness could not be changed before Rumsfeld completes his review of nuclear deterrence, the president requests such a step and Congress approves it.

Meanwhile, pressures are building on the nuclear complex to move ahead with a variety of programs designed to maintain the safety and the reliability of the stockpile, no matter what size it becomes.

An advisory committee of nuclear scientists, headed by John Foster, former director of the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory and a former Pentagon official, recommended shortening the time it takes to prepare for testing to less than a year. Foster also wants to add training for new designers who could produce "robust, alternative warheads that will provide a hedge if problems occur in the future . . . within the current stockpile."

One result of the Foster recommendation may have been Gordon's request for funds and the initiation of "an internal review on how we could improve our test readiness posture." A second plan presented by Gordon to Congress was one to "reinvigorate" advanced nuclear warhead concept design activities.

"Again," Gordon told the House committee, "this is not a proposal to develop new weapons in the absence of requirements. But I am now not exercising design capabilities, and because of that, I believe this capacity and capability is atrophying rapidly."

A House Appropriations Committee spokesman said no funds could be used for advanced warhead concept design until authorized by Congress. However, the Pentagon, at the direction of Congress last year, is working on a study to develop "a deep penetrator [low-yield nuclear warhead] that could hold at risk a rogue state's deeply buried weapons or Saddam Hussein's bunker without torching Baghdad," according to one former senior Pentagon official who is still involved in military and intelligence research.

3. Excerpt from interview with Sec. Abraham Sunday, July 1 on CNN

HUNT: Mr. Secretary, it's been reported that the Bush Administration has asked scientists to look into the possibility of resuming nuclear testing in the underground in Nevada to test weapons. That's under your department, too. You have a big responsibility in your department.

Is the U.S. government really to the point now where, after all this time, nuclear testing is possible in the near future?

ABRAHAM: No. We're not considering that option. In fact, it would take years if we were to start today to even be in a position to resume testing. We're committed at this point not only to the moratorium, but to pursuing the science-based, what we call stockpile stewardship approach to determining the reliability of our nuclear stockpile.

The issue that's been raised and was raised during hearings in the past is

whether or not we ever will be in a position to scientifically determine whether our stockpile functions.

Now, today that's not much of a problem due to the relative youth of the stockpile. But in the future, as some of these weapons systems age, there's a question. We're moving with a lot of resources to be able to do it scientifically without testing. That's a decision we have to continue to monitor.

4. Excerpt from Radio Journalist interview with Paul Wolfowitz, Deputy Secretary of Defense, June 29, 2001

Q: And another question, Reuters is saying that the administration may be considering resuming underground nuclear testing. What are your thoughts about resuming underground nuclear testing?

Wolfowitz: I'm not aware of a need to resume testing at this time.

Q: At any foreseeable future?

Wolfowitz: It depends on how long you can foresee the future. There are no plans that I've been, that have been discussed with me or with Secretary Rumsfeld to do anything at this time.

Q: And what do you think about resuming them? You don't think it's a good idea to do it? What are your thoughts?

Wolfowitz: Well, there may be circumstances where particularly if we develop questions about the reliability or safety of our nuclear weapons where you would have to contemplate doing that. And bear in mind, like everything else, these are things that age with time, and more so because the elements of which they're composed are radioactive and are actively decomposing all the time. So you have to keep a very close eye on the condition of that force. But I'm not aware of any imminent need to contemplate testing.

5. "U.S. Studying Nuclear Test Site," June 29, 2001

By THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

WASHINGTON (AP) -- The Energy Department is studying ways to improve the Nevada Test Site's readiness to resume nuclear weapons trials in case the Bush administration decides testing is needed, officials said Friday.

Joe Davis, a department spokesman, said there has been no change to the requirement, set in 1994, to be capable of resuming testing within 24 to 36 months of a presidential decision to test. He said the department is reviewing whether the readiness level can be improved, for the sake of efficiency.

Some have concluded from reports on the review that the administration is contemplating resuming nuclear testing.

“It would be wrong to interpret it that way,” he said.

Paul Wolfowitz, the deputy secretary of defense, on Friday said the administration does not plan to order a resumption of testing, which was halted in 1992. He could not rule out that it might one day be necessary.

“I’m not aware of a need to resume testing at this time,” Wolfowitz said in an interview with radio reporters. If questions arose about the reliability or safety of nuclear warheads and underground blasts were required to resolve those questions, the administration would contemplate testing, he said.

That also was the policy of the Clinton administration, and it is the reason why the Energy Department is required by Congress to maintain the scientific and other capabilities to resume testing.

Prior to the U.S. decision in 1992 to place a moratorium on nuclear testing, it was the Pentagon’s view that periodic testing was an indispensable tool in ensuring that nuclear weapons were reliable. But rapid advances in computer simulation and other technologies have made it possible to collect vast amounts of safety and reliability data without testing.

Asked about the matter on Thursday, White House spokesman Ari Fleischer said the review of the Nevada Test Site’s readiness was strictly a technical matter.

“It does not have anything to do with resumption of nuclear tests,” Fleischer said. “The president is going to continue the moratorium.”

The secretaries of defense and energy are required by law to certify to the president each year whether there are nuclear weapons safety or reliability concerns that would require a return to nuclear testing.

John Gordon, head of the National Nuclear Security Administration, an arm of the Energy Department, said in testimony to a House Armed Services subcommittee on Wednesday that the most recent assessment confirmed that the nuclear weapons stockpile is safe and reliable and that no nuclear testing is needed.

Gordon said confirmation was possible because of technological advances, which can also help maintain the readiness of the Nevada Test Site, a protected federal range of 1,350 square miles situated 65 miles northwest of Las Vegas.

“We are conducting an internal review on how we can improve significantly our readiness posture to conduct a nuclear test, should we ever be so directed,” Gordon told the panel. “This is not a proposal to conduct a test, but I am not comfortable with not being able to conduct a test within three years.”

An Energy Department spokeswoman, Lisa Cutler, said Friday the current 24-36 months standard for readiness ``may be inadequate," but the department has not made a final decision on reducing it.

Darwin Morgan, a spokesman for the Nevada Test Site, said the readiness of the site is under constant review to ensure that the lead time for nuclear testing does not exceed the 24-36 month standard.

``If we can reduce the lead time, great," but it would be done for the sake of improving efficiency, not in anticipation of a presidential decision to resume testing, Morgan said.

6. "Russian envoy hears nuke concerns," by Mary Manning, Las Vegas Sun, July 6, 2001

Russian Ambassador Yuri Ushakov listened as Nevada scientists explained how they plan to remove radioactive material that remains from nuclear testing in Southern Nevada.

Ushakov, who is scheduled today to visit the Nevada Test Site, where more than 1,000 nuclear warheads exploded above and below ground 1951 through 1992, portrayed the similarities between the remote site 65 miles northwest of Las Vegas with one in Semipalatinsk, Russia.

Nevada Sen. Harry Reid met with the ambassador after the opening of a resource center for Nevada Test Site Workers in Las Vegas, where those exposed to radiation, dust and beryllium can apply for up to \$150,000 in benefits.

The ambassador acknowledged Russia's nuclear workers are also suffering, and an environmental cleanup would be a massive undertaking.

In 1998 scientists from the United States and the former Soviet Union also exchanged visits to test sites and viewed parallel underground nuclear weapons tests.

Since then, the Test Site has opened its gates to environmental research, and subcritical tests -- where weapons materials undergo experiments without sustaining a chain reaction. The government is also welcoming university scientists to areas that were once top-secret.

Despite the fact that Russia signed a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty that the U.S. Senate rejected on Oct. 13, 1999, Ushakov said the existence of roughly 12,000 nuclear weapons still poses a major problem for the United States and Russia, the heart of the former Soviet Union.

"We have to do everything we can to make our nuclear arsenals safer," Ushakov told Reid, as well as scientists from UNLV, the University of Nevada, Reno and the Desert Research Institute.

The most important task for both nations in the 21st century is to cooperate, Ushakov said.

Reid said that the Russian Parliament did a better job seeking nuclear disarmament than U.S. lawmakers.

"I was terribly embarrassed," the senator said of the 1999 Senate vote [on the CTBT]. "The Russians approved it and we didn't. They set an example and we should follow. In my opinion, there is not nearly enough being done."

7. "Inside The Ring," By Bill Gertz and Rowan Scarborough, The Washington Times, July 6, 2001

China nuke experiment

U.S. intelligence officials said China conducted some type of nuclear weapons-related experiment recently. The test was carried out at the remote Lop Nur nuclear testing facility in western Xinjiang province.

Another test is expected soon, we are told.

Intelligence agencies remain in the dark about what kind of test took place because the blast gave off no seismic readings. Also, U.S. "sniffer" aircraft capable of detecting venting of radioactive material from the site came up empty. The key indicator of the test was an increase in vehicle activity.

Officials said the test may have been a "subcritical" nuclear test a blast that simulates a nuclear explosion but falls short of reaching an actual nuclear chain reaction. China is developing a small nuclear warhead that U.S. intelligence agencies believe is based on stolen U.S. warhead design information.

Preparations for the test were first reported May 11 by The Washington Times.

Intelligence officials said China recently purchased special nuclear containment vessels from Russia that were used by Moscow to mask its underground nuclear tests.

8. "Nuclear Weapons Showing Age," Aviation Week & Space Technology, May 21, 2001, by Robert Wall

As the Bush Administration completes its nuclear posture review, the aging of those weapons and hurdles to keeping them operationally viable are emerging as key issues that will need to be addressed.

The scope of the problems has been highlighted by a group of experts conducting a congressionally mandated, three-year assessment of the U.S. nuclear stockpile. Furthermore, holes in the nuclear weapons stewardship program were also brought out in congressional testimony by John A. Gordon,

the head of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA).

In the second of its three annual reports, the Panel to Assess the Reliability, Safety, and Security of the U.S. Nuclear Stockpile has found that there continue to be shortages in the Energy and Defense Departments' nuclear weapons management efforts, although improvements have been made. Among the problems are the aging stockpile and nonexistent retrofit capabilities, low morale and recruitment difficulties, and lack of a plan to reestablish critical production capabilities.

THE AVERAGE AGE of the nuclear weapons arsenal is about 18 years, compared with an intended design life of 12 years when the systems were fielded, John S. Foster, chairman of the panel, said at a National Defense University Foundation presentation. "They will be many times their design life" before they are refurbished or replaced. "We have opened some of the warheads and found some defects that are worrisome," he added.

That trend creates extra burdens on the stockpile stewardship program. "As our nuclear weapons continue to age, we expect more parts to require replacement," Gordon said. Creating exact replacement parts is difficult, he noted, because some production facilities have closed, and manufacturing techniques have changed. Component changes, of which nine are currently being undertaken, can affect the performance of nuclear weapons. Gordon pointed out that extensive analysis is required to ensure the components are acceptable, since full-up weapons tests aren't allowed, given the current test moratorium.

But Gordon also said the overall financial situation is getting better and NNSA's \$5.3-billion Fiscal 2002 budget request represents a 4.6% increase over last year. However, Foster said, that amount "does not turn the [existing] situation around."

The budget submission includes funds to pay for maintenance, evaluation and certification of the stockpile; manufacturing a certifiable W88 Trident missile warhead with a new pit that would be ready in 2003; and maintaining existing infrastructure, Gordon testified. However, it does not address issues such as future weapons refurbishment requirements or certification and production plans for the W88.

But the ongoing nuclear review could substantially change the magnitude of some of the stockpile problems, especially if the size of the nuclear inventory is cut. President Bush, in a speech May 1 at the National Defense University, indicated the Administration would pursue unilateral strategic arms reductions.

One of the areas that would be affected is the supply of tritium, a critical substance in every U.S. nuclear warhead. The current supply will last until 2005 before the five-year reserve has to be drawn on, Gordon said. However, if nuclear weapons levels are reduced, the supply would last longer. If they aren't, one year of the reserve "may be consumed," Gordon noted.

Deliveries of new tritium gas, to be produced by the Tennessee Valley Authority, has been delayed because of congressional action in 1999 and

won't start until February 2006. However, Gordon said that enough tritium would be produced to rebuild the reserve within 2-3 years.

Another major area of concern for both NNSA and the expert panel is the status of plutonium pit production for W88 warheads. Every year, one warhead of each type is destructively tested, leaving fewer weapons in the stockpile. In the case of the W88, the Energy Dept. is nearing the point where continued destructive testing would drop the number of weapons below the required level.

A limited pit production capability is now being established at Los Alamos National Laboratory, N.M., with eight development pits having been produced. A W88 pit that could be certified is supposed to be ready by 2003.

But there is some question about whether the new pits can be certified. Foster noted that the manufacturing process has changed and that the new pits are being cast, not rolled, and then machined. As a result, the structure is slightly different. While some testing of cast pits was done before the moratorium, indicating there won't be a performance change, Foster said there are those who aren't convinced. Two key issues surround the debate, he said: "One, nobody knows; two, nobody can prove [they're right]."

TO RUN THE PIT production effort, NNSA established a project office. The organization will also examine long-term production needs. Decisions on the future production facility, which Foster said could take 15 years to become operational, would be based on the findings of the nuclear posture review. Furthermore, results from a pit-aging study should become available in 2004, which would reveal how long the existing ones can last. "We are making progress in plutonium pit manufacturing and certification, although there are serious issues ahead of us," Gordon said.

Concerning other nuclear warheads, such as the W76, W80 and B61 bomb, the Nuclear Weapons Council last year finally resolved the amount of refurbishment work that should be undertaken. But existing budget levels don't support the schedule and scope of work planned for the W76 and W80, Gordon said, although the B61 is funded. That situation may change, though, pending the Pentagon review.

FOSTER ALSO SAID consideration should be given to designing alternative warheads. "There is not much margin in these weapons," he said, noting that in the competition to build smaller, lighter and higher yield warheads, designers at the Lawrence Livermore and Los Alamos national laboratories devised "very sensitive" designs. But given the difficulty of sustaining weapons without nuclear tests, more robust designs may be needed, even if the warheads are less efficient. An added benefit, Foster said, is that the activity would train warhead designers and test personnel.

To assess the performance of nuclear weapons with a test moratorium in place, the Energy Dept. has been pushing for the development of computer models that can adequately simulate weapons performance. The debate over whether simulations can replace testing has been among the most heated in conjunction with the moratorium. Foster noted that computer programs have produced good results, but "there are a number of underground tests we can't reproduce. We have these enigmas." Gordon's outlook is more positive,

though. "Early versions of the three-dimensional weapon performance codes are resolving previously unexplained phenomena from past underground test data and are contributing to the resolution of issues that have been raised by our surveillance program."

Even if a decision was made to test, Foster noted that it would take 2-3 years to get ready for such an event. That time span is too long and doesn't give the President any real options, he said, arguing it should be cut to 3-4 months. The NNSA director said his organization "will look hard again at improving test readiness, and will review whether an appropriate level of resources is being applied."

THE SIMULATION SIDE is experiencing its own budget woes. The Advanced Simulation and Computing effort is trying to deliver the massive computing power needed to model nuclear weapons performance in three dimensions. The goal has been to reach a 100-teraops (100-trillion operations-per-sec.) capability by 2004. But funding in the 2002 budget will cause a one-year delay, Gordon said.

Daryl Kimball

UNTIL JULY 27:
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>>

BEGINNING SEPTEMBER 4:
Executive Director
Arms Control Association
1726 M Street, NW, Suite 201
Washington, DC 20036
(ph) 202-463-8270 (fax) 202-463-8273
website <<http://www.armscontrol.org>>
email <dkimball@armscontrol.org>

To: holronfost@aol.com, kiki@wizard.net, jfnorth@aol.com, jcm@duncanallen.com,
mupj@igc.org, beverley@erols.com, andrewsa@saic.com
Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 10:49:47 -0400
Subject: Fw: FW: Mark Your Calendar
X-Mailer: Juno 5.0.27
From: Dwight O Smith <dosmith6@juno.com>

For your information, forwarded is a copy of an email from Paul Britner sent to elected officials concerning our Poverty Forum on October 23, 2001. The Outreach Committee will meet with Paul at 11:00 AM on Tuesday, July 17, 2001, to discuss specific details of the forum and to assign responsibilities. Please bring a brown bag lunch; drinks will be provided.

Thanks, Dwight

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

From: Paul Britner <Pbritner@communityministrymc.org>
To: "'dosmith6@juno.com'" <dosmith6@juno.com>,
"mupj@igc.org" <mupj@igc.org>
Date: Fri, 29 Jun 2001 09:11:22 -0400
Subject: FW: Mark Your Calendar
Message-ID: <415F23FA7392D3119363005004ACC7480B60AE@cmmc01>

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"

X-Sender: jdi@[63.106.26.66]
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)
Date: Mon, 09 Jul 2001 11:50:20 -0400
To: jdi@clw.org
From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>
Subject: Analysis of revised military budget request

REVISED FISCAL YEAR 2002 MILITARY BUDGET AT A GLANCE
(Detailed weapons program numbers follow)

=====

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE NEW MILITARY BUDGET

=====

==Requests \$343.2 billion in national defense (050) spending for fiscal 2002 representing a \$32.6 billion increase (10.5 percent) above 2001 levels of \$310.6 billion.

==The largest single-year increase since early in the Reagan Administration and the third largest peace-time increase since WWII. The increase alone is greater than the defense budgets of every country in the World except England, Russia, China and Japan and it is greater than the Gross Domestic Products of over one third of the individual nations in the world.

==Cuts Defense Department Cooperative Threat Reduction Programs (Nunn-Lugar) by \$40 million from \$443 million to \$403 million. The Administration has already reduced the Department of Energy non-proliferation programs by \$100 million.

==Provides Ballistic Missile Defense programs \$8.3 billion (an increase of \$3 billion or 57% from FY 2001).

==Despite talk of "skipping a generation of weapons," the budget funds all major weapons systems on the drawing board, postponing weapons decisions until the fiscal 2003 budget.

==The Defense Department's recent request for an additional \$18 billion was not covered by the fiscal 2002 budget resolution adopted earlier this year and now has to be approved by the House and Senate Budget Committee Chairmen.

==The Pentagon's budget revision includes a section repealing the statute barring the unilateral reduction of the U.S. nuclear weapons (Section 714). The budget also provides for the retirement of all 50 U.S. Peacekeeper (MX) missiles.

=====

MAJOR CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS REQUESTS (in millions of dollars)

=====

(number of weapons in FY 2002 and states of prime contractors in parentheses)

F/A-18 E/F Navy Super Hornet - (48 planes made in MA, MO, MD & CA)
FY 2001 - \$2,987
FY 2002 - \$3291

F-22 Air Force advanced fighter (13 planes made in GA, TX, WA and FL)

FY 2001 - \$3,922

FY 2002 - \$3,903

JSF Navy-Air Force-Marine Joint Strike Fighter (Competition in WA, MD, FL)

FY 2001 - \$682

FY 2002 - \$1,537

V-22 Osprey - (12 planes made in TX, PA and IN)

FY 2001 - \$1,708

FY 2002 - \$1,788

RAH-66 Army Comanche light helicopter (made in CT, PA, AZ, IN)

FY 2001 - \$608

FY 2002 - \$788

AH-64 Longbow Apache helicopter (made in MD)

FY 2001 - \$755

FY 2002 - \$918

Crusader Mobile Howitzer (made in MN, MA, MI, OK)

FY 2001 - \$352

FY 2002 - \$448

C-17 Air Force airlift aircraft (15 planes made in CA and CT)

FY 2001 - \$2,931

FY 2002 - \$3,684

C-130J cargo aircraft (2 planes made in GA and IN)

FY 2001 - \$206

FY 2002 - \$221

E-8C Joint STARS airborne radar system (1 plane made in FL)

FY 2001 - \$294

FY 2002 - \$332

F-16 Air Force Falcon (0 aircraft made in TX, CT and OH)

FY 2001 - \$121

FY 2002 - \$0

NSSN New Attack Submarine (1 sub made in CT and VA)

FY 2001 - \$1,701

FY 2002 - \$2,293

DDG-51 Navy Aegis destroyer (3 destroyers made in ME and MS)

FY 2001 - \$3,131

FY 2002 - \$2,966

LPD-17 Navy transport dock ship (2 ships made in LA, ME, CA & AL)

FY 2001 - \$556

FY 2002 - \$422

Source: Department of Defense Amended Budget Fiscal Year 2002

=====
MOST EXPENSIVE WEAPONS SYSTEMS - TOTAL PROGRAM COSTS
=====

??? billion: National and theater missile defense
\$200 billion: JSF Navy-Air Force-Marine Joint Strike Fighter (3,128)
\$ 65.7 billion: Virginia Class Attack Submarine (30)
\$ 61.2 billion: F-22 (341)
\$ 46.8 billion: F/A-18 E/F (548)
\$ 44.9 billion: C-17 Cargo plane (134)
\$ 27.2 billion: Trident II Missiles (453)
\$ 11.2 billion: Crusader Mobile Howitzer (480)
\$ 10.7 billion: LPD 17 (12)
\$ 10.3 billion: LHD 1 (8)
\$ 8.8 billion: Longbow Apache (850)
\$ 8.6 billion: JSTARS airborne radar system
\$ 6.3 billion: Airborne Laser (7)

Source: Selected Acquisition Reports, December 11, 2000; JSF, Crusader and ABL from Director of Operational Test and Evaluation Fiscal 2000 report to Congress

=====
STRATEGIC NUCLEAR PROGRAM REQUESTS IN FY 2001 BUDGET
=====

B-1B bomber: \$290 million
B-2 bomber: \$166.9 million
Trident II (D-5 missile): \$559 million (12 new missiles, made in CA)
Ballistic Missile Defense: \$8.3 billion (an increase of \$3 billion or 57% from FY 2001)
 \$3,940.5 million - Ballistic Missile Defense Midcourse Defense Segment
 \$685.3 million - Ballistic Missile Defense Boost Defense Segment
 \$495.6 million - Ballistic Missile Defense Sensors
 \$779.6 million - Ballistic Missile Defense System Segment
 \$968.2 million - Ballistic Missile Defense Terminal Segment
 \$783.7 million - Patriot PAC3 theater defense
 \$405.3 million - Space Based Infrared System (SBIRS High)
 \$388.5 million - Navy Area Missile Defense

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: "CAROL Q. COSBY" <ccosby@dhm.disciples.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 13:29:53 -0500
Subject: Re: Sign-on letter on NMC funding
Priority: normal
X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Win32 (v3.12c)

Howard, Timing is difficult about this; we are all off to our General Assembly meeting and chaos precedes that. I've sent the request to our DPF moderator and DPF will probably sign on. I doubt that I can get it to Dick Hamm before you need it, but I can try. CQC

From: David Robinson <dave@paxchristiusa.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: Sign-on letter on funding for national missile defense
Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 14:41:36 -0400

Howard,

Please add Bishop Walter Sullivan, President, Pax Christi USA. Thanks for doing this.
dave

From: Howard W. Hallman [SMTP:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Monday, July 09, 2001 1:44 PM
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: Sign-on letter on funding for national missile defense

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.

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: "Charlotte V. Davenport, csjp" <csjp@igc.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: Sign-on letter on funding for national missile defense
Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 15:01:49 -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

Please include us as signers.

Ann Rutan, CSJP
President, Congregation of the Sisters of St. Joseph of Peace

Thanks,
Charlotte

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Monday, July 09, 2001 1:44 PM
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: Sign-on letter on funding for national missile defense

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.

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-Authentication-Warning: red1.netwurx.net: Host [209.242.228.58] claimed to be cc.edu
Date: Mon, 09 Jul 2001 19:25:08 -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: mupj@igc.org
Subject: Missile Defense Letter

Howard,

Please sign me on to the missile defense letter.

Joel J. Heim
Moderator, Disciples Peace Fellowship.

P.S. It would be helpful if you would add me to your email list (jheim@cc.edu)--you send email to Carol Cosby at Disciple office and should continue to do so--but our structure means that I am the one who makes such decisions.

From: "Melvin G. Talbert" <bishopmel@netzero.net>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Sign-on letter on NMD funding
Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 19:18:53 -0500
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4133.2400
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400

Dear Howard,

I am prepared to sign on to this letter as follows: Bishop Melvin G. Talbert, Ecumenical Officer, Council of Bishops, The United Methodist Church. Due to my schedule, I don't have the time to contact my colleagues from the AME, AMEZ and CME churches. I suggest you contact the NCCCUSA National Policy Office, Washington, DC to get the names of contact persons for those communions. They must be invited to join this coalition of concern.

Sincerely, Melvin G. Talbert

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

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: <bishopmel@netzero.com>
Sent: Monday, July 09, 2001 1:12 PM
Subject: Sign-on letter on NMD funding

> Dear Bishop Talbert:

>
> Funding for national missile defense, a major concern of the United
> Methodist Council of Bishops, is coming to focus in congressional
> committees within the next four weeks. Therefore, I invite you to sign
> the following letter as ecumenical officer of the Council of Bishops. We
> are also inviting Jim Winkler to sign for the General Board of Church and
> Society.

>
> Would you also be willing to communicate with the appropriate officers of
> the AME, AMEZ, and CME Churches and invite them to sign? Although they
> haven't been active on this issue, it is coming into focus as a social
> justice issue because of the vast funds it would draw away from endeavors
> that meet human and community needs.

>
> 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. You can reply by e-mail at mupj@igc.org or by fax at 301 896-0013.

>
>
> 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.

>
>
> 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.

>

NetZero Platinum
No Banner Ads and Unlimited Access
Sign Up Today - Only \$9.95 per month!
<http://www.netzero.net>

User-Agent: Microsoft-Outlook-Express-Macintosh-Edition/5.02.2022
Date: Tue, 10 Jul 2001 09:32:49 -0400
Subject: Hallman2001 Financials
From: Edward Brueggemann <edbruegge@mediaone.net>
To: Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.org>
CC: Mary Brueggemann <mmbuegg@aol.com>

Expenses for Hallmann2001

Ed and LuAnn:

Postage, two mailings	\$	7.92	
9-8-99			
Kinko copies		18.20	
9-29-00			
Large Envelopes		3.32	
9-29-00			
FAX, Terri McQueen		7.00	
1-13-01			
Postage			
10.20			3-30-01
Staples, Notebooks, folders, labels et al		67.97	4-16-01
Hudson Trophy Company, Hudson Cream		119.00	4-20-01
Postage		16.50	
5-3-01			
Stafford Co. Flour Mills, prizes		76.75	
5-18-01			
Kinko copies		16.00	
5-31-01			

Walter and Mary:

Caterer for 67 at Banquet	847
6-30-01	
Child care during Banquet	50
6-30-01	
Wine	123
7-1-01	
Postage	4
Groceries	87
6-29-01	
Bakery	45
7-1-01	

=====
\$
1498.89

Revenues consisted of \$ 1041 from the Banquet and \$ 240 in gifts from the cousins. The result is that the reunion cost us a total of \$220. There are some expenses, both direct and indirect which were not reported but this is the best picture I can provide you. edb

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

Greetings,

We're back from a family reunion and a few days at Lake Junaluska and the Smokies. I'm getting back into things. Is Peace Leaf out? If so, please send the extra copies for me to my home: 6508 Wilmett Road, Bethesda, MD 20817

Thanks,
Howard

From: Tom Hart <thart@episcopalchurch.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Cc: Brian Grieves <bgrieves@dfms.org>, Mary Miller
<MARY_MILLER.parti@ecunet.org>
Subject: RE: Sign-on letter on funding for national missile defense
Date: Tue, 10 Jul 2001 11:47:44 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

Please sign me on.

Thomas H. Hart
Director of Government Relations
Episcopal Church, USA

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Monday, July 09, 2001 1:44 PM
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: Sign-on letter on funding for national
missile defense

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.

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: Motives for missile defense
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Janet,

Now that I'm back from vacation, I'm replying to your e-mail of June 26 on national missile defense.

There seem to be several motives behind development of missile defense, some of them overlapping.

(1) Persons who look for the worst-case scenario believe there is a genuine threat of missile attack on the United States by states they don't trust. They attest diabolical motives to foreign leaders. By and large it's the same persons who were strongly anti-communist and are now seeking other states and rules to be against.

(2) Among conservatives there is a fervent ideological commitment to national missile defense that defies rational analysis. President Reagan was this way, and many Republicans make it a litmus test for true believers.

(3) There are persons who believe that the United States should achieve dominance in space before other nations enter this sphere. It starts with a desire to protect U.S. satellites from harm, for the military is now highly dependent on satellites. It extends to a desire to have war-fighting capability in space. Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld is of this persuasion. They see missile defense, particularly as deployed in space, as a way station to broader militarization of space.

Regarding first strike capability, I doubt that very many persons these days envision launching a first strike against the Russians. However, the Russians, who share with Americans the doctrine of mutually assured destruction (MAD), fear that an extensive U.S. missile defense would put the United States in a position to initiate a first strike. Although the U.S. is unlikely to deploy missile defense large enough to offer protection from the entire Russian arsenal, the U.S. defense might be able to withstand an attack of what's left of the Russian arsenal after a U.S. first strike.

I believe that it is the third motivation that is most worrisome: the desire to achieve and maintain U.S. military superiority for the purpose of world dominance. Although first strike capability may be part of the picture, I don't believe that desire to initiate a first strike is a major underlying motivation for missile defense. That's my opinion, and others may differ. In any case the push for militarization of space is worrisome and needs to be opposed.

If you would like to talk about this further, please call me at 301 896-0013.

Shalom,
Howard

To: jwinkler@umc-gbcs.org, jhanson@umc-gbcs.org, jhorman@umc-gbcs.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Contacting Senator Byrd
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Friends:

The struggle against national missile defense has shifted to the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees. Although Senator Robert Byrd, chair of the Senate Appropriations Committee, supports the eventual deployment of national missile defense, he is highly skeptical of the rush to deploy an unproven system. He also questions whether it is prudent to vastly increase funding for missile defense in light of tightening federal resources after the tax cut. His views were laid out in a speech to the Senate on June 25, 2001 (p. S6844 of the Congressional Record).

I talked with Senator Byrd's Appropriations Committee staff to request a meeting with an interfaith delegation. I was told that Senator Byrd prefers his staff to meet only with persons from West Virginia, or at least that a West Virginian be part of the delegation.

Given the senator's home state orientation, it might be particularly useful to ask Bishop Ives to communicate with Senator Byrd, if he hasn't already. Bishop Ives could express his concern for the budgetary implications of a 57% increase in funding for missile defense. (This is laid out in the sign-on letter I am now circulating, which you have) He could send the senator the Council of Bishop statement on missile defense. He could refer to Senator Byrd's June 25 speech and urge him to cut back on missile defense funding for the 2002 fiscal year.

You folks are fully capable of drafting such a letter, but if you need some help, let me know.

On the sign-on letter, I sent it to Bishop Talbert as the UMC ecumenical bishop, and he has signed it. I hope that Jim Winkler will also.

Shalom,
Howard

From: Janet Horman <JHorman@UMC-GBCS.ORG>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Cc: Jaydee Hanson <JHanson@UMC-GBCS.ORG>, James Winkler
<JWinkler@UMC-GBCS.ORG>
Subject: RE: Contacting Senator Byrd
Date: Tue, 10 Jul 2001 15:57:42 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Howard:

Your thoughts are right alongside ours these days..We've got a letter written to a number of Bishops(draft edition only at this point)encouraging them to lead delegations from their Annual Conferences to meet with key legislators about Missile Defense/Nuclear Threat Reduction while the Congress is on August recess or ASAP. Jim will be back in the office on Monday, and if he has the time, I will ask him to speak with Bishop Ives about the project and solicit his assistance-both in leading a delegation to Sen. Byrd and in signing onto the letter to other Bishops requesting that they also lead delegations. Each letter will give the Bishop the contact info. for his/her most influential Sen./Representative on this issue.

On another track, we are talking with the Council for a Livable World about linking to their website since their site will have the capacity to be updated frequently and to solicit e-mails to legislators (to be printed out and delivered as hard copies). If we develop such a partnership, they would format their letter page requesting a person's denomination and/or organizational affiliation and report to us and/or other web-site partners as to the affiliations/geographical locations, etc. It's just in a dialogue stage at this point, but I think it makes a lot of since for us..and maybe for many of the Interfaith group's members.

Robert Bowman (Inst. for Space and Security Studies) is meeting with Harry Kiely, Rodney Shaw, Kathryn Johnson(MFSA) and me tomorrow at 2 PM in my office. I thought that you might like to join us as we glean some of his info and perhaps discuss workplans together. If you're unavailable, perhaps you and I can meet in the near future.

I've reviewed the sign on and have forwarded it to Jaydee for his review. I will follow up on Thursday with Jaydee if not before...it looks like a good letter.

Good to have you back. Thanks for all of your energy.

Janet Horman

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Tuesday, July 10, 2001 1:51 PM
To: James Winkler; Jaydee Hanson; Janet Horman
Subject: Contacting Senator Byrd

Dear Friends:

The struggle against national missile defense has shifted to the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees. Although Senator Robert Byrd, chair of the Senate Appropriations Committee, supports the eventual deployment of national missile defense, he is highly skeptical of the rush to deploy an unproven system. He also questions whether it is prudent to vastly increase funding for missile defense in light of tightening federal resources after the tax cut. His views were laid out in a speech to the Senate on June 25, 2001 (p. S6844 of the Congressional Record).

I talked with Senator Byrd's Appropriations Committee staff to request a meeting with an interfaith delegation. I was told that Senator Byrd prefers his staff to meet only with persons from West Virginia, or at least that a West Virginian be part of the delegation.

Given the senator's home state orientation, it might be particularly useful to ask Bishop Ives to communicate with Senator Byrd, if he hasn't already. Bishop Ives could express his concern for the budgetary implications of a 57% increase in funding for missile defense. (This is laid out in the sign-on letter I am now circulating, which you have) He could send the senator the Council of Bishop statement on missile defense. He could refer to Senator Byrd's June 25 speech and urge him to cut back on missile defense funding for the 2002 fiscal year.

You folks are fully capable of drafting such a letter, but if you need some help, let me know.

On the sign-on letter, I sent it to Bishop Talbert as the UMC ecumenical bishop, and he has signed it. I hope that Jim Winkler will also.

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: Janet Horman <JHorman@UMC-GBCS.ORG>

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

Subject: Wednesday meeting

Cc:

Bcc:

X-Attachments:

In-Reply-To: <619BD1E95646D311B69D0008C79FE32D5424B7@church2.umc-gbcs.org>

References:

Janet,

I'll try to be there for your meeting with Robert Bowman and others tomorrow, Wednesday, July at 2:00 p.m., though I may run a little late.

Would you like suggestions about which senators to emphasize in your outreach to bishops?

Howard

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

Date: Tue, 10 Jul 2001 19:08:23 -0400

Subject: Thank you

From: Edward Brueggemann <edbruegge@mediaone.net>

To: Brian Hallman <bhallman@slb.com>,

Jeanette Hallman <vhall110@southwind.net>, Edgar Hallman <halledee@aol.com>,

Gordon Hallman <JoanHallman@hotmail.com>,

Jim Brueggemann <jbbruegg@aol.com>,

John Brueggemann <jbruegge@skidmore.edu>,

Terri McQueen <maxandlil@yahoo.com>, Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.org>,

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

Joy Hallman <jlhallman@aol.com>,

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

Katrina Hallman <katrinaeh@yahoo.com>,

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

Sara Vettraino <mvettraino@aol.com>, Ben Spencer <spencbe@opp.51.org>,

Beth Johnson <bahj666@aol.com>

CC: Mary Brueggemann <mubruegg@aol.com>

Dear Cousins:

It was gracious of all you to contribute \$240 toward the expenses of our recent reunion. We enjoyed planning and hosting the reunion and thank you for your generosity.

Walter and Mary Brueggemann

Ed and LuAnn Brueggemann

To: hipkins
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Peace Leaf arrived
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Jim,

The box of Peace Leafs arrived yesterday afternoon, June 10.

Thanks,
Howard

Reply-To: <kenanddavida@starpower.net>
From: "Ken Giles & Davida Perry" <kenanddavida@starpower.net>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: Sign-on letter on funding for national missile defense
Date: Tue, 10 Jul 2001 20:11:51 -0400
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2911.0)
Importance: Normal
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400

OK.

Jewish Peace Fellowship signs on.
I checked with Murray Polner.
You may list me as the D.C. representative of Jewish Peace Fellowship:
Ken Giles
4525 Burlington Pl, NW
Washington, DC 20016
202-686-9479
kenanddavida@starpower.net

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Monday, July 09, 2001 1:44 PM
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: Sign-on letter on funding for national missile defense

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.

