

Dear Lisa and Kathy:

I suggest that we pick up the discussion started by Bob Tiller's "too many meetings" communication at Thursday's meeting of the Nuclear Weapons Working Group.

Howard

Dear George Farebrother:

Thanks for circulating the speech of Miguel Marin-Bosch. It is a very helpful analysis.

He says that 28 nations who voted against pro-disarmament resolutions "represent today the biggest obstacle to nuclear disarmament". Can you provide me a list of those 28 nations?

The Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition, which I serve as a co-convener, is lining up some world religious leaders to communicate with delegates to the NPT PrepCom and to sponsor a reception for delegates in Geneva. We would like to encourage our religious contacts in various nations to lobby their governments prior to the PrepCom. It appears that we should concentrate particularly on those 28 nations. That's why the list will be useful.

Is there anyone in the Abolition 2000 network who is coordinating such lobbying?

Shalom,

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

Dear friends,

The International Network of Engineers and Scientists for Global Responsibility (INES) based in Dortmund, Germany, the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation in Santa Barbara, California, USA and the Austrian Study Center for Peace and Conflict Resolution (ASPR) are organizing a People for Peace Conference at Burg Schlaining in Austria from 17-19 August 1998. Any other organizations interested in co-sponsoring this event can contact Basil Massey <R.Braun@lilly.ping.de> or Dietrich Fischer <102464.1110@compuserve.com>.

The aim of the conference is twofold. First, to provide inputs for the 1999 Hague Peace Conference and second, to bring together people sharing the same ideas to advance the evolving global culture of peace. A draft of details of the conference is enclosed. The organizing committee, participating organizations and experts will refine and develop this list in the upcoming months. A brochure of the town selected for the Peace Conference will be mailed to you soon.

Your organization is invited to participate and share your views with others in planning future steps towards the culture of peace.

Please let one of us know your views and whether you would like to participate in this conference.

Yours sincerely,

Basil Massey Major, Indian Army Engineers and Scientists for Global Responsibility Gutenbergstrasse 31 44139 Dortmund, Germany	Dietrich Fischer Professor at Pace University 114 Conover Road Robbinsville, NJ 08691, USA
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Phone: +49-231-57 52 02 Fax: +49-231-57 52 10 E-mail: R.Braun@lilly.ping.de>	Phone & Fax: +1-609-799-8319 E-mail: 102464.1110@compuserve.com
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------

PEOPLE FOR PEACE CONFERENCE

17 - 19 August 1998
Peace Center, Burg Schlaining
Austria

"If there is no struggle, there is no progress.
Those who profess to favor freedom and yet deprecate
agitation are people who want crops without plowing
up the ground. They want rain without thunder and

lightening. That struggle might be a moral one; it might be a physical one; it might be both moral and physical, but it must be a struggle. Power concedes nothing without a demand. It never did and never will. People might not get all that they work for in this world, but they must certainly work for all they get."

Frederick Douglass
Abolitionist

VISION STATEMENT

This century has seen the end of slavery, colonialism and apartheid. The United Nations has been successful to a large extent in the role for which it was created, mainly stopping wars between states. After the two world wars, wars between states have gradually been reduced, and in the last few years after Iraq invaded Kuwait there has been no act of aggression by a state. Yet, we in this same century have seen internal conflicts sharply increasing. More people have died in them than the combined toll of the two world wars.

There have been incredible advances in technology and scientific developments. Advances in communications have made the world smaller as distances hardly matter any longer. Information can be shared in seconds, which has truly made the world global. Yet, all this has not benefitted the people. The gulf between the favored and the less fortunate on this earth has been widening, and there is no meeting point in sight.

In the past, discussions about national and international security have focussed primarily on the threat of military aggression across borders and on military means to meet such threats. Although this threat must not be underestimated, it represents only one among many dangers that pose a risk to human life or inhibit the development of humanity's full potential, in harmony with nature.

Threats to human survival also include potential ecological catastrophes, such as climate change and population explosion. Exhaustible resources are being used up rapidly, pollution is generated at a rate that in many cases exceeds nature's capacity to render it harmless, and many species are becoming rapidly extinct, while the human population may soon exceed a sustainable level, if it has not already done so. Many vital old cultures are disappearing, and many people are denied elementary rights and freedom.

The growing interdependence of the world has given rise to a series of global problems that states can no longer solve by themselves. Only through worldwide cooperation can we cope with such issues as preventing climate shifts, stabilizing the population growth, preventing nuclear winter/nuclear terrorism,

having a code of conduct in the international arms trade, stopping the use of children in government as well as insurgent armies. And to achieve all this there is an urgent need to strengthen the United Nations. But above all the people have to voice their opinion and make their governments change policies.

The importance of people and NGOs is manifested in that some international NGOs have memberships of millions of people, which in certain cases is more than the population of entire countries. In this People for Peace Conference, we cannot touch on all issues, hence it will focus on four themes. One goal of this People for Peace Conference is to provide input for the 1999 PEACE CONFERENCE IN THE HAGUE on these four global issues.

In this conference, specifically let us find the moral, spiritual and political will to do what our leaders know must be done but cannot bring themselves to do:

- Abolish weapons of mass destruction;
- Abolish the arms trade, or at least reduce it to levels compatible with the prohibition of aggression enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations;
- Stop the cruel practice of using child soldiers;
- Strengthen the United Nations.

CONFERENCE DETAILS

DATE 17-19 August 1998

LOCATION Peace Center Burg, Schlainning, Austria

PROPOSED NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS: 150-200

COST Details not yet available, but assistance to participants from developing countries is expected

FORMAT

The People for Peace Conference will bring together a wide variety of groups to facilitate the development of new ideas and projects, as well as to create plans for sustained follow-up activities. The participants of such a large number of organizations from activist to strategic to government backgrounds will allow for extensive networking and collaboration across a variety of sectors. The conference will discuss the full spectrum of initiatives integral to the promotion of peace in the 21st century with special reference to the four themes.

The conference will have plenary meetings every day at which major world leaders will address the conference on the day's key Agenda item, which will be followed by a variety of lectures, panel discussions, round table sessions and other activities.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

Organizing Committee

The functions of the organizing committee include:
Development and implementation of key agenda items;
Dissemination of information to; and
Cooperation with other interested organizations;
Arrange the key staff for this conference.

Coordinating Committee

The Coordinating Committee is the core group of citizens responsible for the entire project. Its functions include:

- Oversight of the legal, administrative and financial aspects of the People for Peace Conference;
- Responsibility for fund raising;
- Establishment of an Honorary Committee comprising renowned individuals;
- Outreach to media, governments and citizens organizations.

Participating Organizations

A variety of citizens' organizations will participate in the conference. They will:

- Assist in the development of the key agenda items;
- Provide practical and logistical support throughout the various stages of the conference;
- Organize delegations to participate in the conference;
- Conduct outreach and dissemination of information.

Honorary Committee

An Honorary Committee comprising world leaders, Nobel laureates, peace activists, and others is being established to provide advice and vision to the People for Peace Conference.

Honorary Advisory Committee

An Advisory Committee, comprised of individual scholars, representatives of key academic bodies and activist organizations, will be formed to provide expert assistance and input in the formulation of the Conference Agenda for the four themes.

ABOLITION 2000 EMAIL ADDRESSES:
254 subscribers as of 12/97:

PLEASE FILL IN THE BLANKS!

102464.1110@compuserve.com
Dietrich Fischer

106351.1634@compuserve.com
Nigel Chamberlain
Cumbria & N.Lancashire Peace Groups

A.Malten@net.HCC.nl
Ak Malten,
Global Anti Nuclear Alliance

aam@trecom.tomsk.su

abeier@igc.apc.org
Ann Beier

abol@amok.antenna.nl

abolition@motherearth.agoranet.be
For Mother Earth
Abolition Days/ List serve address

abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Abolition Caucus / List-serve address

abolition-caucus@mail.wisewire.com

achin@avk.unv.ernet.in
Achin Vanaik,
Trustee INREP, N.Delhi

acronym@gn.apc.org
Rebecca Johnson
Acronym Institute

act@web.net
Saul Chernos,
ACT for Disarmament, Canada

afscamb@igc.apc.org
Joseph Gerson,
AFSC - New England

agrieg@online.no
Anne Grieg
IPPNW Norway

akiramed@pop01.odn.ne.jp

aldavisjones@juno.com

alicherman@igc.apc.org

amok@amok.antenna.nl
Karel Koster
AMOK

anidecker@bluewin.ch
Andi Nidecker
PSR/IPPNW Switzerland

agrieg@sn.no
Anne Grieg
IPPNW Norway

appel100@worldnet.fr
Anick Sicart,
Appel des Cent Paris

aslater@igc.apc.org
Alice Slater,
Global Resource Action Center(GRACE)

astrauss@netrunner.net

atwood@pop.unicc.org
David Atwood
Quakers

azaluar@undp.org

bent@math.uio.no
Bent Natvig

Scientists for Responsibility, Norway

bernard.dewitte@ping.be

BERNAS@frcpn11.in2p3.fr

beukes@aft.sn.no
WILPF Norway

bjack8@3-cities.com

bkinsey@peacemission.org
Bob Kinsey

bplumley@igc.apc.org

bries11@mail.euronet.nl

bstedman@igc.apc.org

btiller@psr.org
Bob Tiller,
Physicians for Social Responsibility

btree@osk.threewebnet.or.jp

cathpete@camtech.net.au
Cathy Picone

cfpa@cyberenet.net

chiapski@aol.com

civiak_r@a1.eop.gov

clarkg2@rpi.edu

cloudflowers@igc.org

cnd@gn.apc.org
Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, UK

cnic-jp@po.iijnet.or.jp

contia@dvol.com
Rich Conti

cppnw@web.net
PGS CAnada

crazymail@technologist.com

crramey@igc.apc.org

crusader@fpm.bsu.unibel.by
Andrew Tumas,
Int'l Sakharov Institute on Radioecology

crypt.keeper@arena.leba.net

ctb@igc.apc.org
Bruce Hall,
CTB Clearinghouse

cxj15621@niftyserve.or.jp

danfine@igc.apc.org
Dan Fine

dave@paxchristiusa.org

Dave Robinson
Pax Christi

davidmcr@aol.com

dcortright@igc.apc.org
David Cortright
Fourth Freedom Forum

DCulp@nrdc.org
David Culp

ddur@FranceNet.fr
Daniel Durand
Mouvement de la Paix

decowan@acs.ucalgary.ca

dellsberg@igc.apc.org
Dan Ellsberg

Dgracie@afsc.org
David Gracie

dh3m@hrzpub.th-darmstadt.de
Jürgen Scheffran?
INESAP

dh3o@hrzpub.th-darmstadt.de

disarmtimes@igc.apc.org
Roger Smith
NGO Comm on Disarmament

dkimball@igc.apc.org
Daryl Kimball
Coalition for a Nuclear Free Future?

dolly@giasdla.vsnl.net.in

dpflanz@cedar.alberni.net
Dolores Pflanz

driscoll@the-hermes.net

drtd@compuserve.com

e.jacobsen@psyc.canterbury.ac.nz

ebk@a0370.aetat.no

ecaaras@igc.apc.org

ECAAR

edibal@iprolink.ch
Edith Ballantyne
WILPF?

edshaff@web.net

epic1934@aol.com

epp92@antenna.nl
Dirk Jan Dullemond
Nederlanse Kernstop Coalitie

EricMoon@juno.com

erippy@compuserve.com
Ed Rippy

fboyle@law.uiuc.edu

fbp@igc.apc.org

fcpj@afn.org

flick@igc.apc.org
Felicity Hill

flprop1@gate.net

fm2melfn@lucano.uco.es

foesydney@peg.apc.org

FOE Sydney

fornatl@igc.apc.org

forum.abolition@alinks.se

fredpax@online.no
Frederik Heffermehl
IALANA Norway

freedom@peg.apc.org

freezone@hookele.com

friedman@uconnvm.uconn.edu

frtjs@fy.chalmers.se
INESAP

ftb@argonet.co.uk

gdaniell@wt.com.au
Graham Daniell

gekegaerd@nn.apc.org

gensuikin@igc.apc.org
Masa?
Gensuikin

georg.schoefbaenker@jk.uni-linz.ac.at
Georg Schöfbänker
Burg Schlaining Peace Centre

geowcpuk@gm.apc.org
George Farebrother,
World Court Project UK

GHewison@manukau.govt.nz
Grant Hewison

global2000@t0.or.at
Andrea Paukovits

goodwill@indigo.ie

greensfelder@igc.apc.org
Claire Greensfelder
Plutonium Free Future

grinberg@wamani.apc.org

guardian@peg.apc.org

guerilla@tky0.att.net.or.jp

guster2@leland.Stanford.EDU

gw@ss.gu.se
Gunnar Westberg
SLMK, IPPNW Sweden

henrik.arnell@klingen.uu.se
Henrik Arnell

SLMK, IPPNW Sweden

herniels@sn.no

hgw@scruznet.com
Jennifer Olaranna Viereck,
Healing Global Wounds Alliance

hhagelun@online.no

iakim@glas.apc.org
Vladimir Iakimov

ialana@antenna.nl
Francis van Holtoon
IALANA

ic3t-kwt@asahi-net.or.jp

ike@swva.net

info@nuclearfreeworld.org

ipb@gn.apc.org
Colin Archer, Chris Bross
International Peace Bureau

ipis@igc.apc.org

ippnw@vlberlin.comlink.de
Xanthe Hall
IPPNW Deutschland

irss@igc.apc.org

ishihara@okiu.ac.jp

jan.vande.putte@diala.greenpeace.org
Jan van de Putte
Greenpeace Belgium

jbloomfield@gn.apc.org
Janet Bloomfield
Oxford Research Group

jburroughs@igc.apc.org
John Burroughs,
Western States Legal Found

Jenny.WMCND@btinternet.com
West Midlands CND?

JGG786@aol.com
Jonathan Granoff,
NGO Committee on Disarmament

jim@merical.mhs.compuserve.com

jklotz@walrus.com

jlonn@undp.org

jloretz@medglobe.tiac.net
John Loretz
Medicine and Global Survival

johnpike@fas.org

jopax@juno.com
John Owen,
L.A. No Nukes

jsp-sls@pacbell.net

jsteinbach@igc.apc.org
John Steinbach & Louise Franklin-Ramirez

jtlowe@aol.com
Colby Lowe,
Nuclear Task Force, Peace Action

kaibraat@online.no

kalinowski@hrzpub.tu-darmstadt.de
Martin Kalinowski
INESAP

kataoka@mcai.med.hiroshima-u.ac.jp

Kathy4Paz@aol.com

kathy-s@k2nesoft.com

katie@chch.planet.org.nz
Kate Dewes

kawapic@sag.bekkoame.or.jp

ke3k-tknm@asahi-net.or.jp

kekula@hookele.com

kgrossman@hamptons.com
Karl Grossman

kliu@chaminade.edu

kurt.hanevik@ikb.uib.no
Kurt Hanevik
IPPNW Norway

kwood@igc.apc.org
Karina H. Wood,
NATO Expansion Speakers Tour

LANLaction@aol.com

lasg@igc.apc.org

lcapt@efn.org

lcnp@aol.com
Alyn Ware,
Lawyers' Cttee on Nuc Policy

ledwidge@psr.org
Lisa Ledwidge
Physicians for Social Responsibility

lennart.bernam@swipnet.se

leumasbj@juno.com

lforrow@igc.apc.org
Lachlan Forrow
IPPNW

liebert@hrzpub.th-darmstadt.de
Wolfgang Liebert
INESAP

liz.westmorland@Leeds.Gov.Uk
Liz Westmorland
Nuclear Free Local Authorities, UK

lorjacy@ix.netcom.com

lwirbel@igc.apc.org
Loring Wirbel,
Citizens for Peace in Space

magoo@giasdl01.vsnl.net.in
Brigadier Vijai K Nair,
Forum for Strategic & Security Studies

mailserv@insync.net
Case Black

mapw@ozemail.com.au
Medical Association for the Prevention of War, IPPNW Australia

margetts@iinet.net.au

martinez@servidor.unam.mx

maryl@mt.arias.net

marylia@igc.apc.org

maternatura@ax.apc.org

mcasper@physics.carleton.edu

mcken1@student.monash.edu.au

medact@gn.apc.org
Gillian Reeve
MEDACT, IPPNW UK

meldredge@igc.apc.org

melinda@stimson.org

mfrisch@gn.apc.org

millerl@duke.usask.ca

mkantola@kaapeli.fi
Malla Kantola

Peace Union of Finland

mlist@parsecweb.com

morganth@hooked.net

Morten.Bremer.Maerli@nrpa.no

mpbovy@mail.allia-com.fr

mupj@igc.apc.org

Howard Hallman,
Methodists United for Peace & Justice

mvtpaix@globenet.org

Mouvement de la Paix

nan@gn.apc.org

nbutler@basicint.org

Nicola Butler
BASIC

nde@igc.apc.org

Pamela Meidell
Nevada Desert Experience

neuneck@math.uni-hamburg.de

Götz Neuneck
ISFH

nfpb@gn.apc.org

NFPC@phil.gn.apc.org

nfznsc@gn.apc.org

nhpeaceact@igc.apc.org

nirsnet@igc.apc.org
Michael Mariotte,
NIRS

npc@gn.apc.org

nukeresister@igc.org

nvmpsecr@antenna.nl
Hans van Iterson
NVMP, IPPNW Netherlands

okamoto@shudo-u.ac.jp
Mitsuo Okamoto
(Hiroshima Shudo University)

P.Low@fren.canterbury.ac.nz

pacar@t3.rim.or.jp

pacific@rainbow.net.au

panukes@igc.apc.org

paprogr@igc.apc.org
Fran Teplitz,
Peace Action Education Fund

paweb@igc.apc.org

pbidwai@pb.unv.ernet.in

peacedepot@y.email.ne.jp

PeaceFirst@aol.com

pff@igc.apc.org

pgs@web.net
Debbie Grisdale
PGS Canada

philr@sonic.net

plough@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca
Bill Robinson

ploughshares@igc.apc.org

pma@xtra.co.nz

pmeidell@igc.apc.org
Pamela Meidell,
Atomic Mirror

pohlmeie@uke.uni-hamburg.de
Lars Pohlmeier
IPPNW Germany

prcsandiego@igc.apc.org

prior@wnmeds.ac.nz
Ian Prior
IPPNW New Zealand

PROOSE@oberlin.edu

prop1@prop1.org
Ellen & Wm Thomas
Proposition One Committee

psrnatl@igc.apc.org

Physicians for Social Responsibility

psrnyc@igc.org

Carol Garman,

PSR/NYC,

psrsm@igc.apc.org

psrsm@psr.org

Jonathan Parfrey,

PSR/LA (Santa Monica)

psysrusa@interserv.com

quercus@concentric.net

rc@vom.com

Robert Cherwink

redoak999@aol.com

Ray Somerville,

Le Poco

regina.hagen@jugendstil.da.shuttle.de

Regina Hagen

rene.moi@mailbox.swipnet.se

r-grayle@classic.msn.com

Ron Gray

riegle@tardis.svsu.edu

Rosalie Riegler

rush@hnrc.tufts.edu

David Rush

PSR

rwilcock@execulink.com

Ross Wilcock

PGS Canada

salvador@hawaii.edu

sbrackman@igc.apc.org
Selma Brackman
War and Peace Foundation

schertze@ccr.jussieu.fr

serfo@tornado.be (Serfo)

sfcny@igc.apc.org
Diane Swords
Peace Action of Central New York

sfr@nn.apc.org

shundahai@radix.net
Corbin Harney, etc.
Shundahai Network

shundahai@intermind.net

sinhas@cognos.com

spearce@igc.apc.org

srfnyusa@igc.apc.org

stephen@congress.demon.co.uk

stopnuketest@igc.org

stuwhis@enter.net

Summer summer@iname.com

sys21@nuri.net

TDRozman@aol.com

Tilruff@aol.com
Tilman Ruff
MAPW, IPPNW Australia

tinabell@walrus.com
Tina Bell,
Oxford Research Group

t-midori@mx6.meshnet.or.jp

tobdam@aol.com
Tobias Damjanov
DFG-VK

TracyMM@aol.com

tsbrueni@wheel.dcn.davis.ca.us

uphc01@uxp1.hrz.uni-dortmund.de
Reiner Braun
INES

veiluvawslf@igc.apc.org

vsidel@igc.apc.org
Vic Sidel
Co-President, IPPNW

wagingpeace@napf.org
David Krieger, Christoph Hantermann
Nuclear Age Peace Foundation

wandwill@clark.net
Deborah Walden,
WAND

warehams@ozemail.com.au
Susan Wareham
MAPW, IPPNW Australia

wcp@antenna.nl
World Court Project

weavepaz@wco.com

Weissdor@aol.com
Dora Weiss
NGO Comm on Disarmament

wfm@igc.apc.org
William Pace,
World Federalist Movement

womensleague@gn.apc.org

worldpeace@gn.apc.org

wrl@igc.apc.org

wslf@igc.apc.org
Jackie Cabasso,
Western States Legal Found

Thanks to all of you who have sent your email addresses to help me in the quest for a current Abolition email list to post on our website. This is the list I've compiled so far. You'll note that names are missing from many of the addresses. If you want your name and/or organization listed, please let me know. ALSO, I'd like to add websites to this list so it can be a complete reference for us all. If you have a website, please let me know?

The e-mail addresses are listed alphabetically.

Ellen Thomas -- prop1@prop1.org

ABOLITION 2000 EMAIL ADDRESSES:

254 subscribers as of 12/97:

102464.1110@compuserve.com Dietrich Fischer
106351.1634@compuserve.com
A.Malten@net.HCC.nl Ak Malten, Global Anti Nuclear Alliance
aam@trecom.tomsk.su
abeier@igc.apc.org Ann Beier
abol@amok.antenna.nl
abolition@motherearth.agoranet.be
abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org Abolition Caucus / (list-serve address)
abolition-caucus@mail.wisewire.com
achin@avk.unv.ernet.in Achin Vanaik, Trustee INREP, N.Delhi
acronym@gn.apc.org
act@web.net Saul Chernos, ACT for Disarmament, Canada
afscamb@igc.apc.org Joseph Gerson, AFSC - New England
agrieg@online.no (Anne Grieg)
akiramed@pop01.odn.ne.jp
aldavisjones@juno.com
alicherman@igc.apc.org
amok@amok.antenna.nl
anidecker@bluewin.ch
agrieg@sn.no Anne Grieg
appel100@worldnet.fr Anick Sicart, Appel des Cent Paris
aslater@igc.apc.org Alice Slater, Global Resource Action Center(GRACE)
astrau@netrunner.net
atwood@pop.unicc.org
azaluar@undp.org
bent@math.uio.no
bernard.dewitte@ping.be
BERNAS@frcpn11.in2p3.fr
beukes@aft.sn.no
bjack8@3-cities.com
bkinsey@peacemission.org
bplumley@igc.apc.org
bries11@mail.euronet.nl
bstedman@igc.apc.org
btiller@psr.org Bob Tiller, Physicians for Social Responsibility
http://www.psr.org

btree@osk.threewebnet.or.jp
cathpete@camtech.net.au Cathy Picone
cfpa@cyberenet.net
chiapski@aol.com
civiak_r@a1.eop.gov
clarkg2@rpi.edu
cloudflowers@igc.org
cnd@gn.apc.org
cnic-jp@po.iijnet.or.jp
contia@dvol.com Rich Conti
cppnw@web.net
crazymail@technologist.com
crramey@igc.apc.org
crusader@fpm.bsu.unibel.by Andrew Tumas, Int'l Sakharov Institute on
Radioecology
crypt.keeper@arena.leba.net
ctb@igc.apc.org Bruce Hall, CTB Clearinghouse
cxj15621@niftyserve.or.jp
danfine@igc.apc.org
dave@paxchristiusa.org
davidmcr@aol.com
dcortright@igc.apc.org
DCulp@nrdc.org
ddur@FranceNet.fr
decowan@acs.ucalgary.ca
dellsberg@igc.apc.org
Dgracie@afsc.org
dh3m@hrzpub.th-darmstadt.de
dh3m@hrzpub.tu-darmstadt.DE
dh3o@hrzpub.th-darmstadt.de
disarmtimes@igc.apc.org Roger Smith NGO Comm on Disarm
dkimball@igc.apc.org
dolly@giasdla.vsnl.net.in
dpflanz@cedar.alberni.net (Dolores Pflanz)
driscoll@the-hermes.net
drtd@compuserve.com
e.jacobsen@psyc.canterbury.ac.nz
ebk@a0370.aetat.no
ecaaras@igc.apc.org
edibal@iprolink.ch Edith Ballantyne
edshaff@web.net
epic1934@aol.com
epp92@antenna.nl
EricMoon@juno.com
erippy@compuserve.com Ed Rippy
fboyle@law.uiuc.edu
fbp@igc.apc.org
fcpj@afn.org
flick@igc.apc.org
flprop1@gate.net
fm2melfn@lucano.uco.es
foesydney@peg.apc.org
fornatl@igc.apc.org George Farebrother, World Court Project UK
forum.abolition@alinks.se

fredpax@online.no
freedom@peg.apc.org
freezone@hookele.com
friedman@uconnvm.uconn.edu
frtjs@fy.chalmers.se
ftb@argonet.co.uk
gdaniell@wt.com.au
gekegaerd@nn.apc.org
gensuikin@igc.apc.org
georg.schoefbaenker@jk.uni-linz.ac.at
geowcpuk@gn.apc.org
GHewison@manukau.govt.nz Grant Hewison
global2000@t0.or.at Andrea Paukovits
goodwill@indigo.ie
greensfelder@igc.apc.org
grinberg@wamani.apc.org
guardian@peg.apc.org
guerilla@tky0.attnet.or.jp
guster2@leland.Stanford.EDU
gw@ss.gu.se
henrik.arnell@klingen.uu.se
herniels@sn.no
hgw@scruznet.com Jennifer Olaranna Viereck, Healing Global Wounds Alliance
hhagelun@online.no
iakim@glas.apc.org
ialana@antenna.nl
ic3t-kwt@asahi-net.or.jp
ike@swva.net
info@nuclearfreeworld.org
ipb@gn.apc.org
ipis@igc.apc.org
IPPNW@VLBERLIN.comlink.de
irss@igc.apc.org
ishihara@okiu.ac.jp
jan.vande.putte@diala.greenpeace.org
jbloomfield@gn.apc.org
jburroughs@igc.apc.org John Burroughs, Western States Legal Found
Jenny.WMCND@btinternet.com
JGG786@aol.com Jonathan Granoff, NGO Committee on Disarmament
jim@merical.mhs.compuserve.com
jklotz@walrus.com
jlonn@undp.org
jloretz@medglobe.tiac.net
johnpike@fas.org
jopax@juno.com John Owen, L.A. No Nukes
jsp-sls@pacbell.net
jsteinbach@igc.apc.org John Steinbach & Louise Franklin-Ramirez
jtlowe@aol.com Colby Lowe, Nuclear Task Force, Peace Action
kaibraat@online.no
kalinowski@hrzpub.tu-darmstadt.de
kataoka@mcai.med.hiroshima-u.ac.jp
Kathy4Paz@aol.com
kathy-s@k2nesoft.com
katie@chch.planet.org.nz

kawapic@sag.bekkoame.or.jp
ke3k-tknm@asahi-net.or.jp
kekula@hookele.com
kgrossman@hamptons.com
kliu@chaminade.edu
kurt.hanevik@ikb.uib.no
kwood@igc.apc.org Karina H. Wood, NATO Expansion Speakers Tour
LANLaction@aol.com
lasg@igc.apc.org
lcapt@efn.org
lcnp@aol.com Alyn Ware, Lawyers' Cttee on Nuc Policy
ledwidge@psr.org
lennart.bernam@swipnet.se
leumasbj@juno.com
lforrow@igc.apc.org
liebert@hrzpub.th-darmstadt.de
liz.westmorland@Leeds.Gov.Uk
lorjacy@ix.netcom.com
lwirbel@igc.apc.org Loring Wirbel, Citizens for Peace in Space
magoo@giasdl01.vsnl.net.in Brigadier Vijai K Nair, Forum for Strategic & Security Studies
mailserv@insync.net Case Black
mapw@ozemail.com.au
margetts@iinet.net.au
martinez@servidor.unam.mx
maryl@mt.arias.net
marylia@igc.apc.org
maternatura@ax.apc.org
mcasper@physics.carleton.edu
mcken1@student.monash.edu.au
medact@gn.apc.org
meldredge@igc.apc.org
melinda@stimson.org
mfrisch@gn.apc.org
millerl@duke.usask.ca
mkantola@kaapeli.fi
mlist@parsecweb.com
morganth@hooked.net
Morten.Bremer.Maerli@nrpa.no
mpbovy@mail.allia-com.fr
mupj@igc.apc.org Howard Hallman, Methodists United for Peace & Justice
mvtpaix@globenet.org
nan@gn.apc.org
nbutler@basicint.org
nde@igc.apc.org
neuneck@math.uni-hamburg.de
nfpb@gn.apc.org
NFPC@phil.gn.apc.org
nfznsc@gn.apc.org
nhpeaceact@igc.apc.org
nirsnet@igc.apc.org Michael Mariotte, NIRS
npc@gn.apc.org
nukeresister@igc.org
nvmpsecr@antenna.nl

okamoto@shudo-u.ac.jp Mitsuo Okamoto (Hiroshima Shudo University)
P.Low@fren.canterbury.ac.nz
pacar@t3.rim.or.jp
pacific@rainbow.net.au
panukes@igc.apc.org
paprogr@igc.apc.org Fran Teplitz, Peace Action Education Fund
paweb@igc.apc.org
pbidwai@pb.unv.ernet.in
peacedepot@y.email.ne.jp
PeaceFirst@aol.com
pff@igc.apc.org
pgs@web.net Debbie Grisdale
philr@sonic.net
plough@waterv1.uwaterloo.ca Bill Robinson
ploughshares@igc.apc.org
pma@xtra.co.nz
pmeidell@igc.apc.org Pamela Meidell, World Court Project
pohlmeie@uke.uni-hamburg.de
prcsandiego@igc.apc.org
prior@wnmeds.ac.nz
PROOSE@oberlin.edu
prop1@prop1.org Ellen & Wm Thomas Proposition One Committee
psrnatl@igc.apc.org
psrnyc@igc.org Carol Garman, PSR/NYC,
psrsrm@igc.apc.org
psrsrm@psr.org Jonathan Parfrey, PSR/LA (Santa Monica)
psysrusa@interserv.com
quercus@concentric.net
rc@vom.com Robert Cherwink
redoak999@aol.com Ray Somerville, Le Poco
regina.hagen@jugendstil.da.shuttle.de Regina Hagen
rene.moi@mailbox.swipnet.se
r-grayle@classic.msn.com Ron Gray
riegle@tardis.svsu.edu Rosalie Riegler
rush@hnrc.tufts.edu
rwilcock@execulink.com
salvador@hawaii.edu
sbrackman@igc.apc.org
schertze@ccr.jussieu.fr
serfo@tornado.be (Serfo)
sfcny@igc.apc.org
sfr@nn.apc.org
shundahai@radix.net Shundahai Network -- Corbin Harney etc.,
shundahai@intermind.net
sinhas@cognos.com
spearce@igc.apc.org
srfnyusa@igc.apc.org
stephen@congress.demon.co.uk
stopnuketest@igc.org
stuwhis@enter.net
Summer summer@iname.com
sys21@nuri.net
TDRozman@aol.com
Tilruff@aol.com

tinabell@walrus.com Tina Bell, Oxford Research Group
t-midori@mx6.meshnet.or.jp
tobdam@aol.com
TracyMM@aol.com
tsbrueni@wheel.dcn.davis.ca.us
uphc01@uxp1.hrz.uni-dortmund.de
veiluvawslf@igc.apc.org
vsidel@igc.apc.org
wagingpeace@napf.org Nuclear Age Peace Foundation
wandwill@clark.net Deborah Walden, WAND
warehams@ozemail.com.au
wcp@antenna.nl
weavepaz@wco.com
Weissdor@aol.com
wfm@igc.apc.org William Pace, World Federalist Movement
womensleague@gn.apc.org
worldpeace@gn.apc.org
wrl@igc.apc.org
wslf@igc.apc.org Jackie Cabasso, Western States Legal Found

Dear Ellen,

Thanks for doing this tedious but important task. sfcny@igc.apc.org is Peace Action of Central New York and my name, Diane Swords, can go with it. Our web page is www.cnypeaceaction.com.