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: vhall110@pop.southwind.net
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 4.3.1
Date: Tue, 10 Jul 2001 20:32:47 -0500
To: "DKNUTSONR@aol.com" <DKNUTSONR@aol.com>,
Edward Brueggemann <edbruegge@mediaone.net>, halledee@aol.com,
mupj@igc.apc.org, Spencersage@aol.com, joanhallman@hotmail.com
From: Jeanette Hallman <vhall110@southwind.net>
Subject: A. Helen

To the Nieces and Nephews : An estate sale will be held on A. Helen's belongings. There has not been a date set. Is there anything that you had seen setting around A. Helen's house that you wanted as a reminder of A. Helen. If I can find it I will put it back for you. The house will be put up for sale after the estate sale of her belongings. Jeanette

Will e-mail Mary Hallman through Lynette Mehall and Stan through Diane Gniadek and drop Mary Hurrell a note. Also Mary Brueggeman an e-mail
Jeanette Hallman
110 Downing Rd.
Hutchinson, KS 67502
316-663-4355

To: Jeanette Hallman <vhall110@southwind.net>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: A. Helen
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <4.3.1.2.20010710134438.00b30b90@pop.southwind.net>
References:

Jeanette,

Thanks for your notice. We have no request. It's great of you to handle this and all your other duties as executor.

Best wishes,
Howard

To: dave@paxchristiusa.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Funding for national missile defense -Forwarded
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dave,

For your information.

Howard

>From: Sdwpjip@aol.com
>Date: Tue, 10 Jul 2001 23:19:08 EDT
>Subject: Re: Funding for national missile defense -Forwarded
>To: mupj@igc.org
>X-Mailer: AOL 6.0 for Windows US sub 10513
>
>Howard:
>
>Wed have a subcommittee of our International Policy Committee reviewing our
> until labor day but I
>
>
>As you know, one of the major considerations in our opposing SDI was the
> We also highlighted this
>issue -- ie, the cost of military -- extensively in our 1993 statement, The
>Harvest of Justice.
>
> I hope we can have something by the
> Things don't always move quickly over here, but you
>know that well by now.
>
>Peace,
>
>Jerry Powers

X-Sender: jdi@[63.106.26.66]
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)
Date: Wed, 11 Jul 2001 09:08:07 -0400
To: jdi@clw.org
From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>
Subject: Missile defense: 2 items

1. "Potential Sites Could Provide New 'Geometries' For Missile Defense Testing, Says Pentagon" - Aerospace Daily
2. "Pentagon Report Reveals Flaws In Missile Defense" - Tierney OpEd

=====
1. "Potential Sites Could Provide New 'Geometries' For Missile Defense Testing, Says Pentagon"
Aerospace Daily - July 11, 2001 - Jefferson Morris

New missile defense test facilities in Alaska could form a "triangle" of sites offering increased flexibility as the Bush Administration ramps up its missile defense R&D efforts, according to the Pentagon.

The other points on the "test bed" triangle would be the existing sites at Vandenberg Air Force Base in California and Kwajalein atoll in the Pacific.

The new test bed will consist of a series of new sites whose precise locations have yet to be decided, according to Pentagon spokesman Rear Adm. Craig Quigley, who spoke at a briefing July 10. One potential location for a new site is Kodiak Island, Alaska, he said.

The addition of new sites would allow testers to "present more challenging interception geometries," Quigley said. "Add a third point to give me that triangle, and I have flexibility in my testing."

Missiles could be launched from the Alaska sites, said Quigley.

"There's certainly a possibility, that we could fly our test missiles and do a lot of the command and control of the overall testing from any or several of the sites under consideration," he said.

Funding for the test bed has already been set aside in the amended 2002 defense budget, although it is too early to put an exact price tag on its construction, Quigley said.

Quigley said it was also too early to speculate on a time frame, pending discussions with industry over logistics and resources.

Quick, rudimentary system a possibility

Quigley said that if the technologies being explored prove effective - and if the need arises - work done at the test bed could lead to a rudimentary operational missile defense system.

He compared this eventuality to the accelerated deployment of the JSTARS (Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System) aircraft, which was still

pre-IOC (Initial Operational Capability) when it was pressed into service during the Persian Gulf War.

"If the need arose, and that's what the nation needed, we would do anything and everything we could to provide a [missile defense] capability," he said.

Asked if the terms of the Anti-Ballistic Missile treaty would conflict with the Administration's plans for more robust missile defense testing, Quigley responded, "the President has said and Secretary [of Defense Donald] Rumsfeld has said that we need to move beyond the ABM treaty."

He wouldn't speculate as to when activities at the test bed might come in direct conflict with the terms of the treaty.

The Clinton Administration was focused on ground-based systems, although it deferred the decision on whether to actually deploy a system to the next Administration, Quigley said.

President Bush is more interested in a multi-layered approach, he said, which could include ground-based, sea-based, or space-based systems to intercept missiles in their boost-, mid-, or terminal phases.

=====
2. "Pentagon Report Reveals Flaws In Missile Defense"
Boston Globe - July 10, 2001 - John F. Tierney OpEd

NOT TOO LONG ago, the Pentagon's purchase of \$400 hammers and \$640 toilets raised eyebrows in Congress and among the public. Yet few people claimed those deluxe hammers couldn't cleanly hit their targets - most likely overpriced nails. And the toilets were said to flush with exquisite efficiency.

Not so the Pentagon's latest folly - an obscenely expensive but flawed missile defense system the Bush administration appears determined to deploy as early as 2004, even though the individual who was charged with evaluating its readiness has declared that it will not be ready, even in a limited form, until 2011.

Philip Coyle, formerly the Pentagon's chief civilian test evaluator, testified last September at a hearing before the national security subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Reform, of which I am a member. Coyle outlined the findings of a report he prepared during the National Missile Defense Deployment Readiness Review a month earlier. I asked him to provide his report, which is unclassified, to the subcommittee. Neither he nor Lieutenant General Ronald Kadish, director of the missile defense program, expressed reservations about making the report public. The subcommittee voted unanimously to make the report part of the hearing record.

Finally pried free two weeks ago - after eight months, six official requests, threats of subpoenas, a letter to Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld from 55 House Democrats, and over the continuing objections of Pentagon officials - the report confirms the glaring deficiencies in the testing program that Coyle raised last September.

The report describes a phenomenon in simulation exercises called "phantom tracks" in which interceptors were accidentally launched against missiles that did not exist. Although operators attempted to take emergency actions to override these launches, they failed every time. The system "simply was not behaving according to operator actions."

Coyle concluded that the system's effectiveness is not yet proven, even in the most elementary sense. In fact, according to his report, the program is so immature that "a rigorous assessment of potential system performance cannot be made."

Yet the Pentagon has no plans to test basic elements of the system, not even to conduct flight tests with more than a single missile, even though the Pentagon concedes that multiple engagements are the most likely scenario. The testing program also ignores widely available decoys that adversaries would find simple to implement."

The report describes how flight tests are being dumbed down to ensure the public perception of success. The Pentagon, for example, is reducing the number of decoys, operators are relying on artificially "canned" scenarios, and interceptors are being given advance information they won't have in real engagements. Even with these "adjustments," the program has experienced embarrassing failures.

Significantly, the report finds that the system can't defend against accidental or unauthorized launches from major nuclear powers, as originally envisioned. The Pentagon has been backtracking on this issue and no longer considers it a key goal.

Despite these warnings, President Bush proposes accelerating deployment and spending \$3 billion more for all missile defense next year - a 57 percent increase. The Pentagon will move to deploy a "rudimentary" system, even before this limited and flawed testing is complete, just to build "something" by the politically significant date of 2004.

As Congress examines the president's missile defense program, and as the administration begins testing components of the system this weekend, I submit that the 52 recommendations in the Coyle report should be the minimum standard by which the new program is evaluated. And the Pentagon's "you-can't-handle-the-truth" attitude that kept this report bottled up for eight months must give way to a constructive and reasoned public dialogue based on full disclosure and honest information.

Absent that, the Pentagon might consider those \$640 toilets as a more reliable way to dispose of the \$200 billion to \$300 billion that this flawed system could cost our nation.

John F. Tierney of Massachusetts is a Democratic member of the US House of Representatives.

John Isaacs
Council for a Livable World
110 Maryland Avenue, NE - Room 409

Washington, D.C. 20002
(202) 543-4100 x.131
www.clw.org

X-Sender: jdi@[63.106.26.66]
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)
Date: Wed, 11 Jul 2001 11:42:37 -0400
To: jdi@clw.org
From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>
Subject: Senate colloquy on potential Fort Greely national missile
defense site

Senate colloquy on potential Fort Greely national missile defense site
Congressional Record - July 11, 2001

FORT GREELY

Mr. NELSON of Florida. I would like to ask the Senator from Alaska to confirm my understanding of the intent of the provision [in the Senate version of the Supplemental Appropriations Bill] regarding Fort Greely, AK, in section 1205 of this supplemental. I understand this provision will allow the Secretary of the Army to modify a previously made determination that the property in question was excess to the needs of the Army and surplus to the needs of the Federal Government. Modifying this decision will allow the Secretary of the Army to retain this property until such time as a determination is made as to whether this property is needed for any defense purpose.

Is that the intent of this provision?

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator from Florida is correct. Clarifying the ability of the Army to retain this property will allow the Secretary of the Army to heat and otherwise maintain the buildings through the Alaska winter so that they are not irreparably damaged. This will allow the buildings to be preserved until a future decision is made.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. I thank the Senator from Alaska for this clarification. I was concerned that this provision was an attempt to predetermine a missile defense deployment decision.

Mr. LEVIN. I, too, thank the Senator from Florida for this clarification.

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, 11 Jul 2001 13:08:28 -0500
From: Kevin Martin
Reply-To: kmartin@projectabolition.org
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win98; U) X-Accept-Language: en
To: Kevin Martin
Subject: Action Alert on this Saturday's Star Wars flight test Dear Friends,

Following are suggestions for action around this Saturday's Star Wars missile flight test and two sample letters to the editor, one to use if the test "works" and the other if it fails. Feel free to use either letter as is or modify to your liking and send to your local newspaper. Please let us know if you get a letter printed, and also what action(s) you and your local group undertake.

In Peace,

Kevin Martin
Director, Project Abolition

Menu of suggested activities:

1. Press conference with your Member of Congress

Call your congresspeople this week and ask them to join a press conference next Monday after the test, with you and your local group if they are home in the district, or with other congresspeople in D.C. if they will be in the capital. Whether the test succeeds or fails, the message should be that a missile shield will violate the ABM treaty, the cornerstone of the nuclear arms control, and should be stopped before the plans go any farther.

(Thanks to Carol Wolman of the Sonoma, CA Nuclear Peace Action Group and Keith Swartzendruber of Indiana Peace Action Network for this idea)

2. Star Wars is a Lemon activities

Here are a few ideas based on Peace Action's "Star Wars is a Lemon" campaign:

*Set up a lemonade stand in a public area. Offer lemonade to thirsty passersby and ask them to sign letters to their representative against Star Wars. Alternatively, ask people to sign actual lemons that say "No Star Wars" and deliver them to your representative's office.

*Deliver lemon balloons to your local representative's office and ask them to protect American

From: Donahuersm@aol.com
Date: Wed, 11 Jul 2001 15:09:51 EDT
Subject: NMD Sign-on Letter
To: mupj@igc.org
X-Mailer: AOL 5.0 for Windows sub 125

Dear Friends,

Please add our group to the list of those signing the letter to members of the House and Senate Armed Forces and Appropriations Committees urging them to cut funding for a National Missile Defense and redirect these resources to meet pressing human needs.

Karen M. Donahue, RSM
Issues Coordinator
Institute Justice Team
Sisters of Mercy of the Americas
433 Laurel Ave #3
Des Plaines, IL 60016-4361

We are a five member team which coordinates justice and peace ministry for the Sisters of Mercy of the Americas, a Roman Catholic religious congregation of 5,200 women serving in twelve countries.

From: sdeboe@csm.org
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: RE: Sign-on letter on funding for national missile defense
Date: Wed, 11 Jul 2001 16:07:58 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

Please add my name to this letter. Thank you for initiating it and getting it to the appropriate people.

Stan De Boe

Stan De Boe, OSST
Director
Office of Justice and Peace
Conference of Major Superiors of Men
8808 Cameron Street
Silver Spring, MD 20910
Phone: 301-588-4030
Fax: 301-587-4575

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Monday, July 09, 2001 1:44 PM
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: Sign-on letter on funding for national missile defense

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.

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: "Lisa Wright" <lisaw@nccusa.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Methodist Contacts
Date: Wed, 11 Jul 2001 17:18:28 -0400
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)
Importance: Normal
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.2106.4

Sorry not to send this yesterday, Howard - I wanted to make sure I had the correct names and addresses. I think this should do it!

Best,
Lisa

Bishop Cecil Bishop
African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church
2663 Oakmeade Drive
Charlotte, NC 28270

The Rt. Rev. McKinley Young
African Methodist Episcopal Church
4347 South Hampton Rd., Suite 245
Dallas, TX 75232-1064

Bishop Paul A. Stewart Jr.
Christian Methodist Episcopal Church
310 18th Street Northsuite 400 D
Birmingham, AL 35203

X-Sender: dkimball@[63.106.26.66]
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.0.1
Date: Wed, 11 Jul 2001 21:45:47 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: NMD/Deep Cuts Alert: Bush ready to break ABM Treaty in
"months" say reports

July 11, 2001

TO: Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers members and friends

RE: NMD/Deep Cuts Update: Bush NMD development and testing plan will break
ABM Treaty "in months"

FR: Daryl Kimball

Further details on the Bush administration's NMD proposals confirm that it is seeking to deploy a rudimentary missile defense by 2004 under the pretense of a new testing range at Fort Greeley and Kodiak Island in Alaska and that its plan will -- if Congress does not somehow block it through its power of the purse -- violate the ABM Treaty "in months, not years."

Such a crash deployment would, of course, provide only the illusion of protection from potential long-range missile threats, while at the same time it would violate the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty and set off a dangerous action reaction cycle, involving the United States, Russia, and China.

The reports of the administration's plan to abrogate the ABM Treaty also undermine the credibility of President Bush's pledge to 'consult' with allies and with Russia on the missile defense issue.

Look for further details as events unfold. On Thursday, July 12, top DoD officials will testify before the Senate Armed Services Committee on the NMD issue and are likely to face tough questions from skeptical Senators. In addition, Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld will speak at noon on Capitol Hill to a pro-missile defense forum and NSC advisor Condi Rice will speak at the National Press Club. Friday at 1:30, DoD officials will brief the press on the scheduled July 14 flight test of the ground-based, mid-course NMD system.

More later.

- DK

NOTE: The attached articles are for educational purposes only. For previous editions of the Coalition's "NMD/Deep Cuts Update," see <http://www.clw.org/coalition/nmdnews.htm>.

AP Washington

"State Notifies of US Missile Plans"

by BARRY SCHWEID
AP Diplomatic Writer

WASHINGTON (AP) -- The State Department has notified all U.S. diplomatic posts abroad that stepped up tests for an anti-missile shield will come into conflict with a 1972 treaty with Moscow "in months, not years."

On Saturday, the Pentagon has scheduled its first flight test in a year of interceptors designed to shoot down long-range missiles. The attempt last July failed.

"The world has changed fundamentally and the rationale for Cold War arrangements no longer exists," says the 14-page memorandum sent to U.S. embassies and consulates July 3.

It is intended to provide American diplomats with talking points to help persuade other governments to support President Bush's aspirations for an anti-missile shield.

Deployment of an interim ground-based system in Alaska could be completed as early as 2004, the memorandum said.

The tests, the memorandum said, "will come into conflict with the ABM treaty in months, not years."

Bush has called the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty with Russia, which forbids deployment of a U.S. shield against long-range missiles in any state except North Dakota, a relic of the Cold War.

Russian President Vladimir Putin opposes setting aside the treaty and has warned it could touch off a new nuclear arms race.

Many U.S. allies are skeptical or noncommittal

On Wednesday, the new British foreign secretary, Jack Straw, agreed with Bush's assessment that there is a growing nuclear danger in the world. But he signaled on a visit to Washington that his government intends to withhold judgment on an anti-missile shield while the Bush administration weighs its options on an anti-missile program.

Putin, meanwhile, proposed on July 6 that the five long-established nuclear power states -- the United States, Russia, Britain, France and China -- begin negotiations aimed at eliminating 10,000 warheads in the next seven years.

Putin is expected to bring up the proposal with Bush at the Economic summit meeting in Genoa, Italy, later this month.

The Russian leader is not likely to get very far.

A senior U.S. official told The Associated Press Wednesday Putin's proposal is not going to win over the administration.

The unclassified memorandum to U.S. diplomatic posts, obtained by the AP, said the most urgent threat stems not from thousands of Russian missiles but from a small number of missiles in the hands of rogue states armed with weapons of mass destruction.

"Those states also possess a large number of short and medium-range missiles that pose a significant threat to deployed U.S. forces and friends and U.S. allies abroad," it said.

As a result, the memorandum continued, "the United States needs release from the constraints of the ABM treaty to pursue the most promising technologies and basing modes to field limited, but effective missile defenses."

At the same time, the memorandum acknowledges that the 1972 treaty prohibits a U.S. nationwide defense and sharing anti-missile defenses with allies.

As a result, it said, the administration will pursue a program to be able to deploy such defenses to protect the United States, its forces, friends and allies.

Richard Boucher, the State Department spokesman, confirmed that "we have given to our embassies basic arguments on the need for a new strategic framework, for moving beyond the strategies of the Cold War."

He said the memorandum would help the embassies make a case for these ideas.

AP-NY-07-11-01 1857EDT<

Daryl Kimball

UNTIL JULY 27:
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>>

BEGINNING SEPTEMBER 4:
Executive Director
Arms Control Association
1726 M Street, NW, Suite 201
Washington, DC 20036
(ph) 202-463-8270 (fax) 202-463-8273
website <<http://www.armscontrol.org>>

email <dkimball@armscontrol.org>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.5.2
Date: Thu, 12 Jul 2001 10:24:59 -0400
From: "Gerard Powers" <GPowers@usccb.org>
Sender: Postmaster@usccb.org
Reply-To: GPowers@usccb.org
To: <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Meeting reminder; action now on NMD -Reply

I will be out off the office on paternity leave until the end of August. If your matter is very pressing and can't wait until my return, only then, contact Walter Grazer at wgrazer@nccbuscc.org; 202-541-3182, or Ramona Looney at rlooney@nccbuscc.org; 202-541-3160.

From: Janet Horman <JHorman@UMC-GBCS.ORG>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: Meeting reminder; action now on NMD
Date: Thu, 12 Jul 2001 12:40:35 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Howard:

The GBCS in signing onto the letter. Since Jim's out of the office until Monday, I want to clarify with him or Jaydee that it's ok for his name to go on. But the organization is officially signing on. Jaydee is out this afternoon....but I'll check with him tomorrow or wait and talk to Jim on Monday.

Janet

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Thursday, July 12, 2001 10:25 AM
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: Meeting reminder; action now on NMD

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Dear Colleagues:

First, a reminder that the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament will meet on Tuesday, July 17 from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. in the Methodist Building, Room 3, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, DC. Dealing with national missile defense funding will be our main order of business. But we can't wait until then to engage our grassroots on this issue.

The front page headline of today's Washington Post reads: "Bush Speeds Missile Defense Plans".

Our headline should read: "Interfaith Committee Speeds Opposition to Missile Defense".

Focus of opposition

It seems to me that the primary focus of our opposition should be the Senate Armed Services and Appropriations Committees. We should also give attention to several moderate Republicans who serve on the Foreign Relations Committee.

We have in the works a sign-on letter addressed to Armed Services and Appropriations members (including the House of Representatives). Even more important we need to mobilize our grassroots in a number of key states.

Message

Our message can be twofold regarding the defense authorization bill and defense appropriations: (1) cut back on excessive funding for missile

defense and (2) enact prohibitions for any activity that would violate the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty. The sign-on letter now in circulation deals with spending as a justice issue. The piece I wrote on "Missile Defense as a Moral Issue" discusses the ABM Treaty (if you want a fresh copy, let me know).

Armed Services Committee

The Senate Armed Services is actively considering the defense authorization bill. Markup may occur in July with a floor vote in early August or September. Membership of the committee is as follows:

Democrats:

Carl Levin, MI Chairman

Edward Kennedy, MA

Robert Byrd, WV

Joseph Lieberman, CT

Max Cleland, GA

Mary Landrieu, LA

Jack Reed, RI

Daniel Akaka, HI

Bill Nelson, FL

Ben Nelson, NE

Jean Carnahan, MO

Mark Dayton, MN

Jeff Bingaman, NM

Republicans:

John Warner, VA Ranking Member

Strom Thurmond, SC

John McCain, AZ

Bob Smith, NH

James Inhofe, OK

Rick Santorum, PA

Pat Roberts, KS

Wayne Allard, CO

Tim Hutchinson, AR

Jeff Sessions, AL

Susan Collins, ME

Jim Bunning, KY

The chair, Senator Carl Levin, is strongly committed to preserving the ABM Treaty and has doubts about aspects of missile defense. He should receive letters from his constituents in Michigan thanking him for his leadership on this issue and urging him to stand steadfast.

All of the Democrats need to hear from their constituents about the need to reduce missile defense funding and to preserve the ABM Treaty. With Republicans this message will have a harder sell. Based upon where we have strength, who is influential, and who tends toward the moderate side, you might considering reaching out to your grassroots in the home states of Senators Warner, McCain, Roberts, and Collins. We might add Santorum and Allard because we have good networks in Pennsylvania and Colorado.

Appropriations Committee

There is a report that the Senate Appropriations Committee may consider defense as the last of its appropriations bill because the Administration's defense budget has just been presented and because Senator Byrd and others may want a perspective of how much money is left without busting the budget. If this is the case, markup may not be completed until September.

Committee members are as follows:

Democrats:

Robert Byrd, WV Chairman

Daniel Inouye, HI

Ernest Hollings, SC

Patrick Leahy, VT

Tom Harkin, IA

Barbara Mikulski, MD

Harry Reid, NV

Herb Kohl, WI

Patty Murray, WA

Byron Dorgan, ND

Dianne Feinstein, CA

Richard Durbin, IL

Tim Johnson, SD

Mary Landrieu, LA

Jack Reed, RI

Republicans:

Ted Stevens, AK Ranking Member

Thad Cochran, MS

Arlen Specter, PA

Pete Domenici, NM

Christopher Bond, MO

Mitch McConnell, KY

Conrad Burns, MT

Richard Shelby, AL

Judd Gregg, NH

Robert Bennett, UT

Ben Nighthorse Campbell, CO

Larry Craig, ID

Kay Bailey Hutchison, TX

Mike DeWine, OH

The Appropriations Committee is divided into subcommittees whose chairs have authority to make the initial mark for their portion of the budget.

Senator Inouye is chair of the defense subcommittee and as a strong supporter of the military is likely to give the Bush Administration what it wants for missile defense. Subcommittee members tend not to oppose the chair's mark unless the chair of the full committee takes some initiative.

Senator Byrd gave a floor speech on June 25 expressing doubts about the proposed level of missile defense funding and the need to preserve the ABM Treaty (see Congressional Record, p. S6844). Because he is particularly attuned to views of West Virginians, it is desirable that he hear from his constituents, praising him for his leadership on this issue and asking him to reduce funding for missile defense and to insert a prohibition against activities that would violate the ABM Treaty.

Democrats on the defense subcommittee need to hear from their constituents on the need to cut back missile defense funding and to preserve the ABM Treaty. They include Senators Hollins, Leahy, Harkin, Reid (NV), Dorgan, and Durbin. Other Democrats on the full committee need to receive the same message. Republicans who deserve attention include Senators Specter, Domenici, Bond, and DeWine.

Foreign Relations Committee

Although the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has a lesser legislative role at the moment on missile defense, several influential Republican moderates from that committee deserve attention, including Senators Lugar (IN), Hagel (NE), Smith (OR), and Chafee (RI). For those working on Senator Roberts in Kansas, Senator Brownback might be added to the list. When the issue reaches the senator floor, their voice and vote will be important. The message is similar: provide leadership to oppose excessive funding for missile defense and to preserve the ABM Treaty.

The senators suggested above are my listing after talking with some senate staff and persons from the arms control community. The list may be revised and prioritized when we meet on July 17. In the meantime please use your discretion to activate your grassroots in states where you have strength.

Shalom,
Howard

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

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

X-Lotus-FromDomain: MCC
From: J._Daryl_Byler@mail.mcc.org
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Date: Thu, 12 Jul 2001 14:24:31 -0400
Subject: Re: Meeting reminder; action now on NMD

To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj @ igc.org>
From: J. Daryl Byler
Date: 7/12/2001 2:23:43 PM
Subj: Re: Meeting reminder; action now on NMD

Hi Howard:

I'm going to miss this meeting as I will be in northern Indiana. However, please add our name to the NMD letter, as follows:

J. Daryl Byler, Director
MCC U.S. Washington Office

To: J_Daryl_Byler@mail.mcc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Indiana contacts
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <85256A87.00637A7F.00@mail.mcc.org>
References:

Daryl,

Thanks for signing. If you are in Indiana on official, I urge you to have your contacts get in touch with Senator Lugar on national missile defense.

Howard

From: "Lisa Wright" <lisaw@nccusa.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: Meeting reminder; action now on NMD
Date: Thu, 12 Jul 2001 14:09:08 -0400
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.2106.4
Importance: Normal

Howard:

Please add:

Brenda Girton-Mitchell
Director, Washington Office
National Council of Churches/
Church World Service

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Thursday, July 12, 2001 10:25 AM
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: Meeting reminder; action now on NMD

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Dear Colleagues:

First, a reminder that the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament will meet on Tuesday, July 17 from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. in the Methodist Building, Room 3, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, DC. Dealing with national missile defense funding will be our main order of business. But we can't wait until then to engage our grassroots on this issue.

The front page headline of today's Washington Post reads: "Bush Speeds Missile Defense Plans".

Our headline should read: "Interfaith Committee Speeds Opposition to Missile Defense".

Focus of opposition

It seems to me that the primary focus of our opposition should be the Senate Armed Services and Appropriations Committees. We should also give attention to several moderate Republicans who serve on the Foreign Relations Committee.

We have in the works a sign-on letter addressed to Armed Services and Appropriations members (including the House of Representatives). Even more important we need to mobilize our grassroots in a number of key states.

Message

Our message can be twofold regarding the defense authorization bill and defense appropriations: (1) cut back on excessive funding for missile defense and (2) enact prohibitions for any activity that would violate the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty. The sign-on letter now in circulation deals with spending as a justice issue. The piece I wrote on "Missile Defense as a Moral Issue" discusses the ABM Treaty (if you want a fresh copy, let me know).

Armed Services Committee

The Senate Armed Services is actively considering the defense authorization bill. Markup may occur in July with a floor vote in early August or September. Membership of the committee is as follows:

Democrats:

Carl Levin, MI Chairman

Edward Kennedy, MA

Robert Byrd, WV

Joseph Lieberman, CT

Max Cleland, GA

Mary Landrieu, LA

Jack Reed, RI

Daniel Akaka, HI

Bill Nelson, FL

Ben Nelson, NE

Jean Carnahan, MO

Mark Dayton, MN

Jeff Bingaman, NM

Republicans:

John Warner, VA Ranking Member

Strom Thurmond, SC

John McCain, AZ

Bob Smith, NH

James Inhofe, OK

Rick Santorum, PA

Pat Roberts, KS

Wayne Allard, CO

Tim Hutchinson, AR

Jeff Sessions, AL

Susan Collins, ME

Jim Bunning, KY

The chair, Senator Carl Levin, is strongly committed to preserving the ABM Treaty and has doubts about aspects of missile defense. He should receive letters from his constituents in Michigan thanking him for his leadership on this issue and urging him to stand steadfast.

All of the Democrats need to hear from their constituents about the need to reduce missile defense funding and to preserve the ABM Treaty. With Republicans this message will have a harder sell. Based upon where we have strength, who is influential, and who tends toward the moderate side, you might considering reaching out to your grassroots in the home states of Senators Warner, McCain, Roberts, and Collins. We might add Santorum and Allard because we have good networks in Pennsylvania and Colorado.

Appropriations Committee

There is a report that the Senate Appropriations Committee may consider defense as the last of its appropriations bill because the Administration's defense budget has just been presented and because Senator Byrd and others may want a perspective of how much money is left without busting the budget. If this is the case, markup may not be completed until September. Committee members are as follows:

Democrats:

Robert Byrd, WV Chairman

Daniel Inouye, HI

Ernest Hollings, SC

Patrick Leahy, VT

Tom Harkin, IA

Barbara Mikulski, MD

Harry Reid, NV

Herb Kohl, WI

Patty Murray, WA

Byron Dorgan, ND

Dianne Feinstein, CA

Richard Durbin, IL

Tim Johnson, SD

Mary Landrieu, LA

Jack Reed, RI

Republicans:

Ted Stevens, AK Ranking Member

Thad Cochran, MS

Arlen Specter, PA

Pete Domenici, NM

Christopher Bond, MO

Mitch McConnell, KY

Conrad Burns, MT
Richard Shelby, AL

Judd Gregg, NH
Robert Bennett, UT

Ben Nighthorse Campbell, CO

Larry Craig, ID
Kay Bailey Hutchison, TX

Mike DeWine, OH

The Appropriations Committee is divided into subcommittees whose chairs have authority to make the initial mark for their portion of the budget. Senator Inouye is chair of the defense subcommittee and as a strong supporter of the military is likely to give the Bush Administration what it wants for missile defense. Subcommittee members tend not to oppose the chair's mark unless the chair of the full committee takes some initiative.

Senator Byrd gave a floor speech on June 25 expressing doubts about the proposed level of missile defense funding and the need to preserve the ABM Treaty (see Congressional Record, p. S6844). Because he is particularly attuned to views of West Virginians, it is desirable that he hear from his constituents, praising him for his leadership on this issue and asking him to reduce funding for missile defense and to insert a prohibition against activities that would violate the ABM Treaty.

Democrats on the defense subcommittee need to hear from their constituents on the need to cut back missile defense funding and to preserve the ABM Treaty. They include Senators Hollins, Leahy, Harkin, Reid (NV), Dorgan, and Durbin. Other Democrats on the full committee need to receive the same message. Republicans who deserve attention include Senators Specter, Domenici, Bond, and DeWine.

Foreign Relations Committee

Although the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has a lesser legislative role at the moment on missile defense, several influential Republican moderates from that committee deserve attention, including Senators Lugar (IN), Hagel (NE), Smith (OR), and Chafee (RI). For those working on Senator Roberts in Kansas, Senator Brownback might be added to the list. When the issue reaches the senator floor, their voice and vote will be important. The message is similar: provide leadership to oppose excessive funding for missile defense and to preserve the ABM Treaty.

The senators suggested above are my listing after talking with some senate staff and persons from the arms control community. The list may be

revised and prioritized when we meet on July 17. In the meantime please use your discretion to activate your grassroots in states where you have strength.

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: (abolition-usa) Controversy and Protest Surround Missile Test
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Janet,

This news release develops the thesis you are exploring and sites a couple of reports.

Howard

###

>X-Sender: abolition2000@mail.abolition2000.org
>Date: Thu, 12 Jul 2001 15:57:08 -0600
>To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
>From: Carah Lynn Ong <admin@abolition2000.org>
>Subject: (abolition-usa) Controversy and Protest Surround Missile Test
>Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
>Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
>
>
> FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
> 14 July 2001
>
> CONTACT:
> Carah Ong
> Research and Publications Director, Nuclear Age Peace Foundation
> research@napf.org
>
> Gregory, Greenpeace Media Office - (805) 291-1747 (cell), (805) 740-1430
>(Communications Center)
>
>
> Controversy and Protest Surround Missile Test
>
> The last test, which failed, was conducted on 7 July 2000.
>
> "" will launch from Kwajalein Atoll in the Pacific Ocean
> and be directed toward the target, using data collected from the system's
>radars.
>
> A Press Conference
>
>
> ICBMs are capable of reaching the territory of countries
>separated by oceans or continents
> "" "" states, or terrorist groups sponsored by them, wanted to attack the
>US, there are much cheaper and more efficient means to deliver a weapon of

To: mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Meeting reminder; action now on NMD
Cc:
Bcc: icnd
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Dear Colleagues:

First, a reminder that the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament will meet on Tuesday, July 17 from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. in the Methodist Building, Room 3, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, DC. Dealing with national missile defense funding will be our main order of business. But we can't wait until then to engage our grassroots on this issue.

The front page headline of today's Washington Post reads: "Bush Speeds Missile Defense Plans". Our headline should read: "Interfaith Committee Speeds Opposition to Missile Defense".

Focus of opposition

It seems to me that the primary focus of our opposition should be the Senate Armed Services and Appropriations Committees. We should also give attention to several moderate Republicans who serve on the Foreign Relations Committee.

We have in the works a sign-on letter addressed to Armed Services and Appropriations members (including the House of Representatives). Even more important we need to mobilize our grassroots in a number of key states.

Message

Our message can be twofold regarding the defense authorization bill and defense appropriations: (1) cut back on excessive funding for missile defense and (2) enact prohibitions for any activity that would violate the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty. The sign-on letter now in circulation deals with spending as a justice issue. The piece I wrote on "Missile Defense as a Moral Issue" discusses the ABM Treaty (if you want a fresh copy, let me know).

Armed Services Committee

The Senate Armed Services is actively considering the defense authorization bill. Markup may occur in July with a floor vote in early August or September. Membership of the committee is as follows:

Democrats:
Carl Levin, MI Chairman
Edward Kennedy, MA
Robert Byrd, WV
Joseph Lieberman, CT
Max Cleland, GA
Mary Landrieu, LA
Jack Reed, RI
Daniel Akaka, HI
Bill Nelson, FL
Ben Nelson, NE

Jean Carnahan, MO
Mark Dayton, MN
Jeff Bingaman, NM

Republicans:

John Warner, VA Ranking Member
Strom Thurmond, SC
John McCain, AZ
Bob Smith, NH
James Inhofe, OK
Rick Santorum, PA
Pat Roberts, KS
Wayne Allard, CO
Tim Hutchinson, AR
Jeff Sessions, AL
Susan Collins, ME
Jim Bunning, KY

The chair, Senator Carl Levin, is strongly committed to preserving the ABM Treaty and has doubts about aspects of missile defense. He should receive letters from his constituents in Michigan thanking him for his leadership on this issue and urging him to stand steadfast.

All of the Democrats need to hear from their constituents about the need to reduce missile defense funding and to preserve the ABM Treaty. With Republicans this message will have a harder sell. Based upon where we have strength, who is influential, and who tends toward the moderate side, you might considering reaching out to your grassroots in the home states of Senators Warner, McCain, Roberts, and Collins. We might add Santorum and Allard because we have good networks in Pennsylvania and Colorado.

Appropriations Committee

There is a report that the Senate Appropriations Committee may consider defense as the last of its appropriations bill because the Administration's defense budget has just been presented and because Senator Byrd and others may want a perspective of how much money is left without busting the budget. If this is the case, markup may not be completed until September. Committee members are as follows:

Democrats:

Robert Byrd, WV Chairman
Daniel Inouye, HI
Ernest Hollings, SC
Patrick Leahy, VT
Tom Harkin, IA
Barbara Mikulski, MD
Harry Reid, NV
Herb Kohl, WI
Patty Murray, WA
Byron Dorgan, ND
Dianne Feinstein, CA
Richard Durbin, IL
Tim Johnson, SD
Mary Landrieu, LA
Jack Reed, RI

Republicans:

Ted Stevens, AK Ranking Member

Thad Cochran, MS
Arlen Specter, PA
Pete Domenici, NM
Christopher Bond, MO
Mitch McConnell, KY
Conrad Burns, MT
Richard Shelby, AL
Judd Gregg, NH
Robert Bennett, UT
Ben Nighthorse Campbell, CO
Larry Craig, ID
Kay Bailey Hutchison, TX
Mike DeWine, OH

The Appropriations Committee is divided into subcommittees whose chairs have authority to make the initial mark for their portion of the budget. Senator Inouye is chair of the defense subcommittee and as a strong supporter of the military is likely to give the Bush Administration what it wants for missile defense. Subcommittee members tend not to oppose the chair's mark unless the chair of the full committee takes some initiative.

Senator Byrd gave a floor speech on June 25 expressing doubts about the proposed level of missile defense funding and the need to preserve the ABM Treaty (see Congressional Record, p. S6844). Because he is particularly attuned to views of West Virginians, it is desirable that he hear from his constituents, praising him for his leadership on this issue and asking him to reduce funding for missile defense and to insert a prohibition against activities that would violate the ABM Treaty.

Democrats on the defense subcommittee need to hear from their constituents on the need to cut back missile defense funding and to preserve the ABM Treaty. They include Senators Hollins, Leahy, Harkin, Reid (NV), Dorgan, and Durbin. Other Democrats on the full committee need to receive the same message. Republicans who deserve attention include Senators Specter, Domenici, Bond, and DeWine.

Foreign Relations Committee

Although the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has a lesser legislative role at the moment on missile defense, several influential Republican moderates from that committee deserve attention, including Senators Lugar (IN), Hagel (NE), Smith (OR), and Chafee (RI). For those working on Senator Roberts in Kansas, Senator Brownback might be added to the list. When the issue reaches the senator floor, their voice and vote will be important. The message is similar: provide leadership to oppose excessive funding for missile defense and to preserve the ABM Treaty.

The senators suggested above are my listing after talking with some senate staff and persons from the arms control community. The list may be revised and prioritized when we meet on July 17. In the meantime please use your discretion to activate your grassroots in states where you have strength.

Shalom,
Howard

From: HolRonFost@aol.com
Date: Fri, 13 Jul 2001 14:07:16 EDT
Subject: Re: Africa University
To: mupj@igc.org
X-Mailer: AOL 6.0 for Windows US sub 10519

We'll give you (or Dwight) the time to make the announcement and we'll encourage other Alums to join in...

Be God's,
Ron

From: Washofc@aol.com

Date: Fri, 13 Jul 2001 08:16:15 EDT

Subject: Re: Sign-on letter on funding for national missile defense

To: mupj@igc.org

X-Mailer: AOL 6.0 for Windows US sub 10519

Howard,

Our office would like to be signed onto your sign-on letter. Thanks.

Carol Longenecker

Intern Legislative Associate

Church of the Brethren Washington Office

To: Washofc@aol.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Sign-on letter on funding for national missile defense
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <90.1704f67c.2880408f@aol.com>
References:

At 08:16 AM 7/13/01 EDT, you wrote:

>Howard,
> Thanks.
>
>Carol Longenecker
>Intern Legislative Associate
>Church of the Brethren Washington Office

Thanks,

Whose name and title should appear on the letter?

Howard

From: Washofc@aol.com
Date: Fri, 13 Jul 2001 09:07:09 EDT
Subject: Re: Sign-on letter on funding for national missile defense
To: mupj@igc.org
X-Mailer: AOL 6.0 for Windows US sub 10519

Sorry about that,

Greg Laszakovits
Coordinator
Church of the Brethren Washington Office

X-Sender: jdi@[63.106.26.66]
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)
Date: Fri, 13 Jul 2001 12:18:54 -0400
To: jdi@clw.org
From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>
Subject: The Administration's 'Fuzzy' Logic on
Missile Defense: Rhetoric vs. Reality

The Administration's 'Fuzzy' Logic on Missile Defense:
Rhetoric vs. Reality

In selling its proposal for deploying missile defenses to the American public and the international community, the Bush administration has practiced the art of misdirection by drawing attention away from the four common-sense criteria by which an anti-missile system should be evaluated: cost, technological readiness, the level of the missile threat, and the likely effects on arms control and international security.

The administration's high-pressure sales tactics include exaggerating the ballistic missile threat, invoking missile defense as a way to move beyond "anachronistic" Cold War nuclear thinking, blaming the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty for the system's poor test record and technical failures, and promising consultations with allies while simultaneously planning to proceed unilaterally with deployment. "Cost" has been treated as an unspeakable four-letter word. Below are some examples of the administration's misleading and contradictory missile defense rhetoric.

RHETORIC: "I have made it clear to our friends and allies that I think it's necessary to set aside the ABM Treaty, but I will do so in close consultation with not only members of NATO and EU countries who are not members of NATO, but, as well, with the Russians."
— President Bush, June 13th Press Conference in Brussels

REALITY: Although President Bush has repeatedly vowed to consult with U.S. allies on the subject of missile defenses, other administration statements indicate that the decision has already been made. For instance, in a June 7 address to NATO foreign ministers, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld said, "Deploying missile defenses capable of protecting the U.S., friends and Allies will eventually require moving beyond the ABM Treaty. We understand this conclusion is not welcomed by some. It is simply inescapable." In light of statements like these, promises of consultations appear to be nothing more than a euphemism for telling our allies to "deal with it." After President Bush's NATO visit, one European diplomat commented, "If Bush has already decided to go ahead with breaking the ABM Treaty and building his project, then how are we supposed to believe that these consultations have any meaning?" (Washington Post, June 13)

RHETORIC: "We must achieve release from the constraints of the ABM Treaty."
— Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz, July 12 Testimony Before the Senate Armed Services Committee

REALITY: According to Philip Coyle, former Pentagon Director of Operational Test and Evaluation, "Until the U.S. government learns whether the technical, budgetary, and operational problems that the National Missile Defense presents can be solved, the ABM treaty is the least of President Bush's problems." ("NMD Development is not Hostage to the ABM Treaty," Center for Defense Information Issue Brief, June 12) The new booster rocket for the NMD interceptor has not even been tested once, and the first flight intercept test with the new booster will not take place before mid-2002. Even if a basic intercept capability can eventually be demonstrated, tests will then have to be attempted at greater distances and against increasingly sophisticated targets with decoys, countermeasures, or debris designed to confuse the system. Philip Coyle estimates that "[s]ome 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 [a mid-course] NMD system." While all of this near-term research and testing promises to require considerable time and investment, none of it is prohibited by the ABM treaty. Rather, it will likely be a decade or more before the treaty presents an obstacle to further development.

RHETORIC: "Of course, we're not going to deploy a system that doesn't work. What good will that do?"
— President Bush, June 13th Press Conference in Brussels

REALITY: Although the currently proposed system has failed two out of three carefully scripted intercept tests, the Administration has indicated in recent days that it may decide to deploy a small group of interceptors by 2004, just before the presidential election. "The president and the secretary [of defense] have made it pretty clear they believe that some missile defense in the near term is in fact better than nothing," said an Administration official in a June 8 Washington Post..

RHETORIC: "We will not make decisions on systems architecture until our technologies have been tested."
— Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, June 7th address in Brussels

REALITY: Any crash program to put in place some elements of a missile defense system before 2004 would likely involve deploying technologies before they are fully tested and therefore in advance of any decision on systems architecture. In fact, the administration is crafting just such a scheme. In the same speech on June 7, Rumsfeld said, "[W]e will likely deploy test assets to provide rudimentary defenses to deal with emerging threats. We will likely continue to improve the effectiveness of any deployed capabilities over time," implying that the administration may deploy technologies before they are mature and deal with the question of systems architecture only after some elements of missile defenses are in place. This is an imprudent and dangerous "foot in the door" approach to missile defense designed to pave the way for additional spending down the road.

RHETORIC: "Our goal is to deploy defenses against handfuls of missiles, not hundreds.... Such defenses are no threat whatsoever to anyone."

— Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, June 7th address in Brussels

REALITY: China currently has only a "handful"— approximately 18— weapons capable of being launched at the U.S., a force that even a limited land-based system could threaten. In order to protect their deterrence, the Chinese would likely accelerate their development of larger and more sophisticated nuclear forces, a buildup that could fuel arms races in South and East Asia.

Moreover, while the administration has tried to calm Russian and Chinese fears by insisting that U.S. missile defenses will be limited, it has tried to make the concept palatable to the Europeans by telling them just the opposite— that the U.S. will deploy missile defenses to protect itself, its allies in Europe and Asia, and its deployed troops overseas, against both rogue state missiles and accidental or unauthorized launches. Such a proposal is anything but limited, and would require considerable time and massive investment, although the administration has given no indication of how much.

RHETORIC: "We need to get over the Cold War, and the legacy of Cold War thinking and approaches that still narrow and restrict our thinking."

— Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, June 7th address in Brussels

REALITY: Missile defense itself is very much a legacy of Cold War thinking. Since the 1950s, the U.S. has tried and repeatedly failed to develop effective missile defenses. One system, Safeguard, was constructed in North Dakota in 1975, only to be shut down four months after it became operational. It is not clear that the Bush administration has learned anything from these failures, the cost of which to date exceeds \$125 billion. Truly moving beyond the Cold War means de-alerting nuclear forces, making significant reductions in nuclear arsenals and strengthening multinational arms control agreements, not building new weapons.

RHETORIC: "In 1972, we knew of only five countries that had nuclear weapons programs; today we know of twelve."

— Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz, July 12 Testimony Before the Senate Armed Services Committee

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

RHETORIC: "Today, the number of countries pursuing nuclear, chemical and biological weapons is growing. The number of countries pursuing advanced conventional weapons is growing. The number of countries pursuing ballistic missile technology is growing. The number of missiles on the face of the earth is growing."

— Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz, July 12 Testimony Before the Senate Armed Services Committee

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

RHETORIC: "If anything, building effective defenses will reduce the value of ballistic missiles, and thus remove incentives for their development and proliferation."

— Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz, July 12 Testimony Before the Senate Armed Services Committee

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

Another option for overwhelming missile defenses would be to place multiple warheads on individual missiles. Russia could follow through on its threat to equip each of its new Topol SS-27 ICBMs with as many as three independently targetable warheads, a step that would entail Russia's withdrawal from the START II agreement, which prohibits multiple-warhead ICBMs. Speaking at a June 18th press conference, Russian President Vladimir Putin promised that "We will reinforce our capability" by "mounting multiple warheads on our missiles" and "that will cost us a meager sum." And so, he said, "the nuclear arsenal of Russia will be augmented multi-fold." (New York Times, June 19)

Finally, countries could employ simple and inexpensive countermeasures to confuse the missile defense system. According to a September 1999 National Intelligence Estimate, China and Russia already possess the technology for such countermeasures, and may be willing to sell the technology to interested states. Furthermore, China and North Korea may refuse to cooperate on non-proliferation and increase their export of missile components and technologies to proliferators.

RHETORIC: "I believe the Kyoto Treaty is a flawed treaty. I think that it set unscientific goals."

— President Bush, June 13th Press Conference in Madrid

"There is not a single major technological development in human history that did not begin with a process of trial and error and many of our most successful weapons developments have been marked by testing failures... Failure is how we learn. If a program never suffers test failures, it means someone is not taking enough risks and pushing the envelope. Intelligent risk taking is critical to any advanced development program..."

— Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz, July 12 Testimony Before the Senate Armed Services Committee

REALITY: It is hypocritical to argue, as the Bush administration does, that the Kyoto protocol on global climate change is scientifically flawed and should be opposed, while missile defense should be pursued aggressively despite its more serious scientific flaws. Ironically, a solid scientific consensus exists on the severity of global warming, while no such consensus exists on whether or not "hitting a bullet with a bullet" can ever be done with the necessary degree of consistency to make missile defenses worth the considerable costs, both financial and in terms of lost security.

July 2001

Council for a Livable World Education Fund
110 Maryland Avenue, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20002
(202) 546-0795

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

The Administration's 'Fuzzy' Logic on Missile Defense: Rhetoric vs. Reality

by John Isaacs, President, Council for a Livable World

In selling its proposal for deploying missile defenses to the American public and the international community, the Bush administration has practiced the art of misdirection by drawing attention away from the four common-sense criteria by which an anti-missile system should be evaluated: cost, technological readiness, the level of the missile threat, and the likely effects on arms control and international security.

The administration's high-pressure sales tactics include exaggerating the ballistic missile threat, invoking missile defense as a way to move beyond "anachronistic" Cold War nuclear thinking, blaming the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty for the system's poor test record and technical failures, and promising consultations with allies while simultaneously planning to proceed unilaterally with deployment. "Cost" has been treated as an unspeakable four-letter word. Below are some examples of the administration's misleading and contradictory missile defense rhetoric.

RHETORIC: "I have made it clear to our friends and allies that I think it's necessary to set aside the ABM Treaty, but I will do so in close consultation with not only members of NATO and EU countries who are not members of NATO, but, as well, with the Russians."

— President Bush, June 13th Press Conference in Brussels

REALITY: Although President Bush has repeatedly vowed to consult with U.S. allies on the subject of missile defenses, other administration statements indicate that the decision has already been made. For instance, in a June 7 address to NATO foreign ministers, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld said, "Deploying missile defenses capable of protecting the U.S., friends and Allies will eventually require moving beyond the ABM Treaty. We understand this conclusion is not welcomed by some. It is simply inescapable." In light of statements like these, promises of consultations appear to be nothing more than a euphemism for telling our allies to "deal with it." After President Bush's NATO visit, one European diplomat commented, "If Bush has already decided to go ahead with breaking the ABM Treaty and building his project, then how are we supposed to believe that these consultations have any meaning?" (Washington Post, June 13)

RHETORIC: "We must achieve release from the constraints of the ABM Treaty."
— Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz, July 12 Testimony Before the Senate Armed Services Committee

REALITY: According to Philip Coyle, former Pentagon Director of Operational

Test and Evaluation, "Until the U.S. government learns whether the technical, budgetary, and operational problems that the National Missile Defense presents can be solved, the ABM treaty is the least of President Bush's problems." ("NMD Development is not Hostage to the ABM Treaty," Center for Defense Information Issue Brief, June 12) The new booster rocket for the NMD interceptor has not even been tested once, and the first flight intercept test with the new booster will not take place before mid-2002. Even if a basic intercept capability can eventually be demonstrated, tests will then have to be attempted at greater distances and against increasingly sophisticated targets with decoys, countermeasures, or debris designed to confuse the system. Philip Coyle estimates that "[s]ome 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 [a mid-course] NMD system." While all of this near-term research and testing promises to require considerable time and investment, none of it is prohibited by the ABM treaty. Rather, it will likely be a decade or more before the treaty presents an obstacle to further development.

RHETORIC: "Of course, we're not going to deploy a system that doesn't work. What good will that do?"

— President Bush, June 13th Press Conference in Brussels

REALITY: Although the currently proposed system has failed two out of three carefully scripted intercept tests, the Administration has indicated in recent days that it may decide to deploy a small group of interceptors by 2004, just before the presidential election. "The president and the secretary [of defense] have made it pretty clear they believe that some missile defense in the near term is in fact better than nothing," said an Administration official in a June 8 Washington Post..

RHETORIC: "We will not make decisions on systems architecture until our technologies have been tested."

— Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, June 7th address in Brussels

REALITY: Any crash program to put in place some elements of a missile defense system before 2004 would likely involve deploying technologies before they are fully tested and therefore in advance of any decision on systems architecture. In fact, the administration is crafting just such a scheme. In the same speech on June 7, Rumsfeld said, "[W]e will likely deploy test assets to provide rudimentary defenses to deal with emerging threats. We will likely continue to improve the effectiveness of any deployed capabilities over time," implying that the administration may deploy technologies before they are mature and deal with the question of systems architecture only after some elements of missile defenses are in place. This is an imprudent and dangerous "foot in the door" approach to

missile defense designed to pave the way for additional spending down the road.

RHETORIC: "Our goal is to deploy defenses against handfuls of missiles, not hundreds.... Such defenses are no threat whatsoever to anyone."

— Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, June 7th address in Brussels

REALITY: China currently has only a "handful"— approximately 18— weapons capable of being launched at the U.S., a force that even a limited land-based system could threaten. In order to protect their deterrence, the Chinese would likely accelerate their development of larger and more sophisticated nuclear forces, a buildup that could fuel arms races in South and East Asia.

Moreover, while the administration has tried to calm Russian and Chinese fears by insisting that U.S. missile defenses will be limited, it has tried to make the concept palatable to the Europeans by telling them just the opposite— that the U.S. will deploy missile defenses to protect itself, its allies in Europe and Asia, and its deployed troops overseas, against both rogue state missiles and accidental or unauthorized launches. Such a proposal is anything but limited, and would require considerable time and massive investment, although the administration has given no indication of how much.

RHETORIC: "We need to get over the Cold War, and the legacy of Cold War thinking and approaches that still narrow and restrict our thinking."

— Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, June 7th address in Brussels

REALITY: Missile defense itself is very much a legacy of Cold War thinking. Since the 1950s, the U.S. has tried and repeatedly failed to develop effective missile defenses. One system, Safeguard, was constructed in North Dakota in 1975, only to be shut down four months after it became operational. It is not clear that the Bush administration has learned anything from these failures, the cost of which to date exceeds \$125 billion. Truly moving beyond the Cold War means de-alerting nuclear forces, making significant reductions in nuclear arsenals and strengthening multinational arms control agreements, not building new weapons.

RHETORIC: "In 1972, we knew of only five countries that had nuclear weapons programs; today we know of twelve."

— Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz, July 12 Testimony Before the Senate Armed Services Committee

REALITY: Thirty years ago the world had five nuclear powers: the U.S., U.S.S.R., Britain, France, and China. Several other countries, including

India, Israel, Pakistan, and North Korea, were already engaged in nuclear research. Since the end of the Cold War, the number of states possessing or seeking nuclear weapons has actually decreased. Although Iran and Iraq can be considered to have nuclear aspirations, several other countries— South Africa, Ukraine, Kazakhstan, Belarus, Argentina, and Brazil— have abandoned their nuclear programs and joined the Non-Proliferation Treaty as non-nuclear weapon states. Thus, the world is hardly the nuclear free-for-all that the Secretary's language implies.

RHETORIC: "Today, the number of countries pursuing nuclear, chemical and biological weapons is growing. The number of countries pursuing advanced conventional weapons is growing. The number of countries pursuing ballistic missile technology is growing. The number of missiles on the face of the earth is growing."

— Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz, July 12 Testimony Before the Senate Armed Services Committee

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

RHETORIC: "If anything, building effective defenses will reduce the value of ballistic missiles, and thus remove incentives for their development and proliferation."

— Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz, July 12 Testimony Before the Senate Armed Services Committee

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

Another option for overwhelming missile defenses would be to place multiple warheads on individual missiles. Russia could follow through on its threat

to equip each of its new Topol SS- 27 ICBMs with as many as three independently targetable warheads, a step that would entail Russia's withdrawal from the START II agreement, which prohibits multiple-warhead ICBMs. Speaking at a June 18th press conference, Russian President Vladimir Putin promised that "We will reinforce our capability" by "mounting multiple warheads on our missiles" and "that will cost us a meager sum." And so, he said, "the nuclear arsenal of Russia will be augmented multi-fold." (New York Times, June 19)

Finally, countries could employ simple and inexpensive countermeasures to confuse the missile defense system. According to a September 1999 National Intelligence Estimate, China and Russia already possess the technology for such countermeasures, and may be willing to sell the technology to interested states. Furthermore, China and North Korea may refuse to cooperate on non-proliferation and increase their export of missile components and technologies to proliferators.

RHETORIC: "I believe the Kyoto Treaty is a flawed treaty. I think that it set unscientific goals."

— President Bush, June 13th Press Conference in Madrid

"There is not a single major technological development in human history that did not begin with a process of trial and error and many of our most successful weapons developments have been marked by testing failures... Failure is how we learn. If a program never suffers test failures, it means someone is not taking enough risks and pushing the envelope. Intelligent risk taking is critical to any advanced development program..."

— Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz, July 12 Testimony Before the Senate Armed Services Committee

REALITY: It is hypocritical to argue, as the Bush administration does, that the Kyoto protocol on global climate change is scientifically flawed and should be opposed, while missile defense should be pursued aggressively despite its more serious scientific flaws. Ironically, a solid scientific consensus exists on the severity of global warming, while no such consensus exists on whether or not "hitting a bullet with a bullet" can ever be done with the necessary degree of consistency to make missile defenses worth the considerable costs, both financial and in terms of lost security.

July 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

To: mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: The Administration's 'Fuzzy' Logic on Missile Defense: Rhetoric vs. Reality
Cc:
Bcc: icnd
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

I want to share with you this analysis by John Isaacs of the Administration's fuzzy logic on missile defense. I believe it would be a useful item for our shared web site material.

Howard

>X-Sender: jdi@[63.106.26.66]
>X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)
>Date: Fri, 13 Jul 2001 12:18:54 -0400
>To: jdi@clw.org
>From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>
>Subject: The Administration's 'Fuzzy' Logic on
> Missile Defense: Rhetoric vs. Reality
>
>The Administration's 'Fuzzy' Logic on Missile Defense:
>Rhetoric vs. Reality
>
>
>In selling its proposal for deploying missile defenses to the American
>public and the international community, the Bush administration has
>practiced the art of misdirection by drawing attention away from the four
>common-sense criteria by which an anti-missile system should be evaluated:
>cost, technological readiness, the level of the missile threat, and the
>likely effects on arms control and international security.
>
>The administration's high-pressure sales tactics include exaggerating the
>ballistic missile threat, invoking missile defense as a way to move beyond
>"anachronistic" Cold War nuclear thinking, blaming the 1972 Anti-Ballistic
>Missile (ABM) Treaty for the system's poor test record and technical
>failures, and promising consultations with allies while simultaneously
>planning to proceed unilaterally with deployment. "Cost" has been treated
>as an unspeakable four-letter word. Below are some examples of the
>administration's misleading and contradictory missile defense rhetoric.
>
>
>RHETORIC: "I have made it clear to our friends and allies that I think it's
>necessary to set aside the ABM Treaty, but I will do so in close
>consultation with not only members of NATO and EU countries who are not
>members of NATO, but, as well, with the Russians."
>— President Bush, June 13th Press Conference in Brussels
>
>REALITY: Although President Bush has repeatedly vowed to consult with U.S.
>allies on the subject of missile defenses, other administration statements

>indicate that the decision has already been made. For instance, in a June 7
>address to NATO foreign ministers, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld
>said, "Deploying missile defenses capable of protecting the U.S., friends
>and Allies will eventually require moving beyond the ABM Treaty. We
>understand this conclusion is not welcomed by some. It is simply
>inescapable." In light of statements like these, promises of consultations
>appear to be nothing more than a euphemism for telling our allies to "deal
>with it." After President Bush's NATO visit, one European diplomat
>commented, "If Bush has already decided to go ahead with breaking the ABM
>Treaty and building his project, then how are we supposed to believe that
>these consultations have any meaning?" (Washington Post, June 13)

>
>
>RHETORIC: "We must achieve release from the constraints of the ABM Treaty."
>— Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz, July 12 Testimony Before the
>Senate Armed Services Committee

>
>REALITY: According to Philip Coyle, former Pentagon Director of Operational
>Test and Evaluation, "Until the U.S. government learns whether the
>technical, budgetary, and operational problems that the National Missile
>Defense presents can be solved, the ABM treaty is the least of President
>Bush's problems." ("NMD Development is not Hostage to the ABM Treaty,"
>Center for Defense Information Issue Brief, June 12) The new booster rocket
>for the NMD interceptor has not even been tested once, and the first flight
>intercept test with the new booster will not take place before mid-2002.
>Even if a basic intercept capability can eventually be demonstrated, tests
>will then have to be attempted at greater distances and against
>increasingly sophisticated targets with decoys, countermeasures, or debris
>designed to confuse the system. Philip Coyle estimates that "[s]ome 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 [a mid-course] NMD system." While all of this
>near-term research and testing promises to require considerable time and
>investment, none of it is prohibited by the ABM treaty. Rather, it will
>likely be a decade or more before the treaty presents an obstacle to
>further development.

>
>
>RHETORIC: "Of course, we're not going to deploy a system that doesn't work.
>What good will that do?"
>— President Bush, June 13th Press Conference in Brussels

>
>REALITY: Although the currently proposed system has failed two out of three
>carefully scripted intercept tests, the Administration has indicated in
>recent days that it may decide to deploy a small group of interceptors by
>2004, just before the presidential election. "The president and the
>secretary [of defense] have made it pretty clear they believe that some
>missile defense in the near term is in fact better than nothing," said an
>Administration official in a June 8 Washington Post..

>
>
>RHETORIC: "We will not make decisions on systems architecture until our
>technologies have been tested."
>— Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, June 7th address in Brussels

>
>REALITY: Any crash program to put in place some elements of a missile
>defense system before 2004 would likely involve deploying technologies
>before they are fully tested and therefore in advance of any decision on
>systems architecture. In fact, the administration is crafting just such a
>scheme. In the same speech on June 7, Rumsfeld said, "[W]e will likely
>deploy test assets to provide rudimentary defenses to deal with emerging
>threats. We will likely continue to improve the effectiveness of any
>deployed capabilities over time," implying that the administration may
>deploy technologies before they are mature and deal with the question of
>systems architecture only after some elements of missile defenses are in
>place. This is an imprudent and dangerous "foot in the door" approach to
>missile defense designed to pave the way for additional spending down the
>road.

>
>
>
>RHETORIC: "Our goal is to deploy defenses against handfuls of missiles, not
>hundreds.... Such defenses are no threat whatsoever to anyone."
>— Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, June 7th address in Brussels

>
>REALITY: China currently has only a "handful"— approximately 18— weapons
>capable of being launched at the U.S., a force that even a limited
>land-based system could threaten. In order to protect their deterrence, the
>Chinese would likely accelerate their development of larger and more
>sophisticated nuclear forces, a buildup that could fuel arms races in South
>and East Asia.

>
>Moreover, while the administration has tried to calm Russian and Chinese
>fears by insisting that U.S. missile defenses will be limited, it has tried
>to make the concept palatable to the Europeans by telling them just the
>opposite— that the U.S. will deploy missile defenses to protect itself, its
>allies in Europe and Asia, and its deployed troops overseas, against both
>rogue state missiles and accidental or unauthorized launches. Such a
>proposal is anything but limited, and would require considerable time and
>massive investment, although the administration has given no indication of
>how much.

>
>
>RHETORIC: "We need to get over the Cold War, and the legacy of Cold War
>thinking and approaches that still narrow and restrict our thinking."
>— Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, June 7th address in Brussels

>
>REALITY: Missile defense itself is very much a legacy of Cold War thinking.
>Since the 1950s, the U.S. has tried and repeatedly failed to develop
>effective missile defenses. One system, Safeguard, was constructed in North
>Dakota in 1975, only to be shut down four months after it became
>operational. It is not clear that the Bush administration has learned
>anything from these failures, the cost of which to date exceeds \$125
>billion. Truly moving beyond the Cold War means de-alerting nuclear forces,
>making significant reductions in nuclear arsenals and strengthening
>multinational arms control agreements, not building new weapons.

>
>
>RHETORIC: "In 1972, we knew of only five countries that had nuclear weapons

>programs; today we know of twelve."

>— Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz, July 12 Testimony Before the
>Senate Armed Services Committee

>

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

>

>

>RHETORIC: "Today, the number of countries pursuing nuclear, chemical and
>biological weapons is growing. The number of countries pursuing advanced
>conventional weapons is growing. The number of countries pursuing ballistic
>missile technology is growing. The number of missiles on the face of the
>earth is growing."

>— Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz, July 12 Testimony Before the
>Senate Armed Services Committee

>

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

>

>

>RHETORIC: "If anything, building effective defenses will reduce the value
>of ballistic missiles, and thus remove incentives for their development and
>proliferation."

>— Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz, July 12 Testimony Before the
>Senate Armed Services Committee

>

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

>

>Another option for overwhelming missile defenses would be to place multiple
>warheads on individual missiles. Russia could follow through on its threat

>to equip each of its new Topol SS- 27 ICBMs with as many as three
>independently targetable warheads, a step that would entail Russia's
>withdrawal from the START II agreement, which prohibits multiple-warhead
>ICBMs. Speaking at a June 18th press conference, Russian President Vladimir
>Putin promised that "We will reinforce our capability" by "mounting
>multiple warheads on our missiles" and "that will cost us a meager sum."
>And so, he said, "the nuclear arsenal of Russia will be augmented multi-
>fold." (New York Times, June 19)

>
>Finally, countries could employ simple and inexpensive countermeasures to
>confuse the missile defense system. According to a September 1999 National
>Intelligence Estimate, China and Russia already possess the technology for
>such countermeasures, and may be willing to sell the technology to
>interested states. Furthermore, China and North Korea may refuse to
>cooperate on non-proliferation and increase their export of missile
>components and technologies to proliferators.

>
>
>RHETORIC: "I believe the Kyoto Treaty is a flawed treaty. I think that it
>set unscientific goals."

>— President Bush, June 13th Press Conference in Madrid

>
>"There is not a single major technological development in human history
>that did not begin with a process of trial and error and many of our most
>successful weapons developments have been marked by testing failures...
>Failure is how we learn. If a program never suffers test failures, it means
>someone is not taking enough risks and pushing the envelope. Intelligent
>risk taking is critical to any advanced development program..."
>— Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz, July 12 Testimony Before the
>Senate Armed Services Committee

>
>REALITY: It is hypocritical to argue, as the Bush administration does, that
>the Kyoto protocol on global climate change is scientifically flawed and
>should be opposed, while missile defense should be pursued aggressively
>despite its more serious scientific flaws. Ironically, a solid scientific
>consensus exists on the severity of global warming, while no such consensus
>exists on whether or not "hitting a bullet with a bullet" can ever be done
>with the necessary degree of consistency to make missile defenses worth the
>considerable costs, both financial and in terms of lost security.

>
>July 2001

>
>Council for a Livable World Education Fund
>110 Maryland Avenue, N.E.
>Washington, D.C. 20002
>(202) 546-0795

>
>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: dkimball@[63.106.26.66]
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.0.1
Date: Fri, 13 Jul 2001 18:14:17 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: N-Testing Update: Butler's and other reactions to Bush
position on CTBT

July 13, 2001

TO: Coalition members and friends

FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: Nuclear Testing Update: Richard Butler blasts Bush position on CTBT

There have been several notable responses to a report in The New York Times on July 7 that quotes sources as saying the administration has no immediate intention to seek Senate approval for ratification of the Treaty and that the President cannot unilaterally withdraw the Treaty from the Senate. Since the report, the State Department has confirmed The New York Times report (see "N-Testing Update, July 8 <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/n-testing070801.htm>>).

At the July 9, 2001 State Department Daily Press Briefing, State Department spokesperson Richard Boucher was asked: "Could you kindly tell us where the Bush Administration stands on the Test Ban Treaty? Does it want to see the Test Ban Treaty die gradually, or is it time to persuade allies and supporters of the Test Ban Treaty that it is virtually dead?"

Boucher replied: "As usual, let me not take your options but rather give mine. We are certainly looking at the issues that are related to the Test Ban Treaty, but we also have made quite clear that we have no plans to ask the Senate to reconsider its 1999 vote that refused consent to the treaty's ratification. So we are not going to ask the Senate to do anything with this treaty and at that point, that is where we stand.

The most powerful criticism of the Bush administration position comes from Ambassador Richard Butler, former Australian representative to the United Nations and leader of the effort to secure UN approval for the CTBT in September 1996. Butler's op-ed, "Nuclear Testing and National Honor," was published in The New York Times today. It provides an excellent array of powerful arguments for U.S. leadership on the CTBT.

- DK

NOTE: Further information and analysis 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>

"Nuclear Testing And National Honor"

By Richard Butler

The New York Times, July 13, 2001

Last weekend, The New York Times reported the latest attack by the Bush administration on a major international agreement — the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, banning all test explosions of nuclear weapons. Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz recently raised the possibility of circumstances "where you would have to contemplate" nuclear testing, and an administration official told Agence France-Presse that the treaty "has no support within the administration." Meanwhile, General John Gordon, head of the National Nuclear Security Administration, recently informed Congress that he is looking hard at "improving test site readiness."

The intention of the White House to kill the test ban treaty, if fulfilled, would have deeply serious consequences for nuclear arms control and would constitute a major renunciation by the United States of undertakings it has solemnly made. It also throws glaring light on the extremist views of international law held within the administration.

The test ban treaty was signed by President Bill Clinton in September 1996, after its adoption by the United Nations General Assembly by a vote of 158 to 3. (Five nations abstained; nineteen others were either absent or so behind in their dues they could not vote.) The United States voted for it. The three states actively opposed were India, Bhutan (acting under Indian pressure) and Libya. The treaty has now been signed by 161 nations and ratified by 31 of the 44 nuclear- capable, or potentially capable, states named as necessary participants for it to enter into force. A test ban organization has been established, in Vienna, to verify the operations of the treaty. A global seismological network has been set up to detect violations. Until the treaty enters into force, it is universally agreed that a moratorium on testing should be observed.

Three years after President Clinton's signature, the Senate decided against ratifying the treaty by a vote of 51 to 48. Senate debate was gagged by the Republican leadership, and the vote was influenced by Republicans' wish to take retribution against President Clinton for winning the impeachment battle. Simply put, there was shabbiness all round, for which a terrible price was paid.

This treaty has been sought for almost 30 years. The United States had promised to support it on several crucial occasions during the last 10 years, when failure to end nuclear testing was manifestly threatening the broader nonproliferation effort that the United States said, and continues to say, it considers of fundamental importance for national security.

If the United States now destroys the test ban treaty and moves to resume nuclear testing, other nuclear- weapons states will follow suit, and still other states will consider acquiring nuclear weapons. The nonproliferation regime will perish.

Not only will the world be made a much more dangerous place in the obvious ways, but it will become a world in which the word of the United States will have been exposed as meaningless. There is such a thing as national honor. However intangible, it nonetheless exists and is the basis for successful relationships between states. The consequences of simply refusing to honor national commitments — of the United States going back on its word — are incalculable for American and global security.

In May 2000, as part of a regular review conference concerning the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, the United States, together with the four other acknowledged nuclear-weapons states, declared that it remained unequivocally committed to "the ultimate goal of a complete elimination of nuclear weapons" and agreed to 13 steps toward nuclear arms control, including aggressive advocacy of the test ban treaty.

But that was in the distant days of the Clinton administration. The new team in Washington seems to have declared year zero as far as prior American undertakings are concerned. The attitude of senior figures in the administration to past commitments and to international law seems to suggest that there is no history before them, a ludicrous and dangerous conception.

At present, government legal analysts in Washington have prepared papers for senior policy makers on the attitude the United States should adopt toward international law. One such paper posits the existence of a new, threatening concept of international law that would gradually strip nations of their sovereignty, replacing national laws with global norms. International law, in this vision, would become a weapon used by a concert of nations against the United States.

The administration's approach is a fearful and misguided one of unilateral rejection. International agreements already in existence and considered offensive, virtually to the United States alone, include the treaties banning land mines and biological weapons, and the accord to establish an International Criminal Court. We might add the Kyoto Protocol on global warming, the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty and, most recently, a pact now being negotiated at the United Nations to limit small-arms trafficking. The administration seems to believe that international agreements will increasingly pressure the United States to sacrifice its sovereignty and become subject to direction by international institutions. This argument ignores reality. The United States depends on international treaties for its own safety and prosperity. After all, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is just that, a treaty organization. The World Trade Organization, the International Monetary Fund, the Free Trade Area of the Americas, the United Nations — all these are based on treaties, and the United States, under normal circumstances, has participated in them, often led them, and benefited immensely. International commitments do not threaten American sovereignty. If anything, they make possible a measured extension of American sovereignty. Without them we would not have globalization and America would not, in all likelihood, enjoy its present prosperity or, indeed, its power.

Until recent months, America has behaved largely as a good international citizen. Fulminating against the dark forces of "new" international law can only limit American influence in the international arena. The wiser course

now would be for the United States to work to improve treaties where they are flawed and to put its muscle behind gaining universal acceptance of them, to deploy, not withdraw, its sovereignty. If this does not occur, we may well find ourselves at year zero — on nuclear time.

Richard Butler is author of the forthcoming ``Fatal Choice: Nuclear Weapons and the Illusion of Missile Defense."

[HTTP://WWW.LN.MID.RU/WEBSITE/BRP_4.NSF/e78a48070f128a7b43256999005bcbb3/54e533cd1dfe9f8543256a8800352150?OpenDocument](http://WWW.LN.MID.RU/WEBSITE/BRP_4.NSF/e78a48070f128a7b43256999005bcbb3/54e533cd1dfe9f8543256a8800352150?OpenDocument)

Unofficial translation from Russian

Interview Granted by Alexander Yakovenko, the Official Spokesman of Russia's Ministry of Foreign Affairs, to the Russian News Agency RIA Novosti in Respect of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, July 13, 2001

Question: Please comment on foreign media reports that the United States of America intends to break the nine-year moratorium on nuclear testing and to withdraw from the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

Answer: Russia has attached and continues to attach primary importance to the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) as a major instrument in strengthening the regime for the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons and expresses hope that all the states on whom the entry of the CTBT into force depends will make their choice in favor of the earliest ratification of the Treaty.

Question: But the U.S., it seems, is in no hurry to review the Senate decision of 1999 in which it did not give consent to ratification of this Treaty, as Richard Boucher, the spokesman for the U.S. State Department, said yesterday. Can it be held that because of the American stand the CTBT is dead?

Answer: We would very much dislike a scenario along these lines. Refusal by the United States to ratify the CTBT can provoke a crisis not only of this major Treaty in the field of arms limitation and nonproliferation, but also of the whole international nonproliferation regime based on the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT).

"Abandoning nuclear deals destabilizes U.S. security"

Editorial, The Atlanta Journal and Constitution, July 13, 2001

One can debate whether certain types of international agreements are good or bad for the United States. But no sane person can claim that nuclear proliferation is a good thing for this nation's security.

It is mystifying, then, that President Bush and his administration would so systematically disassemble the very foundations of nuclear arms control.

First,
Bush indicated the United States would unilaterally abrogate the
Anti-Ballistic
Missile Treaty, a critical curb on the arms race among the nuclear powers. Now
the administration is trying to scuttle the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty,
a key
piece of the international effort to prevent more nations from developing
nuclear arsenals.

The test-ban treaty has been signed by 161 countries and ratified by 77 since
it was developed in 1996. Although the United States under former President
Clinton played a major role in negotiating the treaty, the then-Republican
Senate in 1999 refused to endorse it, by a vote of 51-48. Even with Democrats
now in control of the Senate, there is little chance of getting the two-thirds
majority needed to approve the treaty.