Happy New Year!

Peace,

Diane Swords

Hi Howard,

Hope you had a happy holiday.

As far as getting statements on nuclear abolition from various religious faiths, FCNL has a list of leaders from a wide range of faiths that we compiled during our work on the CWC. Perhaps it would be useful for a mailing requesting statements. It is mostly U.S. groups/names, and you may be looking for more international representation, but if it would be of use, let me know. I'm in the office on Dec. 29 for a few hours, but out the rest of the week.

Happy New Year!
bridget

At 11:19 AM 12/23/97 -0800, you wrote:

>Dear Colleagues:

>The Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition is planning a reception
>for world religious leaders and delegates to the Nuclear
>Non-Proliferation Treaty Preparatory Committee (NPT PrepCom) meeting in
>Geneva, scheduled for April 27 to May 8, 1998. We are drafting a
>statement in advance to offer a religious perspective. For that purpose
>we are well supplied with statements from Protestant and Catholic sources
>but need more from Jewish, Islami, Buddhists, and other religious faiths.
>Therefore, I would appreciate receiving your suggestions. We would also
>like to identify individuals and organizations from these faiths who have
>spoken out on the need for nuclear abolition.

>

>Shalom,

>

>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

>

I am aware of at least eight regular coalitional meetings at which participants plan strategies and tactics related to CTBT ratification (there may be more that I am not remembering):

1. Nuclear Weapons Working Group
2. Monday Lobby (and Coolfont Retreat)
3. Disarmament Clearinghouse Steering Committee
4. CTBT Summits Planning Committee (for grassroots training)
5. Howard Hallman's meetings on grassroots
6. CTBT WG of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
7. informal lobbying meeting following the CTBT WG of CRND
8. CRND membership meeting (and occasional subgroups)

PSR tries (and generally succeeds) to have a representative at every one of these meetings. Some other organizations may attempt to do the same, while most organizations participate in only some of these coalitions.

The problem of duplication is serious; the same reports are repeated at several meetings and the same papers are passed around many times. But the problems of fragmentary knowledge and missed communication are also serious. We can not develop a winning approach this way.

I believe that meetings are an important piece of each day's work, and that we can not shape successful strategies and tactics without meetings. However, this list of meetings on CTBT is far too long. And I have heard recently that some folks want to form yet another group.

I propose that we (1) identify the coalitional settings where we want the heavy work done, and (2) consider ways to shrink the total list.

I think we need some informal discussion over the next few weeks on how to get this done. My own suggestions are as follows: (a) The two major arenas for heavy work should be the Nuclear Weapons Working Group and the CTBT Working Group of the CRND. Other groups would be, with respect to the CTBT, primarily reporting occasions. (b) We should consider folding the Summits Planning Committee and the informal lobbying meeting into other groups, thus shrinking the list to six.

What do others think?

Shalom,
Bob Tiller

TO: CTBT colleagues
FR: Daryl Kimball
RE: suggestions on CTBT meetings

Bob Tiller wrote:

"I am aware of at least eight regular coalitional meetings at which participants plan strategies and tactics related to CTBT ratification ... This list of meetings on CTBT is far too long. I propose that we (1) identify the coalitional settings where we want the heavy work done, and (2) consider ways to shrink the total list. My own suggestions are as follows:
(a) The two major arenas for heavy work should be the Nuclear Weapons Working Group and the CTBT Working Group of the CRND. Other groups would be, with respect to the CTBT, primarily reporting occasions; (b) We should consider folding the Summits Planning Committee and the informal lobbying meeting into other groups, thus shrinking the list to six. What do others think?"

DK's Reply:

I generally agree with Bob Tiller's observations and suggestions. It is important for us to reduce the number of meetings to the minimum necessary and that we make each meeting as efficient and productive as possible. And I agree that we can do a better job. To do this we need to be clear about what each meeting is about and to be professional about how meetings are conducted. On the other hand, we have to keep in mind that no one meeting can't practically include everyone or be about everything CTBT.

So, what can, should be, or already are the set of CTBT meetings about?

The CTBT campaign, like any national public policy campaign, consists of efforts by our community of NGOs in four basic areas:

- * communication with the Executive Branch
- * media work
- * direct education, liaison and lobbying of the Senate
- * grassroots lobbying and public education/outreach

I agree with Bob Tiller that the two "heavy lifting" sets of CTBT campaign meetings should be the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers CTBT Working Group Meetings and the Nuclear Weapons Working Group Meetings. Because of the larger number and variety of groups who are interested in the CTBT effort and because of the huge scope of work involved, I believe that it is necessary to have more than one series of meetings.

However, if we can be more disciplined about what each setting is trying to accomplish and if we can effectively and efficiently report to one another about work/developments in other areas of the campaign, we'll have a smoother and less time consuming series of meetings.

In that spirit, I would like to describe/suggest the following general

division of labor, which is based on the pattern of work that has already been fairly well established over past weeks as well as the CWC campaign experience:

"CTBT Meetings: Where to go and for what?"

CTBT WORKING GROUP OF THE COALITION TO REDUCE N-DANGERS (Chair, T. Collina)

Meeting Times: approx. once a month on Fridays from 9:30-10:00. Next meeting January 23 at NRDC, with subsequent meetings at UCS 7th floor on Feb 27; Mar 27; Apr 24; May 22; June 26. More frequent meetings may be necessary as the campaign heats up.

Function: *information sharing
*strategy and coordination of efforts related to direct education and liaison of the Senate (i.e. press briefings, polling, reports and fax blasts)
*strategy and coordination of work with Executive branch
*strategy and coordination of associated media work (i.e. press briefings, polling, reports, expert speakers, and Coalition press releases)
*brief report (preferably in written form) on grassroots outreach and lobbying work from a representative of the Nuclear Weapons Working Group.

Participants: open to Coalition members and other groups who support the CTBT. A larger number of participants is expected as the campaign heats up. Generally includes research-oriented and membership-based groups as well as some APS, LWV, and BENS.

AD HOC CTBT LOBBYING MTG. following the CTBT WKG. GRP. MTG.
-- this setting can bring together the key individuals engaged in direct lobbying for a short face to face meeting.

Function: to share information about DC meetings/lobbying of specific Senators assign tasks, schedule future meetings

Participants: open to representatives of organizations who are actively engaged in direct lobbying activities in the Senate on the CTBT, including LWV, APS, BENS and others who may not attend the CTBT WKG. GRP. MTG. and who do not attend NWWG meetings.

Meeting Times: following every CTBT Wkg. Grp. Meeting from 10:00-10:30.

COALITION TO REDUCE N-DANGERS MEMBERSHIP MEETING: A CTBT Wkg. Grp. report will be made at each meeting, which

summarizes developments, solicits suggestions, and information about the CTBT. Other issues of concern to the Coalition will be reported on and discussed. In addition, this meeting serves to facilitate group decisions about policy recommendations in letters and statements, and about proposals for major Coalition expenditures. Open to member groups of the Coalition. Minutes are taken and sent to member groups.

OTHER SUBGROUPS: Tom Collina and I have and will pulled together ad hoc meetings to advance work in specific areas such as long-range media strategy and Coalition polling on the CTBT.

NUCLEAR WEAPONS WORKING GROUP (rotating chairs) -- Approx. 1/3 of meetings devoted to CTBT, the other 2/3 to stockpile stewardship and other nuclear weapons issues.

Meeting Times: generally once a week on Thursdays from 9:00-10:30.

Function: *information sharing on CTBT and other nuclear weapons

topics of concern

*strategy and coordination of efforts related to
GRASSROOTS mobilization, education,
and grassroots lobbying. (i.e. post card alerts, action alerts, press
briefings, polling, reports and fax blasts)

*strategy and coordination of grassroots media work
(primarily letters to editor and radio call-in)
*brief report (preferably in written form) on
news and activities from a
representative of the CTBT Working Group of the Coalition (usually Kimball
or Collina)

Participants: open, but generally includes members of membership-based
(grassroots) organizations and some faith-based groups.

*One way to save time and perhaps be more efficient would be to forego NWWG discussion/work on the CTBT (but not necessarily cancel its meeting) during the week that the CTBT Working Group Meeting is held each month.

COMMENTS ON OTHER CTBT-RELATED MEETINGS:

MONDAY LOBBY: not really a CTBT strategy meeting. Someone (preferably the current chair of the NWWG) should report to the Monday Lobby group on major CTBT developments, suggest any grassroots call to action needed, report on next set of meetings on CTBT.

DISARMAMENT CLEARINGHOUSE STEERING COMMITTEE: this project is clearly about CTBT, but it, as far as I can see it, is a managerial meeting -- not a strategy meeting -- involving 3-4 people for a project/person that participates in other meetings.

CTBT SUMMITS PLANNING MTGS.: these Summits, while they may be part of the

Disarmament Clearinghouse's mandate, or part of the work of other groups/projects, are part of the larger grassroots mobilization outreach work of the groups in the NWWG. It seems to make common sense that the folks who are doing summit work should report to (preferably in writing) and seek input from the NWWG.

HOWARD HALLMAN'S MTGS. ON THE CTBT FOR GRASSROOTS WORK BY THE RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY: As I understand it, Howard is using these monthly meetings to cater to and focus on the interests of the faith-based groups who interested in CTBT ratification. Thus, they are essentially outreach meetings meant to inform and mobilize another, important constituency. However, they aren't "strategy" meetings that require the participation or time of all of the other NWWG or Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers organizations.

We need to and can, however, avoid scheduling these meetings at the same time as other CTBT strategy meetings or events.

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
at Council for a Livable World Education Fund
110 Maryland Ave. NE #201
Washington DC 20002
p: (202)546-0795; fax: (202)546-5142
website: <http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/>

At 02:15 PM 12/29/97 -0500, Bob Tiller wrote:

>I am aware of at least eight regular coalitional meetings at which
>participants plan strategies and tactics related to CTBT ratification....

Dear Bob:

I agree with you that we should consolidate the meetings on the CTBT. I'm certainly open to modifying the grassroots meeting I have been convener for if there is a consensus. But we do need a way to keep the religious community involved in an integrated CTBT grassroots campaign. As you know, these organizations are multi-issue and most can't attend weekly meetings on the CTBT. I have been sending these folks a one-page summary of Nuclear Weapons Working Group meetings as it relates to CTBT, and also of the CTBT Working Group meetings if it is relevant. After the last session of our Grassroots general meeting, I checked with absentees from denominational offices and was assured of their continued commitment.

I don't want to personalize the sessions with the religious community as "Hallman's meetings", for they are everybody's. I want to keep the religious community and the others together for the benefit of both. I would like to see other segments participate, such as environmental groups, LWV, etc. This could occur monthly as the CTBT campaign intensifies as a "CTBT Grassroots Plenary" or "General Meeting" or some other name. I'm willing to yield the chair to someone else or to rotation, but will continue serving as moderator and catalyst if people want me to. What I don't want to see happen is to have the religious community not fully involved or isolated.

Maybe we can use Coolfont as an opportunity to sort this out.

Shalom,

Howard

At 07:13 AM 12/29/97 -0500, Peace through Reason wrote:

>Thanks to all of you who have sent your email addresses to help me in the
>quest for a current Abolition email list to post on our website. This is
>the list I've compiled so far. You'll note that names are missing from
>many of the addresses. If you want your name and/or organization listed,
>please let me know. ALSO, I'd like to add websites to this list so it can
>be a complete reference for us all. If you have a website, please let me
>know?

>
>The e-mail addresses are listed alphabetically.

>
>Ellen Thomas -- prop1@prop1.org

>-----

>
vsidel@igc.apc.org is the edress for "Victor W. Sidel, MD, New York City".
I am co-president of the International Association for the Prevention of
Nuclear War (IPPNW).

Thanks for the list!

Vic Sidel

At 06:16 PM 12/29/97 -0500, Daryl Kimball wrote:

>TO: CTBT colleagues

>FR: Daryl Kimball

>RE: suggestions on CTBT meetings

>

>Bob Tiller wrote:

>

>"I am aware of at least eight regular coalitional meetings at which

>participants plan strategies and tactics related to CTBT ratification ...

>

>

>*****

>

>DK's Reply:

>

>I generally agree with Bob Tiller's observations and suggestions....

>

>**HOWARD HALLMAN'S MTGS. ON THE CTBT FOR GRASSROOTS WORK BY THE RELIGIOUS**

>**COMMUNITY:** As I understand it, Howard is using these monthly meetings to

>cater to and focus on the interests of the faith-based groups who interested

>in CTBT ratification. Thus, they are essentially outreach meetings meant to

>inform and mobilize another, important constituency. However, they aren't

>"strategy" meetings that require the participation or time of all of the

>other NWWG or Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers organizations.

>

>We need to and can, however, avoid scheduling these meetings at the same

>time as other CTBT strategy meetings or events.

>

Dear Daryl and Others:

The above comment indicates that I have so far failed in gaining full acceptance of the religious community as an integral part of the CTBT ratification campaign, not merely a useful appendage to call upon now and then for outreach to states where peace organizations are weak (that's a lot of the swing list).

These are not "Hallman's meetings" but rather instruments of the CTBT campaign.

They have succeeded in establishing sets of horizontal relationships between peace organizations and religious organizations so that 20/20, Disarmament Clearinghouse, PSR, etc. know who to call on for particular aspects of the campaign, such as postcards, regional meetings, etc.

Because denominational staff deal with many diverse issues, most can't attend the so-called CTBT strategy meetings. I try to keep them informed by brief reports. Most seem to be comfortable with that. However, when there are meetings with top administration officials it would be appropriate for several representatives of the religious community to participate in order to show the breadth of support and for some direct linkages. (So far we have been excluded.)

It would also be useful to share drafts of common material, such as postal cards and brochures, with some in the religious community who are potential users.

I agree that scheduling needs to be coordinated, but twice other meetings have been set at the same time after the grassroots general meetings were already scheduled.

I repeat the suggestion I offered in my reply to Bob Tiller's communication that we might consider the meetings I

have helped convene as "Grassroots General Meetings" and involve not only persons from the religious community but also grassroots segments, such as environmental groups, LWV, and others who have special constituencies important for the CTBT campaign. With the CTBT Working Group meeting toward the end of each month, these could be scheduled in the middle of the month.

Shalom,
Howard

At 01:27 AM 12/30/97 -0500, you wrote:

><http://www.foto.com/foto/news/content/1997/tx97dec/e29edit1.htm>

>Fayetteville Observer-Times

Dear Ike:

I find certain items you send as useful to read but rarely your whole dispatch. Some of it duplicates what I've already read in the newspaper. It would be useful to me if you provided an index in the beginning. Otherwise on busy days I tend to delete your entire message without searching for useful tidbits.

With best regards,

Howard

Dear Howard and others:

I wanted to reply to Howard's note about the recent messages from Bob Tiller and my reply on CTBT meeting coordination.

On Dec. 30, Howard wrote:

Dear Daryl and Others:

The above comment [see earlier messages from Tiller and Kimball] indicates that I have so far failed in gaining full acceptance of the religious community as an integral part of the CTBT ratification campaign, not merely a useful appendage to call upon now and then for outreach to states where peace organizations are weak (that's a lot of the swing list).

These are not "Hallman's meetings" but rather instruments of the CTBT campaign.

They have succeeded in establishing sets of horizontal relationships between peace organizations and religious organizations so that 20/20, Disarmament Clearinghouse, PSR, etc. know who to call on for particular aspects of the campaign, such as postcards, regional meetings, etc.

Because denominational staff deal with many diverse issues, most can't attend the so-called CTBT strategy meetings. I try to keep them informed by brief reports. Most seem to be comfortable with that. However, when there are meetings with top administration officials it would be appropriate for several representatives of the religious community to participate in order to show the breadth of support and for some direct linkages. (So far we have been excluded.)

It would also be useful to share drafts of common material, such as postal cards and brochures, with some in the religious community who are potential users.

I agree that scheduling needs to be coordinated, but twice other meetings have been set at the same time after the grassroots general meetings were already scheduled.

I repeat the suggestion I offered in my reply to Bob Tiller's communication that we might consider the meetings I have helped convene as "Grassroots General Meetings" and involve not only persons from the religious community but also grassroots segments, such as environmental groups, LWV, and others who have special constituencies important for the CTBT campaign. With the CTBT Working Group meeting toward the end of each month, these could be scheduled in the middle of the month.

Shalom,
Howard

I agree with you Howard that these meetings have proven useful in establishing relationships between groups and that the religious community IS an integral part of the CTBT effort. I don't think that my earlier comments reflect the view -- which I too have heard and witnessed at times -- that the religious community is there simply to call upon when we need help in certain states.

I also would like to make it clear that representatives from religious community constituencies are welcome to participate in CTBT-related meetings with Administration officials that I or the Chair of the CTBT Working Group have arranged. In fact you have been in two that I remember and a representative from FCNL has been attended at least 2 that I can recall. Not even the members of the Coalition can attend every meeting with an administration official, because it is simply impractical to have 15-16 people in every meeting and it is more efficient to divide the labor and report to one another about those conversations. In this sense, no one has been excluded from meetings. Please let me know who from the religious community that you work with might be interested in being part of the upcoming meetings with Administration officials that we are trying to meet (State, ACDA, and DOE at the moment). This list meetings and other CTBT activities are all listed in the handouts at CTBT Wkg. Grp. Mtgs. and e-mailed to you and others.

It might also be worthwhile to invite some of the individuals representing religious constituencies to the CTBT Working Group Mtgs. which are open to them anyway.

But the key question that really seems to be emerging through this discourse is where and when should "grassroots" groups meet to discuss/plan/strategize their CTBT field work. I personally don't have a strong preference about whether it is the weekly NWWG meeting or the "Grassroots" meetings that Howard has convened -- I'll do either -- but I don't think it makes sense try to have a comprehensive discussion of grassroots work at both meetings. If folks think it would be useful to have, as Howard suggests, a "General CTBT Grassroots Meeting," it sounds logical that it should be held in the middle of the month while the CTBT Working Group meets toward the end of the month.

Peace, Paz, Shalom, DK

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
at Council for a Livable World Education Fund
110 Maryland Ave. NE #201
Washington DC 20002
p: (202)546-0795; fax: (202)546-5142
website: <http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>

Received: (from majordomo@localhost)

by igc7.igc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) id QAA22050;

Mon, 16 Feb 1998 16:09:44 -0800 (PST)

Received: from beach.silcom.com (beach.silcom.com [199.201.128.19])

by igc7.igc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id QAA20954

for <abolition-caucus@igc.org>; Mon, 16 Feb 1998 16:03:54 -0800 (PST)

Received: from dial.silcom.com (pm0-10.sba1.avtel.net [207.71.218.10])

by beach.silcom.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id PAA00953;

Mon, 16 Feb 1998 15:57:41 -0800 (PST)

Content-Type: text/enriched; charset="us-ascii"

Date: Mon, 16 Feb 1998 15:48:35 -0800

X-UIDL: 887720149.002

From: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <wagingpeace@napf.org>

Message-Id: <3.0.32.19980216154832.007c9a40@silcom.com>

Mime-Version: 1.0

Precedence: bulk

Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: A2000 Petition

To: abolition-2000@mail.agoranet.be, abolition-caucus@igc.org

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)

X-Sender: napf@silcom.com

Status: U

X-Mozilla-Status: 0001

I just received word that the Youth Division of Soka Gakkai in Italy plans to gather 25,000 signatures on the Abolition 2000 Petition prior to the NPT PrepCom. These will be added to the more than 13 million already collected in Japan. These signatures can help put the public back into the disarmament process, and the people back into "We, the

Peoples...."

Who else in the caucus is working on gathering signatures? Please let us know.

David Krieger

<bigger> NUCLEAR AGE PEACE FOUNDATION

A founding member of

and global contact point for the

Abolition 2000 Global Network for the

Elimination of Nuclear Weapons

1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 123

Santa Barbara, CA 93108-2794

Phone (805) 965-3443 * Fax (805) 568-0466

E- mailto:wagingpeace@napf.org

<http://www.wagingpeace.org></bigger>

Dear Nuclear Disarmament Advocates:

Stay tuned for the statement, and the press coverage in early February.

Webber Professional Media Consulting

Press Advisory for
12:30 p.m. Monday February 2 1998

General Lee Butler to Address National Press Club in Conjunction
With Release of Nuclear Abolition Statement
Signed By World Leaders From Around the Globe

Nearly 100 Civilian Leaders, Including 36 Past or Present Heads of
State To Call for Nuclear Weapons Elimination

WASHINGTON, DC - The National Press Club Newsmaker Luncheon on
Monday, February 2, 1998 will feature guest speaker General Lee
Butler; USAF, (ret.), Commander-in-Chief, United States Strategic
Air Command (1992-94). General Butler garnered worldwide headline
news when he spoke last year at a National Press Club Luncheon,
calling for the elimination of nuclear weapons. Sixty-two national
and international retired military leaders joined his call by
releasing a companion statement. This year's speech will be made in
conjunction with the release of a statement by international civilian
leaders.

FROM: Disarmament Clearinghouse

1101 14th Street NW #700
Washington DC 20005
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232
FAX: 202 898 0172
<disarmament@igc.org>

General Butler's speech on February 2, 1998 will address progress
achieved since last year's statements and core issues surrounding the
future role of nuclear weapons. Butler will announce the release of a
new statement by international civilian leaders calling for specific
action to reduce the nuclear weapons threat and to move towards
nuclear weapons abolition. The new statement is signed by a growing
number - now approaching 100 - international civilian leaders,
including former and current heads of states, Nobel Peace Laureates,
defense ministers, national security leaders, and many individuals
with nuclear responsibility during their careers.

THE SUNFLOWER
a free electronic monthly newsletter
No. 8, January 1998
NUCLEAR AGE PEACE FOUNDATION

-----oOo-----

The Sunflower is an educational newsletter providing information on nuclear weapons abolition and other issues relating to peace in the Nuclear Age.

-----oOo-----

IN THIS ISSUE

-----oOo-----

NEWS

- ABOLITION 2000 NETWORK GROWING
- SUNFLOWERS: SYMBOL OF A NUCLEAR FREE WORLD
- INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT PREPARATORY MEETING

NEWS BRIEFS

ACTIONS YOU CAN TAKE

JANUARY DATES TO REMEMBER

JANUARY and FEBRUARY EVENTS

RESOURCES

FOUNDATION NEWS

WORDS OF WISDOM

-----oOo-----

"My handicaps are quite visible. They can remind us of the invisible handicaps we all have...the 'landmines of the heart.' These landmines inside can lead us to war, to jealousy, to cruel power over others. If we ban the landmines of the heart along with the landmines in the earth, the needs of the poor will take priority over the wants of the rich, the freedom of the dominated over the liberty of the powerful....Together we can stop a coward's war that makes victims of us all."

-- Tun Channareth, Cambodia, International Campaign to Ban Landmines, Nobel Peace Prize Acceptance Speech

-----oOo-----

NEWS

-----oOo-----

ABOLITION 2000 NETWORK GROWING

The Foundation is the international contact for the Abolition 2000 Global Network for the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons and manages the database of all citizen action groups and municipalities that endorse the Abolition 2000 Statement. Currently, 888 organizations from 74 countries have signed on and 174 municipalities endorse the goals of Abolition 2000. Our Abolition 2000 web-page has recently been totally restructured and now offers background information, FAQs, articles, documentation, petitions and sign-on sheets in different languages, addresses to keep in touch, and information about working groups and regional coordinators of the Network. A directory of available information, articles, documents, petitions, and the current lists of endorsing organizations and municipalities will be mailed to you upon request. Mailto:wagingpeace@napf.org The lists are sometimes changed on a daily basis and can be found at the following web

address: <http://www.wagingpeace.org/abolition2000.html>

NOTE ->| Recent prominent individuals signing the Abolition 2000
NOTE ->| International Petition include several Nobel Laureates:
NOTE ->| Arthur Schawlow, E. Neher, Mairead Maguire, and Roald
NOTE -> Hoffmann. For a copy of the petition:
GO TO: <http://www.wagingpeace.org/intlpetition.html>

**SUNFLOWERS: THE SYMBOL OF A WORLD
FREE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS**
by David Krieger

Sunflowers are a simple miracle. They grow from a seed. They rise from the earth. They are natural. They are bright and beautiful. They bring a smile to one's face. They produce seeds that are nutritious, and from these seeds oil is produced. Native Americans once used parts of the sunflower plant to treat rattlesnake bites, and sunflower meal to make bread. Sunflowers were even used near Chernobyl to extract radionuclides cesium 137 and strontium 90 from contaminated ponds following the catastrophic nuclear reactor accident there.

Now sunflowers carry new meaning. They have become the symbol of a world free of nuclear weapons. This came about after an extraordinary celebration of Ukraine achieving the status of a nuclear weapons free state. On June 1, 1996, Ukraine transferred to Russia for dismantlement the last of the 1900 nuclear warheads it had inherited from the former Soviet Union. Celebrating the occasion a few days later, the Defense Ministers of Ukraine, Russia, and the United States met at a former nuclear missile base in the Ukraine that once housed 80 SS-19 missiles aimed at the United States.

The three Defense Ministers planted sunflowers and scattered sunflower seeds. Ukrainian President Leonid Kuchma said, "With the completion of our task, Ukraine has demonstrated its support of a nuclear weapons free world." He called on other nations to follow in Ukraine's path and "to do everything to wipe nuclear weapons from the face of the Earth as soon as possible." U.S. Secretary of Defense William Perry said, "Sunflowers instead of missiles in the soil would ensure peace for future generations."

This dramatic sunflower ceremony at Pervomaisk military base showed the world the possibility of a nation giving up nuclear weapons as a means of achieving security. It is an important example, featuring the sunflower as a symbol of hope. The comparison between sunflowers and nuclear missiles is stark -- sunflowers representing life, growth, beauty and nature, and nuclear armed missiles representing death and destruction on a massive, unspeakable scale. Sunflowers represent light instead of darkness, transparency instead of secrecy, security instead of threat, and joy instead of fear.

The Defense Ministers were not the first to use sunflowers in celebrating the elimination of nuclear weapons. In the late 1980s a group of brave and committed resisters known as "The Missouri Peace Planters" entered onto nuclear missile silos in Missouri and planted sunflowers as a symbol of nuclear disarmament. On August 15, 1988, 14 peace activists simultaneously entered ten of Missouri's 150 nuclear missile silos, and planted sunflowers. They issued a statement that said, "We reclaim this land for ourselves, the beasts of the land upon which we depend, and our children. We interpose our bodies, if just for a moment, between these weapons and their intended victims."

Which shall we choose for our Earth? Shall we choose life or shall we choose death? Shall we choose sunflowers, or shall we choose nuclear armed missiles? All but a small number of nations would choose life. But the handful of nations that choose to base their security on these weapons of genocide threaten us all with massive uncontrollable slaughter.

In the aftermath of the Cold War, many people believe that the nuclear threat has ended, but this is not the case. In fact, there still more than 20,000 nuclear warheads in the arsenals of the nuclear weapons states. These states have given their solemn promise in the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which entered into force in 1970, to negotiate in good faith to achieve nuclear disarmament, but they have not acted in good faith. It is likely that until the people of the world demand the total elimination of nuclear weapons, the nuclear weapons states will find ways to retain their special status as nuclear "haves". Only one power on Earth is greater than the power of nuclear holocaust, and that is the power of the people once aroused.

INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT PREPARATORY MEETING

As a basis for discussion on war crimes, Germany submitted a draft text which included as war crimes the use of expanding bullets, and chemical and biological weapons, but excluded nuclear weapons and landmines. A large number of countries including Aotearoa-New Zealand, Cuba, Egypt, Iran, Lebanon, Libya, Mexico, Nigeria, Philippines, Samoa, Sudan, Sweden, Syria and Trinidad & Tobago said that if there is to be a list of weapons systems the employment of which would be a crime, nuclear weapons must be part of that list. Many of these delegations cited the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice which stated that "the threat or use of nuclear weapons would generally be contrary to the rules of international law applicable in armed conflict, and particularly the principles and rules of humanitarian law". (ICC Report by Alyn Ware)

-----\----oOo-----
/#/ NEWS BRIEFS
-----\----oOo-----

UNITED STATES: On December 1st a panel of defense experts endorsed plans to spend another \$400 billion of taxpayer money on building two new high-

tech fighters -- the F-22 Raptor and the proposed Joint Strike Fighter (JSF). The \$400 billion would be spent over the next two decades.
(T 971202)

UNITED STATES: President Clinton has issued a new directive for targeting nuclear arms. While the military will no longer need to be prepared to win a protracted nuclear war, long standing options for nuclear strikes against Russia were retained, and the list of sites that might be attacked in the event of a nuclear exchange with China could be broadened. The directive apparently also permits U.S. nuclear strikes in response to enemy attacks using chemical or biological weapons. (Reuters 971206)

FRANCE / UNITED STATES: The ship "MSC Carla," carrying highly radioactive cesium from France to the U.S. broke in half during a storm and lost its contents off the coast of the Azores. Apparently neither Paris nor Washington intends to salvage the cargo, the packages of which are assumed not to have withstood the accident. In January France intends to send a nuclear waste shipment to Japan. (Greenpeace 971219)

BRITAIN: Two former British Chiefs of the Defense Staff declared they would back nuclear weapons abolition. Field Marshal Lord Carver, who previously supported multilateral nuclear disarmament, declared his support for unilateral nuclear disarmament. Field Marshall Lord Bramall, who previously defended the Polaris and Trident nuclear weapons systems, urged ministers to include the "virtually unusable" nuclear deterrent in their strategic review. Lord Carver stated: "The risks of not trying to eliminate nuclear weapons are greater than the risks of trying to do so."
(PA 971217)

-----~oOo~-----
ACTIONS YOU CAN TAKE
-----~oOo~-----

1. Find out about ongoing global efforts for nuclear weapons abolition. Abolition 2000 is a growing network of citizens throughout the world that seeks a treaty by the year 2000 for the prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons early in the next century. The goal of Abolition 2000 is to enter the 21st century with this treaty in place. There are currently some 900 citizen action groups in more than 70 countries on six continents in the Abolition 2000 Global Network. Information on Abolition 2000 is available on the worldwide web at <http://www.wagingpeace.org/abolition2000.html>, or you can write for information to Abolition 2000, c/o Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, 1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 123, Santa Barbara, CA 93108.

2. Join the "Missiles to Sunflowers" campaign. Add your name to the Abolition 2000 International Petition calling for ending the nuclear threat, signing a treaty banning nuclear weapons, and reallocating resources from military purposes to meeting human needs. A copy of the petition is available from Abolition 2000, or on the web at <http://www.wagingpeace.org/intlpetition.html>.

3. Help organize efforts to have your municipality pass a resolution in support of achieving the abolition of nuclear weapons. A sample resolution is available from Abolition 2000, or at <http://www.wagingpeace.org/ab2000city.html>
 4. Plant sunflower seeds, and give away sunflowers. Let your friends and family know that sunflowers are the symbol of a world free of nuclear weapons. "Sunflower Seeds of Peace" are available from the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation.
 5. Send sunflowers or packets of sunflower seeds to leaders of nuclear weapons states, and let them know that you want them to achieve the complete elimination of all nuclear weapons. For a list of these leaders, contact the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, or go to http://www.wagingpeace.org/nuclear_weapons_states.html
 6. Stand in silent vigil with sunflowers whenever you have the chance to be in the presence of leaders of nuclear weapons states. We should try to be sure that no public occasion occurs when leaders of nuclear weapons states are not reminded by the presence of sunflowers of their obligation and responsibility to achieve a nuclear weapons free world.
7. CHECK OUT OUR WEB-PAGE: <http://www.wagingpeace.org>
8. FORWARD THIS NEWSLETTER TO A FRIEND

-----~oOo~-----
JANUARY DATES TO REMEMBER
-----~oOo~-----

JANUARY

- 3 January 1993 Signing of the Strategic Arms Reductions Treaty II (START II) by Presidents George Bush and Boris Yeltsin.
10 January 1946 First meeting of the United Nations General Assembly held in London
11 January 1951 President Harry Truman approves the establishment of the Nevada Proving Grounds, later called the Nevada Test Site.
12 January 1951 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide enters into force
13 January 1993 Chemical Weapons Convention, prohibiting the development, production, acquisition, stockpiling, retention, transfer and use of chemical weapons, signed in Paris.
15 January 1929 Martin Luther King, Jr. born.
see: http://www.wagingpeace.org/martin_luther_king.html
21 January 1954 World's first nuclear-powered ship, the Nautilus, is launched.
27 January 1951 The first atmospheric test at the Nevada Test Site takes place 1,060 feet above Frenchman Flat.
30 January 1948 Mahatma Gandhi assassinated
see: http://www.wagingpeace.org/mahatma_gandhi.html

-----~oOo~-----
JANUARY and FEBRUARY EVENTS

-----~oOo~-----

January 3-5

INTERNATIONAL ANTI-ATOM CONFERENCE

in Dannenberg, Germany

February 2

The National Press Club Newsmaker

will feature guest speaker

General Lee Butler; USAF, (ret.),

Commander-in-Chief,

United States Strategic Air Command (1992-94).

February 5

Peace Vs. Justice: Reconciling Accountability for Human Rights

Atrocities with Conflict Resolution

WHERE: The Great Hall of the House of the

Association of the Bar of the City of New York

42 West 44th Street, New York, New York

WHEN: 7pm

February 13-15

INES Student Congress

in Dortmund, Germany

for information e-mail Reiner Braun at mailto:r.braun@lilly.ping.de

February 14-15

13th Annual South Asia Conference

Center for South Asia Studies, International and Area Studies,

University of California, Berkeley, USA

<http://www.ias.berkeley.edu/southasia/conference.html>

February 20-21

Planning for the NPT, Palais des Nations, Geneva, Switzerland

International Seminar on Disarmament

Information: NGO Committee for Disarmament, Edith Ballantyne

mailto:edibal@iprolink.ch

-----~oOo~-----

RESOURCES

-----~oOo~-----

Housmans Peace Diary and World Peace Directory 1998

The diary includes a feature on the 50th anniversary of the Universal

Declaration of Human Rights. Its pocket format combines a week-to-a-view

appointment section with the World Peace Directory. The directory lists

almost 2000 organizations in 150 countries working for Peace and Conflict

Resolution, for the Environment, and for Human Rights.

The 1998 Peace Diary is on sale in selected bookshops in many countries at

£5.96 or US\$9.95 or equivalent. For a direct order call +44-171-837-4473

or send a fax to +44-171-278-0444 (generous discounts for multiple orders).

-----~oOo~-----

FOUNDATION NEWS

-----~oOo~-----

* NEW ISSUE OF WAGING PEACE WORLDWIDE

The Foundation has released its newest issue of the WAGING PEACE WORLDWIDE journal. The journal features an interview with JOSEPH ROTBLAT and articles by LORD YEHUDI MENUHIN, FRANK KELLY, TRISHA PRITIKIN, and JACKIE CABASSO. The Journal also announces the winners of the 1997 Swackhamer Peace Essay Contest and the winners of the 1997 Lena Chang Scholarship Awards. Foundation members receive the journal on a regular basis.

The Barbara Mandigo Kelly Peace Poetry Award winners and their poems are displayed at:
http://www.wagingpeace.org/bmk_winners_97.html

* NEW RESOURCES

The following new AUDIO TAPES can be ordered from the Foundation for \$8.00 each plus \$3.00 for shipping and handling:

- "The Social Responsibility of Scientists" by Joseph Rotblat
- "A World Without War" by Joseph Rotblat
- "Musicians Don't Make War" by Yehudi Menuhin

FREE OF CHARGE

- Interview with former Calif. Senator Alan Cranston at:
http://www.wagingpeace.org/alan_cranston_itv.html
- "NATO IS PART OF THE OLD THINKING"
An Interview with Alla Yaroshinskaya, member of Russian Presidential Council, at:
http://www.wagingpeace.org/yaroshinskaya_itv.html
- Information packet on Abolition 2000

~oOo~
WORDS OF WISDOM
~oOo~

"Culture is like your sunflower seeds. Culture is a garden, a tree, and the waters and the wind carry the seeds everywhere. States are unfortunately very often only prisons, behind their borders, and build walls around the gardens. And the winds and the waters defy the wall -- the seeds are carried, but many of the trees may be starved or their roots cut off by walls. This is the struggle between walls and wind; between what is throttling and what is free. But human freedom demands its own laws. Human freedom must encourage the freedom of our neighbor. It cannot be at the neighbor's expense; so that human freedom finally, when you reduce it to what the dictators prohibit, is really the freedom to help others and the freedom to know. If we can do that, we can defy every dictatorship, every tyranny."

Lord Yehudi Menuhin speaking at the
1997 Annual Dinner of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation

~oOo~
FEEDBACK
~oOo~

PLEASE SEND US YOUR QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS

<mailto:wagingpeace@napf.org>

~oOo~
EDITORS
~oOo~-----

David Krieger, J.D., Ph.D. - Christoph Hanterman, Ph.D.

~END~-----

To subscribe to "The Sunflower," please send a message

To:majordomo@igc.org

Subject: <leave empty>

subscribe sunflower-napf <your email address here>

To unsubscribe to "The Sunflower," just send a message

To:majordomo@igc.org

Subject: <leave empty>

unsubscribe sunflower-napf <your email address here>

NUCLEAR AGE PEACE FOUNDATION

A founding member of
and global contact point for the
Abolition 2000 Global Network for the
Elimination of Nuclear Weapons

1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 123

Santa Barbara, CA 93108-2794

Phone (805) 965-3443 * Fax (805) 568-0466

E- <mailto:wagingpeace@napf.org>

<http://www.wagingpeace.org>

Dear abolitionists:

Happy 1998!

I just want to remind you all that there is an existing list-serv for discussing and strategizing opposition to NATO expansion. It's called:

start3-europenwfz@igc.org

It has a strange name because when I set it up in February 1997, the first order of business was to for us to promote agreement on START III at the Clinton-Yeltsin summit in Helsinki and simultaneously point out that the US desire for NATO expansion would impede progress on such an agreement.

To subscribe, send an email message to:

Majordomo@igc.org

Leave the subject line blank. In the body of the message write:

subscribe start3-europenwfz@igc.org <your email address>

If you have ideas about how the Abolition 2000 campaign should organize to stop NATO expansion, and to get the US to withdraw its nukes from Europe and create a nuclear weapon-free zone in central Europe, the list-serv above is the place to post to! Come and share information, ask questions, dialogue & strategize!

Thanks,

Karina Wood
NATO Working Group Coordinator for Abolition 2000
&
No to NATO Expansion Speakers Tour (US) Coordinator

Karina Wood
Tour Coordinator
No to NATO Expansion Speakers Tour
43 Nisbet St, 3rd Fl.
Providence, RI 02906
Tel: 401 751-8172
Fax: 401 751-1476
Email: kwood@igc.org

Dear Dwain:

Greetings and best wishes for the New Year.

Did you ever have an opportunity to write to Polish Ambassador Wyzner about our reception on April 27? If not, I'll take care of. Please let me know by a quick reply,

The next order of business is to complete a statement that you and Catholic representatives approve but with room to introduce ideas from other faiths. Thus, I would appreciate receiving your comments on the revised draft I sent you.

Regarding other faiths, we would like to receive suggestions from persons in Geneva who are involved in interfaith dialogue.

Shalom,

Howard

Thanks for starting this discussion Bob, and for your comments Daryl. Some thoughts of my own. ANA (our new name!) attends the CTBT working group meetings of the CRND as well as the NWWG. We are planning grassroots work on the CTBT as well as direct lobbying. However, as we are not official members of the CRND, it is unclear whether we would be invited to attend administration meetings set up by CRND or Senate lobbying assignments. We also have a slightly different take on the CTBT/SSM linkage than some CRND members, although other CRND members such as PSR, WAND, PEace Action share our views. If the CTBT Working Group meeting was to be the primary venue for planning strategy and discussing/setting up administration meetings as well as taking assignments for the same, I am not sure how non-member groups fit in. It would feel very odd to be working on strategy, etc. and not be able to participate in the actual lobbying efforts. And it wouldn't help the duplication problem much for "non-members" to set up our own meetings.

Fundamentally, I don't think the problem is which meeting does what, I think the proliferation of meeting reflects a deeper problem. There is no "master plan" for the CTBT campaign that includes administration, Senate, grassroots, media, etc. in a coordinated fashion that integrates all parts both in message and in timing. We need to do such large scale strategic thinking so that organizations, working groups, and coalitions can see when, where, and how they can participate and invite all to do so. To the extent we can limit turf protecting and exclusive ownership of the campaign, the better off we will all be. I am growing increasingly concerned that there is no integrated approach to winning this extrodinarily difficult ratification effort and I am also concerned that the longer it drags out, the more money and concessions Domenici et.al. will get for the labs and the ongoing weapons work. I recently sat down to do an integrated, multi-year campaign plan for SSM and it was very challenging. Has anyone tried to come up with a similar plan for CTBT? Hopefully we can work on some of this at Coolfont.

See you there!
-Maureen
Alliance for Nuclear Accountability

At 06:16 PM 12/29/97 -0500, Daryl Kimball wrote:

>TO: CTBT colleages
>FR: Daryl Kimball
>RE: suggestions on CTBT meetings
>
>Bob Tiller wrote:
>
>"I am aware of at least eight regular coalitional meetings at which
>participants plan strategies and tactics related to CTBT ratification ...
>This list of meetings on CTBT is far too long. I propose that we (1)
>identify the coalitional settings where we want the heavy work done, and (2)

>consider ways to shrink the total list. My own suggestions are as follows:
>(a) The two major arenas for heavy work should be the Nuclear Weapons
>Working Group and the CTBT Working Group of the the CRND. Other groups
>would be, with respect to the CTBT, primarily reporting occasions; (b) We
>should consider folding the Summits Planning Committee and the informal
>lobbying meeting into other groups, thus shrinking the list to six. What do
>others think?"

>
>*****

1

>DK's Reply:

1

>I generally agree with Bob Tiller's observations and suggestions. It is
>important for us to reduce the number of meetings to the minimum necessary
>and that we make each meeting as efficient and productive as possible. And I
>agree that we can do a better job. To do this we need to be clear about what
>each meeting is about and to be professional about how meetings are
>conducted. On the other hand, we have to keep in mind that no one meeting
>can't practically include everyone or be about everything CTBT.

11

>So, what can, should be, or already are the set of CTBT meetings about?

11

>The CTBT campaign, like any national public policy campaign, consists of
>efforts by our community of NGOs in four basic areas:

11

>* communication with the Executive Branch

>* media work

>* direct education, liaison and lobbying of the Senate

>* grassroots lobbying and public education/outreach

1

>I agree with Bob Tiller that the two "heavy lifting" sets of CTBT campaign
>meetings should be the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers CTBT Working
>Group Meetings and the Nuclear Weapons Working Group Meetings. Because of
>the larger number and variety of groups who are interested in the CTBT
>effort and because of the huge scope of work involved, I believe that is
>necessary to have more than one series of meetings.

11

>However, if we can be more disciplined about what each setting is trying to
>accomplish and if we can effectively and efficiently report to one another
>about work/developments in other areas of the campaign, we'll have a
>smoother and less time consuming series of meetings.

11

>In that spirit, I would like to describe/suggest the following general
>division of labor, which is based on the pattern of work that has already
>been fairly well established over past weeks as well as the CWC campaign
>experience:

11

1

1

> "CTBT Meetings: Where to go and for

>what?"

1

1

>CTBT WORKING GROUP OF THE COALITION TO REDUCE N-DANGERS (Chair, T. Collina)

>
>Meeting Times: approx. once a month on Fridays from 9:30-10:00. Next
>meeting January 23 at NRDC, with subsequent meetings at UCS 7th floor on Feb
>27; Mar 27; Apr 24; May 22; June 26. More frequent meetings may be
>necessary as the campaign heats up.

>Participants: open to Coalition members and other groups who support the
>CTBT. A larger number of participants is expected as the campaign
>heats up. Generally includes research-oriented and membership-based groups
>as well as some APS, LWW, and BENS.

>
> AD HOC CTBT LOBBYING MTG. following the CTBT WKG. GRP. MTG.
>-- this setting can bring together the key individuals
>engaged in direct lobbying for a short face to face meeting.

- > Function: to share information about DC
- > meetings/lobbying of specific Senators
- > assign tasks, schedule future meetings

- > Participants: open to representatives of organizations who
- >are actively engaged in direct lobbying activities
- >in the Senate on the CTBT, including LWW, APS,
- >BENS and others who may not attend the CTBT WKG. GRP. MTG. and who do
- >not attend NWWG meetings.

>
> Meeting Times: following every CTBT Wkg. Grp. Meeting from
>10:00-10:30.

>

> COALITION TO REDUCE N-DANGERS MEMBERSHIP MEETING: A CTBT

>Wkg. Grp. report will be made at each meeting, which

>summarizes developments, solicits suggestions,

>and information about the CTBT. Other issues of concern to the Coalition

>will be reported on and discussed. In addition, this meeting serves to

>facilitate group decisions about policy recommendations

>in letters and statements, and about proposals

>for major Coalition expenditures. Open to member groups of the Coalition.

>Minutes are taken and sent to member groups.

> OTHER SUBGROUPS: Tom Collina and I have and will pulled
>together ad hoc meetings to advance work in
>specific areas such as long-range media strategy and

>inform and mobilize another, important constituency. However, they aren't
>"strategy" meetings that require the participation or time of all of the
>other NWWG or Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers organizations.

>
>We need to and can, however, avoid scheduling these meetings at the same
>time as other CTBT strategy meetings or events.

>

>

>Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers

>at Council for a Livable World Education Fund
>110 Maryland Ave. NE #201
>Washington DC 20002
>p: (202)546-0795; fax: (202)546-5142
>website: <http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/>

>_____

>

>

Maureen Eldredge
Program Director
The Military Production Network
1801 18th St. NW, Suite 9-2
Washington, DC 20009
202-833-4668/fax: 202-234-9536

A national alliance of watchdog organizations
working on DOE's nuclear weapons complex.

Dear Theresa:

There is plenty of time to wait for the return of Larry Egbert.

Howard

At 11:18 AM 1/5/98 EST, you wrote:

>In a message dated 97-12-23 11:24:52 EST, you write:

>

><< We are drafting a

> statement in advance to offer a religious perspective. For that purpose
> we are well supplied with statements from Protestant and Catholic sources
> but need more from Jewish, Islami, Buddhists, and other religious faiths.
> Therefore, I would appreciate receiving your suggestions. We would also
> like to identify individuals and organizations from these faiths who have
> spoken out on the need for nuclear abolition. >>

>

>Attn: Howard Hallman

>From: Theresa Kashin, Unitarian Universalist Assn. Washington Office

>

>Just got back to the office after our holiday break. Larry Egbert will be in
>the office this Friday. Can I put off your request until then (when I will
>hand it over to him) or do you need statements/individuals' names before then?

>

>

Dear Abolitionists

Following is an Update of the POLITICAL effects of the ICJ Opinion which I hope to use for a World Court Project Information Sheet, and as a contribution to a Web Site run by For Mother Earth/ Nuclear Weapon Abolition Days. Please look at it carefully for mistakes. In particular, I would be grateful for any information I have missed.

George Farebrother

INTERNATIONAL COURT OPINION CONTINUES TO BITE

The decision of the International Court of Justice on 8th July 1996 that threat or use of nuclear weapons would generally be contrary to the rules of international law, and that there exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects, is continuing to yield important political results.

NORWAY

In October 1996, Professor Staale Eskeland, University of Oslo, published an article in the Norwegian Law Journal which attracted wide media attention. He expressed the view that the ICJ Opinion has decisive implications for the government of a NATO state like Norway, and governments and their military personnel will have to consider and change policy to avoid criminal liability. Meanwhile, the governing Norwegian Labour Party, encouraged by the ICJ judgment, has adopted a platform demanding "a treaty on a time-bound elimination of nuclear weapons".

CANADA

In September 1996, Project Ploughshares initiated a series of Roundtable discussions in 18 Canadian cities in 10 provinces, facilitated by ex-UN Disarmament Ambassador Douglas Roche. A total of 404 MPs, mayors, city councillors, clergy, academics and other community leaders attended and addressed the topic of the abolition of nuclear weapons. Particular attention was devoted to answering three questions about what should be Canada's response to the ICJ Opinion which their Foreign Affairs Minister Lloyd Axworthy had put to the Canadian public via his Department's Home Page on the Internet. The consultation process was written up by Douglas Roche.

The consensus was very clear. There was overwhelming support for a Nuclear Weapons Convention, and for a change of policy so that the World Court Opinion would supersede the outmoded commitment to NATO which had prevented the expression of the humanitarian, anti-nuclear values of most Canadians. On 8th November 1996, Foreign Minister Axworthy instructed his Commons Foreign Affairs Committee to undertake a review of the issues of nuclear weaponry and Canada's membership of NATO.

Because of an election in June 1997, the outcome is still awaited.

UNITED KINGDOM.

The Government's response to the Court's ruling and the 1996 UN resolution welcoming it continued to be tested in Parliament during 1997 with questions, motions and interjections in debates.

A new Labour Government was elected by a landslide majority on 1 May 1997. This allowed Labour MP and WCP(UK) champion Austin Mitchell to ask his own administration many of the questions which he had put to the previous Conservative government. Initially he received almost identical replies.

However, as part of a major review of defence policy, the Foreign Office inaugurated a series of meetings with representatives of NGOs, including Abolition 2000(UK). An important debate took place in the House of Lords on 17 December 1997 on the Statement by the Holy See to the UN General Assembly First Committee on Disarmament in which the Papal Representative, Archbishop Renato Martino, called for a nuclear weapons-free world, citing the World Court decision.

For the first time Field Marshal Lord Bramall backed up Canberra Commission member Lord Carver in making the anti-nuclear case. Both have been Chief of the Defence Staff. Baroness Symons, speaking for the Government, acknowledged the importance of a recent Gallup Poll in which 87% of the UK population expressed a wish for their country to take a lead in negotiating a Nuclear Weapons Convention; made a strong commitment to the achievement of a nuclear weapon-free world; and recognised the significance of the ICJ Opinion. Despite this, the Government continues to insist on retaining Trident as a nuclear deterrent.

One of the issues being pressed by the World Court Project and Abolition 2000(UK) is the ratification of the 1977 Additional Protocols to the Geneva Convention, which was due by 31 December 1997. The ICJ Opinion makes it quite clear that any threat or use of nuclear weapons would have to comply with international humanitarian law, but that this "seems scarcely reconcilable" with the principles involved, including those protocols - a concept rejected by the NATO nuclear weapon states in 1977 under reservations which they lodged. The UK Government is being urged to ratify without qualification: and it has admitted that the delay is because of the Court decision.

UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly 1997 Disarmament Session.

On 9 December 1997, Malaysia's revised version of its 1996 UNGA resolution was adopted as Resolution 52/38. This called for the commencement of negotiations leading to the conclusion of an international treaty to abolish nuclear weapons. The resolution noted that the conclusion of such a treaty was necessary to implement the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice.

116 states, including most of those in the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM)

voted for it, 26 (mostly the Nuclear Weapon States and their allies) voted against, 24 abstained, and 19 did not vote. In both 1996 and 1997 many of the Francophone NAM states moved towards support of the ICJ Opinion. China, Ireland, Malta, New Zealand, South Africa and Sweden voted "Yes". Australia, Japan, South Korea, Denmark, Iceland, Norway and Finland abstained. Thus we have a sizeable bloc of countries outside the NAM not willing to side with the Nuclear Weapons States.

A significant split opened up between the UK and the USA and France, when the UK moved from total rejection of the 1996 Resolution to partial abstention, on a separate vote on a paragraph signalling support for the World Court decision. In this, 152 states voted "Yes", and only the USA, Russia, France, Israel and Monaco voted against.

International Criminal Court Statute.

The question of whether or not the threat or use of nuclear weapons should be included as a war crime in the draft Statute of the planned International Criminal Court (ICC) has been a very contentious issue at a preparatory meeting in New York 1-12 December 1997. A large number of countries said that if there is to be a list of weapons which it would be a war crime or crime against humanity to use, nuclear weapons must be part of that list. Many cited the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice in their arguments.

However, Germany, supported by the NATO Nuclear Weapon States, has proposed that the Court should adjudicate on the use of expanding bullets, chemical weapons and biological weapons, but not nuclear weapons.

George Farebrother (geowcpuk@gn.apc.org)

67, Summerheath Rd,
Hailsham
Sussex, BN27 3DR, England
Phone & Fax +44 (0)1323 844 269

The World Court Project is an international citizens' network which is working to publicise and have implemented the 8 July 1996 Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice which could find no lawful circumstance for the threat or use of nuclear weapons.

The World Court Project is part of Abolition 2000, A Global Network to Abolish Nuclear Weapons

Dear Phil:

Please prepare a check for \$50.00 payable to "D.C. Treasurer" for the biannual corporate fee for Methodists United for Peace with Justice. I have the corporate report, due January 15, which I'll file with the check.

Thanks,

Howard

Dear Alyn:

I have the outline of the Model Nuclear Weapons Convention, dated January 1997. It would be helpful for me to have the complete draft so that I can study it in preparation for the NPT PrepCom. You can send it to me at Methodists United for Peace for Justice, 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036.

Thanks,
Howard

Dear Mary:

Here is an article on "Sunflowers: The Symbol of a World Free of Nuclear Weapons" by David Krieger. You can publish it as written with proper credit or adapt it to your purposes. I am sharing the same article with Church Women United and the United Methodist Board of Church and Society, so I can't promise exclusive use. Anyway David has used a version of it for his own publication. However, I don't see any harm in some duplication since the mailing lists probably don't overlap much.

If you have any questions, call me at 301 896-0013 or contact David Krieger at 805 965-3443.

Shalom,
Howard

#####

SUNFLOWERS: THE SYMBOL OF A WORLD FREE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

by David Krieger*

Sunflowers are a simple miracle. They grow from a seed. They rise from the earth. They are natural. They are bright and beautiful. They bring a smile to one's face. They produce seeds that are nutritious, and from these seeds oil is produced. Native Americans once used parts of the sunflower plant to treat rattlesnake bites, and sunflower meal to make bread. Sunflowers were even used near Chernobyl to extract radionuclides cesium 137 and strontium 90 from contaminated ponds following the catastrophic nuclear reactor accident there.

Now sunflowers carry new meaning. They have become the symbol of a world free of nuclear weapons. This came about after an extraordinary celebration of Ukraine achieving the status of a nuclear weapons free state. On June 1, 1994, Ukraine transferred to Russia for dismantlement the last of the 1900 nuclear warheads it had inherited from the former Soviet Union. Celebrating the occasion a few days later, the Defense Ministers of Ukraine, Russia, and the United States met at a former nuclear missile base in the Ukraine that once housed 80 SS-19 missiles aimed at the United States.

The three Defense Ministers planted sunflowers and scattered sunflower seeds. Ukrainian President Leonid Kuchma said, "With the completion of our task, Ukraine has demonstrated its support of a nuclear weapons free world." He called on other nations to follow in Ukraine's path and "to do everything to wipe nuclear weapons from the face of the Earth as soon as possible." U.S. Secretary of Defense William Perry said, "Sunflowers instead of missiles in the soil would ensure peace for future generations."

This dramatic sunflower ceremony at Pervomaisk military base

Showed the world the possibility of a nation giving up nuclear weapons as a means of achieving security. It is an important example, featuring the sunflower as a symbol of hope. The comparison between sunflowers and nuclear missiles is stark -- sunflowers representing life, growth, beauty and nature, and nuclear armed missiles representing death and destruction on a massive, unspeakable scale. Sunflowers represent light instead of darkness, transparency instead of secrecy, security instead of threat, and joy instead of fear.

The Defense Ministers were not the first to use sunflowers in celebrating the elimination of nuclear weapons. In the late 1980s a group of brave and committed resisters known as

"The Missouri Peace Planters" entered onto nuclear missile silos in Missouri and planted sunflowers as a symbol of nuclear disarmament. On August 15, 1988, 14 peace activists simultaneously entered ten of Missouri's 150 nuclear missile silos, and planted sunflowers. They issued a statement that said, "We reclaim this land for ourselves, the beasts of the land upon which we depend, and our children. We interpose our bodies, if just for a moment, between these weapons and their intended victims."

Which shall we choose for our Earth? Shall we choose life or shall we choose death? Shall we choose sunflowers, or shall we choose nuclear armed missiles? All but a small number of nations would choose life. But the handful of nations that choose to base their

security on these weapons of genocide threaten us all with massive uncontrollable slaughter.

In the aftermath of the Cold War, many people believe that the nuclear threat has ended, but this is not the case. In fact, there still more than 20,000 nuclear warheads in the arsenals of the nuclear weapons states. These states have given their solemn promise in the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which entered into force in 1970, to negotiate in good faith to achieve nuclear disarmament, but they have not acted in good faith. It is likely that until the people of the world demand the total elimination of nuclear weapons, the nuclear weapons states will find ways to retain their special status as nuclear "haves". Only one power on Earth is greater than the power of nuclear holocaust, and that is the power of the people once aroused.

What You Can Do

1. Find out about ongoing global efforts for nuclear weapons abolition. Abolition 2000 is a growing network of citizens throughout the world that seeks a treaty by the year 2000 for the prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons early in the next century. The goal of Abolition 2000 is to enter the 21st century with this treaty in place. There are currently some

900 citizen action groups in more than 70 countries on six continents in the Abolition 2000 Global Network. Information on Abolition 2000 is available on the worldwide web at www.wagingpeace.org, or you can write for information to Abolition 2000, c/o Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, 1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 123, Santa Barbara, CA 93108.

2. Join the "Missiles to Sunflowers" campaign. Add your name to the Abolition 2000 International Petition calling for ending the nuclear threat, signing a treaty banning nuclear weapons, and reallocating resources from military purposes to meeting human needs. A copy of the petition is available from Abolition 2000, or on the web at www.wagingpeace.org/intlpetition.html.
3. Help organize efforts to have your municipality pass a resolution in support of achieving the abolition of nuclear weapons. A sample resolution is available from Abolition 2000.
4. Plant sunflower seeds, and give away sunflowers. Let your friends and family know that sunflowers are the symbol of a world free of nuclear weapons. "Sunflower Seeds of Peace" are available from the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation.
5. Send sunflowers or packets of sunflower seeds to leaders of nuclear weapons states, and let them know that you want them to achieve the complete elimination of all nuclear weapons. For a list of these leaders and to order packets of seeds, contact the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation.
6. Stand in silent vigil with sunflowers whenever you have the chance to be in the presence of leaders of nuclear weapons states. We should try to be sure that no public occasion occurs when leaders of nuclear weapons states are not reminded by the presence of sunflowers of their obligation and responsibility to achieve a nuclear weapons free world.

* David Krieger is president of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation.

NUCLEAR AGE PEACE FOUNDATION

A founding member of
and global contact point for the
Abolition 2000 Global Network for the
Elimination of Nuclear Weapons

1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 123

Santa Barbara, CA 93108-2794
Phone (805) 965-3443 * Fax (805) 568-0466
E- mailto:wagingpeace@napf.org
<http://www.wagingpeace.org>

Dear Ann:

Here is an article on "Sunflowers: The Symbol of a World Free of Nuclear Weapons" by David Krieger. You can publish it as written with proper credit or adapt it to your purposes. I am sharing the same article with the Episcopal Peace Fellowship and the United Methodist Board of Church and Society, so I can't promise exclusive use. Anyway David has used a version of it for his own publication. However, I don't see any harm in some duplication since the mailing lists probably don't overlap much.

If you have any questions, call me at 301 896-0013 or contact David Krieger at 805 965-3443.

Shalom,
Howard

#####

SUNFLOWERS: THE SYMBOL OF A WORLD FREE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

by David Krieger*

Sunflowers are a simple miracle. They grow from a seed. They rise from the earth. They are natural. They are bright and beautiful. They bring a smile to one's face. They produce seeds that are nutritious, and from these seeds oil is produced. Native Americans once used parts of the sunflower plant to treat rattlesnake bites, and sunflower meal to make bread. Sunflowers were even used near Chernobyl to extract radionuclides cesium 137 and strontium 90 from contaminated ponds following the catastrophic nuclear reactor accident there.

Now sunflowers carry new meaning. They have become the symbol of a world free of nuclear weapons. This came about after an extraordinary celebration of Ukraine achieving the status of a nuclear weapons free state. On June 1, 1994, Ukraine transferred to Russia for dismantlement the last of the 1900 nuclear warheads it had inherited from the former Soviet Union. Celebrating the occasion a few days later, the Defense Ministers of Ukraine, Russia, and the United States met at a former nuclear missile base in the Ukraine that once housed 80 SS-19 missiles aimed at the United States.

The three Defense Ministers planted sunflowers and scattered sunflower seeds. Ukrainian President Leonid Kuchma said, "With the completion of our task, Ukraine has demonstrated its support of a nuclear weapons free world." He called on other nations to follow in Ukraine's path and "to do everything to wipe nuclear weapons from the face of the Earth as soon as possible." U.S. Secretary of Defense William Perry said, "Sunflowers instead of missiles in the soil would ensure peace for future generations."

This dramatic sunflower ceremony at Pervomaisk military base

Showed the world the possibility of a nation giving up nuclear weapons as a means of achieving security. It is an important example, featuring the sunflower as a symbol of hope. The comparison between sunflowers and nuclear missiles is stark -- sunflowers representing life, growth, beauty and nature, and nuclear armed missiles representing death and destruction on a massive, unspeakable scale. Sunflowers represent light instead of darkness, transparency instead of secrecy, security instead of threat, and joy instead of fear.