But that's not dead enough for Bush. He is seeking to drive a stake through
its heart by persuading our allies to treat it as a "relic of the Cold War"

the same argument he makes against the ABM treaty --- and drop it altogether.
The Bushies want to eliminate discussion of the CTBT from the agenda of the G8
summit in Genoa later this month and make no further mention of it.

The move is a travesty in the making, because despite U.S. failure to ratify
the CTBT, both we and the other signatories have been abiding by a testing
moratorium that is unlikely to hold if the United States breaks it. And
Bush is
preparing to do just that with efforts to ready the site in Nevada for
testing.

The test-ban treaty is an important offshoot of the Nuclear
Nonproliferation Treaty, which is the basic bulwark against the planetary
spread
of nuclear weapons. In 1995, at U.S. urging, the members agreed to extend the
nonproliferation treaty indefinitely, provided that a test ban treaty followed
by 1996. Non-nuclear states insisted that existing nuclear powers, too, make
some concessions on the further development and deployment of nukes.

That only makes sense, but the Bushies find this sort of international
cooperation anathema. In addition to the ABM and CTBT, Bush has scrapped U.S.
participation on curbing global warming (not in our economic self-interest)
and
on limiting biological warfare (might require U.S. biotech companies to
divulge
secrets). No degree of planetary peril, apparently, is worth sacrificing the
American ability to do as it damn well pleases.

If the treaties in any way compromised U.S. security, Bush would be right to
be skeptical. If a nuclear umbrella existed to shield us from harm, Bush's
moves
would still be wrongheaded, but far less dangerous to his own people. But in
fact, in both cases the opposite is true. In a world where nuclear material
abounds, Russian scientists are for sale and bomb-making know-how is a mouse
click away, multilateral cooperation is the only real hope for genuine
security.

"Indefensible; Bush is moving to abrogate the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty; Congress must stop him"

Editorial, Newsday (New York, NY), July 13, 2001

The Bush administration's apparent decision to move ahead with missile-defense tests that would abrogate the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty is a woefully wrongheaded decision that will damage U.S. interests in the world without providing any advantages. It represents a capitulation to a band of right-wing ideologues that President George W. Bush has brought into the government, and it makes a mockery of Bush's pledge that this country will conduct its affairs as a humble superpower.

The administration made its intentions clear this week when the State Department notified all its diplomats that the planned missile-defense tests will come into conflict with the treaty "in months, not years."

This whole plan is just plain nuts, not only because it will upset the European allies, the Russians and the Chinese, but because the technology for making a reliable missile-defense system is years away. The decision to test now is gratuitous, seemingly designed just to destroy the ABM Treaty.

Doing away with the treaty has been a longtime goal of the right. Considering that Bush lost the popular vote last November by more than 500,000 votes, his decision to move ahead in this manner is particularly outrageous.

Congress should prevent Bush from taking this unnecessary and dangerous step by voting to cut off funds for any missile-defense tests that do not comply with the ABM Treaty. Both Sen. Carl Levin (D-Mich.), head of the Armed Services Committee, and Sen. Joseph Biden (D-Del.), head of the Foreign Relations Committee, have expressed deep misgivings about moving ahead with these tests. They should lead the fight against it.

This isn't the only instance of the White House's mishandling of arms-control issues.

Recently, U.S. officials said they not only opposed the nuclear test-ban treaty but wanted to scrap it entirely. Their reasoning is hard to fathom, since the United States has such a huge lead in nuclear warhead technology and the test-ban treaty only freezes in that advantage. Allowing testing again gives others a chance to catch up.

It's another regrettable indication that the Bush administration's thinking on arms control is profoundly flawed.

To: "Sally Lilienthal" <ploughshares@ploughshares.org>

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

Subject: Grant proposal

Cc:

Bcc:

X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\A PROPOSAL TO THE PLOUGHSHARES FUND.doc; A:\abl.123.doc;

In-Reply-To:

References:

Dear Sally,

We would like to apply for a grant of \$25,000 in support of the catalytic leadership that Methodists United for Peace with Justice provides interfaith mobilization on nuclear disarmament issues. This occurs through the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair. It is a coalition of more than 30 faith-based organizations that include denominational offices, peace fellowships, and other religious organizations. The focus is upon influencing public policy decisions of Congress and the Executive Branch through a presence in Washington and through grassroots mobilizations. Through the grassroots networks of these participating organizations we are able to reach out to every congressional district and virtually every county in the United States.

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament is the only national religious coalition actively engaged in public policy decision-making processes. At the moment we are giving particular attention to opposing national missile defense. Earlier in the year we focused on de-alerting and deep cuts in the strategic arsenal as the Bush Administration came into office, and we will return to these issues when they emerge in the decision-making arena. We are prepared to support sufficient funding for the Nunn-Lugar cooperative threat reduction program. We have an interest in the overall nuclear weapons policy, now under review.

Our full application is being transmitted as a Word attachment. If this doesn't come through, please let me know, and I'll send it by e-mail text.

If you or your staff need further information, please let me know.

With best regards,

Howard

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

Dear Janet,

On the list of states and senators for bishops to contact that I gave you, I suggest adding California/Senator Feinstein and Washington/Senator Murray. They are both on the Appropriations Committee and both have major defense contractors in their states. So they will be pressed to support maximum appropriations for missile defense. We need to develop counter-pressure.

Thanks for your efforts.

Howard

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

Dear Eric,

In my article on "The Goal of Nuclear Disarmament" I accept the condensation that you did. However, there are a couple of places where the same word or phrase appears in successive sentences or clauses, which is something I avoid. And I have one addition.

Here are my suggested changes.

In the third paragraph, change the final sentence to read: "Even a host of retired admirals and generals favor total nuclear disarmament."

In the last paragraph of the section under "Nuclear Testing" add: "That remains his position." (This deals with Bush's position on the CTBT.)

Change the last paragraph, as follows: "We should call upon our leaders to achieve these objectives. We should insist because it is in defense of God's creation."

Thanks for publishing this article.

Howard

Date: Mon, 16 Jul 2001 10:12:48 -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

FCNLblock
Friends Committee on National Legislation

Nuclear Calendar

- July 16 11 a.m., House Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, hearing on the Defense Department's FY 2002 budget with Defense Secretary Rumsfeld and Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman Gen. Henry Shelton, 2359 Rayburn
- July 16 2 p.m., Senate floor debate begins on the energy and water appropriations bill, H.R. 2311/S. 1171 (general debate only)
- July 16 Defense Department notifies Congress that it plans to begin preparatory work in mid-August on a new missile defense test site at Fort Greely, AK (New York Times, July 12, 2001)
- July 16 Rally and protest on the anniversary of the Trinity atomic bomb explosion. Peace Action New Mexico, Santa Fe, NM. Contact LANLaction@aol.com, (505) 989-4812.
- July 17 9:30 a.m., Senate Armed Services Committee, hearing continues (from July 12) on ballistic missile defense with Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz and Ballistic Missile Defense Organization director Lt. Gen. Ronald Kadish, 216 Hart
- July 17 House floor action on the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill
- July 17 Senate floor action continues on the energy and water appropriations bill, H.R. 2311/S. 1171
- July 17 or 18 Senate floor action on the conference report on the supplemental appropriations bill for FY 2001, H.R. 2216 (estimate)
- July 18 TBD, Senate Budget Committee, hearing of the Defense Department's FY 2002 budget with Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz
- July 18 House floor action on the conference report on the supplemental appropriations bill for FY 2001, H.R. 2216
- July 18 5:30-7:30 p.m., "Missile Defense, De-Alerting and Nuclear Dangers," panel discussion and reception sponsored by Women in International Security and the Back from the Brink Campaign, at the Carnegie Endowment, 1779 Massachusetts Ave., N.W. RSVP to Virginia Johnson, (202) 545-1001.
- July 18 G-8 foreign ministers meeting, Genoa, Italy
- July 18 or 19 House floor action on disapproving normal trade relations with China,

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.5.3
Date: Mon, 16 Jul 2001 11:29:28 -0400
From: "Catherine Gordon" <cgordon@ctr.pcusa.org>
To: <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Meeting reminder; action now on NMD

Howard,

The Presbyterians would like to sign on to the NMD letter.

Please sign us on as

Rev. Elenora Giddings Ivory
Director
Washington Office
Presbyterian Church (USA)

>>> "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> 07/12/01 10:24AM >>>
To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Dear Colleagues:

First, a reminder that the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament will meet on Tuesday, July 17 from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. in the Methodist Building, Room 3, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, DC. Dealing with national missile defense funding will be our main order of business. But we can't wait until then to engage our grassroots on this issue.

The front page headline of today's Washington Post reads: "Bush Speeds Missile Defense Plans". Our headline should read: "Interfaith Committee Speeds Opposition to Missile Defense".

Focus of opposition

It seems to me that the primary focus of our opposition should be the Senate Armed Services and Appropriations Committees. We should also give attention to several moderate Republicans who serve on the Foreign Relations Committee.

We have in the works a sign-on letter addressed to Armed Services and Appropriations members (including the House of Representatives). Even more important we need to mobilize our grassroots in a number of key states.

Message

Our message can be twofold regarding the defense authorization bill and defense appropriations: (1) cut back on excessive funding for missile defense and (2) enact prohibitions for any activity that would violate

the
Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty. The sign-on letter now in
circulation
deals with spending as a justice issue. The piece I wrote on "Missile
Defense as a Moral Issue" discusses the ABM Treaty (if you want a fresh
copy, let me know).

Armed Services Committee

The Senate Armed Services is actively considering the defense
authorization
bill. Markup may occur in July with a floor vote in early August or
September. Membership of the committee is as follows:

Democrats:

Carl Levin, MI Chairman

Edward Kennedy, MA

Robert Byrd, WV

Joseph Lieberman, CT

Max Cleland, GA

Mary Landrieu, LA

Jack Reed, RI

Daniel Akaka, HI

Bill Nelson, FL

Ben Nelson, NE

Jean Carnahan, MO

Mark Dayton, MN

Jeff Bingaman, NM

Republicans:

John Warner, VA Ranking Member

Strom Thurmond, SC

John McCain, AZ

Bob Smith, NH

James Inhofe, OK

Rick Santorum, PA

Pat Roberts, KS

Wayne Allard, CO

Tim Hutchinson, AR

Jeff Sessions, AL

Susan Collins, ME

Jim Bunning, KY

The chair, Senator Carl Levin, is strongly committed to preserving the ABM Treaty and has doubts about aspects of missile defense. He should receive letters from his constituents in Michigan thanking him for his leadership on this issue and urging him to stand steadfast.

All of the Democrats need to hear from their constituents about the need to reduce missile defense funding and to preserve the ABM Treaty. With Republicans this message will have a harder sell. Based upon where we have strength, who is influential, and who tends toward the moderate side, you might consider reaching out to your grassroots in the home states of Senators Warner, McCain, Roberts, and Collins. We might add Santorum and Allard because we have good networks in Pennsylvania and Colorado.

Appropriations Committee

There is a report that the Senate Appropriations Committee may consider defense as the last of its appropriations bill because the Administration's defense budget has just been presented and because Senator Byrd and others may want a perspective of how much money is left without busting the budget. If this is the case, markup may not be completed until September.

Committee members are as follows:

Democrats:

Robert Byrd, WV Chairman

Daniel Inouye, HI

Ernest Hollings, SC

Patrick Leahy, VT

Tom Harkin, IA

Barbara Mikulski, MD

Harry Reid, NV

Herb Kohl, WI

Patty Murray, WA

Byron Dorgan, ND

Dianne Feinstein, CA

Richard Durbin, IL

Tim Johnson, SD

Mary Landrieu, LA

Jack Reed, RI

Republicans:

Ted Stevens, AK Ranking Member

Thad Cochran, MS

Arlen Specter, PA

Pete Domenici, NM

Christopher Bond, MO

Mitch McConnell, KY

Conrad Burns, MT

Richard Shelby, AL

Judd Gregg, NH

Robert Bennett, UT

Ben Nighthorse Campbell, CO

Larry Craig, ID

Kay Bailey Hutchison, TX

Mike DeWine, OH

The Appropriations Committee is divided into subcommittees whose chairs have authority to make the initial mark for their portion of the budget.

Senator Inouye is chair of the defense subcommittee and as a strong supporter of the military is likely to give the Bush Administration what it

wants for missile defense. Subcommittee members tend not to oppose the chair's mark unless the chair of the full committee takes some initiative.

Senator Byrd gave a floor speech on June 25 expressing doubts about the proposed level of missile defense funding and the need to preserve the ABM Treaty (see Congressional Record, p. S6844). Because he is particularly attuned to views of West Virginians, it is desirable that he hear from his constituents, praising him for his leadership on this issue and asking him to reduce funding for missile defense and to insert a prohibition against activities that would violate the ABM Treaty.

Democrats on the defense subcommittee need to hear from their constituents on the need to cut back missile defense funding and to preserve the ABM Treaty. They include Senators Hollins, Leahy, Harkin, Reid (NV), Dorgan, and Durbin. Other Democrats on the full committee need to receive the same message. Republicans who deserve attention include Senators Specter, Domenici, Bond, and DeWine.

Foreign Relations Committee

Although the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has a lesser legislative role at the moment on missile defense, several influential Republican moderates from that committee deserve attention, including Senators Lugar (IN), Hagel (NE), Smith (OR), and Chafee (RI). For those working on Senator Roberts in Kansas, Senator Brownback might be added to the list. When the issue reaches the senator floor, their voice and vote will be important. The message is similar: provide leadership to oppose excessive funding for missile defense and to preserve the ABM Treaty.

The senators suggested above are my listing after talking with some senate staff and persons from the arms control community. The list may be revised and prioritized when we meet on July 17. In the meantime please use your discretion to activate your grassroots in states where you have strength.

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: wstarman@wesleysem.edu
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: NMD as a Moral issue
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\icnd.095.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Wendy,

Thanks for catching the misspellings in my article on "National Missile Defense as a Moral Issue". A corrected version is sent as a Word attachment.

Howard

From: STARMAN WENDY <wstarman@wesleysem.edu>
To: "mupj@igc.org" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: please re-send
Date: Mon, 16 Jul 2001 15:09:35 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

Dear Howard,

Thank you very much for correcting and re-sending the article. Believe it or not, I printed out a hard copy and also intended to save it on the computer...but lo and behold...I cannot find it anywhere. If you don't mind, please send the corrected version of "National Missile Defense as a Moral Issue" one more time.

Also, we are actively assisting a synagogue that is using our materials for a big peace weekend this fall. It looks like they are going to have Adm. Stansfield Turner speak on Oct. 6, and a whole array of activities, with a special emphasis on nuclear arms. On Sunday of that weekend, they will kick off an advocacy day and will be introducing letter-writing, e-mailing, post cards, etc... I offered to provide them with contacts that could assist them with activities and referred them to FCNL and Back from the Brink. Is it OK to refer them to you too?

The synagogue is Teferet Bet Israel in Blue Bell, PA.

Thanks for getting back to me on both accounts.

Wendy

From: STARMAN WENDY <wstarman@wesleysem.edu>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: please re-send
Date: Mon, 16 Jul 2001 15:53:00 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

Howard,

Did you intend to re-send the article too? If so, it did not come attached.

Thanks.

Wendy

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Monday, July 16, 2001 3:35 PM
To: STARMAN WENDY
Subject: Re: please re-send

At 03:09 PM 7/16/01 -0400, you wrote:

>Dear Howard,

If you don't mind, please send the corrected version of "National Missile Defense as a Moral Issue" one more time.

It is attached.

>Also, we are actively assisting a synagogue that is using our materials for
>a big peace weekend this fall. ...Is it OK to refer them to you too?

Yes, you may.

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: STARMAN WENDY <wstarman@wesleysem.edu>

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

Subject: Re: please re-send

Cc:

Bcc:

X-Attachments:

In-Reply-To: <DC1977460103D311B0DE0060943F439F870255@WESLEY-EXCH1>

References:

At 03:09 PM 7/16/01 -0400, you wrote:

>Dear Howard,

If you don't mind, please send the corrected version of "National Missile Defense as a Moral Issue" one more time.

It is attached.

>Also, we are actively assisting a synagogue that is using our materials for

>a big peace weekend this fall. ...Is it OK to refer them to you too?

Yes, you may.

Howard

From: UUAWO@aol.com
Date: Mon, 16 Jul 2001 17:35:32 EDT
Subject: Re: Sign-on letter on funding for national missile defense
To: mupj@igc.org
X-Mailer: AOL 5.0 for Windows sub 125

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

Date: Mon, 16 Jul 2001 16:11:43 -0700
From: Leonard Pitt <ldpitt@Earthlink.net>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en]C-CCK-MCD NSCPCD47 (Win98; I)
X-Accept-Language: en
To: mupj@igc.apc.org
Subject: Search for Howard W. Hallman

Hello,

I have been referred to you by Peter Voth.

Can you please put me in touch with Howard W. Hallman, Chair of Methodists United for Peace with Justice? I read an article he wrote some years ago on neighborhood control and would like to ask him a

few questions for a research topic I am working on.

Thank you,

Leonard Pitt
Professor of History Emeritus
California State University, Northridge
phone: 310-397-3917
fax: 310-398-5801
e-mail: ldpitt@earthlink.net

To: Leonard Pitt <ldpitt@Earthlink.net>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Search for Howard W. Hallman
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <3B5374AF.23FA9B85@Earthlink.net>
References:

You've found me. You can call me at 301 896-0013. After 1:30 p.m. is the best time to reach me, though I'm not available every afternoon.

I'll warn you that I have done any field research on neighborhoods for a long time, but I generally keep track of trends.

Howard Hallman

To: marsusab@aol.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Sign-on letter on national missile defense
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Mark,

When I called you about a sign-on letter on national missile defense, I heard your message that you would be away until July 24. In case you are monitoring your e-mail, I am send a fresh copy of the letter. It is addressed to members of the House and Senate Armed Services and Appropriations Committee. We hope that you or some other representative of the Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs can sign. The deadline is 12 noon, Friday, July 20.

Beyond signing, I hope that your office will mobilize public opposition to national missile defense. We are giving particular attention to members of the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Senate Appropriations Committee. The message is twofold:

(1) cut back on funds authorized (appropriated) for missile defense and (2) include a requirement that no funds may be spend for any activity that violates the ABM Treaty.

If you need further information on this issue, please call me at 301 896-0013 or e-mail me at mupj@igc.org.

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

To: Bpinguel@afsc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Sign-on letter on national missile defense
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Bal,

Here is a fresh copy of the letter on national missile defense addressed to members of the House and Senate Armed Services and Appropriations Committee. We hope that you or some other AFSC representative can sign. The deadline is 12 noon, Friday, July 20.

Beyond signing, I hope that you and your regional offices will mobilize public opposition to national missile defense. We are giving particular attention to members of the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Senate Appropriations Committee. The message is twofold:

(1) cut back on funds authorized (appropriated) for missile defense and (2) include a requirement that no funds may be spend for any activity that violates the ABM Treaty.

If you need further information on this issue, please call me at 301 896-0013 or e-mail me at mupj@igc.org.

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: 76622.637@compuserve.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Sign-on letter on national missile defense
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Lonnie,

Here is a fresh copy of the sign-on letter on national missile defense. It is addressed to members of the House and Senate Armed Services and Appropriations Committees. I am entering your name as a signer.

I hope that the Cooperative Baptist Fellowship will help organize grassroots opposition to national missile defense. We are focusing particularly on members of the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Senate Appropriations Committee. The message is twofold:

(1) cut back on funds authorized (appropriated) for missile defense and (2) include a requirement that no funds may be spend for any activity that violates the ABM Treaty.

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.

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

Date: Tue, 17 Jul 2001 03:40:16 -0400

Subject: Brueggemann Email

From: Edward Brueggemann <edbruegge@mediaone.net>

To: Bob Forsing <forsing@mediaone.net>, Elaine Hoyt <elainemhoyt@aol.com>, Marian Clark <Mclark@ttlc.net>, Doris Nuttelman <pilnl@tds.net>, Jim Reinhardt <kjbstudio@aol.com>, Mendon MacDonald <mmacd@alumni.unh.edu>, Don Davidson <ddavidson@aarp.org>, Penny Willey <lenwpenw@aol.com>, Alice Guay <alsvea@aol.com>, Joshua Legg <jlegg@aarp.org>, "Dorthea O'Neil" <doviking@webtv.net>, Ethel Nilsen <eaviking@aol.com>, 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 <eaa.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>, Beth Johnson <bahj666@aol.com>, Robert Ahrendt <rcahrendt@crossville.com>, Bill Foley <BillFTA@aol.com>, Thom Gleiber <tgleiber@mobium.com>, Jim Brueggemann <jbbruegg@aol.com>, Mary Brueggemann <mmbuegg@aol.com>, John Brueggemann <jbruegge@skidmore.edu>, Don Harvey <dharvey603@aol.com>, Carol Matthias <carol_matthias@hotmail.com>, Joe Willette <josephwillette@gateway.net>, Norma Ordway <nordway@mymailstation.com>, Bertie Jennings <bertiej12@aol.com>, Everett Sims <esims@tds.net>, Bob and Dottie Soule <bndsoule@mediaone.net>, Helen Mallery <helenmallery@hotmail.com>, Richard Armstrong <armo1954@aol.com>, Richard/Jean Rathmell <rathmell@cfw.com>, Vi Constant <vconstant4@aol.com>, Pastor Dave Keller <pastor@concordfirstchurch.org>, Caregivers Donna Odde <ivcp@tds.net>, Marilyn Fischer <mlfisc@htc.net>, Thom Gleiber <tgleiber@mobium.com>, Carol Matthias <carol_matthias@hotmail.com>, Carol Stamatakis <CStamatakis@dhhs.state.nh.us>, Carolyn Andrews <ndrws@mediaone.net>, Bob/Kathleen Carr <recarr8372@aol.com>, Don Harvey <dharvey603@aol.com>, Dan Tolley <mystoe@aol.com>, David MacArthur Treasurer <dmacart@aol.com>, Nancy Kyle <nckyle@mediaone.net>, Barb Nason <bnason@pocketmail.com>, "NH Conference, UCC" <nhcucc@nhcucc.org>, "R. C. Ahrendt" <rcahrendt@a1access.net>,

Ramona Brooks <walter2@tps.chi.net>, Ray Lacasse <rlac@mediaone.net>, Jane and Bob Morin <rcaddyhut@home.com>, Robert Ahrendt <rcahrendt@crossville.com>, Helen Reio <hreio@hotmail.com>, "Michel C. Cerene Smith Realtors" <rentals@smithrealtors.com>, Sue Rineer <serrs@aol.com>, Tony/Rita Guarino <ritatony@mediaone.net>, "Heart Assoc. Rob Werner" <rwerner@heart.org>, Alice/Cleon West <cwest@htc.net>, Susan Almy <susan.almy@valley.net>, Arthur Trevorrow <arttrev@aol.com>, Bradenton <bacvb@hotmail.com>, Barbara Salvatore <bsalv@hotmail.com>, Martha Bauman <jma@cheshire.net>, Sue Belanger <sbelanger@hhhinfo.org>, Cliff Below <cbelow@tpk.net>, Betty Klaus <mbettysanta@hotmail.com>, Bill Metevier <wmetevier@bownet.org>, Bob and Helen Livingston <helenbob@livingco.com>, Burt Cohen <burtc@nh.ultranet.com>, Frank Gross <fhgross@aol.com>, Mark Fernald <fernalds@monad.net>, Ed Simon <eddotsimon@juno.com>, Globe Letters <letter@globe.com>, Matt Gooby <mlgooby@worldpath.net>, Ilse Wahle <iwahle@earthlink.net>, Irene Irving <imipj@totalnetnh.net>, Jan Sanborn <jpsanborn@mediaone.net>, Jim Pilliod <jimp@together.net>, Joe Willette <josephwillette@gateway.net>, David/Lindy Keller <kellers4@earthlink.net>, Sylvia Larsen <sylvia.larsen@leg.state.nh.us>, Liz Hager <lizh@unitedwymc.org>, Cremation Michele <michele@csnh.com>, Mike Palmieri <mpalmieri@hhhinfo.org>, Peter Burling <peter.burling@leg.state.nh.us>, Richard Ellerbrake <richardE@charter.net>

Our Email service is currently very erratic and ATT tells us they may not be able to repair it. We will not be able to receive or send Email for some time and may have to change addresses. Will inform you of changes as we can.

Ed and LuAnn Brueggemann

From: Kohler Answer Center Correspondent <plbgfb@excel.net>
Reply-To: plbgfb@excel.net
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: RE: Kohler Plumbing Feedback
Date: Tue, 17 Jul 2001 07:27:39 -0500
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook 8.5, Build 4.71.2173.0
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6600
Importance: Normal

Thank you for visiting Kohler Co. on the World Wide Web.

Replacement parts are available from the Kohler Answer Center. (Sorry, can't send parts from here.) You can reach the Answer Center at 1-800-456-4537, weekdays, between 7:00 AM and 6:00 PM Central Time. Thank you.

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

From: mupj@igc.org [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Monday, July 16, 2001 6:51 PM
Subject: Kohler Plumbing Feedback

Request Type: SERVICE

Customer Entered Model Number: 15076

Model Number: 15076

First Name: Howard

Last Name: Hallman

Email: mupj@igc.org

Phone Location: Home Number

Daytime Phone: 301-897-3668

Evening Phone:

Best Time: 12:00-18:00

Fax:

Company: NONE

Address1: 65-8 Wilmet Road

Address2:

City: Bethesda

State/Province: MD

Postal Code: 30817

Country: United States

Comments: Our faucet leaks at the base. Please provide replacement parts under the lifetime guarantee. Thanks.

From: STARMAN WENDY <wstarman@wesleysem.edu>
To: "'gms@netcarrier.com'" <gms@netcarrier.com>
Cc: "'mupj@igc.org'" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: another advocacy contact
Date: Tue, 17 Jul 2001 09:39:49 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

Dear Gloria,

Thanks for the great update the other day. Glad things are on track with the peace weekend at Teferet Bet Israel! Here's another excellent contact for your advocacy day this coming fall.

Howard Hallman has dedicated much of his time and energy to coordinating people of different faiths (including the Jewish community) around nuclear weapons issues, and continues to spearhead efforts to call upon our political leaders to take action. He might be able to give you some great ideas for letter-writing, post cards, e-mails to officials, etc.

I informed Howard that I would be passing along his contact information to you.

Howard W. Hallman, Chair
Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament
1500 16th St., NW
Washington, DC 20036-1402
Telephone: (301)896-0013
FAX: (301)896-0013
E-mail: mupj@igc.org

Howard is also the chair of Methodists United for Peace with Justice.

I hope that this is helpful!

Best,

Wendy

From: David Robinson <dave@paxchristiusa.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: Funding for national missile defense -Forwarded
Date: Tue, 17 Jul 2001 09:55:12 -0400

Howard,

It appears like there are missing sections to these sentences. Is this supposed to indicate that USCCB WILL issue a statement and adopt opposition to NMD as a program priority?

dave

From: Howard W. Hallman [SMTP:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Monday, July 16, 2001 8:46 PM
To: dave@paxchristiusa.org
Subject: Re: Funding for national missile defense -Forwarded

Dave,

For your information.

Howard

>From: Sdwpjip@aol.com
>Date: Tue, 10 Jul 2001 23:19:08 EDT
>Subject: Re: Funding for national missile defense -Forwarded
>To: mupj@igc.org
>X-Mailer: AOL 6.0 for Windows US sub 10513
>
>Howard:
>
>Wed have a subcommittee of our International Policy Committee reviewing our
> until labor day but I
>
>
>As you know, one of the major considerations in our opposing SDI was the
> We also highlighted this
>issue -- ie, the cost of military -- extensively in our 1993 statement, The
>Harvest of Justice.
>
> I hope we can have something by the
> Things don't always move quickly over here, but you
>know that well by now.
>
>Peace,
>
>Jerry Powers

To: David Robinson <dave@paxchristiusa.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: NCCB on missile defense.
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <01C10EA6.94DA9EC0@dave.paxchristiusa.org>
References:

Dave,

I'm sorry the text of Jerry Power's e-mail was garbled. Unfortunately I neither saved nor printed it, as I usually do. From memory I can reconstruct it as follows:

Jerry indicate that he was out on paternity leave until fall but that he was monitoring what was going on at the office.

He wrote, "On Wed we will have a subcommittee of our International Policy Committee reviewing our policy on national missile defense. As you know, one of the major considerations in our opposing SDI was the cost. We also highlighted this issue -- ie, the cost of military -- extensively in our 1993 statement, The Harvest of Justice.

"I hope we can have something by the fall. Things don't always move quickly over here, but you know that well by now.

"Peace,
Jerry Powers"

You ask, "Is this supposed to indicate that USCCB WILL issue a statement and adopt opposition to NMD as a program priority?"

I can't say for sure, but my guess is that they will issue some kind of statement. Whether they will make opposition to NMD a major priority, I can't say. But at least they are finally addressing this issue. If I hear anything, I'll keep you posted.

Howard

From: OGrabc@aol.com
Date: Tue, 17 Jul 2001 11:57:58 EDT
Subject: Re: Sign-on letter on funding for national missile defense
To: mupj@igc.org
X-Mailer: AOL 5.0 for Windows sub 138

Thank you for faxing as well as emailing the NMD sign-on letter. Please sign me on as follows:

Curtis Ramsey-Lucas
Director of Legislative Advocacy
National Ministries, American Baptist Churches USA

From: STARMAN WENDY <wstarman@wesleysem.edu>
To: "'mupj@igc.org'" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: FW: The Administration's 'Fuzzy' Logic on Missile Defense: Rhetoric vs. Reality
Date: Tue, 17 Jul 2001 15:26:53 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

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

From: STARMAN WENDY
Sent: Tuesday, July 17, 2001 3:26 PM
To: STARMAN WENDY
Subject: RE: The Administration's 'Fuzzy' Logic on Missile Defense: Rhetoric vs. Reality

Thanks for the suggestion Howard! We already had this posted on our site, and it's still there under the GET INVOLVED section, Words About Weapons. Your article about NMD will soon be there too (www.nrdi.org).

Best,

Wendy

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

From: STARMAN WENDY
Sent: Monday, July 16, 2001 2:58 PM
To: STARMAN WENDY
Subject: FW: The Administration's 'Fuzzy' Logic on Missile Defense: Rhetoric vs. Reality

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Friday, July 13, 2001 1:44 PM
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: The Administration's 'Fuzzy' Logic on Missile Defense: Rhetoric vs. Reality

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

I want to share with you this analysis by John Isaacs of the Administration's fuzzy logic on missile defense. I believe it would be a useful item for our shared web site material.

Howard

>X-Sender: jdi@[63.106.26.66]
>X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)

>Date: Fri, 13 Jul 2001 12:18:54 -0400

>To: jdi@clw.org

>From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>

>Subject: The Administration's 'Fuzzy' Logic on

> Missile Defense: Rhetoric vs. Reality

>

>The Administration's 'Fuzzy' Logic on Missile Defense:

>Rhetoric vs. Reality

>

>

>In selling its proposal for deploying missile defenses to the American
>public and the international community, the Bush administration has
>practiced the art of misdirection by drawing attention away from the four
>common-sense criteria by which an anti-missile system should be evaluated:
>cost, technological readiness, the level of the missile threat, and the
>likely effects on arms control and international security.

>

>The administration's high-pressure sales tactics include exaggerating the
>ballistic missile threat, invoking missile defense as a way to move beyond
>"anachronistic" Cold War nuclear thinking, blaming the 1972 Anti-Ballistic
>Missile (ABM) Treaty for the system's poor test record and technical
>failures, and promising consultations with allies while simultaneously
>planning to proceed unilaterally with deployment. "Cost" has been treated
>as an unspeakable four-letter word. Below are some examples of the
>administration's misleading and contradictory missile defense rhetoric.

>

>

>RHETORIC: "I have made it clear to our friends and allies that I think it's
>necessary to set aside the ABM Treaty, but I will do so in close
>consultation with not only members of NATO and EU countries who are not
>members of NATO, but, as well, with the Russians."
>- President Bush, June 13th Press Conference in Brussels

>

>REALITY: Although President Bush has repeatedly vowed to consult with U.S.
>allies on the subject of missile defenses, other administration statements
>indicate that the decision has already been made. For instance, in a June 7
>address to NATO foreign ministers, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld
>said, "Deploying missile defenses capable of protecting the U.S., friends
>and Allies will eventually require moving beyond the ABM Treaty. We
>understand this conclusion is not welcomed by some. It is simply
>inescapable." In light of statements like these, promises of consultations
>appear to be nothing more than a euphemism for telling our allies to "deal
>with it." After President Bush's NATO visit, one European diplomat
>commented, "If Bush has already decided to go ahead with breaking the ABM
>Treaty and building his project, then how are we supposed to believe that
>these consultations have any meaning?" (Washington Post, June 13)

>

>

>RHETORIC: "We must achieve release from the constraints of the ABM Treaty."

>- Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz, July 12 Testimony Before the
>Senate Armed Services Committee

>

>REALITY: According to Philip Coyle, former Pentagon Director of Operational

>Test and Evaluation, "Until the U.S. government learns whether the
>technical, budgetary, and operational problems that the National Missile
>Defense presents can be solved, the ABM treaty is the least of President
>Bush's problems." ("NMD Development is not Hostage to the ABM Treaty,"
>Center for Defense Information Issue Brief, June 12) The new booster rocket
>for the NMD interceptor has not even been tested once, and the first flight
>intercept test with the new booster will not take place before mid-2002.
>Even if a basic intercept capability can eventually be demonstrated, tests
>will then have to be attempted at greater distances and against
>increasingly sophisticated targets with decoys, countermeasures, or debris
>designed to confuse the system. Philip Coyle estimates that "[s]ome 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 [a mid-course] NMD system." While all of this
>near-term research and testing promises to require considerable time and
>investment, none of it is prohibited by the ABM treaty. Rather, it will
>likely be a decade or more before the treaty presents an obstacle to
>further development.

>

>

>RHETORIC: "Of course, we're not going to deploy a system that doesn't work.
>What good will that do?"

>- President Bush, June 13th Press Conference in Brussels

>

>REALITY: Although the currently proposed system has failed two out of three
>carefully scripted intercept tests, the Administration has indicated in
>recent days that it may decide to deploy a small group of interceptors by
>2004, just before the presidential election. "The president and the
>secretary [of defense] have made it pretty clear they believe that some
>missile defense in the near term is in fact better than nothing," said an
>Administration official in a June 8 Washington Post..

>

>

>RHETORIC: "We will not make decisions on systems architecture until our
>technologies have been tested."

>- Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, June 7th address in Brussels

>

>REALITY: Any crash program to put in place some elements of a missile
>defense system before 2004 would likely involve deploying technologies
>before they are fully tested and therefore in advance of any decision on
>systems architecture. In fact, the administration is crafting just such a
>scheme. In the same speech on June 7, Rumsfeld said, "[W]e will likely
>deploy test assets to provide rudimentary defenses to deal with emerging
>threats. We will likely continue to improve the effectiveness of any
>deployed capabilities over time," implying that the administration may
>deploy technologies before they are mature and deal with the question of
>systems architecture only after some elements of missile defenses are in
>place. This is an imprudent and dangerous "foot in the door" approach to
>missile defense designed to pave the way for additional spending down the
>road.

>

>

>RHETORIC: "Our goal is to deploy defenses against handfuls of missiles, not
>hundreds.... Such defenses are no threat whatsoever to anyone."

>- Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, June 7th address in Brussels

>

>REALITY: China currently has only a "handful"- approximately 18- weapons
>capable of being launched at the U.S., a force that even a limited
>land-based system could threaten. In order to protect their deterrence, the
>Chinese would likely accelerate their development of larger and more
>sophisticated nuclear forces, a buildup that could fuel arms races in South
>and East Asia.

>

>Moreover, while the administration has tried to calm Russian and Chinese
>fears by insisting that U.S. missile defenses will be limited, it has tried
>to make the concept palatable to the Europeans by telling them just the
>opposite- that the U.S. will deploy missile defenses to protect itself, its
>allies in Europe and Asia, and its deployed troops overseas, against both
>rogue state missiles and accidental or unauthorized launches. Such a
>proposal is anything but limited, and would require considerable time and
>massive investment, although the administration has given no indication of
>how much.

>

>

>RHETORIC: "We need to get over the Cold War, and the legacy of Cold War
>thinking and approaches that still narrow and restrict our thinking."

>- Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, June 7th address in Brussels

>

>REALITY: Missile defense itself is very much a legacy of Cold War thinking.
>Since the 1950s, the U.S. has tried and repeatedly failed to develop
>effective missile defenses. One system, Safeguard, was constructed in North
>Dakota in 1975, only to be shut down four months after it became
>operational. It is not clear that the Bush administration has learned
>anything from these failures, the cost of which to date exceeds \$125
>billion. Truly moving beyond the Cold War means de-alerting nuclear forces,
>making significant reductions in nuclear arsenals and strengthening
>multinational arms control agreements, not building new weapons.

>

>

>RHETORIC: "In 1972, we knew of only five countries that had nuclear weapons
>programs; today we know of twelve."

>- Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz, July 12 Testimony Before the
>Senate Armed Services Committee

>

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

>

>

>RHETORIC: "Today, the number of countries pursuing nuclear, chemical and
>biological weapons is growing. The number of countries pursuing advanced

>conventional weapons is growing. The number of countries pursuing ballistic
>missile technology is growing. The number of missiles on the face of the
>earth is growing."

>- Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz, July 12 Testimony Before the
>Senate Armed Services Committee

>

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

>

>

>RHETORIC: "If anything, building effective defenses will reduce the value
>of ballistic missiles, and thus remove incentives for their development and
>proliferation."

>- Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz, July 12 Testimony Before the
>Senate Armed Services Committee

>

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

>

>Another option for overwhelming missile defenses would be to place multiple
>warheads on individual missiles. Russia could follow through on its threat
>to equip each of its new Topol SS- 27 ICBMs with as many as three
>independently targetable warheads, a step that would entail Russia's
>withdrawal from the START II agreement, which prohibits multiple-warhead
>ICBMs. Speaking at a June 18th press conference, Russian President Vladmir
>Putin promised that "We will reinforce our capability" by "mounting
>multiple warheads on our missiles" and "that will cost us a meager sum."
>And so, he said, "the nuclear arsenal of Russia will be augmented multi-
>fold." (New York Times, June 19)

>

>Finally, countries could employ simple and inexpensive countermeasures to
>confuse the missile defense system. According to a September 1999 National
>Intelligence Estimate, China and Russia already possess the technology for
>such countermeasures, and may be willing to sell the technology to
>interested states. Furthermore, China and North Korea may refuse to
>cooperate on non-proliferation and increase their export of missile
>components and technologies to proliferators.

>

>

>RHETORIC: "I believe the Kyoto Treaty is a flawed treaty. I think that it
>set unscientific goals."

>- President Bush, June 13th Press Conference in Madrid

>

>"There is not a single major technological development in human history
>that did not begin with a process of trial and error and many of our most
>successful weapons developments have been marked by testing failures...
>Failure is how we learn. If a program never suffers test failures, it means
>someone is not taking enough risks and pushing the envelope. Intelligent
>risk taking is critical to any advanced development program..."

>- Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz, July 12 Testimony Before the
>Senate Armed Services Committee

>

>REALITY: It is hypocritical to argue, as the Bush administration does, that
>the Kyoto protocol on global climate change is scientifically flawed and
>should be opposed, while missile defense should be pursued aggressively
>despite its more serious scientific flaws. Ironically, a solid scientific
>consensus exists on the severity of global warming, while no such consensus
>exists on whether or not "hitting a bullet with a bullet" can ever be done
>with the necessary degree of consistency to make missile defenses worth the
>considerable costs, both financial and in terms of lost security.

>

>July 2001

>

>Council for a Livable World Education Fund

>110 Maryland Avenue, N.E.

>Washington, D.C. 20002

>(202) 546-0795

>

>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

>

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: Kevin Martin <kmartin@projectabolition.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Connecticut contact
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Kevin,

I recall that at one time you working with a religious coalition in Connecticut. Will you please supply me this contact? Senator Lieberman is speaking very pro-national missile defense. There may be a proposal presented to the Senate Armed Services Committee, of which he is a member, to forbid all activities that would violated the ABM treaty. We're seeking people in the faith community in Connecticut to express their opposition to missile defense and withdrawal from the ABM treaty.

Thanks for your assistance,
Howard

X-Sender: pmeidell@pop.igc.org
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.5 (32)
Date: Tue, 17 Jul 2001 15:00:04 -0700
To: <pamela@atomicmirror.org>
From: Pamela Meidell <pamela@atomicmirror.org>
Subject: (abolition-usa) ALERT: Bush II and International Treaties
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

Dear Friends,

A British activist colleague who has worked for years on nuclear issues has the following article printed in the Guardian today. Definite food for thought and seeds for creative action. Please consider how you can get involved and speak out if you haven't already!

In peace,
Pamela Meidell

Doomsday
Bush Has Been Ditching Treaties Since He Came To Power.
He Must Be Stopped Before It's Too Late.
by Rebecca Johnson

They pulled out of the Kyoto treaty, and I did not speak out, because I thought global warming wouldn't affect me personally. Then they trashed the anti-ballistic-missile treaty, but I did not speak out, because it was an old, bilateral agreement from 30 years ago.

Then they put private, commercial interests above implementing and verifying the treaties banning chemical, biological and toxin weapons, but I did not speak out because such weapons are too complicated for media coverage. Then they threatened the nuclear test ban treaty, and I did not speak out, because the United States is a major ally that I did not want to offend.

Then the international arms control and non-proliferation regimes collapsed. Americans weren't bothered at first, for hadn't the government promised a super-sophisticated force field round the whole nation that no terrorist or missile would ever penetrate? So nuclear testing resumed in Nevada for new warheads to improve the kill prospects of missile interceptors and to penetrate deep into enemies' bunkers.

India had been waiting for just such a go-ahead, and Pakistan soon followed; both raced to test warheads to fit on to missiles, upping the tension in Kashmir and along the borders with China. Free now to resume its own testing, China boosted its program to modernize and increase the size of its small nuclear arsenal. Somewhat reluctantly, Russia followed. Moscow suspended all further reductions and cooperative security and safety programs for its still-large nuclear arsenal and facilities.

Within a few short years, the nuclear nonproliferation treaty was just

another discarded agreement. Many governments with nuclear power programs developed nuclear weapons as well, while others fitted anthrax or sarin on to weapons, just in case. Most hadn't wanted to, but fearful that their neighbors would, all felt compelled.

Regional rivalries grew quickly into major international problems. Alliances collapsed amid suspicion and recriminations. The burgeoning arms races even spread into outer space, threatening military surveillance, as well as public communication, entertainment and navigation. No one knew who had what.

Deterrence was empty, as defense analysts calculated the advantages of the pre-emptive strike. In that terrified atmosphere of insecurity and mistrust, someone launched first. And then it was too late to speak out. The Republicans hadn't yet managed to get missile defense to work.

Such a doomsday scenario is not so fanciful. On July 7, the New York Times announced that President Bush wants to ditch the comprehensive test ban treaty. A week before, the administration asked nuclear laboratories to work out how quickly the US could resume testing after its nine-year moratorium.

If Bush were to back out of the test ban treaty or break the moratorium on nuclear testing - undertaken with China, Russia, Britain and France - he would also explicitly breach agreements made last May, when 187 countries negotiated measures to strengthen and implement the non-proliferation treaty.

The test ban is no outdated cold war instrument, but a fundamental tool to prevent new, destabilizing developments in nuclear weapons. Over several decades, from the Arctic to the Pacific, from the capitals of Europe to the deserts of Nevada, people have marched, petitioned, demonstrated and even sailed or hiked into test sites. Many have been imprisoned, and some even lost their lives trying to stop the nuclear weapons governments from polluting our oceans and earth with radioactivity from nuclear explosions, conducted for one purpose only - to make "better" nuclear bombs.

It took three arduous years to complete negotiations on the comprehensive test ban treaty. It isn't perfect. No product of compromise ever is. The verification system is very thorough, but it also had to be affordable, financially and politically.

The treaty stopped short of closing and dismantling the known test sites or banning laboratory testing, which the weapon states said they needed to assure the safety and reliability of weapons in the stockpiles (pending achievement of their other treaty obligations to eliminate the nuclear arsenals completely). But it does ban all nuclear test explosions in all environments.

India panicked, because the treaty would close off its nuclear options. It refused to sign, and then let off a string of nuclear explosions in May 1998. Pakistan followed, to prove it could. Even so, the treaty held. Neither government has felt able to keep testing, which means their options for further developments were curbed.

Bush has embarked on a very slippery slope that could potentially put at risk the future of the citizens of even the most advanced military nation. Mumbling and grumbling won't keep us safe. It is time to speak out.

Rebecca Johnson is executive director
of the Acronym Institute for Disarmament Diplomacy
Published on Tuesday, July 17, 2001 in the Guardian of London

© Guardian Newspapers Limited 2001

Pamela Meidell
Director
The Atomic Mirror
"Reflecting and Transforming our Nuclear World through the Arts"
P.O. Box 220
Port Hueneme, CA 93044
tel: 805 985 5073
fax: 805 985 7563
email: pamela@atomicmirror.org

"Politics is the art of the possible,
Creativity is the art of the impossible."
Ben Okri

-

To 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.

Sample action alert on national missile defense and the defense authorization bill.

The week of July 30 the Senate Armed Services Committee will be "marking up" the Defense Authorization Bill for the 2002 fiscal year. This will include funding for national missile defense. We have two concerns for you to raise with Senator _____, who is a member of this committee: funding level for national missile defense and the need to preserve the ABM Treaty.

Reduce Funding for National Missile Defense

President Bush is asking \$8.3 billion for missile defense, a 57 percent increase over the current fiscal year. This is extravagant because presently there is no credible threat to the U.S. homeland from long-range missiles. It is also a misdirection of spending priorities, given the urgent need to increase funding of programs designed to "Leave No Child Behind", for health care and other social needs. True national security comes from providing greater opportunities for persons in need, not enriching defense contractors. Therefore, we ask you urge Senator _____ to seek reduction in the amount of funds authorized for national missile defense.

Preserve the ABM Treaty

The Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty, which restricts the deployment of a national missile defense, is part of the nuclear arms control structure that has served the world well during the past 30 years. U.S. withdrawal from the treaty in order to deploy missile defense runs the grave risk of causing this structure to collapse and re-fueling the nuclear arms race. Russia is likely to respond to U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty by withdrawing from other arms control agreements and by deploying new multi-warhead missiles. Russia might also abandon the cooperative threat reduction program whereby the United States provides financial assistance for dismantling Russian missiles and securing fissile material. China, too, is likely to increase its offensive nuclear arsenal. This will threaten India, which will counter by deploying more nuclear weapons. Pakistan will respond by increasing its nuclear arsenal. These are dire consequences of ill-advise U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty.

Therefore, we urge you to ask Senator _____ to support a prohibition in the defense authorization bill on expenditure of funds for any activity that would violate the ABM Treaty.

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

Janet,

Have you decided who will sign the letter on NMD?

Howard

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

David,

Will somebody from FCNL be signing the letter on NMD? I need to know by Friday.

Howard

To: "Bill Beachy" <Topekacpj@aol.com>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Missile defense and Senator Roberts
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Bill,

The Senate Armed Services Committee will mark up the defense authorization bill the week of July 30. Senator Pat Roberts is a member of that committee. Therefore, we ask you to contact your networks in Kansas to have people contact Senator Roberts on a couple of issues related to national missile defense. They are explained in the sample alert, which you can use or modify as you see fit. You will need to add contact information for Senator Roberts.

If you have any questions, please e-mail me at mupj@igc.org or call me at 301 896-0013.

Thanks for your help,
Howard

###

Sample action alert on national missile defense and the defense authorization bill.

The week of July 30 the Senate Armed Services Committee will be "marking up" the Defense Authorization Bill for the 2002 fiscal year. This will include funding for national missile defense. We have two concerns for you to raise with Senator Pat Roberts, who is a member of this committee: funding level for national missile defense and the need to preserve the ABM Treaty.

Reduce Funding for National Missile Defense

President Bush is asking \$8.3 billion for missile defense, a 57 percent increase over the current fiscal year. This is extravagant because presently there is no credible threat to the U.S. homeland from long-range missiles. It is also a misdirection of spending priorities, given the urgent need to increase funding of programs designed to "Leave No Child Behind", for health care and other social needs. True national security comes from providing greater opportunities for persons in need, not enriching defense contractors. Therefore, we ask you urge Senator Roberts to seek reduction in the amount of funds authorized for national missile defense.

Preserve the ABM Treaty

The Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty, which restricts the deployment of a national missile defense, is part of the nuclear arms control structure that has served the world well during the past 30 years. U.S. withdrawal from the treaty in order to deploy missile defense runs the grave risk of causing this structure to collapse and re-fueling the nuclear arms race. Russia is likely to respond to U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty by withdrawing from other arms control agreements and by deploying new multi-warhead missiles. Russia might also abandon the cooperative threat reduction program whereby the United States provides financial assistance for dismantling Russian missiles and securing fissile material. China, too, is likely to increase its offensive nuclear arsenal. This will threaten India, which will counter by deploying more nuclear weapons. Pakistan will respond by increasing its nuclear arsenal. These are dire consequences of ill-advise U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty.

Therefore, we urge you to ask Senator Roberts to support a prohibition in the defense authorization bill on expenditure of funds for any activity that would violate the ABM Treaty.

To: ssidorak@aol.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Missile defense
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\icnd.095.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Steve:

I was glad to make contact with you. I'm chairing the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which is opposing national missile defense as well as working for de-alerting, deep cuts, and other measures of nuclear disarmament.

As I indicated, Senator Levin, chair of the Senate Armed Services Committee, will probably try to include a provision in the defense authorization bill to prohibit expenditure of funds for activities that violate the ABM Treaty. We hope that you can get people in Connecticut to urge Senator Lieberman to support such a provision.

A sample action alert is offered below. It also deals with budgetary implications.

In case you might be interested, I am sending a Word attachment on "National Missile Defense as a Moral Issue".

I hope that we can stay in touch.

Shalom,
Howard

###

The week of July 30 the Senate Armed Services Committee will be "marking up" the Defense Authorization Bill for the 2002 fiscal year. This will include funding for national missile defense. We have two concerns for you to raise with Senator _____, who is a member of this committee: funding level for national missile defense and the need to preserve the ABM Treaty.

Reduce Funding for National Missile Defense

President Bush is asking \$8.3 billion for missile defense, a 57 percent increase over the current fiscal year. This is extravagant because presently there is no credible threat to the U.S. homeland from long-range missiles. It is also a misdirection of spending priorities, given the urgent need to increase funding of programs designed to "Leave No Child Behind", for health care and other social needs. True national security comes from providing greater opportunities for persons in need, not enriching defense contractors. Therefore, we ask you urge Senator _____ to seek reduction in the amount of funds authorized for national missile defense.

Preserve the ABM Treaty

The Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty, which restricts the deployment of a national missile defense, is part of the nuclear arms control structure that has served the world well during the past 30 years. U.S. withdrawal from the treaty in order to deploy missile defense runs the grave risk of causing this structure to collapse and re-fueling the nuclear arms race. Russia is likely to respond to U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty by withdrawing from other arms control agreements and by deploying new multi-warhead missiles. Russia might also abandon the cooperative threat reduction program whereby the United States provides financial assistance for dismantling Russian missiles and

securing fissile material. China, too, is likely to increase its offensive nuclear arsenal. This will threaten India, which will counter by deploying more nuclear weapons. Pakistan will respond by increasing its nuclear arsenal. These are dire consequences of ill-advise U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty.

Therefore, we urge you to ask Senator _____ to support a prohibition in the defense authorization bill on expenditure of funds for any activity that would violate the ABM Treaty.

X-Sender: pmeidell@pop.igc.org
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.5 (32)
Date: Tue, 17 Jul 2001 15:00:04 -0700
To: <pamela@atomicmirror.org>
From: Pamela Meidell <pamela@atomicmirror.org>
Subject: (abolition-usa) ALERT: Bush II and International Treaties
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

Dear Friends,

A British activist colleague who has worked for years on nuclear issues has the following article printed in the Guardian today. Definite food for thought and seeds for creative action. Please consider how you can get involved and speak out if you haven't already!

In peace,
Pamela Meidell

Doomsday
Bush Has Been Ditching Treaties Since He Came To Power.
He Must Be Stopped Before It's Too Late.
by Rebecca Johnson

They pulled out of the Kyoto treaty, and I did not speak out, because I thought global warming wouldn't affect me personally. Then they trashed the anti-ballistic-missile treaty, but I did not speak out, because it was an old, bilateral agreement from 30 years ago.

Then they put private, commercial interests above implementing and verifying the treaties banning chemical, biological and toxin weapons, but I did not speak out because such weapons are too complicated for media coverage. Then they threatened the nuclear test ban treaty, and I did not speak out, because the United States is a major ally that I did not want to offend.

Then the international arms control and non-proliferation regimes collapsed. Americans weren't bothered at first, for hadn't the government promised a super-sophisticated force field round the whole nation that no terrorist or missile would ever penetrate? So nuclear testing resumed in Nevada for new warheads to improve the kill prospects of missile interceptors and to penetrate deep into enemies' bunkers.

India had been waiting for just such a go-ahead, and Pakistan soon followed; both raced to test warheads to fit on to missiles, upping the tension in Kashmir and along the borders with China. Free now to resume its own testing, China boosted its program to modernize and increase the size of its small nuclear arsenal. Somewhat reluctantly, Russia followed. Moscow suspended all further reductions and cooperative security and safety programs for its still-large nuclear arsenal and facilities.

Within a few short years, the nuclear nonproliferation treaty was just

another discarded agreement. Many governments with nuclear power programs developed nuclear weapons as well, while others fitted anthrax or sarin on to weapons, just in case. Most hadn't wanted to, but fearful that their neighbors would, all felt compelled.

Regional rivalries grew quickly into major international problems. Alliances collapsed amid suspicion and recriminations. The burgeoning arms races even spread into outer space, threatening military surveillance, as well as public communication, entertainment and navigation. No one knew who had what.

Deterrence was empty, as defense analysts calculated the advantages of the pre-emptive strike. In that terrified atmosphere of insecurity and mistrust, someone launched first. And then it was too late to speak out. The Republicans hadn't yet managed to get missile defense to work.

Such a doomsday scenario is not so fanciful. On July 7, the New York Times announced that President Bush wants to ditch the comprehensive test ban treaty. A week before, the administration asked nuclear laboratories to work out how quickly the US could resume testing after its nine-year moratorium.

If Bush were to back out of the test ban treaty or break the moratorium on nuclear testing - undertaken with China, Russia, Britain and France - he would also explicitly breach agreements made last May, when 187 countries negotiated measures to strengthen and implement the non-proliferation treaty.

The test ban is no outdated cold war instrument, but a fundamental tool to prevent new, destabilizing developments in nuclear weapons. Over several decades, from the Arctic to the Pacific, from the capitals of Europe to the deserts of Nevada, people have marched, petitioned, demonstrated and even sailed or hiked into test sites. Many have been imprisoned, and some even lost their lives trying to stop the nuclear weapons governments from polluting our oceans and earth with radioactivity from nuclear explosions, conducted for one purpose only - to make "better" nuclear bombs.

It took three arduous years to complete negotiations on the comprehensive test ban treaty. It isn't perfect. No product of compromise ever is. The verification system is very thorough, but it also had to be affordable, financially and politically.

The treaty stopped short of closing and dismantling the known test sites or banning laboratory testing, which the weapon states said they needed to assure the safety and reliability of weapons in the stockpiles (pending achievement of their other treaty obligations to eliminate the nuclear arsenals completely). But it does ban all nuclear test explosions in all environments.

India panicked, because the treaty would close off its nuclear options. It refused to sign, and then let off a string of nuclear explosions in May 1998. Pakistan followed, to prove it could. Even so, the treaty held. Neither government has felt able to keep testing, which means their options for further developments were curbed.

Bush has embarked on a very slippery slope that could potentially put at risk the future of the citizens of even the most advanced military nation. Mumbling and grumbling won't keep us safe. It is time to speak out.

Rebecca Johnson is executive director
of the Acronym Institute for Disarmament Diplomacy
Published on Tuesday, July 17, 2001 in the Guardian of London

© Guardian Newspapers Limited 2001

Pamela Meidell
Director
The Atomic Mirror
"Reflecting and Transforming our Nuclear World through the Arts"
P.O. Box 220
Port Hueneme, CA 93044
tel: 805 985 5073
fax: 805 985 7563
email: pamela@atomicmirror.org

"Politics is the art of the possible,
Creativity is the art of the impossible."
Ben Okri

-

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

From: "Charlotte V. Davenport, csjp"
To: "Weidner, Pat" , "Christenson, Mary"
Cc: "Howard W. Hallman"
Subject: An Alert regarding the Missile Defense Shield budget
Date: Wed, 18 Jul 2001 13:42:42 -0400
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)
Importance: Normal X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2615.200

Action Alert

The week of July 30 the Senate Armed Services Committee will be "marking up" the Defense Authorization Bill for the 2002 fiscal year. This will include funding for national missile defense.

We have two concerns for you to raise with your Senators and ask the to contact their colleagues on the Senate Armed Services committee:

- (1) funding level for national missile defense and**
- (2) the need to preserve the ABM Treaty.**

Reduce Funding for National Missile Defense

President Bush is asking \$8.3 billion for missile defense, a 57 percent increase over the current fiscal year. This is extravagant because presently there is no credible threat to the U.S. homeland from long-range missiles. It is also a misdirection of spending priorities, given the urgent need to increase funding of programs designed to "Leave No Child Behind", for health care and other social needs. True national security comes from providing greater opportunities for persons in need, not enriching defense contractors. Therefore, ask your Senators to urge their colleagues on the Armed Services Committee to seek reduction in the amount of funds authorized for national missile defense.

Preserve the ABM Treaty

The Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty, which restricts the deployment of a national missile defense, is part of the nuclear arms control structure that has served the world well during the past 30 years. U.S. withdrawal from the treaty in order to deploy missile defense runs the grave risk of causing this structure to collapse and re-fueling the nuclear arms race.

Russia is likely to respond to U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty by withdrawing from other arms control agreements and by deploying new multi-warhead missiles. Russia might also abandon the cooperative threat reduction program whereby the United States provides financial assistance for dismantling Russian missiles and securing fissile material. China, too, is likely to increase its offensive nuclear arsenal. This will threaten India, which will counter by deploying more nuclear weapons.

Pakistan will respond by increasing its nuclear arsenal. These are dire consequences of ill-advised U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty.

X-Mailer: ListManager Web Interface

Date: Wed, 18 Jul 2001 11:10:49 -0700

Subject: GBCS General Secretary calls on President Bush to Extend Moratorium on Human Embryo Stem Cell Research

To: Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.org>

From: GBCS<actiongbcs@umc-gbcs.org>

List-Unsubscribe: <mailto:leave-gbcs-5112739D@earth.lyris.net>

Reply-To: GBCS<actiongbcs@umc-gbcs.org>

July 17, 2001

Contact: Erik Alsgaard 202-488-5631

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

GBCS General Secretary calls on President Bush to Extend Moratorium on Human Embryo Stem Cell Research

The General Secretary of the General Board of Church and Society, Jim Winkler, has sent a letter to fellow United Methodist and President George W. Bush, urging him to continue to impose "an extended moratorium" on human embryo stem cell research. The General Board of Church of Society of The United Methodist Church is the denomination's international social witness and advocacy agency, with offices in New York City and Washington, D.C.

Winkler, noting that Bush promised to make a decision on human embryo stem cell research by the end of July, said that "after prayerful reflection... and careful reading of official United Methodist policy and teachings," that he was urging the moratorium "on the destruction of human embryos for the purpose of stem cell or other research."

The United Methodist Church has called for a complete and total ban on human cloning, including embryo cloning, for any purpose. Speaking through its only official voice, the General Conference, which met in May 2000, the church called for a ban on human cloning and "procedures that intentionally generate 'waste [human] embryos' which will knowingly be destroyed." (2000 Book of Resolutions, p. 249.)

"Destroying human embryos for the sole purpose of carrying on scientific research that promises only the possibility of potential treatments with little concrete evidence of success again raises profound and disturbing moral and ethical issues," Winkler wrote in the letter. "Such practices seem to be destructive of human dignity and speed us further down the path that ignores the sacred dimensions of life and personhood and turns life into a commodity to be manipulated, controlled, patented and sold."

The United Methodist Church has engaged in a focused, formal study of genetics and biotechnology since 1988. The church has called for support of appropriate somatic cell research and treatment that respects human dignity.

###

Only General Conference speaks officially for The United Methodist Church. The General Board of Church and Society is the international public witness and advocacy agency of the church.

July 17, 2001

GBCS General Secretary's letter to President Bush to Extend Moratorium on Human Embryo Stem Cell Research

Dear Mr. President:

You have promised to make a decision regarding the use of federal tax dollars to support embryonic stem cell research by the end of July 2001. This is a decision that can maintain the current prohibition on such funding or take us further down a path to the ultimate commodification of human life. After prayerful reflection, I am moved by my faith, by careful reading of official United Methodist policy and teachings, and by my abiding concern for human dignity, justice, and the integrity of God's creation to urge you to impose an extended moratorium on the destruction of human embryos for the purpose of stem cell or other research.

United Methodists have engaged in focused, formal study of genetics and biotechnology since 1988. Our reflections on these critical issues are grounded in both faith and knowledge. As United Methodists we have called for support of appropriate somatic cell research and treatment that respects human dignity. We also recognize the speculation that stem cell research may possibly, someday provide some treatments for a variety of diseases.

At the same time, grounded in a faith that tells us that people are created in the image of God, United Methodists have called for complete and total bans on human cloning, including embryo cloning for any purpose, and "procedures that intentionally generate 'waste [human] embryos' which will knowingly be destroyed." [The Book of Resolutions, 2000, p. 249]

The moral and ethical issues surrounding the beginning of life demand enormous caution in proceeding with activities that result in the destruction of human embryos. Following extended study, prayer, reflection, and discussion The United Methodist Church affirmed a woman's right to make her own prayerful, responsible decision concerning the personal and moral questions surrounding ending the growth of human life in her body when there are "tragic conflicts of life with life."

Destroying human embryos for the sole purpose of carrying on scientific research that promises only the possibility of potential treatments, with little concrete evidence of success again raises profound and disturbing moral and ethical issues. Additionally, adult stem cell research and other genetically based research are showing increasing promise of success in treating most, if not all, of the diseases and conditions that could be addressed by embryonic stem cell research. Finally, such practices seem to be destructive of human dignity and speed us further down the path that ignores the sacred dimensions of life and personhood and turns life into a commodity to be manipulated, controlled, patented, and sold.

Within these contexts, as General Secretary of The United Methodist General Board for Church and Society I feel compelled to urge extreme caution, even when proponents of these research activities promise possible application to ease human suffering.

Sincerely in faith,

Jim Winkler

You are currently subscribed to gbcs as: mupj@igc.org

To unsubscribe send a blank email to leave-gbcs-5112739D@earth.lyris.net

From: SSidorak@aol.com
Date: Wed, 18 Jul 2001 15:25:04 EDT
Subject: Re: Missile defense
To: mupj@igc.org
X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 124

Thanks, Howard.
Got the stuff. I look forward to reading your paper.
Now on sabbatical and then vacation but back in office after Aug. 15.
Peace,
Steve Sidorak

From: David Culp <david@fcnl.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: Sign-on letter
Date: Wed, 18 Jul 2001 15:23:16 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Sign me on.

David Culp
Legislative Representative
Friends Committee on National Legislation

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Wednesday, July 18, 2001 12:30 pm
To: david@fcnl.org
Subject: Sign-on letter

David,

Will somebody from FCNL be signing the letter on NMD? I need to know by Friday.

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: Paul Britner
To: Dwight Smith , Gene Vincent , Howard Hallman , Jeanne North , Jerry Muys , Jo Allen , Kerri Wright Platais , Pat Beverly , Ron&Holly Foster , Tony Andrews Cc: Rebecca Wagner
Subject: BUMC July Minutes
Date: Wed, 18 Jul 2001 15:47:46 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

Minutes
BUMC Outreach Committee
July 17, 2001

The committee continued its discussion of the October 23 forum.

Paul noted that Council Member Howard Denis sent his regrets that he could not attend the event and that Del. Nancy Kopp has a conflict, but hopes she can show up near the end of the program. No other electeds had replied yet.

Paul also explained that he would wait until early September to pick the exact topics/speakers for the program so that he would have the benefit of working this summer within the advocacy community to identify likely priority issues for the next General Assembly. The committee also agreed that the main part of the program will feature an overview by Paul that will include a minimum wage table exercise, followed by short presentations from three panel members, with (time permitting) time to go back to the table exercise so that participants can discuss how the presentations affect their analysis.

The committee agreed on the following assignments:

Invitations: Haven
Facility/Setup: Ron
Refreshments: Jeanne
Publicity: Gene

The next meeting will be Tuesday, September 11 at 11:00 a.m. The committee also agreed to set aside Tuesday, October 16 at 11:00 a.m. to complete final preparations. Additional meetings are likely, and will be scheduled at the September meeting.

To: fenn@hicapitol.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Hallman reunion in 2004
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Ms. Fenn:

When the Hallman family had its 2001 reunion in North Carolina earlier this month, we decided to have our 2004 reunion in Washington, D.C. Therefore, I would like to talk with you further about working out arrangements with Holiday Inn Capitol.

We have chosen the nights of Thursday-Saturday, June 24-26, 2004 (extending to Sunday morning) as the time for the reunion. We would like to reserve a block of 35 guest rooms, which is the maximum we would need. There could be a cut off time, such as two months before the date, at which time we would release unbooked rooms. Previously you quote a rate of \$149 plus tax per room per night. Would that rate be available to those who which to arrive earlier or stay longer?

Our other needs would be as follows:

Thursday, June 24: a hospitality suite to receive arrivals, possible available on subsequent days.

7:00 to 9:30 p.m., Friday, June 25: a gathering room for informal socializing for 60+ people.

Saturday evening, June 26: dinner for 75-90 people. Could be a buffet. An adjacent child care room for young children would be useful.

I would like to stop by some time in the near future to discuss this with you further.

Sincerely yours,
Howard Hallman

Phone: 301 897-3668
E-mail: mupj@igc.org

To: mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Action alert for West Virginia
Cc:
Bcc: icnd
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Senator Robert Byrd, chair of the Senate Appropriations Committee, though a supporter of national missile defense, has serious doubts about the current rush to deployment with unproven systems and the high projected costs in a budget that is tight on funds. He believes that it is unwise to abandon the ABM Treaty.

It would be useful for Senator Byrd to hear from his constituents who share his concerns, including those who oppose deployment of national missile defense. Therefore, I have drafted the following alert which you can use, with modifications you choose, to send out to your contacts in West Virginia. This should be done within the next week if possible. You might also encourage West Virginians to seek out Senator Byrd during the August recess and discuss national missile defense with him.

Shalom,
Howard

###

Sample action alert on national missile defense for use in West Virginia.

The defense appropriations bill for the 2002 fiscal year is now before the Senate Appropriations Committee, which is chaired by Senator Robert Byrd of West Virginia. President Bush has requested \$8.3 billion for missile defense, a 57 percent increase over the current fiscal year. Although Senator Byrd favors deployment of missile defense when proven feasible, he has concerns about the high cost and likelihood that the Bush Administration would want to dip into social security trust funds to finance it. He is also concerned about withdrawal from the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty.

We ask you to contact Senator Byrd, praise him for his concerns about rushing premature deployment of national missile defense, and urge him to reduce the funding level and to preserve the ABM Treaty.

Reduce Funding for National Missile Defense

The request of \$8.3 billion for national missile defense for the 2002 fiscal year is extravagant because presently there is no credible threat to the U.S. homeland from long-range missiles. It is also a misdirection of spending priorities, given the urgent need to increase funding of programs designed to "Leave No Child Behind", for health care and other social needs. True national security comes from providing greater opportunities for persons in need, not enriching defense contractors. Therefore, you can urge Senator Byrd to seek reduction in the amount of funds appropriated for national missile defense.

Preserve the ABM Treaty

The Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty, which restricts the deployment of a national missile defense, is part of the nuclear arms control structure that has served the world well during the past 30 years. U.S. withdrawal from the treaty in order to deploy missile defense runs the grave risk of causing this structure to collapse and re-fueling the nuclear arms race. Russia is likely to respond to U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty by withdrawing from other arms control agreements and by deploying new multi-warhead missiles. Russia might also abandon the cooperative threat reduction program whereby the United States provides financial assistance for dismantling Russian missiles and securing fissile

material. China, too, is likely to increase its offensive nuclear arsenal. This will threaten India, which will counter by deploying more nuclear weapons. Pakistan will respond by increasing its nuclear arsenal. These are dire consequences of ill-advised U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty.

You can ask Senator Byrd to include in the defense appropriations bill a prohibition on expenditure of funds for any activity that would violate the ABM Treaty.

Reply-To: <paul@paxchristi.net>
From: "Paul Lansu" <paul@paxchristi.net>
To: <paul@paxchristi.net>
Subject: Nuclear Disarmament and Small Arms
Date: Thu, 19 Jul 2001 09:39:26 +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-MDRemoteIP: 192.168.0.4
X-Return-Path: paul@paxchristi.net
X-MDAemon-Deliver-To: mupj@igc.org

<x-html><html xmlns:v="urn:schemas-microsoft-com:vml" xmlns:o="urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:office" xmlns:w="urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:word" xmlns="http://www.w3.org/TR/REC-html40">

<head>
<META HTTP-EQUIV="Content-Type" CONTENT="text/html; charset=iso-8859-1">

<meta name=ProgId content=Word.Document>
<meta name=Generator content="Microsoft Word 9">
<meta name=Originator content="Microsoft Word 9">
<link rel=File-List href="cid:filelist.xml@01C11036.B2C8D870">
<link rel=Edit-Time-Data href="cid:editdata.mso@01C11036.B2C8D870">
<!--[if !mso]>
<style>
v\:.* {behavior:url(#default#VML);}
o\:.* {behavior:url(#default#VML);}
w\:.* {behavior:url(#default#VML);}
.shape {behavior:url(#default#VML);}
</style>
<![endif]-->
<title>Name</title>
<!--[if gte mso 9]><xml>
<o:DocumentProperties>
<o:Template>S:\Aletter.dot</o:Template>
<o:Revision>7</o:Revision>
<o:TotalTime>47</o:TotalTime>
<o:LastPrinted>2001-05-31T09:59:00Z</o:LastPrinted>
<o:Created>2001-07-13T08:11:00Z</o:Created>
<o:LastSaved>2001-07-17T08:51:00Z</o:LastSaved>
<o:Pages>1</o:Pages>
<o:Words>493</o:Words>
<o:Characters>2814</o:Characters>
<o:Company>Pax Christi</o:Company>
<o:Lines>23</o:Lines>
<o:Paragraphs>5</o:Paragraphs>
<o:CharactersWithSpaces>3455</o:CharactersWithSpaces>
<o:Version>9.2720</o:Version>
</o:DocumentProperties>
<o:OfficeDocumentSettings>
<o:DoNotRelyOnCSS/>

```
</o:OfficeDocumentSettings>
</xml><![endif]--><!--[if gte mso 9]><xml>
<w:WordDocument>
  <w:View>Print</w:View>
  <w:AttachedTemplate HRef="S:\Aletter.dot"></w:AttachedTemplate>
  <w:EnvelopeVis/>
  <w:DoNotOptimizeForBrowser/>
</w:WordDocument>
</xml><![endif]-->
```

```
<style>
<!--
/* Style Definitions */
p.MsoNormal, li.MsoNormal, div.MsoNormal
  { mso-style-update:auto;
  mso-style-parent:"";
  margin:0in;
  margin-bottom:.0001pt;
  text-align:justify;
  mso-pagination:widow-orphan;
  tab-stops:3.5in;
  font-size:12.0pt;
  font-family:"Times New Roman";
  mso-fareast-font-family:"Times New Roman";
  mso-ansi-language:EN-GB;
  layout-grid-mode:line;}
p.MsoHeader, li.MsoHeader, div.MsoHeader
  { mso-style-next:Body;
  margin:0in;
  margin-bottom:.0001pt;
  text-align:justify;
  mso-pagination:widow-orphan;
  tab-stops:center 3.0in left 261.95pt 6.0in;
  font-size:12.0pt;
  font-family:"Times New Roman";
  mso-fareast-font-family:"Times New Roman";
  mso-ansi-language:EN-GB;
  layout-grid-mode:line;}
p.MsoFooter, li.MsoFooter, div.MsoFooter
  { margin:0in;
  margin-bottom:.0001pt;
  text-align:justify;
  mso-pagination:widow-orphan;
  tab-stops:center 3.0in left 3.5in right 6.0in;
  font-size:12.0pt;
  font-family:"Times New Roman";
  mso-fareast-font-family:"Times New Roman";
  mso-ansi-language:EN-GB;
  layout-grid-mode:line;}
a:link, span.MsoHyperlink
  { color:blue;
  text-decoration:underline;
  text-underline:single;}
a:visited, span.MsoHyperlinkFollowed
  { color:purple;
```

```

text-decoration:underline;
text-underline:single;}
p.Body, li.Body, div.Body
{mso-style-name:Body;
margin:0in;
margin-bottom:.0001pt;
text-align:justify;
mso-pagination:widow-orphan;
tab-stops:3.5in;
font-size:12.0pt;
font-family:"Times New Roman";
mso-fareast-font-family:"Times New Roman";
mso-ansi-language:EN-GB;
layout-grid-mode:line;}
@page Section1
{size:8.5in 11.0in;
margin:89.85pt 1.0in 1.0in 81.1pt;
mso-header-margin:.5in;
mso-footer-margin:.5in;
mso-title-page:yes;
mso-header:url("cid:header.htm@01C11036.B2C8D870") h1;
mso-first-header:url("cid:header.htm@01C11036.B2C8D870") fh1;
mso-paper-source:0;}
div.Section1
{page:Section1;}
/* List Definitions */
@list l0
{mso-list-id:789104;
mso-list-type:hybrid;
mso-list-template-ids:-466575612 67698703 67698713 67698715 67698703 67698713 67698715 67698703
67698713 67698715;}
@list l0:level1
{mso-level-start-at:2;
mso-level-tab-stop:.5in;
mso-level-number-position:left;
text-indent:-.25in;}
@list l1
{mso-list-id:1297950670;
mso-list-type:hybrid;
mso-list-template-ids:2094449144 67698703 67698713 67698715 67698703 67698713 67698715 67698703
67698713 67698715;}
@list l1:level1
{mso-level-tab-stop:.5in;
mso-level-number-position:left;
text-indent:-.25in;}
ol
{margin-bottom:0in;}
ul
{margin-bottom:0in;}
-->
</style>
<!--[if gte mso 9]><xml>
<o:shapedefaults v:ext="edit" spidmax="3074">
<o:colormenu v:ext="edit" fillcolor="none" strokecolor="none"/>

```


style='font-size:12.0pt'>Ref.: Nuclear Disarmament and Small Arms</p>

<p class=Body><![if !supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=Body><!--[if gte vml 1]><:v:line id="_x0000_s1027" style='position:absolute; left:0;text-align:left;z-index:2' from="-81pt,8.25pt" to="-36pt,8.25pt"/><![endif]><![if !vml]><![endif]>Dear friends,</p>

<p class=Body><![if !supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=Body>1. Nuclear Disarmament<o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=Body><![if !supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=MsoNormal>In April 2001, Pax Christi International issued a position paper in which the movement is calling on the International Community and the Churches to renew their commitment to nuclear disarmament. Concern on this issue must continue to be voiced through strong public opinion raised against nuclear weapons. The Call and Statement stresses the urgent need for an international nuclear disarmament convention, and other immediate actions to move closer to abolition. The Statement and the list of signatories have been issued and published late April 2001. </p>

<p class=MsoNormal><![if !supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=MsoNormal>At its meeting in April, the Executive Committee decided to continue to invite more bishops to co-sign the statement. Meanwhile, we received new names of bishops/conferences of New Zealand and Ireland. And we know that Pax Christi USA and the Netherlands (and others) are still working to get more names on the list as well. This new and second list with signatories will be published during the International Council in Mainz, Germany, 1 – 4 November 2001. Therefore, we would like to invite you to contact those bishops/conferences (members of Pax Christi or not) which have not yet signed the Statement in order to strengthen the importance of this initiative. <o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=MsoNormal><![if !supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=MsoNormal>The position paper of Pax Christi International contains two sections: a background briefing, and a statement. It is the second part, the statement, which has to be signed by Cardinals, Bishops and Presidents (members or not) of our movement. The Call and Statement is

available in English, French, German, Dutch and Portuguese (see ref.: SD.04.EFGDP.00 in attached documents).