The Defense Ministers were not the first to use sunflowers in celebrating the elimination of nuclear weapons. In the late 1980s a group of brave and committed resisters known as

"The Missouri Peace Planters" entered onto nuclear missile silos in Missouri and planted sunflowers as a symbol of nuclear disarmament. On August 15, 1988, 14 peace activists simultaneously entered ten of Missouri's 150 nuclear missile silos, and planted sunflowers. They issued a statement that said, "We reclaim this land for ourselves, the beasts of the land upon which we depend, and our children. We interpose our bodies, if just for a moment, between these weapons and their intended victims."

Which shall we choose for our Earth? Shall we choose life or shall we choose death? Shall we choose sunflowers, or shall we choose nuclear armed missiles? All but a small number of nations would choose life. But the handful of nations that choose to base their

security on these weapons of genocide threaten us all with massive uncontrollable slaughter.

In the aftermath of the Cold War, many people believe that the nuclear threat has ended, but this is not the case. In fact, there still more than 20,000 nuclear warheads in the arsenals of the nuclear weapons states. These states have given their solemn promise in the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which entered into force in 1970, to negotiate in good faith to achieve nuclear disarmament, but they have not acted in good faith. It is likely that until the people of the world demand the total elimination of nuclear weapons, the nuclear weapons states will find ways to retain their special status as nuclear "haves". Only one power on Earth is greater than the power of nuclear holocaust, and that is the power of the people once aroused.

What You Can Do

1. Find out about ongoing global efforts for nuclear weapons abolition. Abolition 2000 is a growing network of citizens throughout the world that seeks a treaty by the year 2000 for the prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons early in the next century. The goal of Abolition 2000 is to enter the 21st century with this treaty in place. There are currently some

900 citizen action groups in more than 70 countries on six continents in the Abolition 2000 Global Network. Information on Abolition 2000 is available on the worldwide web at www.wagingpeace.org, or you can write for information to Abolition 2000, c/o Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, 1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 123, Santa Barbara, CA 93108.

2. Join the "Missiles to Sunflowers" campaign. Add your name to the Abolition 2000 International Petition calling for ending the nuclear threat, signing a treaty banning nuclear weapons, and reallocating resources from military purposes to meeting human needs. A copy of the petition is available from Abolition 2000, or on the web at www.wagingpeace.org/intlpetition.html.
3. Help organize efforts to have your municipality pass a resolution in support of achieving the abolition of nuclear weapons. A sample resolution is available from Abolition 2000.
4. Plant sunflower seeds, and give away sunflowers. Let your friends and family know that sunflowers are the symbol of a world free of nuclear weapons. "Sunflower Seeds of Peace" are available from the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation.
5. Send sunflowers or packets of sunflower seeds to leaders of nuclear weapons states, and let them know that you want them to achieve the complete elimination of all nuclear weapons. For a list of these leaders and to order packets of seeds, contact the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation.
6. Stand in silent vigil with sunflowers whenever you have the chance to be in the presence of leaders of nuclear weapons states. We should try to be sure that no public occasion occurs when leaders of nuclear weapons states are not reminded by the presence of sunflowers of their obligation and responsibility to achieve a nuclear weapons free world.

* David Krieger is president of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation.

NUCLEAR AGE PEACE FOUNDATION

A founding member of
and global contact point for the
Abolition 2000 Global Network for the
Elimination of Nuclear Weapons

1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 123

Santa Barbara, CA 93108-2794
Phone (805) 965-3443 * Fax (805) 568-0466
E- mailto:wagingpeace@napf.org
<http://www.wagingpeace.org>

Dear Lee:

Here is an article on "Sunflowers: The Symbol of a World Free of Nuclear Weapons" by David Krieger. You can publish it as written with proper credit or adapt it to your purposes. I am sharing the same article with Church Women United and the Episcopal Peace Fellowship, so I can't promise exclusive use. Anyway David has used a version of it for his own publication. However, I don't see any harm in some duplication since the mailing lists probably don't overlap much.

If you have any questions, call me at 301 896-0013 or contact David Krieger at 805 965-3443.

Shalom,
Howard

#####

SUNFLOWERS: THE SYMBOL OF A WORLD FREE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

by David Krieger*

Sunflowers are a simple miracle. They grow from a seed. They rise from the earth. They are natural. They are bright and beautiful. They bring a smile to one's face. They produce seeds that are nutritious, and from these seeds oil is produced. Native Americans once used parts of the sunflower plant to treat rattlesnake bites, and sunflower meal to make bread. Sunflowers were even used near Chernobyl to extract radionuclides cesium 137 and strontium 90 from contaminated ponds following the catastrophic nuclear reactor accident there.

Now sunflowers carry new meaning. They have become the symbol of a world free of nuclear weapons. This came about after an extraordinary celebration of Ukraine achieving the status of a nuclear weapons free state. On June 1, 1994, Ukraine transferred to Russia for dismantlement the last of the 1900 nuclear warheads it had inherited from the former Soviet Union. Celebrating the occasion a few days later, the Defense Ministers of Ukraine, Russia, and the United States met at a former nuclear missile base in the Ukraine that once housed 80 SS-19 missiles aimed at the United States.

The three Defense Ministers planted sunflowers and scattered sunflower seeds. Ukrainian President Leonid Kuchma said, "With the completion of our task, Ukraine has demonstrated its support of a nuclear weapons free world." He called on other nations to follow in Ukraine's path and "to do everything to wipe nuclear weapons from the face of the Earth as soon as possible." U.S. Secretary of Defense William Perry said, "Sunflowers instead of missiles in the soil would ensure peace for future generations."

This dramatic sunflower ceremony at Pervomaisk military base

Showed the world the possibility of a nation giving up nuclear weapons as a means of achieving security. It is an important example, featuring the sunflower as a symbol of hope. The comparison between sunflowers and nuclear missiles is stark -- sunflowers representing life, growth, beauty and nature, and nuclear armed missiles representing death and destruction on a massive, unspeakable scale. Sunflowers represent light instead of darkness, transparency instead of secrecy, security instead of threat, and joy instead of fear.

The Defense Ministers were not the first to use sunflowers in celebrating the elimination of nuclear weapons. In the late 1980s a group of brave and committed resisters known as

"The Missouri Peace Planters" entered onto nuclear missile silos in Missouri and planted sunflowers as a symbol of nuclear disarmament. On August 15, 1988, 14 peace activists simultaneously entered ten of Missouri's 150 nuclear missile silos, and planted sunflowers. They issued a statement that said, "We reclaim this land for ourselves, the beasts of the land upon which we depend, and our children. We interpose our bodies, if just for a moment, between these weapons and their intended victims."

Which shall we choose for our Earth? Shall we choose life or shall we choose death? Shall we choose sunflowers, or shall we choose nuclear armed missiles? All but a small number of nations would choose life. But the handful of nations that choose to base their

security on these weapons of genocide threaten us all with massive uncontrollable slaughter.

In the aftermath of the Cold War, many people believe that the nuclear threat has ended, but this is not the case. In fact, there still more than 20,000 nuclear warheads in the arsenals of the nuclear weapons states. These states have given their solemn promise in the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which entered into force in 1970, to negotiate in good faith to achieve nuclear disarmament, but they have not acted in good faith. It is likely that until the people of the world demand the total elimination of nuclear weapons, the nuclear weapons states will find ways to retain their special status as nuclear "haves". Only one power on Earth is greater than the power of nuclear holocaust, and that is the power of the people once aroused.

What You Can Do

1. Find out about ongoing global efforts for nuclear weapons abolition. Abolition 2000 is a growing network of citizens throughout the world that seeks a treaty by the year 2000 for the prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons early in the next century. The goal of Abolition 2000 is to enter the 21st century with this treaty in place. There are currently some

900 citizen action groups in more than 70 countries on six continents in the Abolition 2000 Global Network. Information on Abolition 2000 is available on the worldwide web at www.wagingpeace.org, or you can write for information to Abolition 2000, c/o Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, 1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 123, Santa Barbara, CA 93108.

2. Join the "Missiles to Sunflowers" campaign. Add your name to the Abolition 2000 International Petition calling for ending the nuclear threat, signing a treaty banning nuclear weapons, and reallocating resources from military purposes to meeting human needs. A copy of the petition is available from Abolition 2000, or on the web at www.wagingpeace.org/intlpetition.html.
3. Help organize efforts to have your municipality pass a resolution in support of achieving the abolition of nuclear weapons. A sample resolution is available from Abolition 2000.
4. Plant sunflower seeds, and give away sunflowers. Let your friends and family know that sunflowers are the symbol of a world free of nuclear weapons. "Sunflower Seeds of Peace" are available from the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation.
5. Send sunflowers or packets of sunflower seeds to leaders of nuclear weapons states, and let them know that you want them to achieve the complete elimination of all nuclear weapons. For a list of these leaders and to order packets of seeds, contact the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation.
6. Stand in silent vigil with sunflowers whenever you have the chance to be in the presence of leaders of nuclear weapons states. We should try to be sure that no public occasion occurs when leaders of nuclear weapons states are not reminded by the presence of sunflowers of their obligation and responsibility to achieve a nuclear weapons free world.

* David Krieger is president of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation.

NUCLEAR AGE PEACE FOUNDATION

A founding member of
and global contact point for the
Abolition 2000 Global Network for the
Elimination of Nuclear Weapons

1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 123

Santa Barbara, CA 93108-2794
Phone (805) 965-3443 * Fax (805) 568-0466
E- mailto:wagingpeace@napf.org
<http://www.wagingpeace.org>

Invitation
to the next meeting of the
Special NGO Committee for Disarmament
20 and 21 February 1998 at the Palais des Nations
Geneva, Switzerland

Dear Friends and Colleagues,

It was a pity that the international NGO conference on nuclear disarmament which we had planned to hold in Stockholm in early December 1997 had to be postponed. We hope to meet there in the early autumn of 1998.

Reports of the Ottawa conference on the landmines treaty are enthusiastic and some are ready to adopt the 'Ottawa process" as the way to go forward in the disarmament field! It is certainly a great example of how a peoples' movement can influence governmental and intergovernmental policy and commitment and become an intimate part of the process of change. Congratulations to Jody Williams and the many others who were and are the movers and shakers in achieving a ban on, and ridding the world of, landmines. There is a lot more to be done before the world is free of these and the momentum must not be lost.

Please note in your calendar that the Committee will hold an international NGO Disarmament seminar in Geneva on 20 and 21 February 1998.

Enclosed is a rough outline of the programme. If you have suggestions, please send them to the Secretariat to arrive not later than 20 January 1998

A detailed agenda with the number of the meeting room on Friday at the Palais des Nations, and the venue of the Saturday meeting (outside the Palais) will be sent out before the end of January, plus accommodation suggestions..

With greetings and good wishes for the holidays and 1998.

Sincerely,

Edith Ballantyne
for the Bureau of the Committee

Contact: WILPF, 1 rue de Varembe, CP 28, 1211 Geneva 20.
Tel: +41-22-733-6175, fax: 740- 1063

Provisional programme:

FRIDAY 20 FEB

Morning: Nuclear disarmament - NPT prospects; reports on the Conf on Disarmament etc.
Speakers invited: Ambassadors of Poland (chair of 2nd PrepComm), South Africa, others.

Afternoon: New weapons - Louise Doswald-Beck (Intl Committee of Red Cross) (invited)
The work of UNIDIR: (UN Disarmament Research Institute) - Patricia Lewis, Director (invited).

SATURDAY 21 FEB

Morning: Practical plans for the PrepComm period - briefings/panels, Abolition 2000 events, logistics, media work, demonstrations, etc.

Afternoon: Business meeting of the Special NGO Committee for Disarmament.

Suggested timetable: Friday - 10.00 - 13.00 and 14.30 - 18.00
Sat: 9.00 - 12.00 and 13.30 - 16.00

Forwarded by IPB on behalf of the NGO Committee.

NUCLEAR CALENDAR
January 5, 1998

Revised the first Monday of each month (and more frequently when warranted) by David Culp, Plutonium Challenge, (202) 289-2388, dculp@nrdc.org.

Changes from last month's calendar are marked with an asterisk (*).

- *January 1 President reports to Congress on detargeting of Russian strategic missiles (Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998, Pub.L. 105-85, sec. 1301)
- January 3 Fifth anniversary of the signing of START II by President Bush and President Yeltsin in Moscow
- *January 5-6 EPA public hearing on WIPP (N.M.) certification, Carlsbad, N.M.
- January 6-8 Monday Lobby annual retreat, Coolfont Resort, Berkeley Springs, W.Va.
- *January 7 15th anniversary of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982
- *January 7-8 EPA public hearing on WIPP (N.M.) certification, Albuquerque, N.M.
- *January 8-9 EPA public hearing on WIPP (N.M.) certification, Santa Fe, N.M.
- *January 11 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, report to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees on completing the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP) by the year 2002 (Conference Report on the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1998, H.R. 2203, House Report 105-271, p. 37)
- *January 13 Congressional special primary election to replace Rep. Walter Capps (D-Calif.-22)
- *January 13 DOE Richland Operations Office, EPA and Washington State Department of Ecology, public meeting on the operation of the Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF), Hood River, Ore.
- *January 13 DOE Savannah River Operations Office, public hearing on the accelerator for the production of tritium at the Savannah River Site, North Augusta, S.C.
- *January 13 Fifth anniversary of the signing of the Chemical Weapons Convention at Paris
- *January 14 DOE Richland Operations Office, EPA and Washington State Department of Ecology, public meeting on the operation of the Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF), Portland, Ore.
- *January 14 Russian Duma, first meeting of the spring-summer session
- *January 16 President Clinton and the three Baltic

presidents sign the U.S.-Baltic Charter,
Washington

- January 17 Pittsburgh Regional CTBT Summit
- January 19 Martin Luther King, Jr. Day
- January 19 Conference on Disarmament, first session begins, Geneva
- *January 20 DOE Richland Operations Office, EPA and Washington State Department of Ecology, public meeting on the operation of the Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF), Seattle
- *January 21 DOE Environmental Management Advisory Board meeting, 8:30 a.m.-3 p.m., 1E-245 Forrestal Building
- *January 22 DOE Richland Operations Office, EPA and Washington State Department of Ecology, public meeting on the operation of the Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF), Richland, Wash.
- *January 25 Joint U.S.-Russia Plutonium Disposition Steering Committee, Washington
- January 26 Second anniversary of Senate approval of the START II
- January 27 Congress convenes
- January 27 President Clinton delivers the State of the Union speech, 9 p.m.
- *January 31 DOE Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management Al Alm leaves office
- January 31 DOE takes title to the high-level nuclear waste at commercial nuclear power plants
- *January DOE Nonproliferation and National Security Office, strategic plan on nuclear material protection, control and accounting in Russia and other former Soviet republics
- *January DOE Defense Programs Office, commercial reactor for tritium EIS notice of intent
- *January DOE Albuquerque Operations Office, WIPP (N.M.) supplemental EIS record of decision
- *January DOE Environmental Management Office, record of decision from the waste management PEIS on the treatment sites for transuranic waste
- *January Defense Secretary Bill Cohen visits China
- *Late January Defense Department, proposed organization plan to Defense Secretary Bill Cohen for the new Treaty Compliance and Threat Reduction Agency
- *January NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council, Nuclear Weapons Working Group meeting, Brussels, Belgium
- *January Russian Duma, Committees on Defense, International Affairs, Geopolitics, and Security, hearings on military reform and policy on the reduction of conventional and nuclear arms
- *Jan. or Feb. House National Security Subcommittee on Research and Development, hearing on the security of Russian nuclear weapons, with

Russian Gen. Alexander Lebed testifying

February 1 DOE Arms Control and Nonproliferation Office, report to Congress on nonproliferation science and technology (Conference Report on the Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998, H.R. 1119, House Report 105-340)

February 2 President Clinton submits the annual federal budget to Congress

*February 2 Energy Secretary, decision on whether to continue the Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF) at the Hanford Site (Wash.) on standby basis (Conference Report on the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1998, H.R. 2203, House Report 105-271, p. 85)

*February 2 Gen. Lee Butler USAF (ret.), former U.S. Strategic Air Command commander, speaks in conjunction with the release of a nuclear abolition statement signed by nearly 100 world leaders, 12:30 p.m., National Press Club

*February 2 Energy Secretary Federico Peña and others, presentation of the DOE budget for fiscal year 1999, 1 p.m. (estimate) Main Auditorium, Forrestal Building

*February 3 Congressional special election to replace Rep. Floyd Flake (D-N.Y.-6)

*February 4-7 United Kingdom Prime Minister Tony Blair visits Washington

*February 6 Rep. Ron Dellums (D-Calif.-9), ranking minority member of the House National Security Committee, retires

*February 6 Second anniversary of the arrest of Alexander Nikitin by the Russian Federal Security Police in St. Petersburg. (Nikitin was charged with espionage and treason for revealing information on radioactive contamination by the Russian Navy. He was released from jail in December 1996 and is currently under city arrest awaiting trial.)

*February 8-10 House Democratic Caucus issues conference, Wintergreen Resort, Wintergreen, Va.

*February 12 Energy Secretary Federico Peña speaks on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, 12:30 p.m., National Press Club

February 14-22 Congressional Presidents Day recess

February 15 Defense Department, report to Congress on sustainment of strategic nuclear systems (Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998, Pub.L. 105-85, sec. 1302(e))

*February 20 U.S. District Court for the District of Colombia, hearing in NRDC et al. v. Peña, concerning DOE's stockpile stewardship and management PEIS, 2 p.m.

*February 21 Seattle Regional CTBT Summit

*February 25 South Korean President Kim Dae Jung inaugurated

- February 28 DOE Environmental Management Office, report to Congress on privatization projects (Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998, Pub.L. 105-85, sec. 3132 (e))
- *Early February Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, hearing on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and the nuclear weapons stockpile, with U.S. Strategic Command commander Gen. Eugene Habiger testifying (tentative)
- *Early February Defense Secretary Bill Cohen visits Russia, including Nunn-Lugar (Cooperative Threat Reduction) sites
- *Mid-February Four-party Korean peace talks, working group meeting, Beijing
- *February House Commerce Subcommittee on Finance and Hazardous Materials, hearings on Superfund reauthorization bill, H.R. 3000 (Oxley bill) (tentative)
- *February House Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee on Water Resources and the Environment, markup of Superfund reauthorization bill, H.R. 2727 (Boehlert bill) (tentative)
- February Senate Armed Services Committee, hearing on the nomination of Jack Mansfield to be a Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board member (tentative)
- *February Senate Foreign Relations Committee, hearing on the nomination of John Holum to be Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security Affairs (tentative)
- February Senate Foreign Relations Committee, hearing on the nomination of Robert Grey to be the U.S. Representative to the Conference on Disarmament, Geneva (tentative)
- *February House floor action on the Chemical Weapons Convention Implementation Act of 1997, S. 610 (estimate)
- *February Senate floor action of the nomination of Mary Anne Sullivan to be the DOE General Counsel
- *February House-Senate conference committee on the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1997, H.R. 1270 and S. 104, begins
- February House-Senate conference committee on the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1998 and 1999, H.R. 1757, continues
- *February DOE Environmental Management Office, draft 2006 cleanup plan
- *February DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office, request for proposals (RFP) issued for MOX disposition of plutonium
- *February DOE Defense Programs Office, commercial reactor for tritium EIS scoping meetings, Washington

and other cities

- *February DOE Richland Operations Office, Hanford Site (Wash.) draft remedial action EIS and land use plan
- *February DOE Environmental Management Office, Rocky Flats (Colo.) plutonium residues final EIS
- *February Russian Duma, possible ratification of START II
- *February United Kingdom House of Commons, ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (estimate)
- February United Kingdom Ministry of Defense, completion of Strategic Defense Review
- Feb. or March Senate floor action on NATO expansion (estimate)
- *Feb. or March Indian parliamentary elections
- *Feb., March Senate Armed Services Committee, Senate Foreign Relations
- and April Committee, and Senate Select Intelligence Committee, hearings on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (estimate)
- March 1 DOE Defense Programs Office, selection of commercial nuclear power plant(s) for tritium production
- March 1 DOE Environmental Management Office, report to Congress on the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP) (Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998, Pub.L. 105-85, sec. 3170)
- *March 9-13 Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Organization, Fifth PrepCom meeting, Vienna, Austria
- *March 10 Congressional runoff special election (if needed) to replace Rep. Walter Capps (D-Calif.-22)
- March 15 DOE Defense Programs Office, report to Congress on nuclear weapons stockpile stewardship and management (Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998, Pub.L. 105-85, sec. 3151)
- March 15 DOE Defense Programs Office, report to Congress on legislation needed for tritium production for commercial reactors (Conference Report on the Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998, H.R. 1119, House Report 105-340)
- March 15 DOE Environmental Management Office, final land use plans for Hanford Site (Wash.), INEEL (Idaho), Rocky Flats (Colo.), and Savannah River Site (S.C.) (42 U.S.C. sec. 7274k note, amended by Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998, Pub.L. 105-85, sec. 3141) [At least the Hanford Site will not make this deadline.]
- *March 16 Congressional committees submit budget views and estimates to the House and Senate Budget Committees
- *March 16 Four-party Korean peace talks, second plenary session begins, Geneva
- *March 16-April 3 PrepCom on the establishment of an

International Criminal Court, United Nations,
New York

- *March 17 Illinois primary for the Republican candidate to challenge Sen. Moseley-Braun (D)
- *March 23 15th anniversary of President Reagan's "Star Wars" proposal
- *March 23-26 Exchange/Monitor Publications, Conference on the Management and Disposition of Nuclear Weapons Materials, Bethesda, Md.
- *March 24 10th anniversary of the conviction of Mordechai Vanunu by Israel for espionage (Vanunu was convicted for providing information about the Israeli nuclear weapons program to the London Sunday Times in 1986. He is currently in solitary confinement, serving an 18-year sentence.)
- March 27 Conference on Disarmament, first session ends, Geneva
- *March 30 DOE Worker and Community Transition Office, report to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees on the future need and justification for the program (Conference Report on the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1998, H.R. 2203, House Report 105-271, p. 96)
- March 31 President reports to Congress on implementation of the U.S.-Russia Helsinki Joint Statement issued in March 1997 (Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998, Pub.L. 105-85, sec. 1229)
- March 31 DOE Worker and Community Transition Office, report to Congress on the effectiveness of workforce restructuring plans (Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998, Pub.L. 105-85, sec. 3153)
- *March 31-April 1G-8 Energy Ministers Conference, Moscow
- *March DOE Environmental Management Office, Rocky Flats (Colo.) plutonium residues EIS record of decision
- *March House Commerce Subcommittee on Finance and Hazardous Materials, markup of Superfund reauthorization bill, H.R. 3000 (Oxley bill) (tentative)
- *March Gore-Chernomyrdin Commission meeting, Washington (estimate)
- *March Arctic Military Environmental Cooperation meeting (United States, Russia and Norway), Washington
- *April 1 Senate Budget Committee reports budget resolution
- April 2-20 House of Representatives spring recess
- April 4-19 Senate spring recess
- *April 6-28 U.N. Disarmament Commission annual meeting, New York; agenda items are (1) nuclear-weapon-free zones, (2) U.N. General Assembly Special

- Session on Disarmament, and (3) guidelines on conventional arms control
- *April 7 Congressional special election to replace Rep. Ron Dellums (D-Calif.-9)
- April 10-13 Spring Healing Global Wounds gathering, Nevada Test Site
- *April 13 DOE Environmental Management Office, report to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees on technology development, (Conference Report on the Energy and Water Appropriations Act, 1998, H.R. 2203, House Report 105-271, p. 92)
- *April 15 Congress completes action on the budget resolution
- April 22 20th anniversary of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which created the Latin American nuclear-free zone, entering into force
- April 22 Earth Day
- April 24 First anniversary of Senate approval of the Chemical Weapons Convention
- April 26 Chernobyl Commemoration Day
- April 26-28 20/20 Vision and other national organizations, CTBT Lobby Days, Washington (proposed)
- April 28-May 8 Second PrepCom for the 2000 Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference, Geneva
- April 29 First anniversary of the Chemical Weapons Convention entering into force
- *April DOE Arms Control and Nonproliferation Office, draft study on the nonproliferation impact of reprocessing research reactor fuel at the Savannah River Site (S.C.)
- *April DOE Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (Calif.), National Ignition Facility supplemental EIS notice of intent
- *April DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office, surplus plutonium disposition draft EIS
- *April DOE Savannah River Operations Office, Savannah River Site (S.C.), spent nuclear fuel management draft EIS
- April DOE Environmental Management Office, receipt of the first shipment of foreign research reactor spent nuclear fuel at the Concord Naval Weapons Station (northeast of San Francisco, Calif.), to be shipped to INEEL (Idaho)
- *April DOE Albuquerque Operations Offices, Los Alamos National Laboratory (N.M.) site-wide draft EIS
- *April U.N. Department of Humanitarian Affairs, annual pledging conference for health-related Chernobyl projects, New York
- Spring DOE Nevada Test Site, subcritical test "Boomerang"
- *May 1-2 Abolition 2000 annual meeting, Geneva
- May 1-4 Physicians for Social Responsibility national meeting and lobby day, Crystal City Marriott, Arlington, Va.

- May 3-6 Alliance for Nuclear Accountability (formerly Military Production Network), D.C. Days, Washington
- May 11 Conference on Disarmament, second session begins, Geneva
- *May 15 House Appropriations Committee, markup of annual appropriation bills may begin (Markups may occur earlier if the budget resolution has been adopted.)
- May 15 DOE Environmental Management Office, report to Congress on land use plans for Hanford Site (Wash.), INEEL (Idaho), Rocky Flats (Colo.), and Savannah River Site (S.C.) (42 U.S.C. sec. 7274k note, amended by Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998, Pub.L. 105-85, sec. 3141) [At least the Hanford Site will not make this deadline.]
- May 15-17 G-8 Summit, Birmingham, United Kingdom
- *May 19 Congressional special election to replace Rep. Tom Foglietta (D-Pa.-1)
- *May 19 Arkansas primary election for the Democrat and Republican candidates to replace retiring Sen. Dale Bumpers (D)
- *May 22 U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, summary judgment hearing in NRDC et al. v. Peña, concerning DOE's stockpile stewardship and management PEIS, 10 a.m.
- May 23-May 31 Congressional Memorial Day recess
- *May 26 Kentucky primary election for the Democrat and Republican candidates to replace retiring Sen. Wendell Ford (D)
- *May 28 NATO foreign ministers meeting, Luxembourg
- *May 29 NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council foreign ministers meeting, Luxembourg (estimate)
- *May 29 DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office, proposals due for MOX disposition for plutonium
- *May DOE Arms Control and Nonproliferation Office, meetings on the draft nonproliferation study on reprocessing research reactor fuel at the Savannah River Site (S.C.), Washington and near Aiken, S.C.
- *May EPA approval of WIPP (N.M.) opening
- *May DOE WIPP (N.M.), target date for opening the facility (probably will be delayed at least until June)
- *May DOE Defense Programs Office, commercial reactor for tritium draft EIS
- *May DOE Richland Operations Office, decision whether and how to continue with the privatization contract(s) for the Tank Waste Remediation System, Hanford Site (Wash.)
- May DOE Richland Operations Office, Hanford Site (Wash.) solid (radioactive and hazardous) waste program draft EIS

- *May Institute of Medicine, review and recommendations of the National Cancer Institute's studies on radioactive fallout from nuclear testing
- *May President Clinton visits Moscow (estimate)
- Spring or Summer Senate floor action on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (estimate)
- *Spring or Summer President Clinton visits India and Pakistan (estimate)
- *June 1 10th anniversary of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, which eliminated all U.S. and Soviet intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, entering into force at Moscow
- *June 2 California primary for the Republican candidate to challenge Sen. Barbara Boxer (D)
- *June 10 House Appropriations Committee reports last annual appropriation bill
- June 10 35th anniversary of President Kennedy's nuclear testing speech at American University
- *June 15 Congress completes action on reconciliation legislation
- June 20 35th anniversary of the signing of the "Hot Line" agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union at Geneva
- June 26 Conference on Disarmament, second session ends, Geneva
- June 26-July 13 House of Representatives July 4th recess
- June 27-July 5 Senate July 4th recess
- *June 30 House of Representatives completes floor action on annual appropriation bills
- *June 30 Energy Department, report to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees on DOE's management of construction projects, (Conference Report on the Energy and Water Appropriations Act, 1998, H.R. 2203, House Report 105-271, p. 98)
- *June DOE Environmental Management Office, final 2006 cleanup plan
- *June DOE Idaho Operations Office, INEEL (Idaho) advanced mixed waste treatment project draft EIS
- *June DOE Environmental Management Office, records of decision from the waste management PEIS on the treatment sites and storage sites for mixed radioactive waste and low-level radioactive waste
- *June NATO defense ministers meeting
- *June International diplomatic conference to establish an International Criminal Court, Rome
- *July 1 30th anniversary of the signing of the Non-Proliferation Treaty at Washington, Moscow and London
- July 16 53rd anniversary of the first nuclear test, "Trinity," at Alamogordo, N.M.