Pax Christi International will be part of an advocacy programme on nuclear disarmament to some NATO countries later this year. This programme is in close cooperation with the World Council of Churches (WCC) and with the Conference of the European Churches (CEC). The programme will be in line with the Call and Statement of our movement.

2. **Small Arms and Light Weapons**

Our movement is represented at the United Nation's conference on illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in New York, 9 – 20 July 2001. Our delegation consist of, amongst others, Cesar Villanueva, Vice President and Member of the Executive Committee from the Philippines; Joan and Vince Comiskey, representatives at the UN; and Michael Hovey, delegate of Pax Christi International at the UN in New York as well. On 11 July, the Holy See made a statement on small arms. That text is available from the International Secretariat, ref.: SD.13.E.01.

The 2001 Annual Conference of European members of IANSA (International Action Network on Small Arms) will be organized in Brussels on 5-6 October 2001 by the Belgian Network *RAIAL/Belgique Francophone* and by *Vlaams Netwerk Lichte Wapens*. The first day will be entirely devoted to a debate between governmental and civil society representatives who will be discussing fundamental issues of European policy in relation to small arms. The second day will include a working session with European NGOs which are members of IANSA. For further information: <http://www.grip.org/serv/globconfraial.html>

style='font-size:12.0pt'> </p>

<p class=Body>With kind regards,</p>

<p class=Body><![if !supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=Body><![if !supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=Body>Paul Lansu</p>

<p class=Body><![if !supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=Body><![if !supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

</div>

</body>

</html>

</x-html>

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\image001.gif"

<x-html><html xmlns:v="urn:schemas-microsoft-com:vml" xmlns:o="urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:office" xmlns:w="urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:word" xmlns="http://www.w3.org/TR/REC-html40">

<head>

<meta http-equiv=Content-Type content="text/html; charset=windows-1252">

<meta name=ProgId content=Word.Document>

<meta name=Generator content="Microsoft Word 9">

<meta name=Originator content="Microsoft Word 9">

<link id=Main-File rel=Main-File href="cid:.htm@01C11036.B2C8D870">

<!--[if gte mso 9]><xml>

<o:shapedefaults v:ext="edit" spidmax="3074">

<o:colormenu v:ext="edit" fillcolor="none" strokecolor="none"/>

</o:shapedefaults></xml><![endif]--><!--[if gte mso 9]><xml>

<o:shapelayout v:ext="edit">

<o:idmap v:ext="edit" data="2"/>

<o:regrouptable v:ext="edit">

<o:entry new="1" old="0"/>

<o:entry new="2" old="0"/>

<o:entry new="3" old="0"/>

<o:entry new="4" old="0"/>

</o:regrouptable>

</o:shapelayout></xml><![endif]-->

</head>

<body lang=EN-US link=blue vlink=purple>

<div style='mso-element:header' id=h1>

<p class=MsoHeader style='margin-right:27.0pt;tab-stops:center 3.0in left 261.95pt right 6.25in'>

<br style='mso-special-character:line-break'>
<![if !supportLineBreakNewLine]><br style='mso-special-character:line-break'>
<![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=MsoHeader>

<br style='mso-special-character:line-break'>
<![if !supportLineBreakNewLine]><br style='mso-special-character:line-break'>
<![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

</div>

<div style='mso-element:header' id=fh1>

<p class=MsoHeader><!--[if gte vml 1]><v:shapetype id="_x0000_t75" coordsize="21600,21600" o:spt="75" o:preferrelative="t" path="m@4@51@4@11@9@11@9@5xe" filled="f" stroked="f">
<v:stroke jointstyle="miter"/>
<v:formulas>
<v:f eqn="if lineDrawn pixelLineWidth 0"/>
<v:f eqn="sum @0 1 0"/>
<v:f eqn="sum 0 0 @1"/>
<v:f eqn="prod @2 1 2"/>
<v:f eqn="prod @3 21600 pixelWidth"/>
<v:f eqn="prod @3 21600 pixelHeight"/>
<v:f eqn="sum @0 0 1"/>
<v:f eqn="prod @6 1 2"/>
<v:f eqn="prod @7 21600 pixelWidth"/>
<v:f eqn="sum @8 21600 0"/>
<v:f eqn="prod @7 21600 pixelHeight"/>
<v:f eqn="sum @10 21600 0"/>
</v:formulas>
<v:path o:extrusionok="f" gradientshapeok="t" o:connecttype="rect"/>
<o:lock v:ext="edit" aspectratio="t"/>
</v:shapetype><v:shape id="_x0000_s2069" type="#_x0000_t75" style='position:absolute; left:0;text-align:left;margin-left:297pt;margin-top:-18.15pt;width:162pt; height:47.3pt;z-index:2;mso-wrap-edited:f wrapcoords="-86 0 -86 21304 21600 21304 21600 0 -86 0" o:regroupid="4" o:allowoverlap="f">
<v:imagedata src="cid:image002.png@01C11036.B2C8D870" o:title="PCh_cmyk" gain="218453f" blacklevel="-6554f"/>

```
</v:shape><![endif]><!--[if gte vml 1]><v:shapetype id="_x0000_t202"
coordsize="21600,21600" o:spt="202" path="m0,0l0,21600,21600,21600,21600,0xe">
<v:stroke jointstyle="miter"/>
<v:path gradientshapeok="t" o:connecttype="rect"/>
</v:shapetype><v:shape id="_x0000_s2071" type="#_x0000_t202" style='position:absolute;
left:0;text-align:left;margin-left:-9pt;margin-top:34.35pt;width:468pt;
height:18pt;z-index:4' o:regroupid="4" filled="f" stroked="f">
<v:textbox style='mso-next-textbox:#_x0000_s2071'>
<![if !mso]>
<table cellpadding=0 cellspacing=0 width="100%">
<tr>
<td><![endif]>
<div>
<p class=MsoHeader style='line-height:10.0pt;mso-line-height-rule:exactly'><font
size=1 face=Arial><span style='font-size:8.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:12.0pt;
font-family:Arial;mso-ansi-language:EN-US'>Tel&nbsp;: ++32.2.502.55.50<span
style="mso-spacerun: yes"> </span><span style="mso-spacerun: yes">
</span>Fax&nbsp;: ++32.2.502.46.26<span style="mso-spacerun: yes">
</span><span style="mso-spacerun: yes"> </span>hello@paxchristi.net<span
style="mso-spacerun: yes"> </span><span style="mso-spacerun: yes">
</span>www.paxchristi.net<o:p></o:p></span></font></p>
</div>
<![if !mso]></td>
</tr>
</table>
<![endif]></v:textbox>
</v:shape><![endif]><!--[if gte vml 1]><v:line id="_x0000_s2070" style='position:absolute;
left:0;text-align:left;z-index:3' from="-9pt,35.5pt" to="477pt,35.5pt"
o:regroupid="4" strokeweight="1.5pt"/><![endif]><!--[if gte vml 1]><v:shape
id="_x0000_s2068" type="#_x0000_t202" style='position:absolute;left:0;
text-align:left;margin-left:-9pt;margin-top:17.85pt;width:273.6pt;height:18pt;
z-index:1' o:regroupid="4" filled="f" stroked="f">
<v:textbox style='mso-next-textbox:#_x0000_s2068'>
<![if !mso]>
<table cellpadding=0 cellspacing=0 width="100%">
<tr>
<td><![endif]>
<div>
<p class=MsoHeader style='line-height:10.0pt;mso-line-height-rule:exactly'><font
size=1 face=Arial><span lang=FR style='font-size:8.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:
12.0pt;font-family:Arial;mso-ansi-language:FR'>Vieux Marché aux Grains 21 /
1000 Bruxelles / Belgium<o:p></o:p></span></font></p>
</div>
<![if !mso]></td>
</tr>
</table>
<![endif]></v:textbox>
</v:shape><![endif]></span></font></p>

</div>

</body>

</html>
```

</x-html>

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\image002.png"

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

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\SD04E00.doc"

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\SD04F00.doc"

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\SD04G00.doc"

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\SD04N00.doc"

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\SD04P00.doc"

Date: Mon, 16 Jul 2001 10:12:48 -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

FCNLblock
Friends Committee on National Legislation

Nuclear Calendar

July 16	11 a.m., House Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, hearing on the Defense Department's FY 2002 budget with Defense Secretary Rumsfeld and Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman Gen. Henry Shelton, 2359 Rayburn
July 16	2 p.m., Senate floor debate begins on the energy and water appropriations bill, H.R. 2311/S. 1171 (general debate only)
July 16	Defense Department notifies Congress that it plans to begin preparatory work in mid-August on a new missile defense test site at Fort Greely, AK (New York Times, July 12, 2001)
July 16	Rally and protest on the anniversary of the Trinity atomic bomb explosion. Peace Action New Mexico, Santa Fe, NM. Contact LANLaction@aol.com, (505) 989-4812.
July 17	9:30 a.m., Senate Armed Services Committee, hearing continues (from July 12) on ballistic missile defense with Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz and Ballistic Missile Defense Organization director Lt. Gen. Ronald Kadish, 216 Hart
July 17	House floor action on the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill
July 17	Senate floor action continues on the energy and water appropriations bill, H.R. 2311/S. 1171
July 17 or 18	Senate floor action on the conference report on the supplemental appropriations bill for FY 2001, H.R. 2216 (estimate)
July 18	TBD, Senate Budget Committee, hearing of the Defense Department's FY 2002 budget with Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz
July 18	House floor action on the conference report on the supplemental appropriations bill for FY 2001, H.R. 2216
July 18	5:30-7:30 p.m., "Missile Defense, De-Alerting and Nuclear Dangers," panel discussion and reception sponsored by Women in International Security and the Back from the Brink Campaign, at the Carnegie Endowment, 1779 Massachusetts Ave., N.W. RSVP to Virginia Johnson, (202) 545-1001.
July 18	G-8 foreign ministers meeting, Genoa, Italy
July 18 or 19	House floor action on disapproving normal trade relations with China,

	H.J.Res. 50
July 18-24	President Bush visits the United Kingdom, Italy (G-8 summit July 20-22) and the Vatican
July 19	9:30 a.m., House Armed Services Committee, hearing on national missile defense with Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz and Ballistic Missile Defense Organization director Lt. Gen. Ronald Kadish, 2118 Rayburn
July 19	2 p.m., Senate Appropriations Committee, markup of the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill, S-128 Capitol
July 19	House floor action on the foreign appropriations bill
July 20-22	G-8 summit, Genoa, Italy
July 22- Aug. 1	Secretary of State Powell visits Japan (July 23), Vietnam (July 24), South Korea (July 27), China (July 28) and Australia (July 30)

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."

Call and Statement on Nuclear Disarmament List of Signatories July 2001

+ Msgr. Michel Sabbah
Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem
President of Pax Christi International

+ Franz Cardinal König
Former Archbishop of Vienna
Former International Pax Christi President

+ Godfried Cardinal Danneels
Archbishop of Malines – Brussels
Former International Pax Christi President

+ Msgr. Luigi Bettazzi
Former Bishop of Ivrea
Former International Pax Christi President

+ Msgr. H. Ernst
Former Bishop of Breda
Former Vice President of Pax Christi International

+ Msgr. Laurent Monsengwo
Archbishop of Kisangani
Member of the Executive Committee of Pax Christi International
President of the Symposium of the Episcopal Conferences of Africa and Madagascar (SECAM)

+ Msgr. Vaclav Maly
Auxiliary Bishop of Prague
Member of the Executive Committee of Pax Christi International

+ Bishop Walter Sullivan
Bishop of Richmond
President Pax Christi USA

+ Msgr. Henri Derouet
Former Bishop of Sées and of d'Arras
President Pax Christi France

+ Msgr. Dr Hermann Josef Spital
Former Bishop of Trier
President Pax Christi Germany

+ Msgr. Ad van Luyn SDB
Bishop of Rotterdam
President of Pax Christi Netherlands

+ Msgr. Diego Bona
Bishop of Saluzzo
President Pax Christi Italia

+ Msgr. Victor Guazzelli
National President of Pax Christi UK

+ Msgr. Heinrich Fasching
Auxiliary Bishop of St Pölten
President of Pax Christi Austria

+ D. Manuel Martins,
Former Bishop of Setúbal, Portugal
Former Bishop President Pax Christi Portugal

+ D. Januário Torgal Ferreira,
Auxiliary Bishop of Lisbon
President of Pax Christi Portugal

+ Msgr. Amédée Grab OSB
President of the Swiss Bishops' Conference
Cardinal Henri Schwery, évêque émérite de Sion
Pax Christi Switzerland

+ Msgr. Raymond Field
Bishop of Dublin
President Pax Christi Ireland

+ Msgr. Czeslaw Kozon

Bishop of Copenhagen
Pax Christi Denmark

+ Msgr. Roger Vangheluwe
Bishop of Brugge
Pax Christi Flanders

+ Msgr. Paul Lanneau
Auxiliary Bishop of Brussels
Pax Christi Wallonie - Bruxelles

+ Msgr. Fernand Franck
Archbishop of Luxembourg
Pax Christi Luxembourg

Professor Joseph A. Camilleri
School of Sociology, Politics & Anthropology La Trobe University of Melbourne
President Pax Christi Australia

Dr. Michel Van Zeebroeck
President Pax Christi Wallonie-Bruxelles

Dr Karel Vanspringel
President Pax Christi Flanders

Justice and Peace Commission of Thailand, Affiliated with Pax Christi International
Bishop Michael Bunluen Mansap, is a chairperson of the commission

United Kingdom

Archbishop Patrick Kelly / Liverpool
Bishop Rawsthorne / Hallam
Bishop Griffiths OSB / Hexham and Newcastle
Bishop Alexander / Clifton
Bishop Pargeter / Auxiliary of Birmingham
Bishop O'Donaghue / West London
Bishop McMahan, Brentwood
Bishop Brain, Salford
Bishop Malone, Auxiliary, Liverpool
Bishop Noble Shrewsbury
Bishop Crowley, Middlesborough

Bishop Mc Mahon OP, Nottingham
Bishop Smith, East Anglia
Bishop Henderson, Area Bishop, Southwark

Japan

Mons. Nomura of Nagoya
Mons. Shimamoto Archbishop of Nagasaki
Mons. Michel Matsunaga of Osaka
Mons. Tani of Urawa
Archbishop Peter Okada of Tokyo
Mons. Paul Yoshinao Otsuka of Kyoto
Mons. Leo Jun Ikenaga Of Osaka

New Zealand

Cardinal Thomas Williams	Archbishop of Wellington
Bishop Peter Cullinane	Bishop of Palmerston North
	President of Conference
Bishop Patrick Dunn	Bishop of Auckland
Bishop Denis Browne	Bishop of Hamilton
Bishop John Cunneen	Bishop of Christchurch
Bishop Leonard Boyle	Bishop of Dunedin
Bishop Owen Dolan	Coadjutor Bishop of Palmerston North
Bishop Max Takuiria Mariu	Auxiliary Bishop of Hamilton
Bishop Robin Leamy	Emeritus Bishop of Rarotonga
Bishop John Dew	Auxiliary Bishop of Wellington
	Secretary of Conference

Ireland

Bishop Raymond Field	Auxiliary Bishop of Dublin
<i>(President of Pax Christi Ireland, Head, Irish commission for Justice & Peace)</i>	
Bishop Donal McKeown	Auxiliary Bishop of Belfast
Bishop John Kirby	Bishop of Clonfert
Bishop Brendan Commiskey	Bishop of Ferns
Bishop Larry Ryan	Bishop of Kildare & Leighlin
Bishop William Walsh	Bishop of Killaloe
Archbishop Sean Brady	Archbishop of Armagh
Bishop Joseph Duffy	Bishop of Clogher
Christopher Dillon, OSB	Mitred Abbot, Glenstal Abbey

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

Date: Thu, 19 Jul 2001 07:18:12 -0400

Subject: Brueggemann Email

From: Edward Brueggemann <edbruegge@mediaone.net>

To: "R. C. Ahrendt" <rcahrendt@a1access.net>,

Robert Ahrendt <rcahrendt@crossville.com>, Alice Guay <alsvea@aol.com>,
Susan Almy <susan.almy@valley.net>, Howard Anderson <howardfran@yahoo.com>,
Carolyn Andrews <ndrws@mediaone.net>, Richard Armstrong <armo1954@aol.com>,
Bradenton <bacvb@hotmail.com>, Martha Bauman <jma@cheshire.net>,
Sue Belanger <sbelanger@hhhinfo.org>, Cliff Below <cbelow@tpk.net>,
Caregivers Donna Odde <ivcp@tds.net>,
Bob/Kathleen Carr <recarr8372@aol.com>,
Elisha/ Paul Churchill <paulnlsh@aol.com>, Marian Clark <Mclark@ttlc.net>,
Burt Cohen <burtc@nh.ultranet.com>, Vi Constant <vconstant4@aol.com>,
Cremation Michele <michele@csnh.com>,
Richard Ellerbrake <richardE@charter.net>,
Mark Fernald <fernalds@monad.net>, Marilyn Fischer <mlfisc@htc.net>,
Bill Foley <BillFTA@aol.com>, Bob Forsing <forsing@mediaone.net>,
Thom Gleiber <tgleiber@mobium.com>, Matt Gooby <mlgooby@worldpath.net>,
Frank Gross <fhgross@aol.com>, Debby Guarino <Guari@mediaone.net>,
Cait Guarino <nikegirl@mediaone.net>,
Tony/Rita Guarino <ritatony@mediaone.net>,
Tyler Guarino <birdhouse19@mediaone.net>, Alice Guay <alsvea@aol.com>,
Liz Hager <lizh@unitedwymc.org>, Edgar Hallman <halledee@aol.com>,
Brian Hallman <bhallman@slb.com>, Gordon Hallman <JoanHallman@hotmail.com>,
Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.org>, Jeanette Hallman <vhall110@southwind.net>,
Don Harvey <dharvey603@aol.com>,
"Heart Assoc. Rob Werner" <rwerner@heart.org>,
Elaine Hoyt <elainemhoyt@aol.com>, Irene Irving <imipj@totalnetnh.net>,
Bertie Jennings <bertiej12@aol.com>, Jim Brueggemann <jbbruegg@aol.com>,
John Brueggemann <jbruegge@skidmore.edu>,
Mary Brueggemann <mmbruegg@aol.com>,
Ellen and Brian Burns <eaa.burns@aol.com>,
Pastor Dave Keller <pastor@concordsfirstchurch.org>,
Don Davidson <ddavidson@aarp.org>, Betty Klaus <mbettysanta@hotmail.com>,
Don Knutson <dknutsonr@aol.com>, Nancy Kyle <nckyle@mediaone.net>,
Ray Lacasse <rlac@mediaone.net>,
Sylvia Larsen <sylvia.larsen@leg.state.nh.us>,
Lisa and David Briggs <lisahbriggs@msn.com>,
Bob and Helen Livingston <helenbob@livingco.com>,
Mendon MacDonald <mmacd@alumni.unh.edu>,
Carol Matthias <carol_matthias@hotmail.com>,
Terri McQueen <maxandlil@yahoo.com>, Lynette Mehall <lmehall@attglobal.net>,
Bill Metevier <wmetevier@bownet.org>,
"Michel C. Cerene Smith Realtors" <rentals@smithrealtors.com>,
Barb Nason <bnason@pocketmail.com>, Ethel Nilsen <eaviking@aol.com>,
Norma Ordway <nordway@mymailstation.com>, Doris Nuttelman <pilnl@tds.net>,
"Dorthea O'Neil" <doviking@webtv.net>,
Mike Palmieri <mpalmieri@hhhinfo.org>, Carol Pepper <cpepper@towerhill.org>,
Jim Pilliod <jimp@together.net>, Richard/Jean Rathmell <rathmell@cfw.com>,
Jim Reinhardt <kjbstudio@aol.com>, Helen Reio <hreio@hotmail.com>,
Sue Rineer <serrs@aol.com>, Barbara Salvatore <bsalv@hotmail.com>,
David Sanborn <bdq@mediaone.net>, Jan Sanborn <jpsanborn@mediaone.net>,

Ed Simon <eddotsimon@juno.com>, Everett Sims <esims@tds.net>,
Bob and Dottie Soule <bndsoule@mediaone.net>,
Carol Stamatakis <CStamatakis@dhhs.state.nh.us>,
Dan Tolley <mystoe@aol.com>, David MacArthur Treasurer <dmacart@aol.com>,
Arthur Trevorrow <arttrev@aol.com>, Sara Vettraino <mvettraino@aol.com>,
Alice/Cleon West <cwest@htc.net>, Joe Willette <josephwillette@gateway.net>

We continue to have problems with our Internet connection. We can and send and receive Email most of the time but periodically service is interrupted. We have decided to stay with our current server (ATT Broadband) while we shop for another. This may be many months so continue to use this address until further notice.

LuAnn and Ed Brueggemann

From: David Culp <david@fcnl.org>
To: 'Interested Persons' <No.One@fcnl.org>
Subject: Good news from Congress on nuclear testing
Date: Thu, 19 Jul 2001 08:45:45 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

To: Interested Persons

1. Nevada Test Site Readiness Request Denied.

Currently it would take the Energy Department two to three years of preparations to conduct a nuclear test at the Nevada Test Site. The Bush administration had proposed that the readiness period be shortened to six months. However, the Appropriations Committees have rejected the request.

The Republican-controlled House Appropriations Committee barred any funds "to increase the readiness for underground nuclear testing" in its energy and water appropriations bill. The strong language from the subcommittee chairman, Rep. Sonny Callahan (AL), is at the bottom of this message. The Senate Appropriations Committee also rejected the administration's request in its version of the bill.

2. Full Funding for Nuclear Testing Monitoring Organization.

The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Organization (CTBTO) was created as an international body to monitor compliance with the nuclear testing moratorium. The Bush administration budget request for fiscal year 2002 includes the U.S. dues payment to the CTBTO of \$20 million, similar to previous requests. Some Senators have been urging that the U.S. terminate its payments to the organization. In a March 12 letter to the State Department, Sen. Jesse Helms stated: "I believe that it is time ... to terminate funding to CTBT organizations."

However, Republicans on the House Appropriations Committee this week provided full funding for the CTBTO in the foreign operations appropriations bill. Credit goes to Rep. Jim Kolbe (AZ), the foreign operations appropriations subcommittee chairman.

Sen. Patrick Leahy (VT), a strong supporter of arms control, chairs the Senate Appropriations subcommittee that handles the foreign operations bill. Thus CTBTO funding is secure for fiscal year 2002.

However, the Bush administration is currently reviewing whether the U.S. should continue payments to the CTBTO and may decide not to request further funds for the organization in the fiscal year 2003 budget, which will be submitted in February 2003.

Thanks to those of you of that contributed to these victories. We can expect both issues to be back next year.

David Culp, Legislative Representative
Friends Committee on National Legislation (Quakers)
245 Second Street, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20002-5795
Tel: (202) 547-6000, ext. 146
Fax: (202) 546-6019
E-mail: david@fcnl.org
Website: www.fcnl.org

Report on the House Energy and Water Appropriations Bill, FY 2002
House Report 107-112, pp. 125-126.

Underground Nuclear Testing.--The Department of Energy was slow to provide detailed justification for its supplemental appropriations funding request for fiscal year 2001 to the Committee. The information it provided to the Committee was informal and on an ad-hoc rather than a formal basis. After the Committee had made its funding recommendations for the bill, DOE submitted formal justification material to justify its request. The formal material mentions funding to increase the state of readiness of underground nuclear testing.

If the Nation were to decide to invest funds to restore underground nuclear testing to a higher level than presently, this could only be done: (1) once the Secretary of Defense concluded his strategic review; (2) once the President made a recommendation to the Congress; (3) once it was approved by the Armed Services Committees of the House and the Senate; and (4) only if it were subsequently approved by Congress. None of these activities has occurred. It is not the Committee's intent to provide funding in this Act, the supplemental appropriations Act for fiscal year 2001, or any prior Act for activities to increase the readiness for underground nuclear testing. None of the funds in such Acts may be used for that purpose.

To: mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Good news from Congress on nuclear testing
Cc:
Bcc: icnd
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

At the risk of some duplication, I want to share a report from David Culp on nuclear testing matters.

Howard

###

>From: David Culp <david@fcnl.org>
>To: 'Interested Persons' <No.One@fcnl.org>
>Subject: Good news from Congress on nuclear testing
>Date: Thu, 19 Jul 2001 08:45:45 -0400
>X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

>
>To: Interested Persons
>
>
>1. Nevada Test Site Readiness Request Denied.

>
>Currently it would take the Energy Department two to three years of
>preparations to conduct a nuclear test at the Nevada Test Site. The Bush
>administration had proposed that the readiness period be shortened to six
>months. However, the Appropriations Committees have rejected the request.

>
>The Republican-controlled House Appropriations Committee barred any funds
>"to increase the readiness for underground nuclear testing" in its energy
>and water appropriations bill. The strong language from the subcommittee
>chairman, Rep. Sonny Callahan (AL), is at the bottom of this message. The
>Senate Appropriations Committee also rejected the administration's request
>in its version of the bill.

>
>
>2. Full Funding for Nuclear Testing Monitoring Organization.

>
>The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Organization (CTBTO) was created as an
>international body to monitor compliance with the nuclear testing
>moratorium. The Bush administration budget request for fiscal year 2002
>includes the U.S. dues payment to the CTBTO of \$20 million, similar to
>previous requests. Some Senators have been urging that the U.S. terminate
>its payments to the organization. In a March 12 letter to the State
>Department, Sen. Jesse Helms stated: "I believe that it is time ... to
>terminate funding to CTBT organizations."

>
>However, Republicans on the House Appropriations Committee this week

>provided full funding for the CTBTO in the foreign operations appropriations
>bill. Credit goes to Rep. Jim Kolbe (AZ), the foreign operations
>appropriations subcommittee chairman.

>
>Sen. Patrick Leahy (VT), a strong supporter of arms control, chairs the
>Senate Appropriations subcommittee that handles the foreign operations bill.
>Thus CTBTO funding is secure for fiscal year 2002.

>
>However, the Bush administration is currently reviewing whether the U.S.
>should continue payments to the CTBTO and may decide not to request further
>funds for the organization in the fiscal year 2003 budget, which will be
>submitted in February 2003.

>
>
>Thanks to those of you of that contributed to these victories. We can expect
>both issues to be back next year.

>
>
>David Culp, Legislative Representative
>Friends Committee on National Legislation (Quakers)
>245 Second Street, N.E.
>Washington, D.C. 20002-5795
>Tel: (202) 547-6000, ext. 146
>Fax: (202) 546-6019
>E-mail: david@fcnl.org
>Website: www.fcnl.org

>
>-----

>
>Report on the House Energy and Water Appropriations Bill, FY 2002
>House Report 107-112, pp. 125-126.

>
>
>Underground Nuclear Testing.--The Department of Energy was slow to provide
>detailed justification for its supplemental appropriations funding request
>for fiscal year 2001 to the Committee. The information it provided to the
>Committee was informal and on an ad-hoc rather than a formal basis. After
>the Committee had made its funding recommendations for the bill, DOE
>submitted formal justification material to justify its request. The formal
>material mentions funding to increase the state of readiness of underground
>nuclear testing.

>
>If the Nation were to decide to invest funds to restore underground nuclear
>testing to a higher level than presently, this could only be done: (1) once
>the Secretary of Defense concluded his strategic review; (2) once the
>President made a recommendation to the Congress; (3) once it was approved by
>the Armed Services Committees of the House and the Senate; and (4) only if
>it were subsequently approved by Congress. None of these activities has
>occurred. It is not the Committee's intent to provide funding in this Act,
>the supplemental appropriations Act for fiscal year 2001, or any prior Act
>for activities to increase the readiness for underground nuclear testing.
>None of the funds in such Acts may be used for that purpose.

>

X-Sender: jdi@[63.106.26.66]
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)
Date: Thu, 19 Jul 2001 16:45:50 -0400
To: "John Isaacs" <jdi@clw.org>
From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>
Subject: Today's Senate Armed Services Committee hearing: The ABM Treaty: Love it or Leave it?

Today's Senate Armed Services Committee hearing:
The ABM Treaty: Love it or Leave it?

That was the question repeatedly debated as the Senate Armed Services Committee held its third hearing in two weeks today on the Bush Administration's missile defense plans. Last week, Deputy Secretary Paul Wolfowitz stated the Administration's intent to "bump up against" the treaty within months in its efforts to speed up deployment of a missile defense system.

That plan came under close scrutiny today as the committee heard from Richard Perle, Samuel R. Berger, and Philip Coyle. Perle said the treaty is obsolete and the United States should withdraw from it regardless of its impact on missile defense. Without missile defense, Perle said, the United States is "naked before its enemies."

Former Clinton National Security adviser Berger disagreed, saying the Administration should try to negotiate changes to the treaty that would allow the United States to proceed with missile defense. "I welcome Secretary Powell's statement last week that we intend to make a serious effort with the Russians to modify the current ABM Treaty and seek a new strategic framework as the President has discussed. But the gameplan outlined by the Pentagon last week proceeds on a timetable that makes any such negotiation virtually impossible to succeed," he said.

Coyle, former director of operational testing and evaluation for the Pentagon, said current NMD activities need not violate the ABM Treaty anytime soon. "Rather than focusing on the 'red herring' of the ABM Treaty, the NMD program would do better to concentrate on crafting longterm, affordable approaches to technology development."

Even strong supporters of missile defense on the committee appeared wary of unilateral action to break the treaty. Ranking Republican John Warner said he thought the Administration should try to negotiate treaty changes with Russia before proceeding with activities that might break the treaty. "It's important to get an authorization bill" through Congress that does not get "sidetracked" by the issue of abrogating the treaty," Warner said.

Sen. Bill Nelson, Democrat of Florida, said the United States should proceed with vigorous testing on missile defense, but should not unilaterally break the treaty if it is not hampering development.

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: Thu, 19 Jul 2001 17:28:02 -0400
From: Ken Sehested <ken@bpfna.org>
Reply-To: ken@bpfna.org
Organization: Baptist Peace Fellowship
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.73 (Macintosh; I; PPC)
X-Accept-Language: en
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Sign-on letter on funding for national missile defense

Howard,

Sorry I've been so hard to reach. I've been traveling almost continuously since early June; am in the Charlotte office only two days this week, and then leave again Saturday for two more week-long trips.

Yes, please add my name to the letter below re. missile defense.

Rev. Ken Sehested, executive director, Baptist Peace Fellowship of North America

"Howard W. Hallman" wrote:

> 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.

>

> 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, 19 Jul 2001 18:50:31 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: draft sign-on letter on NMD -- REPLY REQ. by 7/24

July 19, 2001

FROM: Victoria Samson & Daryl Kimball, Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers

REPLY NO LATER THAN 5 P.M., TUESDAY, JULY 24 to Victoria Samson at 202.546.0795 x 102 or vsamson@clw.org.

The following is a sign-on letter to members of Congress from interested organizations designed to respond to the Bush Administration's NMD proposal and to encourage explicit Congressional disapproval of activities that would violate the ABM Treaty. While this is designed to be a Coalition sign-on letter (on Coalition letterhead), other groups are also invited to sign.

Given that action on the issue in Congress is imminent, please reply promptly.

Thank you.

*****DRAFT * DRAFT * DRAFT *****

July XX, 2001

Dear Member of Congress:

We believe that the Bush Administration's rush to accelerate national missile defense development to deploy as early as 2004 to be harmful to U.S. national security. Besides fielding an unreliable, inadequately-tested system, this step would unnecessarily violate the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty and is likely set off an arms race with Russia and China. We urge you to withhold funding for any missile defense program activities that would violate the ABM Treaty in fiscal 2002.

The Pentagon budget request for \$8.3 billion in fiscal year 2002 is designed to produce a multi-layered national missile defense that would include land-based interceptors in Alaska, sea-based interceptors on modified Aegis cruisers, air-based lasers on modified 747s, and space-based lasers. It would establish an accelerated research, development and testing program that would sidestep normal procurement and testing practices meant to ensure that systems will work in actual operating environments.

Far from bolstering U.S. national security, a missile defense plan would instead undermine the safety of American citizens. The 2004 milestone is a political deadline that would mean the deployment of an unreliable and ineffective system. The proposal for construction of five surrogate interceptors and silos at a so-called "test bed" at Fort Greely would not

provide technical information that is useful for the NMD program. Likewise, using test assets at Fort Greely and an upgraded radar at Shemya Island for an "emergency deployment" would provide very little if any protection against an unlikely long-range missile attack.

Instead of depending on a risky missile defense scheme that focuses on low-probability missile threats, we encourage a more realistic assessment of the threat posed by weapons of mass destruction and a more comprehensive strategy to deal with higher priority nuclear and missile dangers. We therefore urge additional diplomatic efforts to reduce U.S. and Russian nuclear arsenals, eliminate dangerous, Cold War-era hair-trigger alert levels, end nuclear testing, and freeze North Korea's ballistic missile program.

Sincerely,

Daryl Kimball

UNTIL JULY 27:
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>>

BEGINNING SEPTEMBER 4:
Executive Director
Arms Control Association
1726 M Street, NW, Suite 201
Washington, DC 20036
(ph) 202-463-8270 (fax) 202-463-8273
website <<http://www.armscontrol.org>>
email <dkimball@armscontrol.org>

To: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: draft sign-on letter on NMD -- REPLY REQ. by 7/24
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <5.0.1.4.0.20010719183913.00abe590@[63.106.26.66]>
References:

At 06:50 PM 7/19/01 -0400, you wrote:

>July 19, 2001

>

>FROM: Victoria Samson & Daryl Kimball, Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers

>

>REPLY NO LATER THAN 5 P.M., TUESDAY, JULY 24 to Victoria Samson at
>202.546.0795 x 102 or vsamson@clw.org.

>

>The following is a sign-on letter to members of Congress from interested
>organizations designed to respond to the Bush Administration's NMD proposal
>and to encourage explicit Congressional disapproval of activities that
>would violate the ABM Treaty. While this is designed to be a Coalition
>sign-on letter (on Coalition letterhead), other groups are also invited to
>sign.

I'll sign.

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

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

Dear Colleagues:

The Senate Armed Services Committee will mark up the defense authorization bill the week of July 30. Regarding national missile defense, Senator Levin, committee chair, will probably seek a provision that prohibits the use of funds for any activity that violates the ABM Treaty. On this issue at a hearing yesterday, Ranking Republican John Warner of Virginia said he thought the Administration should try to negotiate treaty changes with Russia before proceeding with activities that might break the treaty. "It's important to get an authorization bill" through Congress that does not get "sidetracked" by the issue of abrogating the treaty," Warner said.

It would be very helpful for Senator Warner to hear from key constituents in Virginia on this issue during the week of July 23. This might include Catholic, Episcopal, and United Methodist bishops and other religious leaders. Could you facilitate this for your denomination?

Have them call or write Senator Warner and ask him to support a provision in the defense authorization bill that prohibits funding any activity that violates the ABM Treaty. Senator Warner can be reached at 202 224-2023, or at 225 Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Thanks for your efforts,
Howard

To: thart@dfms.org, jmskipper@aol.com, jhorman@umc-gbcs.org, cgordon@ctr.pcusa.org,
76622.637@compuserve.com

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

Subject: Virginia contacts

Cc:

Bcc:

X-Attachments:

In-Reply-To:

References:

Dear Colleagues:

The Senate Armed Services Committee will mark up the defense authorization bill the week of July 30. Regarding national missile defense, Senator Levin, committee chair, will probably seek a provision that prohibits the use of funds for any activity that violates the ABM Treaty. On this issue at a hearing yesterday, Ranking Republican John Warner of Virginia said he thought the Administration should try to negotiate treaty changes with Russia before proceeding with activities that might break the treaty. "It's important to get an authorization bill" through Congress that does not get "sidetracked" by the issue of abrogating the treaty," Warner said.

It would be very helpful for Senator Warner to hear from key constituents in Virginia on this issue during the week of July 23. This might include Catholic, Episcopal, and United Methodist bishops and other religious leaders. Could you facilitate this for your denomination?

Have them call or write Senator Warner and ask him to support a provision in the defense authorization bill that prohibits funding any activity that violates the ABM Treaty. Senator Warner can be reached at 202 224-2023, or at 225 Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Thanks for your efforts,
Howard

Subject: apologies!
To: mupj@igc.org
X-Mailer: Lotus Notes Release 5.0.5 September 22, 2000
From: LBlomstrom@wajones.org
Date: Fri, 20 Jul 2001 15:01:03 -0400
X-MIMETrack: Serialize by Router on smtp/srv/wajones(Build V508_04192001 |April 19, 2001) at 07/20/2001 03:00:47 PM

Dear Mr. Hallman,

Below is a corrected version of my emailed grant application invitation from a few minutes ago; the first attempt mistakenly had an inquiry from someone else pasted in it!

Laurie Blomstrom

Laurie
Blomstrom To: mupj@igc.org
 cc: (bcc: Laurie Blomstrom/staff/wajones)
07/20/2001 Subject: W. Alton Jones Fdn. grant
02:57 PM information

Dear Mr. Hallman,

Katherine Magraw asked me to contact you, as you are planning to apply for funding from the W. Alton Jones Foundation in support of your Interfaith Committee for nuclear Disarmament, and we would like to include your proposal in the docket for our October 26, 2001 board meeting.

The deadline for submission of completed proposals, in order to be considered at our October board meeting, is Monday, August 13.

We accept proposals of any length, although the preferred length is no more than approximately 20 pages. Please include:

- an itemized project budget
- information on funds for the organization/project that have already been received/promised by other funders
- other requests pending with other funders for the project
- an itemized one-year budget for the organization as a whole
- brief bios or CVs of project personnel

Please let me know if you have questions at any time as you are completing your proposal.

Thank you.

Laurie Blomstrom
Secure World Program Assistant
W. Alton Jones Foundation
232 East High Street
Charlottesville, Virginia 22902
(804) 244-5229

X-Sender: jdi@[63.106.26.66]
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)
Date: Fri, 20 Jul 2001 15:15:52 -0400
To: jdi@clw.org
From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>
Subject: Tuesday missile defense hearing

Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Joseph R. Biden, Jr. will preside over an unusual set of full-day hearings on the subject of national missile defense and the ABM Treaty next Tuesday, July 24. It also will serve as the kick-off for a series of hearings on the Real Threats and Real Perils to U.S. national security that Senator Biden will conduct during the next several weeks and months.

United States Senate
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

HEARING: THE ADMINISTRATION'S MISSILE DEFENSE

PROGRAM AND THE ABM TREATY

DATE: TUESDAY, JULY 24, 2001

TIME: 10:00 a.m. - Panels 1 and 2
2:30 p.m. - Panel 3

PLACE: SD-419

WITNESSES: PANEL 1: THE ADMINISTRATION'S MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAM

The Honorable Douglas Feith
Under Secretary of Defense for Policy
Department of Defense

The Honorable John Bolton
Under Secretary of State for Arms Control
and International Security
Department of State

PANEL 2: LEGAL AND TECHNICAL ISSUES ASSOCIATED WITH MISSILE DEFENSE

The Honorable John B. Rhinelander
Senior Counsel
Shaw Pittman

Dr. John M. Cornwall
Professor of Physics,
University of California Los Angeles and
Professor of Science and Policy Analysis,
RAND Corporation Graduate School

The Honorable Bill Schneider
Chairman, Defense Science Board
Adjunct Fellow, Hudson Institute

Dr. Robert Turner
Associate Director, Center for National Security Law
University of Virginia School of Law

PANEL 3: MEANS OF ADDRESSING
BALLISTIC MISSILE AND WEAPONS PROLIFERATION THREATS

The Honorable William J. Perry
Berberian Professor and Senior Fellow
Institute for International Studies
Stanford University

The Honorable Lloyd N. Cutler
Senior Counsel
Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering

The Honorable Jim Woolsey
Partner, Shea & Gardner

The Honorable Dave Smith
President, Global Horizons Inc.

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

Date: Mon, 23 Jul 2001 09:14:36 -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

FCNLblock
Friends Committee on National Legislation

Nuclear Calendar

July 22- Aug. 1	Secretary of State Powell visits Japan (July 23), Vietnam (July 24), South Korea (July 27), China (July 28) and Australia (July 30)
July 23	2 pm, Senate Governmental Affairs Subcommittee on International Security, Proliferation, and Federal Services, hearing on FEMA's role in managing a bioterrorist attack and the impact of public health concerns on bioterrorism preparedness, 342 Dirksen
July 23	2:30 pm, House Government Reform Subcommittee on National Security, Veterans Affairs and International Relations, hearing on Federal and state responses to a biological weapons attack, 2154 Rayburn
July 23- Aug. 17	Biological Weapons Convention Protocol Session, Geneva
July 24	10 am, Senate Foreign Relations Committee, hearing on the missile defense program and the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty focusing on the legal and technical issues associated with missile defense, 419 Dirksen
July 24	2:30 pm, Senate Foreign Relations Committee, hearing on the missile defense program and the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty focusing on the means of addressing ballistic missile and weapons proliferation threats, 419 Dirksen
July 24	House floor action continues (from July 19) on the foreign appropriations bill, H.R. 2506
July 25	9 am, Senate Armed Services Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, hearing on examining the global power projection, 124 Dirksen
July 26	10 am, House International Relations Subcommittee on East Asia and the Pacific, hearing on U.S.-North Korea relations after the policy review with Charles Pritchard, U.S. special envoy for Korean peace talks, 2200 Rayburn
July 26	3 pm, Senate Appropriations Committee, markup of the foreign operations appropriations bill, S-128 Capitol
July 30	1:30 pm, House Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, hearing on ballistic missile defense with Ballistic Missile Defense Organization director Lt. Gen. Ronald Kadish, H-140 Capitol (closed)
July 30	Conference on Disarmament, Part III begins, Geneva
July 30-31	Secretary of State Powell and Defense Secretary Rumsfeld visit Australia

X-eGroups-Return: sentto-1300601-467-995937449-mupj=igc.org@returns.onelist.com
X-Sender: MingoMae@aol.com
X-Apparently-To: bumc@yahoogroups.com
To: bumc@yahoogroups.com, schoir@yahoogroups.com
X-Mailer: AOL 6.0 for Windows US sub 10527
From: mingomae@aol.com
Mailing-List: list bumc@yahoogroups.com; contact bumc-owner@yahoogroups.com
Delivered-To: mailing list bumc@yahoogroups.com
List-Unsubscribe: <mailto:bumc-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com>
Date: Mon, 23 Jul 2001 21:17:19 EDT
Subject: [bumc] Fwd: Stem cell research

To unsubscribe from this list, send a message with "unsubscribe" in the message body to mingomae@aol.com

Your use of Yahoo! Groups is subject to <http://docs.yahoo.com/info/terms/>

Return-path: <MingoMae@aol.com>
From: MingoMae@aol.com
Full-name: MingoMae
Message-ID: <98.18029bef.288e10d4@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 23 Jul 2001 19:44:20 EDT
Subject: Fwd: Stem cell research
To: bumc@yahoogroups.com; schoir@yahoogroups.com
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="part2_37.184a925e.288e10d4_boundary"
X-Mailer: AOL 6.0 for Windows US sub 10527

Return-Path: <CrevelingB@extra.niddk.nih.gov>
Received: from rly-zc01.mx.aol.com (rly-zc01.mail.aol.com [172.31.33.1]) by air-zc01.mail.aol.com (v79.27) with ESMTP id MAILINZC11-0723165858; Mon, 23 Jul 2001 16:58:58 -0400
Received: from ims.hub.nih.gov (ims.hub.nih.gov [128.231.90.111]) by rly-zc01.mx.aol.com (v79.20) with ESMTP id MAILRELAYINZC15-0723165840; Mon, 23 Jul 2001 16:58:40 -0400
Received: by ims.hub.nih.gov with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
id <PP0SZ0DQ>; Mon, 23 Jul 2001 16:57:52 -0400
Message-ID: <7D6AD87E1023D311956B00A0C9EA46AB017B438E@niddkextra2.niddk.nih.gov>
From: "Creveling, Bob (NIDDK)" <CrevelingB@extra.niddk.nih.gov>
To: "MingoMae (E-mail)" <MingoMae@aol.com>
Subject: Stem cell research
Date: Mon, 23 Jul 2001 16:53:55 -0400
Importance: high
X-Priority: 1
Return-Receipt-To: "Creveling, Bob (NIDDK)"
<CrevelingB@extra.niddk.nih.gov>
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Sandy,
Please send this to everybody;

I have just heard on the TV that the Roman Catholic Church, the Southern Baptists and THE UNITED METHODIST CHURCH are opposed to using stem cells obtained from human fertilized ova for research. This is a terrible position. It has nothing to do with the question of abortion--(which is a legal procedure in the United States--). I am strongly in favor of an immediate response to both the the DS, the Bishop and the general church opposing any opposition to using stem cells in medical research.

Bob Creveling

X-eGroups-Return: sentto-1300601-468-995983493-mupj=igc.org@returns.onelist.com
X-Sender: MingoMae@aol.com
X-Apparently-To: bumc@yahoogroups.com
To: <bumc@yahoogroups.com>, <choir@yahoogroups.com>
X-Mailer: Unknown (No Version)
From: mingomae@aol.com
Mailing-List: list bumc@yahoogroups.com; contact bumc-owner@yahoogroups.com
Delivered-To: mailing list bumc@yahoogroups.com
List-Unsubscribe: <mailto:bumc-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com>
Date: Tue, 24 Jul 2001 09:18:13 EDT
Subject: [bumc] Fwd: Stem cell research

To unsubscribe from this list, send a message with "unsubscribe" in the message body to mingomae@aol.com

Your use of Yahoo! Groups is subject to <http://docs.yahoo.com/info/terms/>

Return-Path: <mupj@igc.org>
Received: from rly-yg02.mx.aol.com (rly-yg02.mail.aol.com [172.18.147.2]) by air-yg05.mail.aol.com (v79.27) with ESMTP id MAILINYG51-0724090610; Tue, 24 Jul 2001 09:06:10 -0400
Received: from maynard.mail.mindspring.net (maynard.mail.mindspring.net [207.69.200.243]) by rly-yg02.mx.aol.com (v79.20) with ESMTP id MAILRELAYINYG21-0724090528; Tue, 24 Jul 2001 09:05:28 -0400
Received: from default (user-2iveoli.dialup.mindspring.com [165.247.98.178])
by maynard.mail.mindspring.net (8.9.3/8.8.5) with SMTP id JAA28026
for <MingoMae@aol.com>; Tue, 24 Jul 2001 09:05:25 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <3.0.3.32.20010724090249.00695138@pop2.igc.org>
X-Sender: mupj@pop2.igc.org
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.3 (32)
Date: Tue, 24 Jul 2001 09:02:49 -0400
To: MingoMae@aol.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Stem cell research
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"

Sandy,

Please forward this to the BUMC e-mail list.

Thanks,
Howard

###

Dear Friends,

Following up Bob Creveling's message, I offer clarification of the United Methodist position on stem cell research. It derives from a 13-page resolution on "New Developments in Genetic Science", adopted by the 2000 United Methodist General Conference. This is an update of a resolution originally adopted in 1992 following a four year study a Genetic Science

Task Force.

The paragraph in question reads as follows:

"We call for a ban on medical and research procedures which intentionally generate 'waste embryos' which will knowingly be destroyed when the medical procedure or the research is completed."

It is my impression that this does not encompass use of embryos left over from in vitro fertilization but rather only to embryos generate solely for research purposes.

Here is a news release on this subject from James Winkler, general secretary, United Methodist General Board of Church and Society.

Howard

###

July 17, 2001

Contact: Erik Alsgaard 202-488-5631

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

GBCS General Secretary calls on President Bush to Extend Moratorium on Human Embryo Stem Cell Research

The General Secretary of the General Board of Church and Society, Jim Winkler, has sent a letter to fellow United Methodist and President George W. Bush, urging him to continue to impose "an extended moratorium" on human embryo stem cell research. The General Board of Church of Society of The United Methodist Church is the denomination's international social witness and advocacy agency, with offices in New York City and Washington, D.C.

Winkler, noting that Bush promised to make a decision on human embryo stem cell research by the end of July, said that "after prayerful reflection... and careful reading of official United Methodist policy and teachings," that he was urging the moratorium "on the destruction of human embryos for the purpose of stem cell or other research."

The United Methodist Church has called for a complete and total ban on human cloning, including embryo cloning, for any purpose. Speaking through its only official voice, the General Conference, which met in May 2000, the church called for a ban on human cloning and "procedures that intentionally generate 'waste [human] embryos' which will knowingly be destroyed." (2000 Book of Resolutions, p. 249.)

"Destroying human embryos for the sole purpose of carrying on scientific research that promises only the possibility of potential treatments with little concrete evidence of success again raises profound and disturbing moral and ethical issues," Winkler wrote in the letter. "Such practices seem to be destructive of human dignity and speed us further down the path

that ignores the sacred dimensions of life and personhood and turns life into a commodity to be manipulated, controlled, patented and sold."

The United Methodist Church has engaged in a focused, formal study of genetics and biotechnology since 1988. The church has called for support of appropriate somatic cell research and treatment that respects human dignity.

###

Only General Conference speaks officially for The United Methodist Church. The General Board of Church and Society is the international public witness and advocacy agency of the church.

July 17, 2001

GBCS General Secretary's letter to President Bush to Extend Moratorium on Human Embryo Stem Cell Research

Dear Mr. President:

You have promised to make a decision regarding the use of federal tax dollars to support embryonic stem cell research by the end of July 2001. This is a decision that can maintain the current prohibition on such funding or take us further down a path to the ultimate commodification of human life. After prayerful reflection, I am moved by my faith, by careful reading of official United Methodist policy and teachings, and by my abiding concern for human dignity, justice, and the integrity of God's creation to urge you to impose an extended moratorium on the destruction of human embryos for the purpose of stem cell or other research.

United Methodists have engaged in focused, formal study of genetics and biotechnology since 1988. Our reflections on these critical issues are grounded in both faith and knowledge. As United Methodists we have called for support of appropriate somatic cell research and treatment that respects human dignity. We also recognize the speculation that stem cell research may possibly, someday provide some treatments for a variety of diseases.

At the same time, grounded in a faith that tells us that people are created in the image of God, United Methodists have called for complete and total bans on human cloning, including embryo cloning for any purpose, and "procedures that intentionally generate 'waste [human] embryos' which will knowingly be destroyed." [The Book of Resolutions, 2000, p. 249]

The moral and ethical issues surrounding the beginning of life demand enormous caution in proceeding with activities that result in the destruction of human embryos. Following extended study, prayer, reflection, and discussion The United Methodist Church affirmed a woman's right to make her own prayerful, responsible decision concerning the personal and moral questions surrounding ending the growth of human life in her body when there are "tragic conflicts of life with life."

Destroying human embryos for the sole purpose of carrying on scientific

research that promises only the possibility of potential treatments, with little concrete evidence of success again raises profound and disturbing moral and ethical issues. Additionally, adult stem cell research and other genetically based research are showing increasing promise of success in treating most, if not all, of the diseases and conditions that could be addressed by embryonic stem cell research. Finally, such practices seem to be destructive of human dignity and speed us further down the path that ignores the sacred dimensions of life and personhood and turns life into a commodity to be manipulated, controlled, patented, and sold.

Within these contexts, as General Secretary of The United Methodist General Board for Church and Society I feel compelled to urge extreme caution, even when proponents of these research activities promise possible application to ease human suffering.

Sincerely in faith,

Jim Winkler

To: mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: NMD letter to Congress
Cc:
Bcc: icnd
X-Attachments: A:\iclt.160.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

I am sending as a Word attachment the final version of the letter to members of the House and Senate Armed Services and Appropriations Committee on national missile defense. If you can't receive it in that format, let me know, and I'll send it as e-mail text.

Thanks to all who signed. Thanks to Janet Horman for getting staff from the United Methodist General Board of Society to help with delivery to House members. I took care of the Senate.

We need to continue contacting key senators this week, leading up to markup the week of July 30 by the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Shalom,
Howard

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

Dear Ron,

Regarding Connecticut, we would like you to have your contacts there get in touch with Senator Lieberman this week on national missile defense. The Senate Armed Services Committee, of which he is a member, will mark up the Defense Authorization Bill starting July 30. Senator Lieberman has been a strong supporter of missile defense. We probably can't get him to change his position, but we should urge him to support a provision that would prohibit funding of any activity that would violate the ABM treaty.

Below is a sample alert that I sent out earlier. Perhaps only the part about the ABM treaty could be used this week with Senator Lieberman.

Shalom,
Howard

###

Sample action alert on national missile defense and the defense authorization bill.

The week of July 30 the Senate Armed Services Committee will be "marking up" the Defense Authorization Bill for the 2002 fiscal year. This will include funding for national missile defense. We have two concerns for you to raise with Senator _____, who is a member of this committee: funding level for national missile defense and the need to preserve the ABM Treaty.

Reduce Funding for National Missile Defense

President Bush is asking \$8.3 billion for missile defense, a 57 percent increase over the current fiscal year. This is extravagant because presently there is no credible threat to the U.S. homeland from long-range missiles. It is also a misdirection of spending priorities, given the urgent need to increase funding of programs designed to "Leave No Child Behind", for health care and other social needs. True national security comes from providing greater opportunities for persons in need, not enriching defense contractors. Therefore, we ask you urge Senator _____ to seek reduction in the amount of funds authorized for national missile defense.

Preserve the ABM Treaty

The Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty, which restricts the deployment of a national missile defense, is part of the nuclear arms control structure that has served the world well during the past 30 years. U.S. withdrawal from the treaty in order to deploy missile defense runs the grave risk of causing this structure to collapse and re-fueling the nuclear arms race. Russia is likely to respond to U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty by withdrawing from other arms control agreements and by deploying new multi-warhead missiles. Russia might also abandon the cooperative threat reduction program whereby the United States provides financial assistance for dismantling Russian missiles and securing fissile material. China, too, is likely to increase its offensive nuclear arsenal. This will threaten India, which will counter by deploying more nuclear weapons. Pakistan will respond by increasing its nuclear arsenal. These are dire consequences of ill-advise U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty.

Therefore, we urge you to ask Senator _____ to support a prohibition in the defense authorization bill on expenditure of funds for any activity that would violate the ABM Treaty.

To: mrec@erols.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Proposal writing
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Hal,

What is the status of the proposal for CSAP project? Is there anything you want me to do between now and August 18 when I go on a two week vacation?

Have you seen the request for proposals for mini-grants under the Bishops' Initiative on Children and Poverty? The Baltimore-Washington Conference will select five proposals for one-time grants ranging from \$2,500 to \$5,000. The deadline for submission is October 1. This seems a natural for Casa del Pueblo. If I can help on this one, let me know.

With best regards,
Howard

To: jdi@clw.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: NMD briefing on September 7
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

John,

As I mentioned the other day, the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair, wants to have a briefing session on national missile defense soon after Labor Day, specifically on Friday, September 7 from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. at the Mott House. The purpose is to help us develop our strategy related to Senate floor action on NMD during consideration of the defense authorization and defense appropriations bills, which is likely to occur soon after that date.

Would you be willing to be one of the briefers at that session? I am also asking Richard Fieldhouse. If he can't do it, I'll try for another Senate staff person.

The session should describe provisions of defense authorization and appropriations bills that relate to national missile defense and should indicate what issues are likely to arise on the Senate floor. This would lead us to consider what, if anything, we can do to effect the outcome, including quick-response grassroots action.

We hope that you can participate.

Howard

From: Rachel Labush
To: "Howard W. Hallman"
Subject: RE: NMD letter to Congress
Date: Tue, 24 Jul 2001 11:38:36 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

I am very sorry about yesterday. Everyone else said Rabbi Saperstein should be the one to sign, and since he only came back from Israel late last week, I was unable to track him down before the deadline. I will try to get us on to the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers letter, deadline COB today. I'm sorry again. It's a very difficult time to get things done here, since we have three new staff members and nine have recently left or are leaving in the next month.

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Tuesday, July 24, 2001 11:32 AM
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: NMD letter to Congress

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

I am sending as a Word attachment the final version of the letter to members of the House and Senate Armed Services and Appropriations Committee on national missile defense. If you can't receive it in that format, let me know, and I'll send it as e-mail text.

Thanks to all who signed. Thanks to Janet Horman for getting staff from the United Methodist General Board of Society to help with delivery to House members. I took care of the Senate.

We need to continue contacting key senators this week, leading up to markup the week of July 30 by the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Shalom,
Howard

From: "Orr, Elaine" <EOrr@NAPAWASH.ORG>
To: Social Equity Panel <SocEqPanel@NAPAWASH.ORG>
Cc: "Keiner, Suellen T" <SKeiner@NAPAWASH.ORG>,
"Walsh, Charlene"
<CWalsh@NAPAWASH.ORG>,
"gregist@ci.dallas.tx.us"
<gregist@ci.dallas.tx.us>
Subject: Input for Dallas Meeting
Date: Tue, 24 Jul 2001 14:42:16 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

On behalf of Phil Rutledge, I'm conveying some of the discussion about the November 12-13, 2001 proposed meeting on Social Equity, in Dallas, which was discussed at this past weekend's Indianapolis meeting. That meeting was superb, and you will receive summary information in the next two weeks. We are all in the debt of Phil and the many SPEA staff who helped arrange and host the meeting -- especially his assistant, Carrie Dockter.

Phil would like your comments on the purpose and structure of the Dallas meeting, and would like you to relay them to me. I will send him the full text of all comments at the same time.

You may recall that the Dallas meeting has been discussed in the past as a "summit" on social equity, to which would be invited prominent individuals in the field, or representatives of organizations that address social equity issues, as well as some Social Equity Panel members. The meeting is intended to be by invitation. Jim Kunde of the University of Texas at Austin and Gloria Register, the City of Dallas Intergovernmental Affairs Coordinator, have taken the lead on many of the arrangements. The City of Dallas will cover expenses associated with the conference space itself, and the city and university have been finding organizations to host some of the specific other expenses.

At this point, NAPA (the Social Equity Panel leadership) needs to develop an agenda for the conference. Among the points of discussion in Indianapolis were that the conference should:

- 1) Build on what has been learned at the Indianapolis meeting (where prominent points of discussion dealt with environmental justice, and the fact that citizen involvement must be in decision making, not just as an input source, and much more).
- 2) Pick a couple of topics on which we want to know more and have a few speakers who are passionate about them.
- 3) Use the "American Assembly" process, through which advance papers (not necessarily lengthy ones) would be distributed. There would be moderators for sessions, and rapporteurs. The rapporteurs would present session summaries to the plenary group.
- 4) Ask participants what they think should be the primary focus for the Social Equity Panel's resoures, given the discussions. (Or, as Charles Washington succinctly put it, which basket gets our marbles.)

What Phil would like you to comment on:

- 1) The approach described above.
- 2) Whether you can volunteer to help develop an agenda. This would not need to be a huge group, and its work would need to be accomplished in the next few weeks, so that non-NAPA people can be invited to the meeting with plenty of notice.
- 2) If you cannot help with the agenda development, you may have ideas for appropriate topics. (For example, one point raised at the Indianapolis meeting that drew a lot of discussion was that there is little equity in a "war on drugs" when those who have the most problem with substance abuse have few treatment options and little employment/social assistance when they return from prison. Perhaps we need to lose the war metaphor.)
- 4) Whether you would like to attend. Please don't be offended if you are not on the final list. We can't all be on it.

OK, that's it. Since there were many voices offering input on this, I may have not stated this as eloquently as possible. However, I think you can get the gist. If you can get back to me by Tuesday, July 31st, it would be helpful.

Thanks for your thoughts.

Elaine L. Or

Associate Panel Member and

Senior Consultant to NAPA

Home Office: 641-682-2674 or 877-628-9660

X-Sender: jdi@[63.106.26.66]
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)
Date: Tue, 24 Jul 2001 17:20:50 -0400
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>
Subject: Re: NMD briefing on September 7

Howard, now that I have checked my schedule, I will be in Boston for a board meeting that day. Sorry. John

At 04:58 PM 07/24/2001 -0400, you wrote:

>John,

>

>As I mentioned the other day, the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear
>Disarmament, which I chair, wants to have a briefing session on national
>missile defense soon after Labor Day, specifically on Friday, September 7
>from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. at the Mott House. The purpose is to help us
>develop our strategy related to Senate floor action on NMD during
>consideration of the defense authorization and defense appropriations
>bills, which is likely to occur soon after that date.

>

>Would you be willing to be one of the briefers at that session? I am also
>asking Richard Fieldhouse. If he can't do it, I'll try for another Senate
>staff person.

>

>The session should describe provisions of defense authorization and
>appropriations bills that relate to national missile defense and should
>indicate what issues are likely to arise on the Senate floor. This would
>lead us to consider what, if anything, we can do to effect the outcome,
>including quick-response grassroots action.

>

>We hope that you can participate.

>

>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.

>

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: Tue, 24 Jul 2001 18:02:11 -0400
To: jdi@clw.org
From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>
Subject: Editorials: Nationwide Viewpoints on Missile Defense

Editorials: Nationwide Viewpoints on Missile Defense
8 support missile defense; 30 oppose; 4 urge caution

Arizona Republic May 13, 2001 "Even Without Cold War, Missile Shield is Needed; Let's Bet \$8 Billion on Defense"

"Critics of missile-defense research contend the principal nuclear threat to the United States is not something launched from a "rogue" nation, but one found in a terrorist's smuggled suitcase...But that does not negate the threat from the skies. A 'Dr. Strangelove' pact with the irony-saturated title "Mutual Assured Destruction," or MAD, provided Americans with an uncertain sense of security for three decades. But the world has changed. The danger to this nation from the rogues and tyrants at a dozen points on the global map is real, and it needs to be addressed."

Atlanta Journal and Constitution June 20, 2001 "Diplomacy Beats Bullying in Dealings with Russians"

"The United States does not yet have a workable missile defense system and may be many years away from developing one. The Russians...could add warheads to its missiles in relatively short order, reversing hard-won progress toward disarmament. Until there is something to replace it, we don't have the luxury of dismissing the ABM treaty as 'antiquated,' as Putin's remarks this week made clear."

Baltimore Sun July 16, 2001 "Shooting Down a Treaty"

"Conflict with the treaty within months, not years...would harm U.S. interests. Paramount among these is retaining the trust of other countries that this country respects its treaties...Enormous costs would be paid up front for iffy future benefits. Scrapping the arms control relationship with Russia is too high a price to pay for unknown gain. If scrapping it is the administration's real goal, that would be folly. More is at stake than one treaty. An unrestrained arms race, busting the U.S. budget and destabilizing the world, is the last thing the administration should want."

Boston Globe May 30, 2001 "Missile Mirage"

"Impatient attempts to develop missile defense, particularly if they entail an American abrogation of the ABM Treaty, are almost certain to provoke a new arms race in nuclear weapons and the missiles to deliver them. If Bush unilaterally disavows America's commitment not to build elaborate missile

defenses, he will stimulate deployment of more offensive weapons. He will also imperil the START II treaty limiting Russia's multiple-warhead missiles, the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, and the Missile Technology Control Regime, among other crucial arms control accords."

Buffalo News June 15, 2001 "Backward Strategy...Deploy Now, Test Later"

"Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles still remain the least likely technology for a terrorist attack, and we're simply not ready to deploy an ABM system...It's also unnecessary to provoke even our allies now over a \$60 billion to \$100 billion missile shield we're nowhere near ready to deploy...The problem isn't deploying a system that has a reasonable chance of working. Any American government has an obligation to protect its citizens. The problem is deploying a system that just about everybody outside the Bush administration knows can't work because the technology doesn't exist."

Business Week May 14, 2001 "Missile Defense: A Tricky Course"

"The stakes are enormously high in changing security policy at this time. The Bush plan would breach the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, a cornerstone of U.S.-Russia relations. The new system would begin to be deployed well before any of the technologies behind the land, sea, and air-based anti-missile weapons are fully tested. And it could antagonize far more friends and allies than the handful of rogue states it targets. Indeed, ballistic missiles may not be the worst threat from Iraq, Libya, or North Korea. Suitcase nukes or biological weapons carried into U.S. cities may pose more danger...China could respond by building a large, modern ballistic missile force. That, in turn, could set off a nuclear arms race that includes India, Pakistan, perhaps even Japan, and destabilize the entire Pacific region...If his missile defense plan makes new enemies and generates nuclear turmoil in Asia, it will not succeed despite the President's good intentions."

Chicago Sun-Times May 31, 2001 "Europe Will See Light on Missile Defense"

"The ABM treaty is defunct and irrelevant whether we scrap it or not. And Russia, tottering on the brink of chaos, will have difficulty maintaining its status as an industrial nation, never mind threatening the United States. What is and will continue to grow as a threat is the missile capacity of rogue nations such as Iran, North Korea and Iraq...The time, as Colin Powell so aptly reminded NATO, for addressing foes is not when the dagger is at your throat -- not when Saddam Hussein is making his demands, finger poised above the button -- but well beforehand. Should that day come, France and Germany, the chief opponents of the proposed missile system, will be singing a different tune. Good for the Bush administration that we are not waiting for them to see the light, but proceeding despite our allies' foot-dragging, working against the clock to be ready for whatever dangers might someday come. Europe, in time, will realize what we already know."

Chicago Tribune July 17, 2001 "Missile Defense Scores a Hit"

"The [July 2001 missile defense] test was just a step on a long, expensive road of creating and refining an as-yet-unproven technology...The message seems to be that the United States will proceed with or without approval from NATO allies and Russia, regardless of the treaty. In its rush, the administration seems oblivious to the fact that it could destabilize international security in the pursuit of national defense. That's hardly smart diplomacy. Bush is creating a false urgency; there is no need to violate the treaty before trying to renegotiate it with Russia."

Columbian (Vancouver, WA) May 31, 2001 "Going it Alone"

"[T]he nature of the missile defense push [is] all about traffic in arms. The military-industrial complex has become a multinational web. No other nation has the wherewithal to threaten the superpower United States or its regular friends, so the defense establishment resorts to heightened warnings about rogue nations willing to commit suicide to make some points to someone...Meanwhile, the real terrorists...manufacture and deliver their deadly devices in primitive ways far below the flawed sophistication of anti-missile missiles and space-based ray guns."

Commercial Appeal July 10, 2001 "But First, Get it Right."

"In its one success, the system proved only that, with advance notice and careful planning, we could protect Kwajalein Atoll in the Marshall Islands from a solo missile attack from California. . . . The issue of deployment... is moot until the nation has a system that works reliably and repeatedly in tests. The Pentagon is not there yet."

Courier-Journal (Louisville, KY) May 31, 2001 "Diplomatic Flak"

"[I]t's much too soon, technologically and politically, to be talking about [NMD] deployment - or about tearing up the ABM Treaty."

Dayton Daily News June 20, 2001 "Adjust, But Don't Scrap, ABM Treaty"

"Yes, the [ABM] treaty is from a former age, but it has been the foundation on which all major subsequent missile agreements rest. The ABM was a crucial step against the superpowers' spiraling nuclear arms race. Even today, its disappearance could trigger destabilizing change."

Florida Times-Union (Jacksonville, FL) May 21, 2001 "Defense: A Great Debate"

"As for treaties, they should be honored only for as long as they are mutually beneficial...If the system hasn't been perfected yet, improve it."

If that is expensive, cut other programs and use the savings to develop missile defense...Some say a missile defense system would be a mistake because enemies such as Saddam Hussein would be upset. Try telling that to people when nuclear missiles are raining down on them, especially if they are fired from Baghdad."

Hartford Courant June 17, 2001 "Still in Pursuit of Star Wars"

"To build the very expensive Star Wars, Mr. Bush would scrap an arms-control system that has worked well...Once the ban [on national missile defense] is removed, other nuclear powers are likely to develop more offensive missile forces. Their strategy would be to build enough offensive weapons to overwhelm the most sophisticated shield...If an enemy fires enough nuclear missiles, some will get through and devastate a country or even a continent. The result of building a shield to protect just one country would be a more dangerous world...Never before has an administration been more aggressive in wanting to build a hardware and software military system that hasn't even passed muster in experiments. A more sensible policy would be to keep the ABM Treaty in force, continue to reduce the number of offensive warheads in the United States' and Russia's arsenals and press for widespread adherence to the nonproliferation treaty and the nuclear test ban treaty."

Iowa State Daily June 15, 2001 "Bush's Self Defense"

"A national missile defense system, a Reagan-era pipe dream, has never worked, and according to scientists, will never work. All it will do is disable the 1972 Antiballistic Missile Treaty, possibly reinvigorating another arms race. Despite opposition, even among members of his own party, Bush hasn't wavered and plans to start tossing away taxpayer dollars into an ineffective and unproved wastepile."

Long Island Newsday July 22, 2001 "Misguided Warheads; Missile Defense Mustn't Displace Real Military Needs"

"The military chiefs fear that all the money they need for new projects and new missions is going to go to the very expensive missile defense system - a project many professional military people believe should only be a second- or even third-order priority...Bush seems determined to abrogate the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty as soon as possible. A missile defense system won't be technically feasible for years -if at all -according to almost all experts. And rushing the technology is likely to result in costly mistakes and premature deployment of systems that don't work...The administration's approach also ignores the fact that deterrence has kept the peace for the last 50 years. And deterrence, whether Bush understands it or not, will be the basis of U.S. military strategy for decades to come...The Republican right, fearful that Bush cannot be re-elected in 2004, wants to get rid of the ABM Treaty, always its obsession, while the party still controls the White House. It's the only explanation of Bush's actions. And if that sounds nuts to you, it is. Welcome to the world of the misguided warheads."

Los Angeles Times July 17, 2001 "Misguided Missile Plan"

"[The Bush missile defense testing] schedule is not dictated by any scientific consensus about what can soon be achieved...The complex and costly system for an effective defense against [realistic decoys and multiple warhead] attack is at best a long way off...The administration has yet to make a coherent case that the comprehensive missile defense system it favors, involving land, sea and airborne weapons and breakthrough technology, would make the nation any more secure than the threat of nuclear retaliation does today...About all that's clear at this point is that the administration isn't sure where it's going or how it's going to get there. It just knows it's in a hurry to be on its way. That is not a sound approach to policymaking."

Miami Herald July 17, 2001 "Shield Isn't Needed"

"We think a missile-defense system is unnecessary. But undue haste on so crucial an issue should be the last thing on President Bush's missile-defense agenda."

National Review May 28, 2001 "Missile Defense: Still MAD"

"Even if a rogue doesn't actually launch against the U.S., ICBMs give such states new power to blackmail, outright or subtly, the United States and its allies. Missile defense would eliminate, or at least diminish, that power...[T]he idea of a new arms race, prompted by missile defense, is absurd...Missile defense will aid the cause of effective non-proliferation more than any treaty, because it will reduce the value of nuclear weapons. There's a reason, for instance, that North Korea doesn't bother to build aircraft carriers-because (besides being expensive) we can easily blow them out of the water."