- July 27 Conference on Disarmament, third session begins, Geneva
- July 29 Second anniversary of the last nuclear test, Lop Nor, China
- *July DOE Arms Control and Nonproliferation Office, final study on the nonproliferation impact of reprocessing research reactor fuel at the Savannah River Site (S.C.)
- *July DOE Richland Operations Office, Hanford Site (Wash.) final remedial action EIS and land use plan (estimate)
- July DOE Savannah River Operations Office, accelerator for the production of tritium at the Savannah River Site (S.C.) final EIS
- Summer DOE Nevada Test Site, subcritical test "Bagpipe" (estimate)
- *Summer European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, International Chernobyl Sarcophagus Financing Conference, United Kingdom (estimate)
- Aug. 1 or Aug. 8 Senate summer recess begins
- August 5 35th anniversary of the signing of the Limited Test Ban Treaty by the United States, Soviet Union and United Kingdom at Moscow
- August 6 Hiroshima Day
- Aug. 8-Sept. 8 House of Representatives summer recess
- August 9 Nagasaki Day
- August 11 Colorado primary for the Democratic candidate to challenge Sen. Ben Campbell (R)
- *August 30 35th anniversary of the "Hot Line" between Washington and Moscow going into operation
- *August DOE Fissile Materials Office, shipment of MOX nuclear fuel from the Los Alamos National Laboratory (N.M.) to the Chalk River Nuclear Laboratory (northwest of Ottawa) for the "Paralex Project" test burn, using U.S. and Russian plutonium (estimate)
- *August DOE Savannah River Operations Office, Savannah River Site (S.C.) spent nuclear fuel management final EIS (estimate)
- *August DOE Richland Operations Office, Hanford Site (Wash.) remedial action EIS and land use plan record of decision (estimate)
- August DOE Savannah River Site (S.C.), accelerator for the production of tritium EIS record of decision
- September 1 DOE Nonproliferation and National Security Office, report to Congress on safeguards and security at U.S. weapons facilities (Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998, Pub.L. 105-85, sec. 3162)
- September 7 Senate summer recess ends
- September 9 Conference on Disarmament, third session ends, Geneva

- *September 15 New York primary for the Democratic candidate to challenge Sen. Alfonse D'Amato (R);
Washington primary for the Republican candidate to challenge Sen. Patty Murray (D)
- *September 15 U.N. General Assembly, 53rd session convenes, New York
- *September 21 Congressional Rosh Hashanah recess
- *September 21 U.N. General Assembly, general debate begins and President Clinton addresses the General Assembly, New York (estimate)
- *September 24 Second anniversary of the signing of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty at New York
- *September 27 German Federal Assembly (Bundestag) elections
- *September 29-30 Congressional Yom Kippur recess
- *September 30 DOE Civilian Radioactive Waste Management Office, report to the President and Congress on a viability assessment of the Yucca Mountain nuclear waste repository (Conference Report on the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1997, H.R. 3816, House Report 104-782)
- *September DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office, contract award for MOX disposition for plutonium
- *September DOE Albuquerque Operations Office, Sandia National Laboratory (N.M.) site-wide draft EIS
- *September DOE Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (Calif.), National Ignition Facility draft supplemental EIS
- *September DOE Albuquerque Operations Office, Los Alamos National Laboratory (N.M.) site-wide final EIS
- October 1 U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, completion of merger into the State Department (tentative)
- October 1 Federal budget year begins
- October 7 15th anniversary of the DOE Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management
- October 9 Congressional adjournment target date
- *October 9 Nobel Peace Prize announced, Oslo, Norway (estimate)
- *October 13 DOE Environmental Management Office, report to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees on technology development, (Conference Report on the Energy and Water Appropriations Act, 1998, H.R. 2203, p. 92)
- *October 20-24 NGO Committee on Disarmament, Disarmament Week symposium, United Nations, New York (tentative)
- *October 26 15th anniversary of the termination of the Clinch River Breeder Reactor (Tenn.) by Congress
- *October DOE Albuquerque Operations Office, Los Alamos National Laboratory (N.M.) site-wide final EIS
- *October DOE Idaho Operations Office, INEEL (Idaho) advanced mixed waste treatment project final EIS

- *October DOE Savannah River Operations Office, Savannah River Site (S.C.) spent nuclear fuel management EIS record of decision (estimate)
- November 3 U.S. congressional elections
- *November 16-18 Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation summit, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
- *November DOE Defense Programs Office, commercial reactor for tritium final EIS
- *November DOE Idaho Operations Office, INEEL (Idaho), advanced mixed waste treatment project EIS record of decision
- *November President Clinton visits China (estimate)
- *December 7 5th anniversary of former Energy Secretary Hazel O'Leary announcing her "Openness Initiative" and releasing previously classified records
- *December 10 Nobel Peace Prize awarded, Oslo, Norway
- December 31 DOE Defense Programs Office, report to Congress on the technology to be used for tritium production (Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998, Pub.L. 105-85, sec. 3135(a))
- *December Energy Secretary, decision on whether to restart the Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF) at the Hanford Site (Wash.) for tritium production (tentative)
- *December DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office, surplus plutonium disposition final EIS
- *December DOE Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (Calif.), National Ignition Facility final supplemental EIS
- December DOE Richland Operations Office, Hanford Site (Wash.) solid (radioactive and hazardous) waste program final EIS
- *December DOE Defense Programs Office, commercial reactor for tritium EIS record of decision
- *Winter DOE Environmental Management Office, record of decision from the waste management PEIS on the storage sites for high-level nuclear waste now at Hanford Site (Wash.), INEEL (Idaho), Savannah River Site (S.C.) and West Valley Demonstration Project (N.Y.) (estimate)

Copyright (c) 1998 by Plutonium Challenge. Permission (and encouragement) is given to citizens groups to reproduce or use this calendar. Proper credit is appreciated.

Dear Howard,
sorry I couldn't attend to your inquiry on Geneva costs earlier, but have finally caught up with the backlog.

Hope you had a good Christmas, and I wish you and your family a very peaceful and happy new year!

A reception for around 100 people held in a small room (the salon geneve or salon lausanne) in the UN restaurant on the 8th floor will cost around \$2,500, all included.

HOTELS: Geneva is NOT cheap! It depends how posh you want to go. It is difficult to find single person accommodation in Geneva for under \$100 per person per night. For hotels near the UN with reasonable facilities, you need to reckon on \$130-180 per night.

You can find cheaper hotels in France, but that is a bus ride from the Palais, and means crossing the border each day (that's what I usually do, unless I can stay with friends).

Meals: Pizza is around \$14.00, salad around \$4.00

The Palais serves lunch in the canteen, with a good salad costing around \$10 - 15.00. That is considered cheap! If you want good meals, a three course dinner and couple glasses of wine will cost at least \$50.00. I would say the minimum you need for food is \$30.00 per day, which does not include social meals and alcohol.

So for a fortnight in Geneva in a moderately priced hotel with lunches in the Palais and dinners elsewhere, you need to budget from \$1,800 upwards per person. That's pretty much a minimum.

Best wishes,
Rebecca

>Dear Rebecca:

>
>I want to raise some funds so that I can attend the NPT PreCom in Geneva.
>Can you provide me an estimate of hotel and meals for two weeks? This will
>help me prepare a budget.

>
>Thanks
>
>Howard Hallman
>
>

The Acronym Institute
24, Colvestone Crescent, London E8 2LH, England.

telephone (UK +44) (0) 171 503 8857
fax (0) 171 503 9153

Hi Maureen. Thanks for the comments. I am working on a rolling six month campaign plan that I will bring to Coolfont for discussion. Tom.

Reply Separator

Subject: Re: Reply to "Fragmented work on CTBT"
Author: maureen eldredge <uunet!igc.apc.org!meldredge> at INTERNET
Date: 1/5/98 12:42 PM

Thanks for starting this discussion Bob, and for your comments Daryl. Some thoughts of my own. ANA (our new name!) attends the CTBT working group meetings of the CRND as well as the NWWG. We are planning grassroots work on the CTBT as well as direct lobbying. However, as we are not official members of the CRND, it is unclear whether we would be invited to attend administration meetings set up by CRND or Senate lobbying assignments. We also have a slightly different take on the CTBT/SSM linkage than some CRND members, although other CRND members such as PSR, WAND, PEace Action share our views. If the CTBT Working Group meeting was to be the primary venue for planning strategy and discussing/setting up administration meetings as well as taking assignments for the same, I am not sure how non-member groups fit in. It would feel very odd to be working on strategy, etc. and not be able to participate in the actual lobbying efforts. And it wouldn't help the duplication problem much for "non-members" to set up our own meetings.

Fundamentally, I don't think the problem is which meeting does what, I think the proliferation of meeting reflects a deeper problem. There is no "master plan" for the CTBT campaign that includes administration, Senate, grassroots, media, etc. in a coordinated fashion that integrates all parts both in message and in timing. We need to do such large scale strategic thinking so that organizations, working groups, and coalitions can see when, where, and how they can participate and invite all to do so. To the extent we can limit turf protecting and exclusive ownership of the campaign, the better off we will all be. I am growing increasingly concerned that there is no integrated approach to winning this extrodinarily difficult ratification effort and I am also concerned that the longer it drags out, the more money and concessions Domenici et.al. will get for the labs and the ongoing weapons work. I recently sat down to do an integrated, multi-year campaign plan for SSM and it was very challenging. Has anyone tried to come up with a similar plan for CTBT? Hopefully we can work on some of this at Coolfont.

See you there!
-Maureen
Alliance for Nuclear Accountability

At 06:16 PM 12/29/97 -0500, Daryl Kimball wrote:

>TO: CTBT colleagues

>FR: Daryl Kimball

>RE: suggestions on CTBT meetings

>

>Bob Tiller wrote:

>

>"I am aware of at least eight regular coalitional meetings at which
>participants plan strategies and tactics related to CTBT ratification ...

>This list of meetings on CTBT is far too long. I propose that we (1)
>identify the coalitional settings where we want the heavy work done, and (2)
>consider ways to shrink the total list. My own suggestions are as follows:
>(a) The two major arenas for heavy work should be the Nuclear Weapons
>Working Group and the CTBT Working Group of the the CRND. Other groups
>would be, with respect to the CTBT, primarily reporting occasions; (b) We
>should consider folding the Summits Planning Committee and the informal
>lobbying meeting into other groups, thus shrinking the list to six. What do
>others think?"

>

>*****

>

>DK's Reply:

>

>I generally agree with Bob Tiller's observations and suggestions. It is
>important for us to reduce the number of meetings to the minimum necessary
>and that we make each meeting as efficient and productive as possible. And I
>agree that we can do a better job. To do this we need to be clear about what
>each meeting is about and to be professional about how meetings are
>conducted. On the other hand, we have to keep in mind that no one meeting
>can't practically include everyone or be about everything CTBT.

>

>So, what can, should be, or already are the set of CTBT meetings about?

>

>The CTBT campaign, like any national public policy campaign, consists of
>efforts by our community of NGOs in four basic areas:

>

>* communication with the Executive Branch

>* media work

>* direct education, liason and lobbying of the Senate

>* grassroots lobbying and public education/outreach

>

>I agree with Bob Tiller that the two "heavy lifting" sets of CTBT campaign
>meetings should be the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers CTBT Working
>Group Meetings and the Nuclear Weapons Working Group Meetings. Because of
>the larger number and variety of groups who are interested in the CTBT
>effort and because of the huge scope of work involved, I believe that is
>necessary to have more than one series of meetings.

>

>However, if we can be more disciplined about what each setting is trying to
>accomplish and if we can effectively and efficiently report to one another
>about work/developments in other areas of the campaign, we'll have a
>smoother and less time consuming series of meetings.

>

>In that spirit, I would like to describe/suggest the following general

>summarizes developments, solicits suggestions,
>and information about the CTBT. Other issues of concern to the Coalition
>will be reported on and discussed. In addition, this meeting serves to
>facilitate group decisions about policy recommendations
>in letters and statements, and about proposals
>for major Coalition expenditures. Open to member groups of the Coalition.
>Minutes are taken and sent to member groups.

>
> OTHER SUBGROUPS: Tom Collina and I have and will pulled
together ad hoc meetings to advance work in
specific areas such as long-range media strategy and
Coalition polling on the CTBT.

>
>
>NUCLEAR WEAPONS WORKING GROUP (rotating chairs) -- Approx. 1/3 of meetings
devoted to CTBT, the other 2/3 to stockpile stewardship and other nuclear
weapons issues.

>
>Meeting Times: generally once a week on Thursdays from 9:00-10:30.

>
>Function: *information sharing on CTBT and other nuclear weapons
topics of concern
> *strategy and coordination of efforts related to
>GRASSROOTS mobilization, education,
and grassroots lobbying. (i.e. post card alerts, action alerts, press
briefings, polling, reports and fax blasts)
> *strategy and coordination of grassroots media work
>(primarily letters to editor and radio
call-in)
> *brief report (preferably in written form) on
news and activities from a
representative of the CTBT Working Group of the Coalition (usually Kimball
or Collina)

>
>Participants: open, but generally includes members of membership-based
(grassroots) organizations and some faith-based groups.

>
>*One way to save time and perhaps be more efficient would be to forego NWWG
discussion/work on the CTBT (but not necessarily cancel its meeting) during
the week that the CTBT Working Group Meeting is held each month.

>
>
>COMMENTS ON OTHER CTBT-RELATED MEETINGS:

>
>MONDAY LOBBY: not really a CTBT strategy meeting. Someone (preferably the
current chair of the NWWG) should report to the Monday Lobby group on major
CTBT developments, suggest any grassroots call to action needed, report on
next set of meetings on CTBT.

>
>DISARMAMENT CLEARINGHOUSE STEERING COMMITTEE: this project is clearly about
CTBT, but it, as far as I can see it, is a managerial meeting -- not a
strategy meeting -- involving 3-4 people for a project/person that
participates in other meetings.

>CTBT SUMMITS PLANNING MTGS.: these Summits, while they may be part of the
>Disarmament Clearinghouse's mandate, or part of the work of other
>groups/projects, are part of the larger grassroots mobilization outreach >work
of the groups in the NWWG. It seems to make common sense that the folks >who
are doing summit work should report to (preferably in writing) and seek >input
from the NWWG.

>

>HOWARD HALLMAN'S MTGS. ON THE CTBT FOR GRASSROOTS WORK BY THE RELIGIOUS
>COMMUNITY: As I understand it, Howard is using these monthly meetings to
cater to and focus on the interests of the faith-based groups who interested
in CTBT ratification. Thus, they are essentially outreach meetings meant to
inform and mobilize another, important constituency. However, they aren't
"strategy" meetings that require the participation or time of all of the
other NWWG or Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers organizations.

>

>We need to and can, however, avoid scheduling these meetings at the same
time as other CTBT strategy meetings or events.

>

>

>Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
at Council for a Livable World Education Fund
110 Maryland Ave. NE #201
Washington DC 20002
p: (202)546-0795; fax: (202)546-5142
website: <http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/>

>

>

>

Maureen Eldredge
Program Director
The Military Production Network
1801 18th St. NW, Suite 9-2
Washington, DC 20009
202-833-4668/fax: 202-234-9536

A national alliance of watchdog organizations
working on DOE's nuclear weapons complex.

As I mentioned to you some time ago, Foundry's Peace Mission is coordinating an adult forum class at 9:30 to run four weeks starting March 8. I'm counting on your conducting a session on the area of nuclear disarmament.

I've invited Lee Hamilton to either open the class on March 8 or close it on March 29 with a focus on the Middle East/Persian Gulf. As soon as I know which date he desires, I can fill in the remaining three Sundays. David Young, a foreign service officer soon to be posted to Ho Chi Min City, will discuss the situation in Vietnam on one.

For the fourth I would like to see a presentation related to the economics of the weapons industry which, for one thing, makes it necessary to sell weapons to other nations almost as quickly as they are developed in order to amortize their huge cost. Could you recommend any one who might be willing to present on this subject? I've thought of asking FCNL is they have a suggestion.

At 08:43 PM 1/6/98 -0500, you wrote:

>As I mentioned to you some time ago, Foundry's Peace Mission is
>coordinating an adult forum class at 9:30 to run four weeks starting March
>8. I'm counting on your conducting a session on the area of nuclear
>disarmament.....

Dear Phil:

I've made a commitment to speak to a Sunday School class at my church on March 15. March 8 is my wife's birthday. Thus, either March 22 or 29 would be my preferred dates.

For your speaker on the weapons industry, you might try the Center for Defense Information. My contact is Chris Hellman at 202 862-0700. You can use my name. He may not be the one but could help identify some one who could fill the bill.

Shalom,
Howard

Hi - I was raised MEthodist, in HOuston, TX; my mother, WIlda CAmpbell, 86 now, was the first woman chair of the board of West University Methodist there. My activism is based on the principles I learned in Methodist churches and my focus these days in nuclear - besides auporting the Western Shoshone in their efforts to reclaim the land and stop the nuclear weapons testing and waste dumping, I also am working with others to stop two national nuclear waste dumps proposed for west texas. We need help nationally with a bill due up in early February called the COntract Bill (S 270) that says Texas will be host to low level nuke waste from Maine and Vermont. The proposed site is five miles east of SIerra BLanca, unincorporated mainly MExican-AMerican low-income town of less than 600 folk, fewer than 200 adults, 80 miles east of El Paso. THe region is the most seismically-active in TEexas and the proposed facility is built above a buried fault above the sole source aquifer for the area. THe Hispanic caucus rallied behind local Reps Bonilla (R) and REyes (D) in opposing the House bill but the nuclear industry money was well spread and we lost. My congressman, Lloyd Doggett, introduced an amendment meant to gore Gov. Bush and the nuclear industry's ox which limits the waste to be dumped in Texas to just the two states with whom the COntract originated - Maine and Vermont. THe Gov's office had been promising other states - for sure MAssachusetts and Connecticut - that they too could dump their nuclear power waste in west texas.

If the DOggett amendment, which Senator Wellstone will offer along with his own environmental justice amendment and a similar amendment from the White House, passes the Senate with the bill, we believe it will have to go back to the three state legislatures for approval - which gives us a fighting chance to defeat the project because the MAine nuclear utility now wants out of the deal, and because the Texas legislature has gotten pretty sick of the state dumping agency.

This is a long background piece, to see if you believe MUPJ would be interested in helping - by contacting Senators or by putting out an email alert to your members or however you operate - or if you can - I dont know what your 501C3 restrictions might be. If so, and you'd like a much briefer appeal which you could forward, please contact me or erin rogers at (512)447-6222 or at my email or heart@igc.org.

Thanks to your attention for this appeal

susan

Mad Comix Radiation ALert:
Bangkok (Reuters) 11 Nov `97- Radioactive gemstones, some of them already finished to jewelry have been found on the Asian market. The radiation in some of the gemstones lies 50 times over the US safety limit. Wearing it, it could easily cause cancer or other sicknessess. The source of these stones isn't still known but it is very likely to be Indonesia.

At 11:29 PM 1/6/98 EST, you wrote:

>I am in the midst of studying the religious aspect of anti-nuclearism and
>would like your assistance on this. My name is Mike Niece at Mecta @aol.com
>if you can help I would appreciate it. This is from the Christian perspective
>
>I may be able to help you if you would be more specific of what you want.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman

Dear Susan Lee Solar:

Our work is concentrated on the abolition of nuclear weapons. With our limited resources we are unable to deal with the issue of nuclear waste, as important as the issue is.

The United Methodist General Board of Church and Society works on environmental issues and might be able to help you. The best contact there is Jaydee Hanson. His fax is 202 488-5639, phone 202 488-5650. Mailing address: 100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, DC 20002.

Good luck,

Howard W. Hallman

Dear Abolitionists,

The International Campaign to Ban Landmines showed the power of an organized NGO effort. It demonstrated that if the people lead, governments will follow. Jody Williams' Nobel lecture -- reprinted below -- traces the development of the campaign. A clear turning point was the Canadian foreign minister's commitment and challenge to achieve a treaty within a relatively short period of time (one year).

David Krieger

NOBEL LECTURE

December 10, 1997

by

Jody Williams

Coordinator, International Campaign to Ban Landmines

Your Majesties, Honorable Members of the Nobel Committee, Excellencies and Honored Guests:

It is a privilege to be here today, together with other representatives of the International Campaign to Ban Landmines, to receive jointly the 1997 Nobel Peace Prize. Our appreciation goes to those who nominated us and to the Nobel Committee for choosing this year to recognize, from among so many other nominees who have worked diligently for peace, the work of the International Campaign.

I am deeply honored -- but whatever personal recognition derives from this award, I believe that this high tribute is the result of the truly historic achievement of this humanitarian effort to rid the world of one indiscriminate weapon. In the words of the Nobel Committee, the International Campaign "started a process which in the space of a few years changed a ban on antipersonnel mines from a vision to a feasible reality." Further, the Committee noted that the Campaign has been able to "express and mediate a broad range of popular commitment in an unprecedented way. With the governments of several small and medium-sized countries taking the issue up...this work has grown into a convincing example of an effective policy for peace."

The desire to ban land mines is not new. In the late 1970s, the International Committee of the Red Cross, along with a handful of non-governmental organizations (NGOs), pressed the world to look at weapons that were particularly injurious and/or indiscriminate. One of the weapons of special concern was landmines. People often ask why the focus on this one weapon. How is the landmine different from any other conventional weapon?

Landmines distinguish themselves because once they have been sown, once the soldier walks away from the weapon, the landmine cannot tell the difference between a soldier or a civilian -- a woman, a child, a grandmother going out to collect firewood to make the family meal. The crux of the problem is

that while the use of the weapon might be militarily justifiable during the day of the battle, or even the two weeks of the battle, or maybe even the two months of the battle, once peace is declared the landmine does not recognize that peace. The landmine is eternally prepared to take victims. In common parlance, it is the perfect soldier, the "eternal sentry." The war ends, the landmine goes on killing.

Since World War II most of the conflicts in the world have been internal conflicts. The weapon of choice in those wars has all too often been landmines -- to such a degree that what we find today are tens of millions of landmines contaminating approximately 70 countries around the world. The overwhelming majority of those countries are found in the developing world, primarily in those countries that do not have the resources to clean up the mess, to care for the tens of thousands of landmine victims. The end result is an international community now faced with a global humanitarian crisis.

Let me take a moment to give a few examples of the degree of the epidemic. Today Cambodia has somewhere between four and six million landmines, which can be found in over 50 percent of its national territory. Afghanistan is littered with perhaps nine million landmines. The U.S. military has said that during the height of the Russian invasion and ensuing war in that country, up to 30 million mines were scattered throughout Afghanistan. In the few years of the fighting in the former Yugoslavia, some six million landmines were sown throughout various sections of the country -- Angola nine million, Mozambique a million, Somalia a million -- I could go on, but it gets tedious. Not only do we have to worry about the mines already in the ground, we must be concerned about those that are stockpiled and ready for use. Estimates range between one and two hundred million mines in stockpiles around the world.

When the ICRC pressed in the '70s for the governments of the world to consider increased restrictions or elimination of particularly injurious or indiscriminate weapons, there was little support for a ban of landmines. The end result of several years of negotiations was the 1980 Convention on Conventional Weapons (CCW). What that treaty did was attempt to regulate the use of landmines. While the Convention tried to tell commanders in the field when it was okay to use the weapon and when it was not okay to use the weapon, it also allowed them to make decisions about the applicability of the law in the midst of battle. Unfortunately, in the heat of battle, the laws of war do not exactly come to mind. When you are trying to save your skin you use anything and everything at your disposal to do so.

Throughout these years the Cold War raged on, and internal conflicts that often were proxy wars of the Super Powers proliferated. Finally with the collapse of the Soviet Bloc, people began to look at war and peace differently. Without the overarching threat of nuclear holocaust, people started to look at how wars had actually been fought during the Cold War. What they found was that in the internal conflicts fought during that time, the most insidious weapon of all was the antipersonnel landmine -- and that it contaminated the globe in epidemic proportion.

As relative peace broke out with the end of the Cold War, the U.N. was able

to go into these nations that had been torn by internal strife, and what they found when they got there were millions and millions of landmines which affected every aspect of peacekeeping, which affected every aspect of post-conflict reconstruction of those societies. You know, if you are in Phnom Penh in Cambodia, and you are setting up the peacekeeping operations, it might seem relatively easy. But when you want to send your troops out into the hinterlands where four or six million landmines are, it becomes a problem, because the main routes are mined. Part of the peace agreement was to bring the hundreds of thousands of refugees back into the country so that they could participate in the voting, in the new democracy being forged in Cambodia. Part of the plan to bring them back included giving each family enough land so that they could be self-sufficient, so they wouldn't be a drain on the country, so that they could contribute to reconstruction. What they found: So many landmines they couldn't give land to the families. What did they get? Fifty dollars and a year's supply of rice. That is the impact of landmines.

It was the NGOs, the non-governmental organizations, who began to seriously think about trying to deal with the root of the problem -- to eliminate the problem, it would be necessary to eliminate the weapon. The work of NGOs across the board was affected by the landmines in the developing world. Children's groups, development organizations, refugee organizations, medical and humanitarian relief groups -- all had to make huge adjustments in their programs to try to deal with the landmine crises and its impact on the people they were trying to help. It was also in this period that the first NGO humanitarian demining organizations were born -- to try to return contaminated land to rural communities.

It was a handful of NGOs, with their roots in humanitarian and human rights work, which began to come together, in late 1991 and early 1992, in an organized effort to ban antipersonnel landmines. In October of 1992, Handicap International, Human Rights Watch, medico international, Mines Advisory Group, Physicians for Human Rights and Vietnam Veterans of America Foundation came together to issue a "Joint Call to Ban Antipersonnel Landmines." These organizations, which became the steering committee of the International Campaign to Ban Landmines called for an end to the use, production, trade and stockpiling of antipersonnel landmines. The call also pressed governments to increase resources for humanitarian mine clearance and for victim assistance.

>From this inauspicious beginning, the International Campaign has become an unprecedented coalition of 1,000 organizations working together in 60 countries to achieve the common goal of a ban of antipersonnel landmines. And as the Campaign grew, the steering committee was expanded to represent the continuing growth and diversity of those who had come together in this global movement. We added the Afghan and Cambodian Campaigns and Radda Barnen in 1996, and the South African Campaign and Kenya Coalition early this year as we continued to press toward our goal. And in six years we did it. In September of this year, 89 countries came together -- here in Oslo -- and finished the negotiations of a ban treaty based on a draft drawn up by Austria only at the beginning of this year. Just last week in Ottawa, Canada, 121 countries came together again to sign that ban treaty. And as a clear indication of the political will to bring this treaty into force as soon as possible, three countries ratified the treaty upon

signature -- Canada, Mauritius and Ireland.

In its first years, the International Campaign developed primarily in the North -- in the countries which had been significant producers of antipersonnel landmines. The strategy was to press for national, regional and international measures to ban landmines. Part of this strategy was to get the governments of the world to review the CCW and in the review process -- try to get them to ban the weapon through that convention. We did not succeed. But over the two and one-half years of the review process, with the pressure that we were able to generate -- the heightened international attention to the issue -- began to raise the stakes, so that different governments wanted to be seen as leaders on what the world was increasingly recognizing as a global humanitarian crisis.

The early lead had been taken in the United States, with the first legislated moratorium on exports in 1992. And while the author of that legislation, Senator Leahy, has continued to fight tirelessly to ban the weapon in the U.S., increasingly other nations far surpassed that early leadership. In March of 1995, Belgium became the first country to ban the use, production, trade and stockpiling domestically. Other countries followed suit: Austria, Norway, Sweden, and others. So even as the CCW review was ending in failure, increasingly governments were calling for a ban. What had once been called a utopian goal of NGOs was gaining in strength and momentum.

While we still had that momentum, in the waning months of the CCW review, we decided to try to get the individual governments which had taken action or had called for a ban to come together in a self-identifying bloc. There is, after all, strength in numbers. So during the final days of the CCW we invited them to a meeting and they actually came. A handful of governments agreed to sit down with us and talk about where the movement to ban landmines would go next. Historically NGOs and governments have too often seen each other as adversaries, not colleagues, and we were shocked that they came. Seven or nine came to the first meeting, 14 to the second, and 17 to the third. By the time we had concluded the third meeting, with the conclusion of the Review Conference on May 3rd of 1996, the Canadian government had offered to host a governmental meeting in October of last year, in which pro-ban governments would come together and strategize about how to bring about a ban. The CCW review process had not produced the results we sought, so what do we do next?

>From the third to the fifth of October we met in Ottawa. It was a very fascinating meeting. There were 50 governments there as full participants and 24 observers. The International Campaign was also participating in the Conference. The primary objectives of the conference were to develop an Ottawa Declaration, which states would sign signalling their intention to ban landmines, and an "Agenda for Action," which outlined concrete steps on the road to a ban. We were all prepared for that, but few were prepared for the concluding comments by Lloyd Axworthy, the Foreign Minister of Canada. Foreign Minister Axworthy stood up and congratulated everybody for formulating the Ottawa Declaration and the Agenda for Action, which were clearly seen as giving teeth to the ban movement. But the Foreign Minister did not end with congratulations. He ended with a challenge. The Canadian government challenged the world to return to Canada in a year to sign an

international treaty banning antipersonnel landmines.

Members of the International Campaign to Ban Landmines erupted into cheers. The silence of the governments in the room was deafening. Even the truly pro-ban states were horrified by the challenge. Canada had stepped outside of diplomatic process and procedure and put them between a rock and a hard place. They had said they were pro-ban. They had come to Ottawa to develop a road map to create a ban treaty and had signed a Declaration of intent. What could they do? They had to respond. It was really breath-taking. We stood up and cheered while the governments were moaning. But once they recovered from that initial shock, the governments that really wanted to see a ban treaty as soon as possible, rose to the challenge and negotiated a ban treaty in record time.

What has become known as the Ottawa Process began with the Axworthy Challenge. The treaty itself was based upon a ban treaty drafted by Austria and developed in a series of meetings in Vienna, in Bonn, in Brussels, which culminated in the three-week long treaty negotiating conference held in Oslo in September. The treaty negotiations were historic. They were historic for a number of reasons. For the first time, smaller and middle-sized powers had come together, to work in close cooperation with the nongovernmental organizations of the International Campaign to Ban Landmines, to negotiate a treaty which would remove from the world's arsenals a weapon in widespread use. For the first time, smaller and middle-sized powers had not yielded ground to intense pressure from a superpower to weaken the treaty to accommodate the policies of that one country. Perhaps for the first time, negotiations ended with a treaty stronger than the draft on which the negotiations were based! The treaty had not been held hostage to rule by consensus, which would have inevitably resulted in a gutted treaty.

The Oslo negotiations gave the world a treaty banning antipersonnel landmines which is remarkably free of loopholes and exceptions. It is a treaty which bans the use, production, trade and stockpiling of antipersonnel landmines. It is a treaty which requires states to destroy their stockpiles within four years of its entering into force. It is a treaty which requires mine clearance within ten years. It calls upon states to increase assistance for mine clearance and for victim assistance.

It is not a perfect treaty -- the Campaign has concerns about the provision allowing for antihandling devices on antivehicle mines; we are concerned about mines kept for training purposes; we would like to see the treaty directly apply to nonstate actors and we would like stronger language regarding victim assistance. But, given the close cooperation with governments which resulted in the treaty itself, we are certain that these issues can be addressed through the annual meetings and review conferences provided for in the treaty.

As I have already noted, last week in Ottawa, 121 countries signed the treaty. Three ratified it simultaneously -- signalling the political will of the international community to bring this treaty into force as soon as possible. It is remarkable. Landmines have been used since the U.S. Civil War, since the Crimean War yet we are taking them out of arsenals of the world. It is amazing. It is historic. It proves that civil society and governments do not have to see themselves as adversaries. It demonstrates

that small and middle powers can work together with civil society and address humanitarian concerns with breathtaking speed. It shows that such a partnership is a new kind of "superpower" in the post-Cold War world.

It is fair to say that the International Campaign to Ban Landmines made a difference. And the real prize is the treaty. What we are most proud of is the treaty. It would be foolish to say we that we are not deeply honored by being awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. Of course, we are. But the receipt of the Nobel Peace Prize is recognition of the accomplishment of this Campaign. It is recognition of the fact that NGOs have worked in close cooperation with governments for the first time on an arms control issue, with the United Nations, with the International Committee of the Red Cross. Together, we have set a precedent. Together, we have changed history. The closing remarks of the French ambassador in Oslo to me were the best. She said, "This is historic not just because of the treaty. This is historic because, for the first time, the leaders of states have come together to answer the will of civil society."

For that, the International Campaign thanks them -- for together we have given the world the possibility of one day living on a truly mine-free planet.

Thank you.

NUCLEAR AGE PEACE FOUNDATION

A founding member of
and global contact point for the
Abolition 2000 Global Network for the
Elimination of Nuclear Weapons

1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 123
Santa Barbara, CA 93108-2794
Phone (805) 965-3443 * Fax (805) 568-0466
E- mailto:wagingpeace@napf.org
<http://www.wagingpeace.org>

\$\$\$\$\$\$ 1 LINE REFORMATTED BY POPPER AT igc.apc.org \$\$\$\$\$\$

Diese Nachricht ist weitergeleitet von IPPNW@VLBERLIN.comlink.de:

Dear Vijai,

I hope you don't mind me passing on your question and my reply to the abolition caucus that may also provide some useful comment:

> Vijai Nair wrote:

>
> Dear Ms Hall,
>
> Reference your recent communication on Norway and presence of nuclear
> weapons. I am attaching a piece that is of great concern to us in India -
> specially in light of, what we perceive a sanctimonious attitude, the
> non-proliferation concerns being articulated and directed to a specific set
> of developing countries only. I would be grateful for your comments on the
> piece.
>
> Warm reagrds and a very Happy X'mas.