Newsday (New York, NY) May 19, 2001 "Indefensible"

"The Bush administration's apparent decision to move ahead with missile-defense tests that would abrogate the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty is a woefully wrong-headed decision that will damage U.S. interests in the world without providing any advantages. It represents a capitulation to a band of right-wing ideologues that President George W. Bush has brought into the government, and it makes a mockery of Bush's pledge that this country will conduct its affairs as a humble superpower."

New York Times June 4, 2001 "Missile Shield Realities"

"There is ample time to pursue further diplomacy with Moscow before any defensive system is built...Whatever technology the Pentagon decides on must be thoroughly tested and shown to be reliable before funds are appropriated for construction. . . . The administration also ought to

consult further with its NATO allies and begin serious discussions with China."

Oklahoma State University Daily Barometer May 10, 2001 "Star Wars Has No Force"

"Why is it that the president is so hard driven to push a multi-billion dollar missile defense system on the U.S. taxpayers in a time of economic uncertainty to protect us from an enemy that doesn't exist at the expense of our relationship with the rest of the world? It would be a violation of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, which has worked for 30 years, and could in fact spur a new arms race involving every country in the world that has a reason not to trust the intentions of the United States. Furthermore, Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld admitted this week that the government has no clear plan as to how to proceed in building a global missile defense system and yet they want to build it anyway, despite the ramifications."

Pantagraph (Bloomington, IL) May 9, 2001 "National Defense System a Dream Without Costs"

"[W]e still have to refer to 'Star Wars.' What else can you call a system that has no cost estimate, has no timetable for deployment, [and] has not performed well in tests."

Philadelphia Inquirer July 17, 2001 "Missile Defense Work at Odds with ABM Pact"

"In its rush to get weapons to shoot down nuclear missiles from rogue states such as North Korea and Iran, the Bush administration risks emboldening hawks in Russia and China and detonating a new arms race...The Russian government has rightly denounced the latest U.S. demonstration of antimissile muscle - and the prospect that President Bush may simply scrap this long-standing treaty. If it is to be altered, that should be by mutual agreement, not superpower fiat."

Pittsburgh Post-Gazette July 17, 2001 "A Hit in Space: But Missile Test Success Will Reverberate on Earth"

"The bottom line should be that no [missile defense] system should be deployed unless it is reasonably reliable. [The July 2001] test proves only that interception is possible in ideal circumstances; more needs to be done before an end to the ABM treaty is even considered. The worst result would be to proceed to build a useless, hugely expensive white elephant up in Alaska that, absent diplomatic agreement, served only to make the nations of the world more nervous."

Richmond Times-Dispatch May 17, 2001 "America's Defense"

"Missile defense ranks as a need, not a want...Protection from rogue

nations demands whatever price, however much time...The President is on the right track. This space hopes the future details embrace that which would render missile defense most successful in protecting American and her allies from the real, maniacal Dr. Strangeloves."

Roanoke Times and World News June 16, 2001 "Remove the Hair Trigger Alert on U.S., Russian Arsenals"

"Bush's determination to discard the Antiballistic Missile Treaty as an irrelevant Cold War relic and press ahead with developing and deploying a U.S. missile-defense system virtually assures continued Russian anxiety and suspicion about being left vulnerable to a nuclear strike. The ABM treaty that prohibited development of such systems, even in the wake of the Soviet demise, stands as a practical protocol for moving gradually toward the eventual elimination of nuclear weapons."

St. Louis Post-Dispatch July 17, 2001 "A Senseless Triumph"

"The administration is prepared to withdraw from the ABM treaty -- violating our national honor -- in pursuit of a system that will antagonize our allies, alarm other nuclear powers, spend billions of dollars and do nothing to address our most serious security concerns. We will do this because xenophobic isolationism has found common cause with big-dollar defense industry campaign contributors...Call it Son of Star Wars or call it National Missile Defense or call it Ground-Based Midcourse Defense Segment, it is a boondoggle that could eat \$200 billion and leave us no more secure than we are today. It is a mistake."

St. Petersburg Times (FL) June 4, 2001 "Heed NATO's Concerns"

"A precipitous commitment to missile defense would make the world more dangerous, not less so. A missile defense system would, at best, be capable of protecting the United States against missiles launched by terrorists or a rogue nation with only one or two nuclear weapons. Our defense against Russia, China and any other major nuclear power would still be based on mutually assured destruction. But that standoff of terror would exist in a new atmosphere of distrust, one in which longstanding arms-control agreements had been abrogated and U.S. defensive strategies were disengaged from those of our former European allies. That is the dangerous world into which the Bush administration is committed to leading us."

San Francisco Chronicle May 10, 2001 "Launching a New Arms Race"

"The Bush administration appears determined to change the course of U.S. military philosophy in radical ways. Gone would be the presumption that the world is a safer place when nuclear-capable adversaries engage in arms-control treaties that are legally binding and verifiable. Gone would be the notion that the United States needs the confidence and consent of its allies before embarking on something as significant and potentially destabilizing as a missile defense shield. Gone would be the moral, legal

and military qualms about putting offensive weapons into space."

San Jose Mercury News July 16, 2001 "'Star Wars' Wary"

"We have strong misgivings...The first is whether a defensive missile system would work...[The Bush administration] intends to proceed with or without Russia's agreement -- or that of our allies, several of which have misgivings about abandoning the ABM treaty...To start building missile sites in Alaska now, virtually on the Russian border, seems provocative...The ABM treaty has worked for 29 years. Let's not junk it overnight."

Scientific American June 2001 "Faith-Based Reasoning"

"Regarding strategic missile defense, researchers' best guess is that a reliable system is infeasible. The burden of proof is now on the proponents of missile defense. Until they can provide solid evidence that a system would work against plausible countermeasures, any discussion of committing to building one—let alone meeting a detailed timeline—is premature. It is one thing for a software company to hype a product and then fail to deliver; it is another when the failure concerns nuclear weapons, for which "vaporware" takes on a whole new, literal meaning."

Seattle Times May 28, 2001 "Don't Ditch ABM Treaty"

"President Bush's vision of a national missile defense is hampered by a lack of working technology, money to build it, a definable enemy, treaty restrictions and the opposition of allies...For all the technical and financial challenges, the apparent willingness of the Bush administration to unilaterally abandon the 1972 Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty is most vexing at home and abroad."

Star Tribune (Minneapolis, Minnesota) June 12, 2001 "Missile Defense; Tough Questions for Defense in Europe"

"Bush and Rumsfeld exaggerate the size of [the proliferating ballistic missile technology] threat, and they focus unreasonably on missile defense as the proper response...Because [missile defense] potentially overwhelms the deterrent value of Russian and Chinese missiles--giving the United States the theoretical ability to launch a first strike without fear of retaliation--it would upset the existing power balance and spark what could become a dangerous and disastrously expensive global arms race. Inevitably that race would lead to the full militarization of space...The danger now is that Bush and Rumsfeld will short-circuit those discussions and proceed to missile-defense deployment regardless-- because they are driven not by a pragmatic evaluation of the threat, but by an ideological conviction that deterrence must be replaced by defense and the sooner the better."

State-Journal Register (Springfield, IL) June 19, 2001 "Move Cautiously

with Shield Plans"

"In reality, there seems no need to junk a treaty that has worked for nearly three decades, especially given that a workable missile defense shield might take that long or longer to develop...[The Bush administration] continues to call the treaty a "Cold War relic," even though they have no dependable system to replace this 'relic'...The last thing the United States, Russia and the rest of the world need is a new arms race. Yet that is nearly guaranteed if we fail to convince other nations that our true interest in a missile defense shield is a safer - not a more dangerous - world."

Sunday Oklahoman June 17, 2001 "Consult and Listen: Bush Said the Right Things in Europe"

"Missile defense is too important for the United States to be dissuaded by transatlantic naysayers and worrywarts. U.S. officials talked of shared technology - even with Russia - which should indicate America's true, defensive intention...Under Bush, the U.S. has embarked on a new journey to revolutionize its strategic defenses. Developing the technology will take time, as will convincing friends and would-be friends like Russia that missile defense is a good idea."

Sun-Sentinel (Ft. lauderdale, FL) July 13, 2001 "Small Progress Toward Sanity"

"It's one thing to shoot down a warhead you know is on its way. It's something else again to shoot down a warhead during an actual surprise attack in which countermeasures are deployed. Would the United States be more secure with a missile shield? Not if it causes a breach with its NATO allies, an arms buildup in Russia and China, and the return of red ink to the Treasury Department's ledgers."

USA Today May 31, 2001 "Missile Fizzle"

"There's little to gain from haste. The missile technology has yet to prove itself, the administration has yet to choose how it wants defenses built, and Democrats now controlling the Senate aren't convinced of the shield's value. Meanwhile, the rogue missile threat, while nearly certain to arise, remains years off. That leaves plenty of time for the important task of bringing NATO along."

Virginian-Pilot June 25, 2001 "The Terrorists Aren't Going Away"

"It is realistic for Americans and others to expect the worse while bin Laden and other terrorists plot. It is not so realistic to believe that a hugely expensive, unreliable missile defense system would be the best application of resources against the terrorist threat."

Wall Street Journal July 24, 2001 "Dr. No"

"The ABM Treaty is not designed to improve defense; it's designed to thwart it. And arms control processes typically are not directed at achieving results, but at stopping results, in this case a missile defense system. Yet the bottom line remains that despite our technological advances and the successful test intercept of a missile last week, America today remains utterly incapable of intercepting a single ballistic missile aimed at it... The ABM Treaty literally rests on the premise that the best defense is no defense."

Washington Post July 16, 2001 "Missile Defense Rush"

"The danger is that the administration's haste to ready a system -- and, perhaps, satisfy those in the Republican Party who have made missile defense an article of ideology -- will lead to unilateral action that will antagonize allies, inspire a weapons buildup by Russia or China and end by worsening U.S. security. At the moment, such haste looks like more of a threat than any ballistic missile."

Washington Times June 15, 2001 "The Bush Vision"

"Some European governments - Spain, Italy, Hungary and Poland - have declared their readiness to support missile defense. However, French and German reservations are becoming tiresome. It is not the first time that the left-wing parties now ruling both countries have been dead wrong on the most important military issue of the day."

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-eGroups-Return: sentto-1300601-470-996034120-mupj=igc.org@returns.onelist.com
X-Sender: HooperC@OD.NIH.GOV
X-Apparently-To: bumc@yahoogroups.com
To: "bumc@yahoogroups.com" <bumc@yahoogroups.com>
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
From: "Hooper, Celia (OD)" <HooperC@od.nih.gov>
Mailing-List: list bumc@yahoogroups.com; contact bumc-owner@yahoogroups.com
Delivered-To: mailing list bumc@yahoogroups.com
List-Unsubscribe: <mailto:bumc-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com>
Date: Wed, 25 Jul 2001 00:08:15 -0400
Subject: [bumc] Drafting a Stem Cell Letter

Fellow Methodists:

I would like to draft a letter of response to Mr. Winkler and the folks Bob mentioned (DS, the Bishop and the general church) "opposing opposition to using stem cells in medical research." I will go through Mr. Winkler's letter point by point after making a general summary of objections to his stance. I know the stem cell issues quite well, but I would appreciate any input that people want to send me, especially pointers on church politics, addressees (and addresses--I don't even know who our district superintendant is, for e.g.), and strategy. Would it be best if lots of Methodists wrote their own letters? Should we write one letter with lots of signatories? Please send any and all suggestions to: CKozlowski2@netscape.net I will try to draft this Wednesday, then ask Sandy to post the draft for your comments, suggestions, etc. on Thursday. If people think it would be good to have lots of signatories, I'll bring this to church Sunday for people to sign.

>
For anyone who wants to read up on the real science behind stem cell research--and Mr. Winkler most assuredly does NOT have it right--here is the website with the NIH report on stem cell research. (I am the author of chapter 5):
<http://www.nih.gov/news/stemcell/scireport.htm>
>Celia Kozlowski

=====

>>###
>>
>>Dear Friends,
>>
>>Following up Bob Creveling's message, I offer clarification of the United
>>Methodist position on stem cell research. It derives from a 13-page
>>resolution on "New Developments in Genetic Science", adopted by the 2000
>>United Methodist General Conference. This is an update of a resolution
>>originally adopted in 1992 following a four year study a Genetic Science
>>Task Force.
>>
>>The paragraph in question reads as follows:
>>
>>"We call for a ban on medical and research procedures which intentionally
>>generate 'waste embryos' which will knowingly be destroyed when the

medical

>>procedure or the research is completed."

>>

>>It is my impression that this does not encompass use of embryos left over
>>from in vitro fertilization but rather only to embryos generate solely for
>>research purposes.

>>

>>Here is a news release on this subject from James Winkler, general
>>secretary, United Methodist General Board of Church and Society.

>>

>>Howard

>>

>>###

>>

>>July 17, 2001

>>

>>Contact: Erik Alsgaard 202-488-5631

>>

>>FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

>>

>>GBCS General Secretary calls on President Bush to Extend Moratorium on
>>Human Embryo Stem Cell Research

>>

>>The General Secretary of the General Board of Church and Society, Jim
>>Winkler, has sent a letter to fellow United Methodist and President George
>>W. Bush, urging him to continue to impose "an extended moratorium" on
>>human embryo stem cell research. The General Board of Church of Society of
>>The United Methodist Church is the denomination's international social
>>witness and advocacy agency, with offices in New York City and Washington,
>>D.C.

>>

>>Winkler, noting that Bush promised to make a decision on human embryo stem
>>cell research by the end of July, said that "after prayerful
reflection…

>>and careful reading of official United Methodist policy and teachings,"
>>that he was urging the moratorium "on the destruction of human embryos for
>>the purpose of stem cell or other research."

>>

>>The United Methodist Church has called for a complete and total ban on
>>human cloning, including embryo cloning, for any purpose. Speaking through
>>its only official voice, the General Conference, which met in May 2000,
>>the church called for a ban on human cloning and "procedures that
>>intentionally generate 'waste [human] embryos' which will knowingly be
>>destroyed." (2000 Book of Resolutions, p. 249.)

>>

>>"Destroying human embryos for the sole purpose of carrying on scientific
>>research that promises only the possibility of potential treatments with
>>little concrete evidence of success again raises profound and disturbing
>>moral and ethical issues," Winkler wrote in the letter. "Such practices
>>seem to be destructive of human dignity and speed us further down the path
>>that ignores the sacred dimensions of life and personhood and turns life
>>into a commodity to be manipulated, controlled, patented and sold."

>>

>>The United Methodist Church has engaged in a focused, formal study of

>>genetics and biotechnology since 1988. The church has called for support
>>of appropriate somatic cell research and treatment that respects human
>>dignity.

>>

>># # #

>>Only General Conference speaks officially for The United Methodist Church.

>>The General Board of Church and Society is the international public

>>witness and advocacy agency of the church.

>>

>>

>>July 17, 2001

>>

>>GBCS General Secretary's letter to President Bush to Extend Moratorium on

>>Human Embryo Stem Cell Research

>>

>>Dear Mr. President:

>>

>> You have promised to make a decision regarding the use of federal tax

>>dollars to support embryonic stem cell research by the end of July 2001.

>>This is a decision that can maintain the current prohibition on such

>>funding or take us further down a path to the ultimate commodification of

>>human life. After prayerful reflection, I am moved by my faith, by careful

>>reading of official United Methodist policy and teachings, and by my

>>abiding concern for human dignity, justice, and the integrity of God's

>>creation to urge you to impose an extended moratorium on the destruction

>>of human embryos for the purpose of stem cell or other research.

>>

>>United Methodists have engaged in focused, formal study of genetics and

>>biotechnology since 1988. Our reflections on these critical issues are

>>grounded in both faith and knowledge. As United Methodists we have called

>>for support of appropriate somatic cell research and treatment that

>>respects human dignity. We also recognize the speculation that stem cell

>>research may possibly, someday provide some treatments for a variety of

>>diseases.

>>

>>At the same time, grounded in a faith that tells us that people are

>>created in the image of God, United Methodists have called for complete

>>and total bans on human cloning, including embryo cloning for any purpose,

>>and "procedures that intentionally generate 'waste [human] embryos' which

>>will knowingly be destroyed." [The Book of Resolutions, 2000, p. 249]

>>

>>The moral and ethical issues surrounding the beginning of life demand

>>enormous caution in proceeding with activities that result in the

>>destruction of human embryos. Following extended study, prayer,

>>reflection, and discussion The United Methodist Church affirmed a woman's

>>right to make her own prayerful, responsible decision concerning the

>>personal and moral questions surrounding ending the growth of human life

>>in her body when there are "tragic conflicts of life with life."

>>

>>Destroying human embryos for the sole purpose of carrying on scientific

>>research that promises only the possibility of potential treatments, with

>>little concrete evidence of success again raises profound and disturbing

>>moral and ethical issues. Additionally, adult stem cell research and other

>>genetically based research are showing increasing promise of success in

>>treating most, if not all, of the diseases and conditions that could be
>>addressed by embryonic stem cell research. Finally, such practices seem to
>>be destructive of human dignity and speed us further down the path that
>>ignores the sacred dimensions of life and personhood and turns life into a
>>commodity to be manipulated, controlled, patented, and sold.

>>

>>Within these contexts, as General Secretary of The United Methodist
>>General Board for Church and Society I feel compelled to urge extreme
>>caution, even when proponents of these research activities promise
>>possible application to ease human suffering.

>>

>>Sincerely in faith,

>>

>>Jim Winkler

To unsubscribe from this list, send a message with "unsubscribe" in the message body to mingomae@aol.com

Your use of Yahoo! Groups is subject to <http://docs.yahoo.com/info/terms/>

X-Sender: hooperc@156.40.4.62
Date: Wed, 25 Jul 2001 09:10:32 -0400
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: Celia Hooper <hooperc@od.nih.gov>
Subject: Re: [bumc] Drafting a Stem Cell Letter

Super. Thanks. I'll see if I can get them at the church.
celia

>Celia,
>
>As you draft your letter, you may want to read three resolutions of the
>United Methodist General Conference, the official governing body of the
>United Methodist Church:
>Bioethics Task Force
>New Developments in Genetic Science
>Human Cloning
>
>They are found in "The Book of Resolutions of the United Methodist Church".
> They are the product of years of study and consultation with a variety of
>experts in science and ethics. You may or may not agree with the
>conclusions, but at least you may want to be acquainted with the reasoning
>and conclusions of these resolutions.
>
>I assume that there is a copy of "The Book of Resolutions" at the church.
>If not, I can loan you mine.
>
>Howard
>
>301 897-3668
>
>
>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.

Please note my new e-mail address:
HooperC@od.nih.gov
Celia Hooper, Ph.D.
Special Assistant for Communications
Office of Intramural Research, OD, NIH
Bldg.2, Rm. 2W27, Bethesda, MD 20892-0235
phone: (301) 402-4274 fax: (301) 402-4303
cell: (703) 582-5317

.....
To be thrown upon one's own resources is to be cast into the very
lap of fortune; for our faculties then undergo a development and
display an energy of which they were previously unsusceptible. -
Benjamin Franklin

To: dkimball@clw.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: September 7 briefing on NMD
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Daryl,

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament wants to have a briefing session on national missile defense soon after Labor Day, specifically on Friday, September 7 from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. at the Mott House. The purpose is to help us develop our strategy related to Senate floor action on NMD during consideration of the defense authorization and defense appropriations bills, which is likely to occur soon after that date.

Would you be willing to make one of your first appearances as president of the Arms Control Association and be one of the briefers at that session? I am also asking Richard Fieldhouse. If he can't do it, I'll try for another Senate staff person.

The session should describe provisions of defense authorization and appropriations bills that relate to national missile defense and should indicate what issues are likely to arise on the Senate floor. This would lead us to consider what, if anything, we can do to effect the outcome, including quick-response grassroots action.

We hope that you can participate.

Howard

X-Sender: dkimball@[63.106.26.66]
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.0.1
Date: Wed, 25 Jul 2001 10:07:30 -0400
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: Re: September 7 briefing on NMD

Howard:

Thanks for the invite, but I would recommend Wade Boese at ACA (who is very good and handles NMD issues for ACA) or Victoria at the Coalition. I will likely be busy getting my office together and taking care of a number of organizational things that week and would rather not commit the time just yet.

Peace,

DK

At 09:42 AM 7/25/01 -0400, you wrote:

>Daryl,
>
>The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament wants to have a briefing
>session on national missile defense soon after Labor Day, specifically on
>Friday, September 7 from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. at the Mott House. The purpose
>is to help us develop our strategy related to Senate floor action on NMD
>during consideration of the defense authorization and defense
>appropriations bills, which is likely to occur soon after that date.
>
>Would you be willing to make one of your first appearances as president of
>the Arms Control Association and be one of the briefers at that session?
>I am also asking Richard Fieldhouse. If he can't do it, I'll try for
>another Senate staff person.
>
>The session should describe provisions of defense authorization and
>appropriations bills that relate to national missile defense and should
>indicate what issues are likely to arise on the Senate floor. This would
>lead us to consider what, if anything, we can do to effect the outcome,
>including quick-response grassroots action.
>
>We hope that you can participate.
>
>Howard
>
>
>Howard W. Hallman, Chair
>Methodists United for Peace with Justice
>1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036
>Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail: mupj@igc.org
>
>Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a membership association of
>laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any Methodist denomination.

Daryl Kimball

UNTIL JULY 27:

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>>

BEGINNING SEPTEMBER 4:

Executive Director

Arms Control Association

1726 M Street, NW, Suite 201

Washington, DC 20036

(ph) 202-463-8270 (fax) 202-463-8273

website <<http://www.armscontrol.org>>

email <dkimball@armscontrol.org>

To: 76622.637@compuserve.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Letter of support
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Lonnie,

I am applying to some foundations for support for my work as facilitator of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament and as link between the faith community and various civil-sector organizations. Altogether I am trying to raise \$50,000, which would provide me with a part-time salary of \$3,000/month, modest fringe benefits, and operating expenses.

It would be helpful to have letters of support from some of the religious organizations participating in the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. Would you be willing to write such a letter on your letterhead? In your own words you might say something about the usefulness of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament and my role as chair.

You can address the letter to "Dear Funder" and send it to me at Methodists United for Peace with Justice, 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036. I can make copies for use with foundation applications. I would appreciate receiving such a letter by Friday, August 3 so that I can include it with an application to the W. Alton Jones Foundation that I will submit the following week. I'll also send it to the Ploughshares Fund, to whom I've already applied.

If you prefer, you can write directly to the foundations. The first one would be to Sally Lilienthal, President, Ploughshares Fund, Fort Mason Center, San Francisco, CA 94123. I'll let you know when to write the W. Alton Jones Foundation after I have submitted my proposal.

I will appreciate your support. But if don't feel comfortable in writing such a letter, I'll understand.

Shalom,
Howard

To: glaszakovits_gb@brethren.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Letter of support
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Greg,

I am applying to some foundations for support for my work as facilitator of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament and as link between the faith community and various civil-sector organizations. Altogether I am trying to raise \$50,000, which would provide me with a part-time salary of \$3,000/month, modest fringe benefits, and operating expenses.

It would be helpful to have letters of support from some of the religious organizations participating in the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. Would you be willing to write such a letter on your letterhead? In your own words you might say something about the usefulness of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament and my role as chair.

You can address the letter to "Dear Funder" and send it to me at Methodists United for Peace with Justice, 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036. I can make copies for use with foundation applications. I would appreciate receiving such a letter by Friday, August 3 so that I can include it with an application to the W. Alton Jones Foundation that I will submit the following week. I'll also send it to the Ploughshares Fund, to whom I've already applied.

If you prefer, you can write directly to the foundations. The first one would be to Sally Lilienthal, President, Ploughshares Fund, Fort Mason Center, San Francisco, CA 94123. I'll let you know when to write the W. Alton Jones Foundation after I have submitted my proposal.

I will appreciate your support. But if don't feel comfortable in writing such a letter, I'll understand.

Shalom,
Howard

To: thart@dfms.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Letter of support
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Tom,

I am applying to some foundations for support for my work as facilitator of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament and as link between the faith community and various civil-sector organizations. Altogether I am trying to raise \$50,000, which would provide me with a part-time salary of \$3,000/month, modest fringe benefits, and operating expenses.

It would be helpful to have letters of support from some of the religious organizations participating in the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. Would you be willing to write such a letter on your letterhead? In your own words you might say something about the usefulness of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament and my role as chair.

You can address the letter to "Dear Funder" and send it to me at Methodists United for Peace with Justice, 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036. I can make copies for use with foundation applications. I would appreciate receiving such a letter by Friday, August 3 so that I can include it with an application to the W. Alton Jones Foundation that I will submit the following week. I'll also send it to the Ploughshares Fund, to whom I've already applied.

If you prefer, you can write directly to the foundations. The first one would be to Sally Lilienthal, President, Ploughshares Fund, Fort Mason Center, San Francisco, CA 94123. I'll let you know when to write the W. Alton Jones Foundation after I have submitted my proposal.

I will appreciate your support. But if don't feel comfortable in writing such a letter, I'll understand.

Shalom,
Howard

To: J_Daryl_Byler@mcc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Letter of support
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Daryl,

I am applying to some foundations for support for my work as facilitator of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament and as link between the faith community and various civil-sector organizations. Altogether I am trying to raise \$50,000, which would provide me with a part-time salary of \$3,000/month, modest fringe benefits, and operating expenses.

It would be helpful to have letters of support from some of the religious organizations participating in the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. Would you be willing to write such a letter on your letterhead? In your own words you might say something about the usefulness of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament and my role as chair.

You can address the letter to "Dear Funder" and send it to me at Methodists United for Peace with Justice, 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036. I can make copies for use with foundation applications. I would appreciate receiving such a letter by Friday, August 3 so that I can include it with an application to the W. Alton Jones Foundation that I will submit the following week. I'll also send it to the Ploughshares Fund, to whom I've already applied.

If you prefer, you can write directly to the foundations. The first one would be to Sally Lilienthal, President, Ploughshares Fund, Fort Mason Center, San Francisco, CA 94123. I'll let you know when to write the W. Alton Jones Foundation after I have submitted my proposal.

I will appreciate your support. But if don't feel comfortable in writing such a letter, I'll understand.

Shalom,
Howard

To: lisaw@nccusa.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Letter of support
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Lisa,

I am applying to some foundations for support for my work as facilitator of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament and as link between the faith community and various civil-sector organizations. Altogether I am trying to raise \$50,000, which would provide me with a part-time salary of \$3,000/month, modest fringe benefits, and operating expenses.

It would be helpful to have letters of support from some of the religious organizations participating in the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. Would you be willing to write such a letter on your letterhead? In your own words you might say something about the usefulness of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament and my role as chair.

You can address the letter to "Dear Funder" and send it to me at Methodists United for Peace with Justice, 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036. I can make copies for use with foundation applications. I would appreciate receiving such a letter by Friday, August 3 so that I can include it with an application to the W. Alton Jones Foundation that I will submit the following week. I'll also send it to the Ploughshares Fund, to whom I've already applied.

If you prefer, you can write directly to the foundations. The first one would be to Sally Lilienthal, President, Ploughshares Fund, Fort Mason Center, San Francisco, CA 94123. I'll let you know when to write the W. Alton Jones Foundation after I have submitted my proposal.

I will appreciate your support. But if don't feel comfortable in writing such a letter, I'll understand.

Shalom,
Howard

To: cgordon@ctr.pcusa.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Letter of support
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Catherine,

I am applying to some foundations for support for my work as facilitator of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament and as link between the faith community and various civil-sector organizations. Altogether I am trying to raise \$50,000, which would provide me with a part-time salary of \$3,000/month, modest fringe benefits, and operating expenses.

It would be helpful to have letters of support from some of the religious organizations participating in the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. Would you be willing to write such a letter on your letterhead? In your own words you might say something about the usefulness of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament and my role as chair.

You can address the letter to "Dear Funder" and send it to me at Methodists United for Peace with Justice, 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036. I can make copies for use with foundation applications. I would appreciate receiving such a letter by Friday, August 3 so that I can include it with an application to the W. Alton Jones Foundation that I will submit the following week. I'll also send it to the Ploughshares Fund, to whom I've already applied.

If you prefer, you can write directly to the foundations. The first one would be to Sally Lilienthal, President, Ploughshares Fund, Fort Mason Center, San Francisco, CA 94123. I'll let you know when to write the W. Alton Jones Foundation after I have submitted my proposal.

I will appreciate your support. But if don't feel comfortable in writing such a letter, I'll understand.

Shalom,
Howard

To: stiefr@ucc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Letter of support
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Ron,

I am applying to some foundations for support for my work as facilitator of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament and as link between the faith community and various civil-sector organizations. Altogether I am trying to raise \$50,000, which would provide me with a part-time salary of \$3,000/month, modest fringe benefits, and operating expenses.

It would be helpful to have letters of support from some of the religious organizations participating in the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. Would you be willing to write such a letter on your letterhead? In your own words you might say something about the usefulness of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament and my role as chair.

You can address the letter to "Dear Funder" and send it to me at Methodists United for Peace with Justice, 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036. I can make copies for use with foundation applications. I would appreciate receiving such a letter by Friday, August 3 so that I can include it with an application to the W. Alton Jones Foundation that I will submit the following week. I'll also send it to the Ploughshares Fund, to whom I've already applied.

If you prefer, you can write directly to the foundations. The first one would be to Sally Lilienthal, President, Ploughshares Fund, Fort Mason Center, San Francisco, CA 94123. I'll let you know when to write the W. Alton Jones Foundation after I have submitted my proposal.

I will appreciate your support. But if don't feel comfortable in writing such a letter, I'll understand.

Shalom,
Howard

X-Lotus-FromDomain: UCC
From: stiefr@ucc.org
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Date: Wed, 25 Jul 2001 12:14:56 -0400
Subject: Re: Letter of support

Howard,
I will write a letter in support for both foundations. I will send them to you. What is your snail mail address, or do you want to stop by the office on Friday to pick them up? This might be better given your timeline.

Ron Stief

To: stiefr@ucc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Letter of support
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <85256A94.0059429D.00@UCCLN2.ucc.org>
References:

At 12:14 PM 7/25/01 -0400, you wrote:

>

>

>Howard,

>I will write a letter in support for both foundations. I will send them to
>you. What is your snail mail address, or do you want to stop by the office
>on Friday to pick them up? This might be better given your timeline.

Thanks, Ron. My mailing address is Methodists United for Peace with Justice, 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036. You can mail them. There is time.

Howard

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

Dear Janet,

I am applying to some foundations for support for my work as facilitator of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament and as link between the faith community and various civil-sector organizations. Altogether I am trying to raise \$50,000, which would provide me with a part-time salary of \$3,000/month, modest fringe benefits, and operating expenses.

It would be helpful to have letters of support from some of the religious organizations participating in the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. Would you be willing to write such a letter on your letterhead? In your own words you might say something about the usefulness of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament and my role as chair.

You can address the letter to "Dear Funder" and send it to me at Methodists United for Peace with Justice, 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036. I can make copies for use with foundation applications. I would appreciate receiving such a letter by Friday, August 3 so that I can include it with an application to the W. Alton Jones Foundation that I will submit the following week. I'll also send it to the Ploughshares Fund, to whom I've already applied.

If you prefer, you can write directly to the foundations. The first one would be to Sally Lilienthal, President, Ploughshares Fund, Fort Mason Center, San Francisco, CA 94123. I'll let you know when to write the W. Alton Jones Foundation after I have submitted my proposal.

I will appreciate your support. But if don't feel comfortable in writing such a letter, I'll understand.

Shalom,
Howard

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

Dear Dave,

I am applying to some foundations for support for my work as facilitator of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament and as link between the faith community and various civil-sector organizations. Altogether I am trying to raise \$50,000, which would provide me with a part-time salary of \$3,000/month, modest fringe benefits, and operating expenses.

It would be helpful to have letters of support from some of the religious organizations participating in the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. Would you be willing to write such a letter on your letterhead? In your own words you might say something about the usefulness of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament and my role as chair.

You can address the letter to "Dear Funder" and send it to me at Methodists United for Peace with Justice, 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036. I can make copies for use with foundation applications. I would appreciate receiving such a letter by Friday, August 3 so that I can include it with an application to the W. Alton Jones Foundation that I will submit the following week. I'll also send it to the Ploughshares Fund, to whom I've already applied.

If you prefer, you can write directly to the foundations. The first one would be to Sally Lilienthal, President, Ploughshares Fund, Fort Mason Center, San Francisco, CA 94123. I'll let you know when to write the W. Alton Jones Foundation after I have submitted my proposal.

I will appreciate your support. But if don't feel comfortable in writing such a letter, I'll understand.

Shalom,
Howard

To: "Wade Boese" <aca@armscontrol.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: NMD briefing on September 7
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Wade Boese:

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair, is scheduling a briefing session on national missile defense on Friday, September 7 from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. at the Mott House. The purpose is to help us develop our strategy related to Senate floor action on NMD during consideration of the defense authorization and defense appropriations bills, which is likely to occur soon after that date.

Daryl Kimball, your president-elect, suggests that we invite you to be one of the briefers at that session? Would this be possible? I am also asking Richard Fieldhouse. If he can't do it, I'll try for another Senate staff person.

The session should describe provisions of defense authorization and appropriations bills that relate to national missile defense and should indicate what issues are likely to arise on the Senate floor. This would lead us to consider what, if anything, we can do to effect the outcome, including quick-response grassroots action.

We hope that you can participate. If you have any questions, call me at 301 896-0013.

Howard

X-Mailer: ListManager Web Interface
Date: Wed, 25 Jul 2001 12:27:13 -0700
Subject: Say No to Missile Defense Systems
To: Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.org>
From: GBCS<actiongbc@umc-gbcs.org>
List-Unsubscribe: <mailto:leave-gbcs-5112739D@earth.lyris.net>
Reply-To: GBCS<actiongbc@umc-gbcs.org>

URGENT ACTION ALERT

July 24, 2001

Say No to Missile Defense Systems

"The Council of Bishops strongly objects to legislation passed by the U.S. Congress to deploy a limited national defense system as soon as technologically feasible. We call upon the President and the Congress to refrain from development and deployment of a national missile defense system because it is illusory, unnecessary and wasteful" (United Methodist Council of Bishops Meeting, April 2001).

Action: The new administration will soon be unveiling the plans for the national missile defense (NMD) with the budget for FY 2002. There will be votes on NMD this fall as a part of the defense authorization and defense appropriations bills. Please write or call your Senators and Representative urging them to oppose deployment and testing of a national missile defense.

Sen. _____
U.S. Senate
Washington, DC 20510

Rep. _____
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

U.S. Capitol Switchboard: (202) 224-3121

To find your member of Congress online click here
<http://www.berkshire.net/~ifas/activist/index.html>

United Methodist Perspective: The 2000 Book of Resolutions, #315 "Saying No to Nuclear Deterrence" states, "halt all efforts to develop and deploy strategic antimissile defense systems because they are illusory, unnecessary, and wasteful."

Talking Points:
Deploying missile defenses would violate the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty of 1972.

Engaging in construction of a NMD could lead to an escalated problem of a global arms race with Russia, China, North Korea, Iraq and other countries capable of developing offensive weapons.

NMD does not address the threat of attack against chemical or biological warfare.

Rogue nations could employ countermeasures to confuse the missile defense system.

NATO and European Nations continue to challenge the view of the Bush administration.

For more information contact Janet Horman at (202) 488-5647 or <jhorman@umc-gbcs.org>

You are currently subscribed to gbcs as: mupj@igc.org

To unsubscribe send a blank email to leave-gbcs-5112739D@earth.lyris.net

Date: Thu, 26 Jul 2001 06:02:35 -0700 (PDT)
From: Egbert Lawrence <egbertl4pj@yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: NMD letter to Congress
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>

--Dear Howard,

Got copy of your letter. Thanks. I am glad that Meg Riley was able to sign on to it. I am back in town. When is our next meeting?

PEACE! Larry

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

> To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament
>

> I am sending as a Word attachment the final version
> of the letter to

> members of the House and Senate Armed Services and
> Appropriations Committee

> on national missile defense. If you can't receive
> it in that format, let

> me know, and I'll send it as e-mail text.

>
> Thanks to all who signed. Thanks to Janet Horman
> for getting staff from

> the United Methodist General Board of Society to
> help with delivery to

> House members. I took care of the Senate.

>
> We need to continue contacting key senators this
> week, leading up to markup

> the week of July 30 by the Senate Armed Services
> Committee.

>

> Shalom,

> Howard

>

>

>

>

> ATTACHMENT part 2 application/msword
name=iclt.160.doc; x-mac-type=42494E41;

x-mac-creator=4D535744

>

> Howard W. Hallman, Chair

> Methodists United for Peace with Justice

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

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

>

> Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a

> membership association of

> laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any

> Methodist denomination.

Do You Yahoo!?

Make international calls for as low as \$.04/minute with Yahoo! Messenger

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