>
> Vijai K Nair

>
> ****=
>

> Brigadier Vijai K Nair
> Executive Director & Life Trustee
> Forum for Strategic & Security Studies
> Room 2, Administrative Building
> Safdarjung Airport
> New Delhi 110 003
> India

> Tele: 091 118 572483 & 091 11 462 8336. Fax: 091 118 572425

> E-mail: magoo@giasdl01.vsnl.net.in

> E-mail Alias: magoo@nda.vsnl.net.in

> ****=
>

> * DEFACTO NUCLEAR WEAPON STATES

>
> According to a Greenpeace report, World Nuclear Arsenals 1996, Half a
> decade after the ending of the Cold War, none of the nuclear powers display
> any willingness to give up their nuclear arsenals. Instead, all are
> consolidating their nuclear forces at lower levels, adjusting their nuclear
> strategies to new post-Cold War missions, and all continue to modernise
> their nuclear forces. In the loudly articulated non-proliferation concerns
> by the West there is little attention to the fact that the chief
> proliferates are within their own ilk.

>
> A number of NATO states with the NPT label of NNWS are defacto NWS by virtue
> of having nuclear weapons on their territory for use by their nuclear
> mentors and their own military in the event of a conflict. As active
> proliferates these are:

>
> 7 GERMANY with the largest capacity to host foreign nuclear weapons has
> storage facilities for up to 91 US and 10 British nuclear weapons. It is
> required to maintain one fully trained unit of dual capable aircraft to

> execute nuclear missions. [1]

>

> 7 BELGIUM AND THE NETHERLANDS also maintain storage facilities for nuclear weapons and are required to participate with one fully operational unit in NATO nuclear operations using F-16 dual capable fighter-bomber aircraft. [2]

> These facilities acquired operational status in 1991 and 1992 suggesting that this policy is a post Cold War phenomenon under what is known as NATO's new requirement in Programmes of Co-operation.

>

> 7 ITALY. By January 1996, Aviano air base in Italy had become the first base along NATO's Southern flank to receive the new repository system for nuclear weapons meant for Italian dual capable aircraft.[3]

>

> 7 GREECE'S participation in NATO nuclear operations will be maintained by the country hosting nuclear weapons at Araxos air base. [4]

>

> 7 TURKEY'S nuclear weapons storage vaults are planned for three air bases but construction has yet to be completed. As with Germany, under the new NATO policy only one Turkish unit would operate nuclear-capable aircraft. [5]

>

> NATO ENLARGEMENT. The North Atlantic Council's announcement on 10 December 1996 that "enlarging the Alliance will not require a change in NATO's current nuclear posture, and therefore, NATO countries have no intention, no plan, and no reason to deploy nuclear weapons on the territory of new members. [6] - was qualified by - ... new members are supposed to play a role in NATO nuclear policy. They are eligible "to join the Nuclear Planning Group and its subordinate bodies and to participate in nuclear consultation during exercises and crisis. [7] Furthermore, they will be eligible for nuclear co-operation programmes with the US under which their armed forces will be trained to handle nuclear weapons and to carry out nuclear strike missions. [8]

>

> SWITZERLAND'S atomic program was secretly initiated in 1946 by the Swiss Military Department and definitively terminated in 1988, eleven years after Switzerland acceded to the NPT. Although safety agreements with the IAEA came into force on September 6, 1978, unlawful nuclear weapons activities continued until November 1, 1988 when the program was finally terminated by the Federal Council. An official account of the Swiss atomic program was declassified and published on April 25, 1996. [9]

>

> References:

> 1. Otfried Nassauer, Oliver Meier, Nicola Butler, and Stephen Young. A Joint Publication by Berlin information-center for Transatlantic Security British American Security Information Council.

> 2. Ibid.

> 3. Ibid.

> 4. Ibid.

> 5. Ibid.

> 6. NATO: Communique of the North Atlantic Council Meeting, Brussels, 10.12.1996, as reprinted in NATO-Brief, No 1, 1997, p.31

> 7. NATO: Study on Enlargement, Brussels, September 1995.

> 8. Martin Butcher and Sharon Riggle The NATO-Russia Founding Act: A Chance for Change. NATO Briefing - 29 May 1997.

> 9. Andre Gsponer and Jean Pierre Hurni. INESAP - Technical Report No 1.
> August 1997.

I can find no faults in this description of the situation in the West.
It would, however, be useful to know who wrote the piece and why.

India's position of unbending criticism is perhaps understandable given the facts listed above. However, the position that India takes is not entirely helpful to the abolition process since the NWS can continue to ignore what she says while India remains outside the NPT.

If we look at the big picture of international disarmament it may be true to say that the NWS are not looking towards abolition but at simply consolidating at lower levels. However, moving towards lower levels creates confidence in itself and improves the general situation. The reason a nuclear war is less likely today than 10 years ago is because of the conducive atmosphere. This atmosphere can lead to further disarmament. The more transparency and trust in the verification systems that are developed as the numbers go down, the further down the numbers can go. You will find this view echoed by the US National Academy of Sciences, who are very highly thought of by policy makers in the USA.

The problem is that while the situation in Russia remains unstable, NATO is keeping its options open. This is not helped by internal declarations by Russian ministers about increasing the numbers of tactical nuclear weapons, nor is it helped by NATO enlargement. The balance of power in Russia is not yet decided and will be crucial to the disarmament process. However, there are signs of hope that the time is very ripe to start talking about further disarmament.

Our job as abolitionists is to keep the pressure up for a solid commitment. It is becoming increasingly difficult for arms controllers to maintain a position of core or minimal deterrence alone without addressing the subject of abolition or, as the NAS prefers, prohibition.

At the end of the day, however, we need people like you, Vijai, to help us solve the question of the so-called "threshold" states. While this question remains, the NWS still have an argument for retaining a minimal deterrence. Since it is my belief that India does not keep its nuclear option in order to defend itself against all NWS, but in order to maintain a balance of terror within the region, it would be useful to hear some constructive suggestions as to how you think this level of tension could be reduced.

All the best and happy new year!

Xanthe Hall
(Co-Director)

- a Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons -

CrossPoint v3.11 R

TO: Coalition members and friends

FR: Daryl Kimball, Director

RE: recent news coverage of the PDD on new nuclear weapons policy

FYI - below is the text of: 1) PBS Network's The News Hour with Jim Lehrer segment from January 6; a January 7 Associated Press story on the PDD quoting ACA's Spurgeon Keeny; and 3) a Dec. 24 Christian Science Monitor article on the PDD and other nuclear weapons reduction matters, which quotes the Stimson Ctr's Joe Cirincione.

DK

"Nuclear Strategy: Bombs Away"

The Newshour with Jim Lehrer, January 6, 1998

For 16 years the U.S. has designed its nuclear strategy to survive a protracted nuclear war. Now, President Clinton has embraced the attitude that a nuclear war is un-winnable, and the Pentagon has shifted to a deterrence doctrine. Two experts debate the pros and cons of strategic arms reduction.

JIM LEHRER: The new nuclear weapons doctrine recently issued by President Clinton. Charles Krause has some background and a discussion.

CHARLES KRAUSE: Since 1981, U.S. nuclear doctrine has been based on the assumption that if there were ever a nuclear war, it could be a protracted conflict--probably with Russia--and that the United States would have enough nuclear weapons in its arsenal to assure the destruction of its enemies. Based on that doctrine and those assumptions, the Pentagon has spent billions of dollars since 1981 to research and develop sophisticated command, control, and communications equipment to be used to win a prolonged nuclear war.

SPOKESPERSON: We have lift-off of the Titan 4--carrying the first Milstar satellite.

CHARLES KRAUSE: The Milstar communications satellite system, for example, was designed specifically to withstand a first strike by Russian nuclear weapons, thus allowing the U.S. to continue to fight a protracted nuclear conflict. But in 1985, four years after the protracted war doctrine was adopted, President Ronald Reagan and Soviet Leader Mikhail Gorbachev met in Geneva. There, the two men acknowledged that "a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought." That statement seemed to reflect a change in doctrine. Still, the notion that the United States should plan to fight and win a protracted nuclear conflict remained official U.S. policy.

The end of the Cold War calls for policy reconsiderations.

In 1989, four years after the meeting in Geneva, the Cold War came to an end

when the wall in Berlin came down. Two years later, the Soviet Union itself dissolved and eventually split into 15 republics--Russia being the largest and most powerful.

The break-up of the Old Soviet Union and improved relations between Russia and the United States provided new opportunities to reduce the number of nuclear warheads on both sides. The Start I Treaty, signed in 1991, cut the number of strategic nuclear warheads from more than 12,000 to about 6,000 each for the U.S. and Russia. Two years later, the Start II Treaty reduced the number of warheads further to about 3500 for each side; however, while the U.S. Senate has ratified the Start II Treaty, the Russian Duma has not.

Still, Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin and their arms control negotiators continue to discuss a Start III Treaty, which would further reduce the number of warheads in each country's arsenal to about 2,000. Reductions of that scale, according to many experts, would mean that the U.S. could no longer fight a protracted nuclear war. So, last February, President Clinton gave the go-ahead for a formal review of the 1981 policy. And last month, just before Thanksgiving, the President signed a new directive. The details are classified, but the new policy, reportedly, drops a requirement that the U.S. plan to fight and win a protracted nuclear war. Instead, the emphasis now is on deterrence.

CHARLES KRAUSE: Joining us now are Robert Bell, senior director of the National Security Council staff at the White House for defense and arms control. He's one of the drafters of the new presidential directive; and Bruce Blair, a senior fellow and nuclear weapons analyst at the Brookings Institution. He was a nuclear missile launch officer in the U.S. Air Force in the 1970's. Gentlemen, welcome. Mr. Bell, from your perspective and from the President's perspective, why was it time to change the protracted war doctrine?

Continuing the legacy of Start II...

ROBERT BELL, National Security Council: Well, starting about a year ago, we realized that our chances of getting the Russian parliament, the Duma, to approve the Start II Treaty, was going to depend on whether or not they were persuaded that there was another treaty to follow, in other words, that Start II would not be the end of the road. And so for the first time we as a government really began to wrestle with the question of what the next step down this ladder should be and brought actual numbers to play in terms of our own discussions about what Start III would be. And as we looked at those numbers and consulted with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and our strategic command, it was our sense that the 1981 directive was wildly out of date and not consistent not only with the environment seven years after the end of the Cold War but consistent with the course we were trying to follow in terms of strategic reductions with Russia.

CHARLES KRAUSE: So this, in a sense, was a way of signaling to Russians that we were serious about reducing our arsenals and our plans for the use of nuclear weapons.

ROBERT BELL: It wasn't meant so much as a signal because the real signal in terms of the next step came when the President met with Yeltsin at Helsinki in March. And in that summit they agreed that Start III would set levels at

the 2000 to 2500 range in terms of strategic nuclear warheads. But in order to take that step, in order for the President to have the competence to reach that agreement with Yeltsin, we had to be far enough along in our thinking to be assured by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and our strategic command that we could maintain strategic deterrence of any kind of nuclear strike at those levels. That part of the doctrine that has been long-standing in our government has been sustained. What is different, as you said in the setup piece we just saw, is that we have not carried over what we think was an unrealistic--from the beginning--directive from President Reagan that we have a force capable of fighting and winning a protracted nuclear war.

CHARLES KRAUSE: In that case, in the new doctrine what is the principal--what does it say about the mission and deployment of U.S. nuclear weapons? What's different?

ROBERT BELL: Well, it's different in that we make no pretext that there's going to be some effort to acquire forces in numbers or with survivability through round after round after round of general nuclear exchanges that could presumably go on for weeks or month but rather just focus on forces that are capable of deterring that attack in the first place. Now, that doesn't mean you have a very fragile deterrent. You still need a robust force that can absorb a first strike, rather than have to launch on warning of an incoming missile, and have that force spread across enough of types of weapons systems, what we call the triad, of bombers and submarines and intercontinental ballistic missiles, so that the other side--and this is all, of course, assuming some turn in the world situation in which other countries with nuclear weapons would be hostile towards us, but that another side in that deterrence situation would realize that any attack would be futile because, in response, there would be an overwhelming devastating retaliation.

CHARLES KRAUSE: Mr. Blair, do you think that the administration has gone far enough in changing the doctrine?

BRUCE BLAIR: Well, I think they certainly have gone far enough rhetorically. There is a clear sharp discrepancy between the old doctrine of fighting a nuclear war that might last as long as half a year in prevailing at the conclusion, and the idea of improving our relations with Russia and continuing on this path of very sharp, deep reductions in strategic weapons. But none of this rhetoric really changes the operational situation on the ground. It, in fact, reaffirms and perpetuates the Cold War practice of the United States and of Russia of keeping many thousands of strategic weapons on both sides aimed at each other and ploys for immediate launch. So there's a rather large discrepancy between the rhetoric and the actual operational picture. Indeed, somewhat ironically, the United States today and for the foreseeable future under the new guidance projects a much more potent, even more fighting, more winning threat at Russian strategic forces than we did during the 1980's under the old war fighting doctrine. The current balance of strategic forces, in fact, is probably more lopsided in favor of the United States than it has been ever, at least going back into the early 1960's.

The current balance of weapons: more lopsided than ever.

CHARLES KRAUSE: Although, to be fair, that isn't entirely the fault of the United States. A lot of that has to do with the state of the Russian forces, does it not?

BRUCE BLAIR: Well, that's the result of two factors. One, as you say, Charles, is the decline, deterioration of the Russian strategic arsenal and its command system. And the other is the deployment by the United States of increasingly potent forces that do on paper, at least from the perception of the Russian general staff, pose a more fighting, even more winning threat to them.

CHARLES KRAUSE: Mr. Bell, listening to that, I mean, one of the major concerns, I believe, is that we and the Russians both continue to have our weapons on hair-trigger alert, which means they're ready to go almost instantaneously. Why is that necessary?

The U.S. and Russia: partners in disarmament.

ROBERT BELL: I don't think we're in a hair-trigger posture, Charles, but the important point is that we are not just articulating rhetoric. We are working very hard in building down the nuclear dangers of the Cold War. The best way to de-alert or deactivate a nuclear weapons system is to destroy it. And we're in the destruction business now. It's tempting, I think, when you see footage of the signing of a treaty, as we did in the setup piece, to think that you sign the treaty and then you immediately cut forces to that level.

But arms control is very hard work, and it takes a lot of money and a lot of time to come down to those levels. Now, the good news is we are ahead of schedule in attaining the requirements of that first treaty, the Start I Treaty. Just two weeks ago we had the first required milestone under that treaty on the third anniversary of its signing. And we are already down to levels under Start I that are two years ahead of the schedule that was set by Gorbachev and President Bush when they signed those treaties. In fact, two weeks ago, just over a two-day period, with Americans watching on, the Russian navy eliminated 20 submarine launch ballistic missiles in two days. Those are 20 missiles that before could have taken out 20 or 30 or 40 American cities. So we're working very hard. It's not just rhetoric.

BRUCE BLAIR: I'd like to commend Bob Bell for his hard work and President Clinton for a fine record of arms control. And we are making very good headway, but the time frame for this process is measured really in decades. We're talking about agreements that are going to be implemented from six to ten years from now or longer. And I think that this new guidance and the arms control agenda are both predicated on the wrong conception of the problem. They are oriented to the problem of deterrence, which is a very prominent theme in the new guidance. That's better than talking about fighting and winning a nuclear war, but our problem isn't deterrence, in my judgment. Russia does not oppose the threat of a cold-blooded, deliberate attack against the United States. The immediate problem that we confront is the deterioration of Russian nuclear control over its arsenal and the risks that attend that of unauthorized or accidental or inadvertent use of their strategic forces. And we need to try to get those strategic weapons in Russia out of play as soon as possible. I don't think that we really should

be thinking of a five or ten year agenda but rather steps that we could take in the next months or certainly low number of years that would extend the time needed for Russia and the United States to prepare our weapons for launch. That is, we need to de-alert our forces to address an immediate problem, and that is the danger of accidental war.

CHARLES KRAUSE: Let me go to Mr. Bell. Do you agree that the state of Russian nuclear forces is as dangerous to us as their number?

ROBERT BELL: Clearly, there are concerns within our government, including within our intelligence community about the overall security of nuclear weapons and fissile material in Russia. I think that's particularly with regard to the radioactive material, the fissile material, itself, that in the Soviet Union was scattered throughout the country, including a lot of small scale research facilities. And to a degree I think we have some concerns about their consolidation of the small tactical nuclear weapons that existed in so many large numbers. But at the strategic force level, particularly with regard to intercontinental ballistic missiles, I think we have very high confidence about the Russian control and security of those systems. The commander and chief of our strategic command, Gen. Habiger, was invited to Russia in October and given unprecedented access as a western official not only to a nuclear storage facility but to an SS-24 rail mobile intercontinental ballistic missile base, and he came back and reported his high confidence in the Russian control and security over those warheads. Indeed, in many cases he found their practices and procedures to be more conservative than ours.

CHARLES KRAUSE: All right. Well, gentlemen, I'm afraid we are going to have to leave it there. Thank you both very much for joining us.

Associated Press

01/07 0123

US-Nuclear

WASHINGTON - Hoping the Russian parliament will approve the START II arms-reduction treaty by the end of February, the Clinton administration is preparing the Pentagon to be able to mount a sturdy nuclear defense with far fewer long-range missiles.

A new strategy directive approved by President Clinton also is aimed at setting the stage for quicker and deeper cutbacks and assuring skeptics in Moscow that the United States will cut back its number of nuclear weapons.

The Russian parliament has dragged its feet on approving the 1993 treaty, in part because it is unable or unwilling to build the weapons the agreement permits while scuttling those that are banned.

But with a new U.S. strategy, set out in the first major policy overhaul in 17 years, the Pentagon and Russia can prepare for another round of cuts in a START III treaty, which the Clinton administration is willing to negotiate

quickly with Moscow.

The follow-on treaty would slash arsenals to 2,000 to 2,500 strategic warheads on each side. Under agreements now in place, each country has about 8,000 nuclear warheads. START II would reduce that to about 3,000. The proposed START III proposal levels would be 80 percent smaller than the arsenals the United States and the Soviet Union had during the Cold War.

The aim is robust but not brutal deterrence, said Robert G. Bell, the National Security Council's senior director for defense policy. "It is a hedge against an uncertain future, with sufficient nuclear weapons to deter any hostile foreign leadership with access to nuclear forces," he said in an interview.

The directive was developed over a year by White House, Pentagon, State Department and Central Intelligence Agency officials and advisers to Vice President Al Gore. Bell said it retains the right of the United States to use nuclear weapons first if attacked.

However, U.S. nuclear weapons are no longer targeted on Russia, China or any other country, but at the oceans, Bell said. Neither Russia nor China are seen as potential aggressors "so far as we can see into the future," the White House official said.

"But given the uncertainties, they are a hedge against a leadership turning hostile," Bell said.

The directive does not change the three basic situations in which the United States might use nuclear weapons, he said.

They are: If the attacking country had nuclear weapons, if the aggressor violated the international treaty to curb the spread of nuclear technology and if it were allied to a nuclear power in its attack on the United States.

"In those instances, we reserve the right to use nuclear weapons first, and it is reaffirmed in this directive. It has not changed," Bell said.

But, with the support of the joint chiefs of staff, the directive plans for absorbing a first strike and then retaliating with nuclear forces at sea, on land and in the air -- even with a ceiling of 2,000 to 2,500 nuclear warheads.

Anticipating this strategy, Bell said the administration had talked to the Russians on "concepts" for a START III treaty while "being very clear that we will not begin formal negotiations until START II has been ratified."

He said he hoped the Duma would fulfill a long-standing promise by President Boris Yeltsin to approve the 1993 accord within four to six weeks.

Spurgeon Keeny, president of the private Arms Control Association, said the new directive makes possible the reductions called for in START III -- and even lower ceilings.

"While the chiefs were prepared to go to lower levels, they did not want to be operating under a directive that required much higher levels," Keeny

said. "This takes the chiefs out of a bind."

The Christian Science Monitor

Wednesday December 24, 1997 Edition

US Downsizes Its Nuclear-Weapon Ambitions

Jonathan S. Landay, Staff writer of The Christian Science Monitor

WASHINGTON -- For 16 years, the United States sought to survive the unthinkable, designing its nuclear strategy with the aim of emerging victorious from the rubble of a full-blown atomic conflict.

At the height of the cold war, President Reagan gave orders for the targeting of US strategic weapons that opened the door to a massive buildup - one that hit an all-time high of 13,000 warheads in 1987.

Five years after the cold war, President Clinton has brought policy into line with reality.

'Nuclear weapons play a smaller role ... than at any time in the 20th century.'
- Robert Bell, National Security Council

Last month, Mr. Clinton quietly jettisoned Mr. Reagan's doctrine, recognizing that victory in a nuclear war is unachievable. A new secret targeting directive he issued to the Pentagon shifts the US to a policy of deterrence. Now it will merely threaten a swift atomic response to a nuclear attack on it or its allies.

The presidential decision directive (PDD) reaffirms a reliance on nuclear arms as "a hedge against an uncertain future," says Robert Bell, senior director for defense policy at the National Security Council. But by embracing a deterrence doctrine, it brings targeting orders into line with a US-Russia pact under which the two are cutting back to 6,000 warheads each. They now have 7,900 warheads each.

More important, says Mr. Bell, the PDD opens the door to further reductions if Russia ratifies the 1993 Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty, or START II, and negotiate a proposed START III accord.

The PDD "recognizes that nuclear weapons play a smaller role in our national-security posture today than at any time in the 20th century," asserts Bell.

The new directive, to be used by the Pentagon to redraw its nuclear-war plan, known as the Single Integrated Operational Plan, is being welcomed by arms-control advocates. But they see it as only a small step

toward ending the persisting danger of a deliberate or accidental nuclear exchange with Russia.

"The US and Russia have 5,000 to 6,000 nuclear missiles ready to launch on 15 minutes' notice," says Joe Cirincione of the Henry L. Stimson Center, a think tank here. "That hasn't changed since the beginning of the cold war."

Arms-control advocates say the US and Russia must do more to reduce the threat of atomic conflict, including taking most weapons off "alert status," which allows them to be targeted and fired in minutes. They should also slash their armories to as few as 200 warheads and embrace "no first use" policies.

Conservatives oppose further cuts in the US nuclear stockpile. They charge that by abandoning Reagan's doctrine, Clinton is signaling US weakness at a time of growing global uncertainty.

"The Clinton administration is introducing less certainty into the minds of our adversaries," says a GOP congressional staffer.

Critics also question the timing of Clinton's decision, pointing out that START II, which limits Russia and the US to 3,500 warheads each, remains unratified by the Russian Parliament.

Meanwhile, they assert, the Kremlin is becoming more dependent on atomic arms as its cash-strapped conventional forces decay.

A recent CIA statement says President Yeltsin is contemplating a "transitional doctrine" in May broadening Russian reliance on nuclear weapons.

The policy, it says, would end Russia's long-standing "no-first use" pledge. It would also bring Russia in line with NATO doctrine by authorizing nuclear responses to major conventional attacks.

Administration officials respond that Russia is ahead of schedule - as is the US - in cutting its nuclear forces. They also say its nuclear modernization efforts are beset by problems, revealing that Russia's newest submarine-launched ballistic missile exploded in a recent test.

They reiterate that the US will not begin cutting its warheads to the START II level until Russia ratifies the treaty.

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
at Council for a Livable World Education Fund
110 Maryland Ave. NE #201
Washington DC 20002
p: (202)546-0795; fax: (202)546-5142
website: <http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/>

Howard,

Thank you for your message. I've lined up Lee Hamilton to start the series on March 8. I'll hold either the 22nd or 29th for you and let you know as soon as I've secured the fourth speaker for which thanks for the lead.

I'll confirm dates within a week.

Phil

Rtw 01/08 1050 Pilots say they were guinea pigs for Soviet tests

By Robert Eksuzyan

MOSCOW, Jan 8 (Reuters) - A Russian newspaper has reported that over a period of three decades thousands of Soviet bomber pilots and their families were forced to live as guinea pigs near a remote nuclear testing ground in the Kazakh steppes.

The trade union newspaper Rabochaya Tribuna quoted some of the few pilots who survived their ordeal as saying they believed Moscow had kept them there to study the effects of nuclear radiation on their bodies.

They have been pressing the Russian authorities -- so far in vain -- to explain why they were suddenly moved in 1958 from Ukraine to Chagan, just 80 km (50 miles) from the main Soviet nuclear testing ground at Semipalatinsk.

"I suspect a malicious motive and feel that I was used as a guinea pig," said retired pilot Gertrud Khoroshko in a letter to the newspaper.

"None of us doubt now that there was one aim: the scientists needed genetically healthy material to observe the reaction of the organism. And moreover the material had to be under constant observation," Khoroshko added.

There was no immediate comment from government officials to the article, which was in Tuesday's edition of the paper.

Around 70 percent of all Soviet nuclear tests were carried out at Semipalatinsk -- including 124 above-ground explosions and a further 343 underground -- until the site was finally closed in 1988. In 1991 Kazakhstan became an independent state.

Kazakh officials say children are still being born in the vicinity of Semipalatinsk with physical and mental defects, and diseases like cancer and anaemia are widespread.

Rabochaya Tribuna said nuclear tests were virtually a daily occurrence and the residents of Chagan became used to seeing nuclear mushroom clouds on the horizon.

They were asked to go out into the streets when a test was about to be carried out.

The authorities gave them no guarantees that their homes might not collapse from the tremors. They never admitted that there was a health risk and never gave a convincing reason why the pilots, their wives and children should be based there, the paper said.

"The most dreadful explosion was an underground blast conducted on January 15, 1962," the paper quoted retired Major-General Vladimir Ovcharov as saying.
"Our entire garrison then found itself under an atomic cloud. It went dark from soot and smoke, women rushed about in a panic. Nobody knew what to do or where to run...Our local chemists said that radiation levels exceeded by several times the maximum permissible norm in wartime," Ovcharov said.

He added that shortly afterwards pilots at the garrison began to die from leukaemia and tumours.

Visiting scientists, generals and government officials dismissed residents' complaints and one professor even tried to

convince them that radiation in controlled doses was good for their health.

Pilots who complained too loudly about their conditions would be demoted or punished in other ways.

Ovcharov said the pilots were ideal for the scientists' experiments because they underwent regular medical checks. The only other human beings living in the vicinity were Kazakh nomads who, by definition, were constantly on the move.

The paper said the surviving pilots have been fighting red tape for years in their quest for explanations and compensation.

Russia's parliament and President Boris Yeltsin's office have both acknowledged that their plight should be investigated but the pilots are still waiting, the newspaper said.

"Those who conducted the tests are now eminent people in their fields and do not want to acknowledge their guinea pigs," said Ovcharov. REUTERS

FROM: Disarmament Clearinghouse

1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington DC 20005

TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232

FAX: 202 898 017

<disarmament@igc.org>

APO 01/07 0257 Clinton Approves Strategy Change

By BARRY SCHWEID

AP Diplomatic Writer

WASHINGTON (AP) -- Hoping the Russian parliament will approve the START II arms-reduction treaty by the end of February, the Clinton administration is preparing the Pentagon to be able to mount a sturdy nuclear defense with far fewer long-range missiles.

A new strategy directive approved by President Clinton also is aimed at setting the stage for quicker and deeper cutbacks and assuring skeptics in Moscow that the United States will cut back its number of nuclear weapons.

The Russian parliament has dragged its feet on approving the 1993 treaty, in part because it is unable or unwilling to build the weapons the agreement permits while scuttling those that are banned.

But with a new U.S. strategy, set out in the first major policy overhaul in 17 years, the Pentagon and Russia can prepare for another round of cuts in a START III treaty, which the Clinton administration is willing to negotiate quickly with Moscow.

The follow-on treaty would slash arsenals to 2,000 to 2,500 strategic warheads on each side. Under agreements now in place, each country has about 8000 nuclear warheads. START II would reduce that to about 3,000. The proposed START III proposal levels would be 80 percent smaller than the arsenals the United States and the Soviet Union had during the Cold War.

The aim is robust but not brutal deterrence, said Robert G. Bell, the National Security Council's senior director for defense policy. "It is a hedge against an uncertain future, with sufficient nuclear weapons to deter any hostile foreign leadership with access to

nuclear forces," he said in an interview.

The directive was developed over a year by White House, Pentagon, State Department and Central Intelligence Agency officials and advisers to Vice President Al Gore. Bell said it retains the right of the United States to use nuclear weapons first if attacked.

However, U.S. nuclear weapons are no longer targeted on Russia, China or any other country, but at the oceans, Bell said. Neither Russia nor China are seen as potential aggressors "so far as we can see into the future," the White House official said.

"But given the uncertainties, they are a hedge against a leadership turning hostile," Bell said.

The directive does not change the three basic situations in which the United States might use nuclear weapons, he said.

They are: If the attacking country had nuclear weapons, if the aggressor violated the international treaty to curb the spread of nuclear technology and if it were allied to a nuclear power in its attack on the United States.

"In those instances, we reserve the right to use nuclear weapons first, and it is reaffirmed in this directive. It has not changed," Bell said.

But, with the support of the joint chiefs of staff, the directive plans for absorbing a first strike and then retaliating with nuclear forces at sea, on land and in the air -- even with a ceiling of 2,000 to 2,500 nuclear warheads.

Anticipating this strategy, Bell said the administration had talked to the Russians on "concepts" for a START III treaty while "being very clear that we will not begin formal negotiations until START II has been ratified."

He said he hoped the Duma would fulfill a long-standing promise by President Boris Yeltsin to approve the 1993 accord within four to six weeks.

Spurgeon Keeny, president of the private Arms Control Association, said the new directive makes possible the reductions called for in START III -- and even lower ceilings.

"While the chiefs were prepared to go to lower levels, they did not want to be operating under a directive that required much higher levels," Keeny said.

"This takes the chiefs out of a bind."

FROM: Disarmament Clearinghouse

1101 14th Street NW #700

Washington, DC 20005

TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232

FAX: 202 898 0172

<disarmament@igc.org>

Dear CTBT Organizers:

It is especially important for those of you in key states to keep the pressure on your Senators. If you would like assistance in formulating letters to your Senators, or effective strategies for meetings with Senators or their staffs, please contact the Disarmament Clearinghouse.

In the meantime, we also need to maintain pressure to ensure that President Clinton and his administration work very hard for this Treaty, so we urge you -especially those of you in states where you know your Senators will vote for the CTBT- to send this message to the President.

For more information or assistance with the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW campaign, please contact:

Disarmament Clearinghouse
Kathy Crandall, Coordinator
1101 14th Street NW #700
Washington, DC 20005
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232
FAX: 202 898 0172
<disarmament@igc.org>

The Disarmament Clearinghouse is a project of:
Peace Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Plutonium Challenge,
& Women's Action for New Directions

NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY NOW:

Many of you have already been actively engaged in the effort to achieve a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty Now. Early hearings on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) have already occurred in the U.S. Senate. Early in 1998 more hearings will occur, and the final debate and vote is expected this year.

Now is a crucial time for the Clinton Administration to work hard for the CTBT. Analysts say that without strong support from the President, the CTBT could get lost in the busy Senate schedule for this year. The longer we wait, the harder support for the CTBT in the Senate will be to attain.

President Clinton's upcoming State of the Union Address, on Tuesday, January 27, 1998, provides an opportunity for the President to state clearly his commitment to the CTBT. It also provides an opportunity for CTBT advocates nationwide - especially including states where Senators already clearly support the CTBT - to urge the President to work hard for a CTBT this year.

WHAT YOU CAN DO:

FAX a message to President Clinton asking him to declare his commitment to the CTBT, and work hard to support U.S. Senate Ratification this year.

PLEASE SEND THIS MESSAGE RIGHT NOW, SO THAT THE PRESIDENT RECEIVES MANY MESSAGES BEFORE HIS STATE OF THE UNION SPEECH ON JANUARY 27, 1998.

FAX YOUR MESSAGE TO: The Honorable William Jefferson Clinton
President of the United States of America
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington DC 20500
FAX: 202 456 6797

Sample Letter * Sample Letter * Sample Letter * Sample Letter

Dear Mr. President, January 1998

Thank you for your commitment to the nuclear Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). We appreciate your leadership that was vital to ensuring the Treaty's completion in 1996. We are proud that the United States was the very first country to sign the CTBT.

Now the time has come for the U.S. to lead the charge toward implementing the CTBT. We hope that you and your administration will work vigorously with the Senate this year to ensure that the CTBT is considered and ratified in 1998.

When signing the CTBT on September 24, 1996, you said: "By overwhelming global consensus we will make a solemn commitment to end all nuclear tests for all time." This year you stated in your address to the United Nations General Assembly opening, "Our common goal should be for the CTBT to enter into force as soon as possible." (At the United Nations General Assembly Opening Sept. 22, 1997.) It is essential that the United States lead the way toward this goal, and follow-through on our solemn commitment to end all nuclear tests for all time.

We were also encouraged by your remarks at the signing of the CTBT that "[the CTBT] points us toward a century in which the roles and risks of nuclear weapons can be further reduced and ultimately eliminated." We urge further steps on this path in 1998.

We are counting on you, Mr. President, to ensure that this longest-sought, hardest-fought treaty is implemented and is a significant step toward a nuclear weapons-free 21st Century.

For more information or assistance with the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW campaign, please contact:

Disarmament Clearinghouse

Kathy Crandall, Coordinator
1101 14th Street NW #700
Washington, DC 20005
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232
FAX: 202 898 0172
<disarmament@igc.org>

The Disarmament Clearinghouse is a project of:
Peace Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Plutonium Challenge,
& Women's Action for New Directions

The United Nations has completed the translation of the Model Nuclear Weapons Convention (MNWC) submitted by Costa Rica into the six official UN languages and has now released it for general distribution as a UN document (UN Document A/C.1/52/7).

The document was released along with the letter of submission from Costa Rica which referred to the MNWC as "a work in progress setting forth the legal, technical and political issues that should be considered in order to obtain an actual nuclear-weapons convention."

Costa Rica noted that the MNWC "has been carefully drafted by an international consortium of lawyers, scientists and disarmament experts led by the Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy," and is "an effective and helpful instrument in the deliberative process for the implementation of General Assembly resolution 51/45 M ("Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice on the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons")."

Dear Abolitionists

I am re-sending the mailing originally titled "Miguel Marin Bosh Address" as I am not quite sure that it hadn't. The notes at the end are also accurately numbered, whereas those in the first attempt were not.

This is a very important piece by Miguel Marin-Bosh which, I think, fits in well with a great deal of discussion which is now happening on our network - especially about the Middle Powers Initiative

George Farebrother

.....

47TH PUGWASH CONFERENCE ON SCIENCE AND WORLD AFFAIRS

REMEMBER YOUR HUMANITY

Lillehammer, Norway, 1-7 August 1997

VII Plenary Session 4th United Nations Special Session on Disarmament,
7 August 1997

Weapons of Mass Destruction

Miguel Marin-Bosh (1)

.....

Scientific and technological progress in the first half of the twentieth century rendered possible the development of weapons of mass destruction—chemical, biological (bacteriological) and atomic or nuclear—and their delivery systems—planes, ballistic missiles, etc. The use of asphyxiating gases and other chemical substances during the Great War moved European countries to conclude the Geneva Protocol of 1925; the use of atomic weapons at the end of World War II gave rise to a campaign against all weapons of mass destruction. The newly-created United Nations was quick to address this question, an issue that has been at the center of its disarmament debates since 1946.

Disarmament negotiations during the second half of the twentieth century have concentrated on the total elimination of those weapons. After decades of efforts, the international community managed to agree to eliminate all biological and chemical weapons. (2) But in the nuclear field the results have been far less encouraging. In this regard, What can be expected from the Fourth Special Session of the UN General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament (SSOD IV) to be held in 1999?

To begin with, one must stress that preparations for SSOD IV have yet to begin in earnest. The UN General Assembly convened SSOD IV "subject to the emergence of a consensus on its objectives and agenda" (resolution 51/45 C). Despite this caveat, the United States, together with Israel, opposed the resolution. Quite obviously, the success of the SSOD IV will depend on the active and constructive participation of all States, including the major military powers. And, like it or not, the United States' role in this regard is fundamental. This was the case in 1978 when the Carter Administration was instrumental in the drafting of SSOD I's Final Document.

The way things are moving in the world, it is not easy to forecast the international political climate at the time of SSOD IV. Bolstered by a favorable economic situation and the confidence derived from being the unchallenged superpower, the United States is riding high in 1997. But we all know how fickle voters are and how quickly public opinion can change. And by the year 2000 who knows what the political scene will be like in the U.S. and in the rest of the world.

Assuming there is no major political shock, SSOD IV could be instrumental in moving more decisively towards an improved verification system for the BW Convention and perhaps towards the further consolidation of the CW Convention. With regard to nuclear weapons, it will probably not produce much. Remember that SSOD IV will be held the same year that the Parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) will hold their first review conference under the new and improved mechanism agreed to in 1995. If SSOD IV is held before that conference, the nuclear-weapon States (NWS) will argue that the UN General Assembly should not prejudge the results of that five-year review; if it is held after that review, then they will argue that one should not tamper with the results of that review, whatever they may be. It is therefore unlikely that SSOD IV will reach a consensus on the need to move decisively towards nuclear disarmament. It will probably not serve to give nuclear disarmament negotiations the impetus and definitive direction they so urgently need. And yet, there is room for hope. The year 2000 might still produce a minor miracle. And this could be brought about either from the top, i.e., by political leaders, or from the bottom, i.e., by grassroot organizations.

The year 2000 will be the last of the Clinton Administration. As others before him, President Clinton will be wondering what history will say of his tenure in office. In the field of nuclear disarmament, he is already the first post-WW II U.S. President not to test in the traditional way. That, in itself, is significant. Will he go further and become first U.S. President to seek actively the total elimination of nuclear weapons within a specific timeframe. He has already committed the U.S. to do so "ultimately," but will he delete that adverb? Perhaps President Clinton will take that step, but don't hold your breath.

In the meantime, what can non-nuclear-weapon States (NNWS) do? The coming years are unlikely to witness a change in the attitude of the NWS States towards their nuclear weapons. In all likelihood, we shall continue to face the same entrenched and unyielding approach of the NWS: China will continue to "modernize" its nuclear arsenal and improve its delivery systems; France and the U.K. will continue to hold on to their nukes as a passport to what they perceive as a kind of "Big Boys Club"; Russia and the U.S. will continue to seek ways to reorganize their arsenals and thus pretend they are actually disarming.

NGOs and NNWS interested in furthering the cause of nuclear disarmament might begin by trying to clear up a number of issues in preparation for SSOD IV. They could address more candidly some of the little lies and taboos that Nation-States have accepted for years in the nuclear-weapons field. One example is the insistence that there are only five NWS, a fiction derived from the NPT. What about India and Pakistan? Why is nothing or almost nothing said about Israel's nuclear arsenal? Shouldn't everyone get to see I Am Your Spy? Why is the international community finding it so difficult to address the question of fissile material for weapons purposes? Why did the UN General Assembly turn

the CTBT into a partial NPT for India?

But, most of all, NGOs and committed nations should try to embarrass the doubters to join the struggle to convince the NWS to change their attitude towards nuclear weapons and here European public opinion must play a central role.

The enduring attachment to nuclear weapons is reflected in the thinking of many groups within all five NWS, an attitude which, in varying degrees and styles, all five NWS have been defending for years. In the UNGA some NWS have repeatedly relied on parliamentary manoeuvres aimed at shifting the focus away from the nuclear issues. They opposed a number of resolutions but none with the vigor with which they attacked the one requesting an advisory opinion from the International Court of Justice (ICJ) on the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons.(3)

They also applied bilateral pressure on many countries. (4) The NWS thus revealed their true intentions, and yet the governments of the NNWS did nothing at the NPT Conference.

For decades the NNWS have sought to establish a specific calendar of measures aimed at the elimination of nuclear weapons. At SSOD I all countries agreed to pursue negotiations within a comprehensive disarmament program aimed at, among other things, the elimination of nuclear weapons. Since then the international community has been seeking ways to engage NWS in such negotiations. And that should have been accomplished at the 1995 NPT Conference.

Over the past few years most NNWS have displayed schizophrenic tendencies regarding nuclear disarmament. Whereas they were inordinately docile at the NPT Conference and the two-year preparations that preceded it, they have become increasingly active and demanding at the UNGA sessions. Not surprisingly, at the 1995 UNGA, held a few months after the NPT Conference, the nuclear disarmament issues again took center stage. The debates revealed a high degree of frustration among many countries. And the Non-Aligned countries (NAM) in particular seemed to be trying to achieve in the UNGA what had been impossible to attain at the NPT Conference —a commitment by the NWS to a nuclear-weapon-free world.

Preparations for the NPT's review conference in 2000 began in April of 1997. The NAM put forward proposals on a number of issues, including one "to commence negotiations on a phased programme of nuclear disarmament and for the eventual elimination of nuclear weapons within a time-bound framework through a nuclear weapons conventions." It is, however, illusory to expect the NWS to accept now what they adamantly rejected at the 1995 NPT Conference, the UNGA and the Conference on Disarmament.

NWS could be encouraged to eliminate their nuclear weapons in several ways. This can be done directly by the governments of the NNWS or indirectly by pressure groups in those countries and elsewhere. The international community has various tools at its disposal to bring about change in many areas. In the last century the zeal of the Abolitionists finally ended slavery. During its first twenty years, the UN was instrumental in dismantling colonial rule in Africa, Asia and Latin America. In both cases the moral argument was definitive and in both cases NGOs and individual citizens played a prominent role. Slave holders and colonial Powers were shamed into changing their behaviour. Today no one would dare to defend slavery or colonialism. And yet too few couch in similar terms the need to eliminate nuclear weapons.

The ICJ's 1996 advisory opinion should serve to point the way to

a nuclear-weapon-free world and thus redress the damage caused when NNWS rendered the NPT permanent without demanding anything in exchange. But, given the NWS's refusal to engage in genuine nuclear disarmament negotiations, who will do the pressuring? The 1995 NPT Conference demonstrated that most NNWS are not ready or willing to challenge the NWS on this score. Most governments and their officials are simply not interested in taking up the flag of nuclear disarmament. They are more concerned with being returned to office and with the so-called bread and butter issues of economic growth. On environmental questions they have to be cajoled into action, and in many countries this is beginning to work. But in the nuclear field, there is still much to be done. There is no head of state or government whose bilateral agenda with a NWS is topped by the issue of the elimination of nuclear weapons.

The vast majority of NNWS, moreover, are developing countries from regions that have already become nuclear-weapon-free zones. They are therefore against the threat or use of nuclear weapons and nuclear weapons themselves. This leaves the developed NNWS, especially those linked militarily to NWS, and the pressure must come mostly from them. But the governments of NNWS will only act if public opinion makes it clear that inaction will have a heavy political cost. For the time being there is no possibility that this will happen.

The current attitude of many developed NNWS towards nuclear weapons is not very encouraging. Over the last three decades many European governments have changed radically their position on nuclear weapons. After years of open opposition to nuclear weapons (while, at the same time, seeking to preserve their own nuclear option), they joined the NPT and now seem to have accepted the permanence of the five NWS and NATO's nuclear policy.

This is evident in the debates on a number of aspects relating to nuclear weapons at recent UNGA sessions. The votes over the past three years (1994-1996) on eight resolutions offer a measure of the commitment of States to a nuclear-free world. Those resolutions are on the advisory opinion of the ICJ (49/75 K and 51/45 M), the step-by-step proposal for nuclear disarmament put forward by a number of developing countries (49/75 E, 50/70 P and 51/45 O), and the draft convention on the non-use of nuclear weapons (49/76 E, 50/71 E and 51/46 D). Ten countries voted against five, six or seven of those resolutions, while another eighteen States rejected all eight. Those twenty-eight nations represent today the biggest obstacle to nuclear disarmament. The governments of twenty-five of them have embraced the "nuclear posture" of France, the U.K. and the U.S. And it is up to the citizens of those countries to pressure their respective governments by insisting on a moral compass in their approach to nuclear weapons. Are they ready to accept a world where nuclear weapons are a permanent feature or do they want to return to a nuclear-weapon-free world? Citizens' groups should be involved in resolving these issues. Nuclear disarmament is too important to be left to governments and military planners alone. The active participation of NGOs should be promoted and not, as occurred at the NPT Conference, downplayed or ignored altogether. The media should also be more attentive to the moral and legal aspects of nuclear weapons, as it has been recently with regard to landmines. An educated public opinion has moved the position of many militarily important countries from one of defending the use of certain anti-personnel landmines to a call for their total elimination.

And look at the coming expansion of NATO. Who is questioning NATO's doctrines based on the possible use of nuclear weapons? What is NATO's role in the post-Cold War and who is the potential enemy it wants to deter with nuclear weapons? How does one explain the eagerness of several former Soviet-bloc countries to join NATO, an organization that symbolized their erstwhile enemy? For its part, Russia has reluctantly accepted NATO's expansion but has espoused its first-use nuclear doctrine. And why is not more said about the "NATO-ization" of many European Union positions, as shown in the changing voting patterns of some of its members, including Austria, Ireland and Sweden, on nuclear issues at the UN?

The need is for more commitment by individual citizens to further the cause of nuclear disarmament. Education is the primary vehicle for this. The subject should be included in school textbooks in much the same way as environmental issues are in many countries. Nuclear disarmers must also secure the support of those in the scientific and academic community, in government and in the military of the developed NNWS. NGOs must insist that the governments of those NNWS correct their present course with regard to nuclear weapons. By themselves, governments do not usually do the right thing. They tend to hedge their bets. They are guided by interests rather than principles. How much interest does a principle yield? Citizens groups and NGOs must transcend the arbitrary boundaries of the Nation-State and seek greater internationalism. And nuclear disarmament today, as the anti-slavery or anti-colonialist campaigns of the past, is more than ever an internationalist cause. It cannot be left only to the Nation-State and its leaders.

The NPT offers a clear lesson in this regard.

The Court's decision has thus broadened the scope of the NPT's Article VI as a code of conduct. But NWS are bound to continue to reject the ICIJ's opinion. NNWS could, however, turn the ICIJ's opinion into a vehicle for a periodic review of the NWS's behaviour. In the NPT or SSOD context this would be difficult since those conferences work by consensus and any country can block agreement. The UNGA, on the other hand, offers a better forum. The UNGA's agenda already includes a number of items relating to nuclear disarmament but NNWS would do well to add one more.

The UN Charter is the international community's principal code of conduct. The UN Security Council can sanction those that break the rules. The NPT is another code of conduct and the Security Council can, in theory, sanction a Party that has not complied with the Treaty's provisions. The ICJ has now interpreted the NPT's nuclear disarmament provisions in such a way that the five NWS could be considered in breach of their Treaty obligations. But will the five sanction themselves? That is why the NNWS should follow the UN General Assembly path and begin a process of defying and embarrassing the NWS in the same way that the UNGA dealt with the colonial Powers, South Africa's apartheid regime and many specific human rights situations.

Nuclear disarmament is one of the few fields in which the international community is reluctant to pronounce itself from a legal and ethical point of view. Unlike in the areas of human rights, the environment, labor practices, and trade, the NWS's behaviour is not judged. There have been, to be sure, UNGA resolutions on a number of nuclear disarmament negotiations, including START. But there should be one in which the UNGA assesses what the NWS have done to conclude the negotiations

envisioned in the NPT. That would serve as a rallying point for citizens groups in many developed NNWS to pressure their respective governments. And that would set the stage for SSOD IV.

NOTES

1 Mexican career diplomat with degrees in History from Yale (B.A.) and Columbia University (M.A. and Ph.D.), Ambassador Marín-Bosch is a former Representative to the Conference on Disarmament and is currently Consul-General in Barcelona.

2. The views expressed here are not necessarily those of the Mexican Government. The 1972 Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction and the 1993 Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction.

3 The author has described the "devices" used by some NWS in their attempt to prevent the adoption of the UNGA's resolution requesting the advisory opinion in "The NPT Non-Proliferation/Nuclear Disarmament 'Bargain' on the eve of the Extension Conference," in Extending the Non-Proliferation Treaty: Perpetuating the Global Norm (Aurora Papers 27) (Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Global Security, 1995), pp. 59-82, and in "Getting Rid of Nukes: First Erich Geiringer Oration," unpublished speech delivered in Wellington, New Zealand, on November 13, 1996.

4 The NNWS' sense of betrayal by the resumption of French testing soon after the 1995 NPT Conference was translated into a vigorous resolution at the UNGA. After noting that nuclear testing is "not consistent" with the NWS' undertakings at the NPT Conference, resolution 50/70 A "strongly deplores all current nuclear testing."

5. Albania, Andorra, Bulgaria, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Latvia and Slovenia.

6. All are NATO members, aspirants or sympathizers: three NWS (France, UK and USA) and Belgium, Germany, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain and Turkey, as well as the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Monaco. Even the Vatican has supported this unusual trend. During a visit to Poland, Pope John Paul II met on June 3, 1997, with the presidents of seven central and eastern European countries and, with regard to NATO and European Union expansion, insisted no country in the region "can be left out of the communities that are now being created" (International Herald Tribune, June 4, 1997, p.5). In the past, the Vatican has been critical of nuclear weapons.

George Farebrother (geowcpuk@gm.apc.org)

67, Summerheath Rd,
Hailsham
Sussex, BN27 3DR, England
Phone & Fax +44 (0)1323 844 269

The World Court Project is an international citizens' network which is working to publicise and have implemented the 8 July 1996 Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice which could find no lawful circumstance for the threat or use of nuclear weapons.

The World Court Project is part of Abolition 2000, A Global Network to Abolish Nuclear Weapons

Dear Dwain:

On Saturday I mailed the attached letter to Polish Ambassador Wyzner regarding our reception at the PrepCom. This coming week Jonathan Dean of the Union of Concerned Scientists and some other NGO representatives are meeting with Ambassador Wyzner in New York to discuss NGO presentations at the PrepCom. I've asked Dean to include our reception in the discussion. I'll keep you posted.

Shalom,
Howard

#####

January 10, 1998

His Excellency Eugeniusz Wyzner
Permanent Mission of the Republic of
Poland to the United Nations
9 E. 66th Street
New York, NY 10021

Dear Mr. Ambassador:

I have the privilege of serving as a co-convener of the Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition, which is a component of the Abolition 2000 movement. We are working with the World Council of Churches, Pax Christi International, and other world religious organizations on plans for a reception to honor delegates to the next session of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty Preparatory Committee (NPT PrepCom) in Geneva. We cordially invite you and the other delegates to be our guest at this event.

We have tentatively scheduled the reception for Monday, April 27 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. It will be held either at the Ecumenical Centre or at the Palais des Nations if suitable space is available. However, we have heard that the chair of the PrepCom sometimes holds a reception for delegates, and we would not want to conflict with any event you may be scheduling. If that is the case, would you please let us know? If you need further information about our plans, please have one of your aides get in touch with me.

We have a commitment from Dr. Konrad Raiser, general secretary of the World Council of Churches, and Cardinal Danneels, president of Pax Christi International, to serve as hosts of the reception and make welcoming remarks. We are also inviting the representative of the Holy See and other world religious leaders to participate. They would share the concern of the world religious community that the time is ripe to move decisively toward nuclear disarmament.

We see the upcoming PrepCom meeting as a significant session and wish you and the other delegates success in preserving the non-proliferation regime and advancing the course of nuclear disarmament.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Thanks for your reply, What I am looking for is this. Example: Isiah 9 talks about idolatry,

Nuclear Weapons are built for one purpose, to kill. So we build idols and worship them, and we do so in secret. My understanding from the old as well as the new testament is that idols are not to exist period! Even being called a Christian nation we are putting false gods (nuclear weapons) ahead of the one true God. We continue to build these Idols putting our faith and belief in them, as they (nuclear weapons) protect us and keep us safe from harm. Isiah 2:4 and Micah 4, We shall turn weapons into plowshares, spears into pruning hooks, nation shall not war against nation. These are two examples, any other ideas you might have I would appreciate, Thanks, Mike

Howard,

Sunday, March 22, would be fine. The Adult Forum meets in the second floor tower room and starts (I hope sharply) at 9:30. In the area of nuclear disarmament, I fear many people have shoved this whole problem out of their consciousness so your presentation and questions and answers should be very helpful.

Thanks, too, for Chris Hellman who will speak on the arms building morass on March 15. He sounded enthusiastic and intelligent on the phone.

I will be depositing a check from the Holston Conference in the amount of \$85 for Peace Leafs in the Education fund, and a check from the Detroit Annual Conference for \$150 in our General fund.

Thanks.

Phil

Dear Mr. Roche:

I have heard about your middle power initiative for nuclear disarmament and have ordered a copy of your book. I am engaged in a complementary activity related to the forthcoming meeting of the NPT PrepCom. I want to describe our initiative and then call you to discuss our mutual interests.

I serve as a co-convener of the Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition, a component of the Abolition 2000 network. The Religious Working Group is organizing a reception for delegates to the NPT PrepCom meeting in Geneva, to be co-hosted by world religious leaders. Two months before the PrepCom convenes we hope to send a statement signed by world religious leaders to heads of states and foreign ministers, urging them to instruct their PrepCom delegates to support measures that will advance the cause of nuclear disarmament. The current draft of this statement emphasizes stewardship of Earth, for which all nations and all peoples have a responsibility. Therefore, it is appropriate and necessary for non-nuclear weapons states to press for nuclear disarmament, including setting up an intersessional working group of the NPT PrepCom to start drafting a nuclear weapons convention, even if the nuclear weapons states are not yet ready to participate.

So far we have obtained consent of Dr. Konrad Raiser, general secretary of the World Council of Churches, and Cardinal Danneels, president of Pax Christi International, to be co-hosts at the reception and sign the advance statement. It is my understanding that Cardinal Danneels is seeking official representation from the Holy See. We are also seeking participation of world religious leaders of other faiths.

If we can get the statement out by the end of February or early March, we will work through international religious networks to get religious leaders and religious organizations in various nations to lobby their governments to support creation of the intersessional working group and other measures that advance the cause of nuclear disarmament. We hope that this can be related to your middle power initiative. For instance, we might concentrate particularly on governments you are dealing with.

I'll call you in few days to discuss this possibility in greater detail.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
phone/fax: 301 896-0013
e-mail: mupj@igc.org

To: Organizations in religious community working for CTBT ratification

Last week the Monday Lobby held its annual retreat at Coolfont, West Virginia. Speakers and discussion provided background information relevant to our campaign to achieve Senate ratification of the CTBT.

It is clear that NATO enlargement will be the first major foreign policy issue to reach the Senate floor this year. It appears that the Clinton administration wants CTBT to come next but so far there is no commitment from Senate Republican leadership that this will occur. Nor has Senator Helms made a commitment to hold prompt hearings and report the CTBT to the floor.

In the wings is a package of treaties and protocols related to START II, the ABM Treaty, and theatre missile defense. If the Russian Duma ratifies START II by March, this package might compete with CTBT for attention. Also, action must be taken on most favored nation legislation by June. With the Senate starting late and adjourning by mid-October, it is possible that the CTBT will be put off until 1999. The main deadline is 180 days before September 1, 1999 when ratifiers will meet to consider what to do if all 44 nations required to ratify before the treaty can enter into force have not done so.

From our point of view, we don't want consideration put off. Accordingly, we will follow through with the decision made when we met on December 3 to give attention to five members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee -- Frist, Lugar, Hagel, Brownback, and Thomas --and urge them to work for prompt hearings. As agreed, Jim Wetekam has drafted a postcard alert, which he is mailing to you. I suggest that we also give attention to Senator Helms directly by getting people in North Carolina to contact him. I believe that we might also begin some grassroots work in Mississippi to urge Senator Lott to schedule the CTBT for Senate action.

There was considerable discussion of lessons learned from the land mines campaign. One lesson was to look for non-traditional support. This thought along with discussion by a pollster who said that seniors will constitute one-third of the vote in 1998 has led me to start exploring how to get seniors involved, including a concern for our (for I'm one of them) grandchildren. The pollster also indicated that concern for children receives high marks across the whole political spectrum. So perhaps children-oriented organizations could be enlisted.

There is an emerging consensus that by increasing the intensity of our grassroots campaign we can achieve CTBT ratification if the treaty comes to a vote on the floor but that we will have to work hard to get it through committee and scheduled for floor action.

Reminder: The next meeting on the CTBT grassroots campaign will take place from 12:30 to 2:00 p.m., Wednesday, January 28 at the Methodist Building, Room 3.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman

Dear Colleagues:

As we agreed at the December 3 meeting on CTBT grassroots campaign, Jim Wetekam has drafted a postcard alert for organizations in the religious community to use in five states with members on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee: Tennessee, Indiana, Nebraska, Kansas, and Wyoming. I have suggested adding North Carolina so that Senator Helms can receive attention. Jim is sending the draft to you for your comments and is asking you to be a sponsor and mailer of the postcard.

Reminder: The next meeting on the CTBT grassroots campaign is scheduled for 12:30 to 2:00 p.m., Wednesday, January 28 in the Methodist Building, Room 3.

Shalom,

Howard

Dear Kirsten, dear friends,

Last week I spoke to a person of the German Foreign Ministry and today I sent a letter to the German Foreign Minister Klaus Kinkel. I told him about your proposal to establish an NGO delegation to the NPT PrepCom similar to the Landmine Ban. The German government starts its preparations for Geneva end of this month. That means we are well in time. I hope that I can speak again to people of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs about this issue. I will keep contact and let you know anything of interest.
Also I made an appointment with the German Ambassador in Geneva for 20th of January. I told him that I would like to speak about the proposal of an NGO delegation to the NPT PrepCom. I will be in Geneva for two days.

Best regards,
Martin

> PLEASE WRITE A LETTER TO YOUR FOREIGN MINISTER AND URGE HIM/HER TO PROPOSE
> AN OFFICIAL OBSERVER DELEGATION OF ORGANIZATIONS WITHIN ABOLITION 2000 TO
> THE NPT PrepCom 1998.
>
> Dear Martin and Alice and Abolition 2000 friends
> Thank you very much Martin and Alice for your positive comments on our idea
> to ask the Norwegian government to work for an international Abolition
> 2000-delegation to the official NPT PrepCom conference 1998. On your advice,
> we have sent the enclosed letter to our foreign minister. Norway, as one of
> the driving forces in the Ottawa process and responsible for the Nobel Peace
> Prize award, has of course a special obligation to work for the
> implementation of the Ottawa-model in future disarmament negotiations. But,
> as I wrote in my first letter to Martin, OUR INITIATIVE WOULD HAVE A BETTER
> CHANCE TO SUCCEED IF NGOs OF OTHER COUNTRIES, AT LEAST IN THE SIGNATORY
> STATES TO THE OTTAWA_TREATY, WOULD APPROACH THEIR OWN GOVERNMENT WITH A
> SIMILAR REQUEST. For that purpose we enclose an English translation of our
> letter, a transcript of the 1997 Statement of the Nobel Committee, and the
> list of ICBL delegates to the landmine conference in Oslo in September
> 1997.—PLEASE LET ME KNOW IF YOU WRITE A LETTER TO YOUR GOVERNMENT SO THAT WE
> CAN INFORM OURS. On behalf of the Norwegian affiliate of IPPNW, best
> regards Kirsten.
>
> THE NORWEGIAN LETTER TRANSLATED:
>
> Minister of Foreign Affairs Knut Vollebaek
> Oslo 5. January 1998
> Royal Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs
> Pb 8114 Dep, 0032 Oslo
>
> Re proposal on a NGO-delegation to NPT PrepCom 1998
>
> Norwegian Physicians against Nuclear War are proud of the commitment of
> Norway in the Ottawa-process. We will here especially praise the Government
> for granting the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL) status as an
> observer delegation, with the right to participate and talk in all parts of
> the official negotiations. Norway has thus contributed to the creation of a
> new model of cooperation between NGOs and governments in international

> disarmament affairs.

>

> The Nobel Committee has expressed hope that the Ottawa-process should serve
> as a model for similar processes in the future. The NPT PrepCom conferences
> represent a golden opportunity to realize this vision.

>

> We call on the Government to propose that a delegation of representatives of
> some of the leading organizations within the Abolition 2000-network be
> invited to the NPT PrepCom in Geneva this year as official observer group
> with the right to participate and talk in all fora.

>

> Abolition 2000 is a global network of about 900 organizations which, in
> analogy with the ICBL, is dedicated to the abolition of nuclear weapons.

> Among the leading international organizations are International Association
> of Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms (IALANA), International Network of Engineers
> and Scientists Against Proliferation (INESAP), International Peace Bureau
> (IPB), and International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War
> (IPPNW). A participation of these and other organizations within Abolition
> 2000 may revitalize the NPT-process and bring it out of the present deadlock
> in the same way as ICBL did with the landmine cause.

>

> We are looking forward to discuss this proposal with the Ministry of
> Foreign Affairs and arrange the necessary contacts.

>

> On behalf of the Norwegian Physicians against Nuclear War, sincerely

>

> Per Sundby, chair
> Kirsten Osen, vice chair
> Hamborgveien 2, 0860 Oslo
> Luftfartsveien 10, 0385 Oslo
> Tel 22232330
> Tel 22142007, Fax 22920683
> *****

>

> THE STATEMENT OF THE NORWEGIAN NOBEL COMMITTEE 1997, with the leading
> arguments for the Peace Prize award. (Transcript)

>

> "The Nobel Peace Prize for 1997.
> The Norwegian Nobel Committee has decided to award the Nobel Peace Prize for
> 1997, in two equal parts, to the International Campaign to Ban Landmines
> (ICBL) and to the campaign's coordinator Jody Williams for their work for
> the banning and clearing of anti-personnel mines.

> There are at present probably over one hundred million
> anti-personnel mines scattered over large areas on several continents. Such
> mines maim and kill indiscriminately and are the major threat to the
> civilian populations and to the social and economic development of the many
> countries affected.

> The ICBL and Jody Williams started a process which in the space
> of a few years changed a ban on anti-personell mines from vision to a
> feasible reality. The Convention which will be signed in Ottawa in December
> this year is to a considerable extent a result of their important work.

> There are already over 1,000 organizations, small and large,
> affiliated to the ICBL, making up a network through which it bas been
> possible to express and mediate a broad wave of popular commitment in an

> unprecedented way. With the governments of several small and medium-sized
> countries taking the issue up and taking steps to deal with it, this work
> has grown into a convincing example of an effective policy for peace.

> The Norwegian Nobel Committee wishes to express the hope that the
> Ottawa process will win even wider support. As a model for similar processes
> in the future, it could prove of decisive importance to the international
> effort for disarmament and peace. October 10, 1997".

> *****

>

> >From LIST OF DELEGATES, Diplomatic Conference on an International Total Ban
> on Anti-Personnel Land Mines, Oslo 17. September 1997,
> Observer organizations (10 in all),

> INTERNATIONAL CAMPAIGN TO BAN LANDMINES:

> Ms. Jody WILLIAMS, Head of delegation, Vietnam Veterans of American
> Foundation, Coordinator for ICBL.

> Mr. Stephan GOOSE, Alternative Head of delegation, Human Rights Watch, USA.

> Ms. Mereso AGINA, Kenya Coalition Against Landmines.

> Mr. Tim CARSTAIRS, Mine Advisory Group.

> Mr. Noel STOTT, South Africa Campaign to Ban Landmines.

> Ms. Susan B. WALKER, Handicap International.

> Mr. Tun CHANNARETH, Cambodia Campaign to Ban Landmines.

> Mr. Lou MCCRATH, Mines Advisory Group, UK.

> Mr. Carl vom ESSEN, Raedda Barnen, Sweeden.

> Mr. Fazel Karim FAZEL, Afghan Campaign to Ban Landmines.

> Mr. Svein HENRIKSEN, Norwegian People's Aid,

> Mr. Robert KEELEY, Handicap International, Field Staff.

> *****

>

>

> Kirsten Osen

> Anatomical Institute

> Pb 1105 Blindern, 0317 Oslo

> Tlf 47 22851264 (office), 47 22142007 (home)

> Fax 47 22851278 (office), 47 22920683 (home)

> e-mail kirsten.osen@basalmed.uio.no

>

--

Martin B. Kalinowski, IANUS

Hochschulstr. 10, 64289 Darmstadt, Germany

Tel.: +49-6151-163016 FAX: +49-6151-166039

Internet, private: KALINOWSKI@HRZPUB.TU-DARMSTADT.DE

Internet, group: IANUS@HRZPUB.TU-DARMSTADT.DE

<http://www.tu-darmstadt.de/ze/ianus/welcome.htm> and .../inesap.htm

Please mind the change in our postal address!

Please mind the slight change in the internet address: tu instead of th !

Dear Abolitionists,

Happy New Year!

Indeed, this year began with good news. I am happy to report that we just passed the 900 member mark. The list will be up in a few minutes at <http://www.wagingpeace.org/organizs.html>

Please welcome our newest members.

(1) name of organization:

Catholic Justice and Peace Committee Hiroshima

contact person: Ota, Itoko

postal address: Shudo-in, 2-7 Hashimoto-cho, Naka-ku, Hiroshima-shi,

730-0015 Japan

tel: 81-82-221-0885

(2) name of organization: Group From Women 79, Kure YWCA

contact person: Odawara, Eiko

postal address: c/o Kure YWCA, 3-1 Saiwai-cho, Kure-shi, 737-0028 Japan

tel: 81-823-21-2414

(3) name of Organization: Geinan Network to Stop Thermal Power Plant

contact person: Fukui, Yoshiyuki

postal address: Mitsu, Akitsu-cho, Toyota-gun, Hiroshima, 729-2402

Japan

tel: 81-8464-5-0230

(4) name of organization: Hiroshima Seminar to Stop the Path to War

contact person: Hayashi, Shuji

postal address: c/o Christian Shakai-kan, 1-13-3 Ogochi-cho, Nishi-ku,

Hiroshima-shi, 733-0025 Japan

tel: 81-82-232-4274

(5) name of organization:

Kure Citizen's Group for Non-Deployment of Tomahawk

contact person: Yuasa, Ichiro

postal address: c/o Kure YWCA, 3-1 Saiwai-cho, Kure-shi, 737-0028 Japan

tel: 81-823-21-2414

(6) Org: Union of Conscientious Objectors - Finland

Name: Jyrki Lappalainen

Addr: Peace Station, Veturitori 3

City: Helsinki

Prov:

Country: Finland

Zip: Fin 00520

Tel: +358-9-140 427

Fax: +358-9-147 297

Email: akl@kaapeli.fi

(7) Traprock Peace Center

contact: Sunny Miller, Program Coordinator

103A Keets Road, Woolman Hill

Deerfield, MA 01342

Phone: (413) 773-7427; Fax:(413)773-7507
e-mail: cjenks@usa.net

(8) organization: Golden Bay Peace Group

Helen Kingston
Glenview Road, R.D.1
Takaka, Golden Bay
New Zealand
phone: +64 3 525 9576
email: helenk@voyager.co.nz

(9) Grandmothers for Peace, Southeast Chapter, USA.
Lorraine Korfchok <lorjacy@ix.netcom.com>

(10) Stop the Cassini Earth Flyby Action
Jonathan Haber <micropho@equinox.shaysnet.com>

Sincerely,

Christoph Hanterman

NUCLEAR AGE PEACE FOUNDATION

A founding member of
and global contact point for the
Abolition 2000 Global Network for the
Elimination of Nuclear Weapons

1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 123
Santa Barbara, CA 93108-2794
Phone (805) 965-3443 * Fax (805) 568-0466
E- mailto:wagingpeace@napf.org
<http://www.wagingpeace.org>

TO: Coalition members and friends

FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: helpful New York Times editorial on de-alerting -- FYI

The New York Times

January 12, 1998

"Russia's Nuclear Temptation"

The end of the cold war has produced an alarming nuclear irony. Russia is now more dependent on its nuclear weapons than ever and at the same time those weapons are more vulnerable. That increases the chances that in a severe crisis Moscow might consider using them. It is imperative for Washington to help reverse that trend, and President Clinton has the tools to do so, if he is willing to use them.

When the cold war ended, the Soviet Union had one of the largest land armies in the world, an abundance of conventional weapons and a nuclear strike force nearly equal to that of the United States. Since then, domestic politics, economic problems and general neglect of the military have left Russia with a hollow conventional force. As that force has deteriorated, Russian military planners have placed increased emphasis on nuclear weapons, which are less expensive to maintain.

But steeply declining defense budgets have left even some of those weapons dangerously exposed. Most Russian ballistic-missile submarines are kept in port because it costs less to keep them idle than to put them to sea. That makes it easier for another country to knock out Russia's submarine fleet. NATO's ill-advised expansion, if approved, will bring Western forces closer to the Russian border. While a NATO strike against Russian nuclear weapons now seems unimaginable, the psychology of vulnerability on the Russian side is real.

The Clinton Administration should act to defuse this growing nuclear risk. Progress in negotiating and ratifying new arms reduction treaties has slowed, held back in part by the opposition of Communists and nationalists in the Russian parliament and Republicans in the United States Senate. But Mr. Clinton and President Boris Yeltsin of Russia can move on their own to take off high alert some of the 3,000 nuclear warheads each side now has ready to fire at the other on short notice. George Bush and Mikhail Gorbachev took a similar step with nuclear bombers and missiles in 1991.

Such a decision would provide additional time for communication and diplomacy in a crisis. About a third of American warheads could now be taken off alert without risking national security. Russia can be expected to reciprocate. Specifically, Mr. Clinton could order the launch keys for part of the MX missile force removed. MX guidance systems could be taken out of the missiles and stored in their silos. Silos could even be covered with heavy objects that would have to be removed before launching.

Several of these ideas have been proposed by former Senator Sam Nunn and Bruce Blair of the Brookings Institution and are viewed favorably by American military planners. All that is needed now is for Mr. Clinton to take political leadership on this issue. Reducing Russia's reliance on nuclear weapons ought to be a concern of the highest order for the Clinton Administration.

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
at Council for a Livable World Education Fund
110 Maryland Ave. NE #201
Washington DC 20002
p: (202)546-0795; fax: (202)546-5142
website: <http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/>

To: Board of Directors

The Board of Directors of Methodists United for Peace with Justice will meet on Friday and Saturday, February 27 and 28, 1998 at Foundry United Methodist Church, 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, D.C. The Friday session will run from 9:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., and the Saturday session will run from 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.

The agenda will encompass such items as the following:

- A full review of the work I am doing for nuclear abolition, including the grassroots campaign for ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.
- Other issues of public policy of interest to Methodists United.
- Peace Leaf, including content and distribution list.
- Membership
- Finances
- Annual election of officers..

Please let me know whether or not you plan to attend. If you need host housing, please let me know.

I hope to see you on February 27 and 28.

Shalom,

Howard

I still have not received a survey response from you. We will be discussing the results at the meeting this Thursday. Please reply via email or fax to me by noon on Wednesday. I have enclosed another copy of the survey in case you have misplaced yours.

-thanks,
Maureen

Survey of the Nuclear Weapons Working Group Priorities for 1998

Each year the Nuclear Weapons Working Group tries to narrow its focus by more clearly defining what issues we, as a group, are going to work on. Each group has its own set of priorities. This survey will be used to try to develop a picture of where those priorities overlap and how we can be most effective working together. As always, there will be events and issues that arise which are not expected and many of us will shift our priorities to reflect this over the course of the year. This survey is not meant to constrain our flexibility but to help us to focus.

Please rate the following issue areas according to your organization's priorities. A five (5) denotes highest priority, a one (1) is the lowest. You may assign as many "5"s or "1"s as appropriate. If there are issues that are not on this list that you believe should be, please write them in the space provided and provide a ranking (5-1). Please also indicate the ways in which your organization does its work (lobbying, grassroots organizing, research, etc.) by checking all boxes that apply.

If your organization has more than one staff person that works on these issues, please coordinate your response and send in only one response per organization.

Thanks for participating! Please return to Maureen Eldredge via email, fax, or in person by January 15, 1997.
Email: meldredge@igc.org fax: 202-234-9536.

ISSUES -Please rank 5 to 1.

Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Ratification	5	4	3	2	1	
Stockpile Stewardship and Management		5	4	3	2	1
Deep Cuts in Nuclear Arsenals/START		5	4	3	2	1
De-Alerting	5	4	3	2	1	
Use Policy (First Use, Chem & Bio)		5	4	3	2	1
Fissile Material Cut-off	5	4	3	2	1	
Tritium Production	5	4	3	2	1	
Reprocessing/PU separation	5	4	3	2	1	

NATO Expansion/Nukes in Europe	5	4	3	2	1
MOX Fuel/PU Disposition	5	4	3	2	1
Weapons Complex Cleanup	5	4	3	2	1
Nuclear Waste/Waste Policy	5	4	3	2	1
Subcritical Testing	5	4	3	2	1
Other (please list separately)					

WHAT KIND OF WORK DOES YOUR ORGANIZATION DO? (Please check all that apply)

Lobbying/Meeting with Congress (Direct)

Lobbying/Meeting with Administration (Direct)

Research

Media Work

- Ed board
- story placement
- tv/video production
- radio spots
- media training

Legal Work (Lawsuits, etc.)

Conferences, seminars, workshops, summits

Resource/Materials production

- reports
- brochures
- Web Site
- Fact sheets
- Newsletters
- action kits
- Other

Grassroots Organizing/Mobilizing

- action alerts
- email networks

- phone banks
- speakers tours
- local press conferences
- membership recruitment
- letter/postcard campaigns
- Grassroots lobbying (indirect)
- other (please list)

Are you a membership organization? _____

If Yes: How many members do you have (approximately)?_____

How would you rate the ease of getting your members to take action (write a letter, make a call, etc.)?
(circle one)

Easy - We just ask!

Moderately Easy - It takes some prodding but they usually take action.

Difficult - They are very busy and must be convinced it is very important.

Very Difficult - Our members rarely take action, we don't really operate that way.

Do you have Chapters and/or local leadership? _____

If Yes: Compared to your general membership, are your chapters/leaders:

More active The same Less active

How do you communicate with your chapters/members?

- email meetings
- regular mailings phone calls
- faxes
- conference calls

Please include your organizations name

Maureen Eldredge
Program Director
Alliance for Nuclear Accountability
1801 18th St. NW, Suite 9-2
Washington, DC 20009
202-833-4668/fax: 202-234-9536
(formerly the Military Production Network)

A national network of watchdog organizations
working on DOE's nuclear weapons complex.

To: Nuclear Weapons Working Group
Fr: Kathy Crandall and Lisa Ledwidge, co-facilitators
Da: 1-13-98

ANNOUNCEMENT

First NWWG meeting of 1998!

Thursday, Jan. 15, 1998
9:30 am - 10:30 am
Mott House, 122 Maryland Ave. NE

When we last met, it was agreed that we would discuss NWWG's 1998 priorities at this Thursday's meeting. Please come prepared to participate in that discussion, which may include bringing written material, suggestions, ideas, and/or proposals. Maureen Eldredge, ANA, will bring a summary of the surveys which most NWWG groups have now completed and submitted. (If you have not yet done so, please submit yours to Maureen ASAP [form attached below].)

A suggested agenda follows. Looking forward to seeing you this Thursday.

.

Suggested Agenda:

1. Brief reports (10 min)
2. NWWG Priorities discussion (45 min)

What are the goals of the Nuclear Weapons Working Group?
How do we want to structure NWWG time?
How often and when do we want to meet?
Meeting facilitation details.

3. Announcements (5 min)
-

Subject: 1998 Priorities Survey
Date: Thu, 18 Dec 1997 11:26:11 -0800 (PST)
From: maureen.eldredge<meldredge@igc.apc.org>
To: kathy@fcnl.org, wandwill@clark.net, ledwidge@psr.org,
NABbasic@aol.com, vision@igc.org, disarmament@igc.org, jsmith@clw.org,
mupj@igc.org, paprog@igc.org, bmorse@igc.org, dculp@nrdc.org,
dkimball@clw.org, btiller@psr.org, bridget@fcnl.org,
bruce.hall@wdc.greenpeace.org, cdavis@clw.org,
73744.3675@compuserve.com,
tperry@ucsusa.org, tcollina@ucsusa.org, paexec@igc.org,
tom.clements@wdc.greenpeace.org, ieer@ieer.org, anitas@ieer.org

Enclosed is the survey of the Nuclear Weapons Working Group as we discussed

at a previous meeting (a month ago??) regarding our priorities for 1998. I am hoping by giving a weighted average of responses we will have a clearer picture of what areas we want to work on jointly. I will bring hard copies of this survey to Cool Font as well. Please take a moment to fill out the survey and confer with your colleagues if there is more than one staff person in your organization working on nuke issues! Please return these to me by January 15th or earlier.

Thanks,
Maureen

Survey of the Nuclear Weapons Working Group Priorities for 1998

Each year the Nuclear Weapons Working Group tries to narrow its focus by more clearly defining what issues we, as a group, are going to work on. Each group has its own set of priorities. This survey will be used to try to develop a picture of where those priorities overlap and how we can be most effective working together. As always, there will be events and issues that arise which are not expected and many of us will shift our priorities to reflect this over the course of the year. This survey is not meant to constrain our flexibility but to help us to focus.

Please rate the following issue areas according to your organization's priorities. A five (5) denotes highest priority, a one (1) is the lowest. You may assign as many "5"s or "1"s as appropriate. If there are issues that are not on this list that you believe should be, please write them in the space provided and provide a ranking (5-1). Please also indicate the ways in which your organization does its work (lobbying, grassroots organizing, research, etc.) by checking all boxes that apply.

If your organization has more than one staff person that works on these issues, please coordinate your response and send in only one response per organization.

Thanks for participating! Please return to Maureen Eldredge via email, fax, or in person by January 15, 1997.
Email: meldredge@igc.org fax: 202-234-9536.

ISSUES -Please rank 5 to 1.

Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Ratification 5 4 3 2
1

Stockpile Stewardship and Management 5 4 3 2
1

Deep Cuts in Nuclear Arsenals/START 5 4 3 2

1

De-Alerting 5 4 3 2

1

Use Policy (First Use, Chem & Bio) 5 4 3 2

1

Fissile Material Cut-off 5 4 3 2

1

Reprocessing/PU separation 5 4 3 2

1

NATO Expansion 5 4 3 2

1

MOX Fuel/PU Disposition 5 4 3 2

1

Weapons Complex Cleanup 5 4 3 2

1

Nuclear Waste/Waste Policy 5 4 3 2

1

Subcritical Testing 5 4 3 2

1

Other (please list separately)

WHAT KIND OF WORK DOES YOUR ORGANIZATION DO? (Please check all that apply)

Lobbying/Meeting with Congress (Direct)

Lobbying/Meeting with Administration (Direct)

Research

Media Work

Ed board

story placement

tv/video production

radio spots

media training

Legal Work (Lawsuits, etc.)

Conferences, seminars, workshops, summits

Resource/Materials production

- reports
- brochures
- Web Site
- Fact sheets
- Newsletters
- action kits
- Other

Grassroots Organizing/Mobilizing

- action alerts
- email networks
- phone banks
- speakers tours
- local press conferences
- membership recruitment
- letter/postcard campaigns
- Grassroots lobbying (indirect)
- other (please list)

Are you a membership organization?

If Yes: How many members do you have (approximately)?

How would you rate the ease of getting your members to take action
(write a

letter, make a call, etc.)? (circle one)

Easy - We just ask!

Moderately Easy - It takes some prodding but they usually take action.

Difficult - They are very busy and must be convinced it is very
important.

Very Difficult - Our members rarely take action, we don't really operate
that way.

Do you have Chapters and/or local leadership?

If Yes: Compared to your general membership, are your chapters/leaders:

More active The same Less active

How do you communicate with your chapters/members?

- email meetings
- regular mailings phone calls
- faxes
- conference calls

Please include your organizations name:

end

Howard W. Hallman wrote:

>
> Dear Lisa and Kathy:
>
> I suggest that we pick up the discussion started by Bob Tiller's "too many
> meetings" communication at Thursday's meeting of the Nuclear Weapons Working
> Group.
>
> Howard

Thank you Howard, I think this is a very good idea - we will include
it in the agenda.

Bill Robinson wrote:

> Dear Mr. Hallman,

I have received a copy of your comments on preparations for the NPT Prepcom through my involvement in the Canadian Network to Abolish Nuclear Weapons. I found your comments most interesting. I attended the international landmines conference in Ottawa in December and, in particular, participated in the full day forum among government, diplomatic staff and ngo's on the "Ottawa Process" used to achieve the landmines convention in 425 days. They would agree with your call to set a very clear specific goal you wish to achieve and to stay focused on it.

The landmines campaigners taught me that we need to spend considerably more time in putting a human face on the problem of nuclear weapons. The landmines group had many many posters created for use around the world. (Some were done professionally by the campaign groups and there were two poster contests held as well.) The landmines campaign had four professional photographers producing displays (often put up for the various diplomatic conferences around the world) and making the human repercussions of mines very clear. I am wondering if any of the American peace groups have developed posters putting faces to some of the nuclear testing and production victims? I would be pleased to get ahold of copies if so.

The landmines campaign had mines survivors present at each and every diplomatic conference and made them and their stories available to the diplomats and the press. When the diplomats left the dreary and ineffectual meeting in Vienna in April, 1986, they walked past double amputees in wheelchairs in tears. The diplomats are human and they made the links....

The landmines campaigners also worked to identify sympathetic delegations and got them off on their own for group luncheons to brainstorm what they *could* do as a group. One of the European foreign service officers said that he became so close to the members in this core group that he felt more loyalty to them and their goals than he did to his own government. We need to develop this core group and identify things that they can do without the support of the nuclear weapons states.

And in our own countries we need to build up long list of the "good and the great" (the UK expression for faith leaders and well-known's) but also lists of endorsing service and community organizations. This evidence of public support seemed to have emboldened the diplomats.

I have further of a summary of the comments from that day in my paper on "The Ottawa Process and Nuclear Weapons" which I would be happy to share if you are interested and your time allows. But the above ideas struck me as the most important for our consideration.

Thank you for your consideration of these ideas.

Bev Delong, National President, Lawyers for Social Responsibility

> -----
> From: mupj@igc.apc.org
> To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
> Subject: NPT PREPCOM, preparations for
> Date: November 18, 1997 13:53 PM
>
> Dear Abolitionists:
>
> I would like to discuss our preparations for the NPT PrepCom, scheduled to
> meet in Geneva from April 27 to May 8, 1998.
>
> 1. The Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition has initiated an
> effort to bring world religious leaders to Geneva at that time to make the
> religious and moral case for nuclear abolition and to urge delegates to set
> in motion processes that will lead to attaining that goal. The World
> Council of Churches has offered space at the Ecumenical Center, located
> near
> the United Nations, for a gathering and reception for delegates for late
> afternoon or early evening, Monday, April 27. Dr. Konrad Raiser, general
> secretary of the World Council of Churches, has consented to make
> substantive welcoming remarks. Pax Christi is working to obtain Catholic
> participation. We are seeking participation of representatives of other
> major faiths. Conceivably one or more religious leaders could be among NGO
> representatives addressing PrepCom delegates at a plenary session, as has
> been requested by the Abolition 2000 Working Group for the NPT, but it
> remains to be seen whether the PrepCom provides this opportunity. Whether
> or not this occurs, we are going ahead with preparations for the reception
> on Monday, April 27 some time after 16:00. The Working Group for the NPT
> has agreed to put this event on its schedule of activities.
>
> We will develop a joint statement for religious leaders to be released at
> the PrepCom. We are also giving consideration to having an ecumenical
> religious service during the second week of the PrepCom meeting. Delegates
> and NGO representatives would be invited to participate. The chapel of the
> Ecumenical Center would be available for this purpose. Similar religious
> services have been conducted during other conferences, such as the land
> mines gathering.
>
> Anyone with suggestions about these events should get in touch with me.
>
> 2. Communications from the Working Group for the NPT have stressed the
> importance of influencing governments before the PrepCom. I agree.
> Therefore, I intend to work with others in the U.S. religious community to
> seek to influence the U.S. position at the NPT PrepCom. This will be
> coordinated with other nuclear abolition supporters in the United States.
> I
> hope that religious organizations in other countries will likewise be part
> of efforts to influence their government's policy going into the PrepCom.
>
> 3. As we launch this effort, I believe that we in the Abolition 2000
> movement need to sharpen our focus on precisely what we want our
> governments

> to support at the PrepCom. As I re-read the e-mail correspondence since
> August, I note a variety of suggestions but not a complete, working
> consensus.

>

> The Working Group for the NPT and most correspondents have emphasized the
> Abolition 2000 goal of achieving a nuclear weapons convention. For the
> PrepCom this is translated into a proposal to establish an intersessional
> working group to start the process of negotiating such a convention. This
> seems appropriate for our top priority.

>

> Beyond that are suggestions for other agenda items, including no first use,
> negative security assurances, laboratory testing, nuclear free zones,
> cut-off of nuclear weapons usable material. I would add taking nuclear
> forces off alert and removal of warheads from delivery vehicles, as
> recommended by the Canberra Commission (which also favors mutual no first
> use). All of these are suitable topics for forums, but I believe that we
> should settle on one or two of these in our advanced campaign to influence
> governments between now and the PrepCom.

>

> 4. Whatever our priorities, we need to step up our campaign to influence
> governments. For purpose of discussion, let's assume that the recent
> committee vote on the Malaysian resolution reflects the way governments
> feel

> about moving toward negotiations for a nuclear weapons convention. A
> careful analysis of this vote is needed and strategies developed for
> different blocs, such as UK and France with new governments, other NATO
> countries, the C.I.S. states, etc. Presumably Abolition 2000 affiliates in
> each country will have major responsibility for influencing their own
> governments, but perhaps our European colleagues could devise and carry out
> a shared European strategy. There might be other regional groupings. And
> we might also devise an outreach strategy for regions where Abolition 2000
> doesn't have much participation.

>

> We need some kind of feedback and information sharing on activities in
> different countries and some kind of vote count. I'm not sure who should
> have this responsibility.

>

> We could also benefit from shared material that makes the case for our
> recommendations.

>

> 5. Finally I would like to offer an approach for making the case for
> PrepCom action to start the process of developing a nuclear weapons
> convention.

>

> Psalm 24, sacred to Jews and Christians, states: "The earth is the Lord's
> and the fulness thereof, the world and those who dwell therein; for the
> Lord
> has founded it upon the seas, and established it upon the rivers." Genesis
> 2:15 indicates that Planet Earth (symbolized as the Garden of Eden) is
> available to humankind to till and keep, that is, to use for mutual benefit
> and to preserve. It follows that we have responsibility be good stewards
> of
> Earth during our lifetimes. (Humanists who prefer to skip the theological
> beginning can agree with this last point.)

>

> Weapons of mass destruction are contrary to our stewardship responsibility
> because they have potential of doing grave harm to Earth and its
> inhabitants. Therefore, all of us have an obligation to rid Earth of this
> perilous threat. Nuclear weapons states have special responsibilities to
> dismantle their nuclear arsenal. Therefore, it is appropriate for the two
> largest possessors, Russia and the United States, to negotiate for mutual
> reduction. But when the best they can project is retention of 2,000 to
> 2,500

> strategic warheads on each side ten years from now, other nations have a
> responsibility to intervene and insist that this is not good enough.

> Nuclear abolition is necessary for the good of Earth and its people and
> cannot wait for the nuclear weapons states to accomplish at their leisure,
> if and when they choose

>

> Accordingly, it is appropriate for a world body, such as the NPT
> Preparatory Committee, to initiate a process that sets the course for ridding the world
> of nuclear weapons. It is also appropriate for the PrepCom to instruct
> nuclear weapon states to take interim steps, such as adopting a no first
> use policy and taking nuclear weapons off alert by separating warheads
> from

> delivery vehicles. Such measures would provide protection from the use of
> nuclear weapons by accident, design, or miscalculation during the period of
> dismantlement.

>

> Non-nuclear weapon states shouldn't be shy in speaking out to the
> possessors

> of nuclear weapons. It is their Earth and their people who are endangered
> by continued deployment of nuclear weapons. If the nuclear weapon states
> don't want to work out an agreement for total elimination of all nuclear
> weapons, then other nations should devise a program for systematic nuclear
> disarmament that is fair, safe, and complete. If the nuclear weapon states
> are not persuaded to go along with this plan, other nations can use various
> sanctions, such as those developed and applied to other rogue nations. For
> instance, since international trade is highly treasured by the United
> States

> (note dealings with China), there might be a boycott of American products,
> starting with coca cola, pepsi, and McDonald's.

>

> In sum, in our efforts to influence governments to support abolitionist
> policies at the NPT PrepCom, we need to persuade governmental leaders to
> cease their subservience to the nuclear weapon states and to press for a
> nuclear disarmament process that is good for all the people of Earth.

>

> I would appreciate your response to my ideas.

>

> With best regards,

>

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

At 12:00 AM 1/13/98 +0000, you wrote:

>ABOLITION 2000 EMAIL ADDRESSES:

>254 subscribers as of 12/97:

>

>PLEASE FILL IN THE BLANKS!

>

The correct name for our organization is Methodists United for Peace with Justice. It's "with" not "and". Thanks for making the correction.

Howard W. Hallman

>

Dear Clayton:

Here is a brief statement describing the NPT PrepCom, which you requested. If you need something more, please let me know.

Shalom,

Howard

###

The NPT Preparatory Committee

The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) provides for a Review Conference every five years to consider progress made in achieving the treaty's objectives. When the treaty was extended in 1995, provision was made for a Preparatory Committee to meet annually in order to enhance review procedures and prepare for the next five-year Review Conference. The first meeting of the NPT Preparatory Committee (NPT PrepCom) took place in New York in April 1997. The second meeting will occur in Geneva from April 27 to May 8, 1998. The next Review Conference will take place in 2000.

Through its Chair's final report, the annual session of the NPT PrepCom can make policy recommendations to nation states. In 1997 Marshall Islands proposed that a working group be established to begin negotiations on a nuclear weapons convention, a global treaty for the elimination of nuclear weapons. Although the PrepCom did not implement this proposal, this idea was included in the Chair's report and will be a focus of attention in the 1998 session.

Accordingly, the citizen movement known as Abolition 2000 believes that the 1998 NPT PrepCom meeting in Geneva offers an excellent opportunity to advance the cause of nuclear abolition. The NPT Working Group of Abolition 2000 has suggested that non-governmental organizations (NGOs) work together to persuade the PrepCom to adopt a final report calling for the following steps:

- 1) Establish an intersessional working group to assist in the commencement of negotiations in 1998 for a treaty to eliminate nuclear weapons.
- 2) Take all nuclear weapons off alert.
- 3) Adopt a "no first use" pledge by all nuclear weapons states.
- 4) End all nuclear weapons design, development, laboratory, and sub-critical nuclear testing.
- 5) End all international shipments of nuclear waste.
- 6) Establish a Sustainable Energy Agency

The Religious Working Group of Abolition 2000 intends to support NGO participation in the 1998 NPT PrepCom session in Geneva in two ways. First, a statement from world religious leaders will be sent to heads of states and foreign ministers prior to the session, asking them to instruct their PrepCom delegates to support creation of a working group to start drafting a nuclear weapons convention and to advocate other measures that will advance nuclear disarmament. Second, religious leaders will host a reception for PrepCom delegates and NGO representatives on the first night of the session in order to welcome the delegates to Geneva and offer ideas on what they might accomplish during the session.

For further information, contact 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.

January 14, 1998

Thank you for your inquiry about the Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition, which I serve as a co-convener, and the NPT PrepCom.

The Religious Working Group is planning to be involved in the 1998 NPT PrepCom session in Geneva in two ways. First, we are developing a statement from world religious leaders to send to heads of states and foreign ministers prior to the session, asking them to instruct their PrepCom delegates to support creation of a working group to start drafting a nuclear weapons convention and to advocate other measures that will advance nuclear disarmament. Second, religious leaders will host a reception for PrepCom delegates and NGO representatives on the first night of the session in order to welcome the delegates to Geneva and offer ideas on what they might accomplish during the session.

At the moment we have gained the support of Dr. Konrad Raiser, general secretary of the World Council of Churches, and Cardinal Danneels, president of Pax Christi International, who in turn is seeking official participation from the Holy See. We are in the process of broadening this participation to include world leaders from other faiths. Therefore, I would greatly appreciate your advice on prominent Buddhist leaders and world Buddhists organizations we might seek to participate in this endeavor. If you can help me understand the various organizations in the Buddhist community and how they relate to one another, I will appreciate it.

Shalom,

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

Dear Rabbi Bentley:

The Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition, which I serve as a co-convener, is planning to be involved in two ways in the 1998 session of NPT Preparatory Committee, which is meeting in Geneva on April 27 to May 8. First, we are developing a statement from world religious leaders to send to heads of states and foreign ministers prior to the session, asking them to instruct their PrepCom delegates to support creation of a working group to start drafting a nuclear weapons convention and to advocate other measures that will advance nuclear disarmament. Second, religious leaders will host a reception for PrepCom delegates and NGO representatives on the first night of the session in order to welcome the delegates to Geneva and offer ideas on what they might accomplish during the session.

At the moment we have gained the support of Dr. Konrad Raiser, general secretary of the World Council of Churches, and Cardinal Danneels, president of Pax Christi International, who in turn is seeking official participation from the Holy See. We are in the process of broadening this participation to include world leaders from other faiths. Therefore, I would greatly appreciate your advice on prominent Jewish leaders and world Jewish organizations we might seek to participate in this endeavor. If you need further information on this request, please let me know.

Shalom,

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

Following is the preliminary newsletter of the New England Nuclear Weapons Abolition Network. It grows out of the October 24-26 conference held at Boston College and reflects much of the abolition organizing and action going on in this six state region.

New England Nuclear Weapons Abolition NETWORK

A PRELIMINARY NEWSLETTER

January 9, 1998

CONTEXT AND TOWARD THE FUTURE:

During the co-sponsors meeting, in the closing session of October 24-26 Organizing Conference for Nuclear Weapons Abolition at Boston College, a five-part plan for future organizing was adopted which included the establishment of a New England Nuclear Weapons Abolition Network and a call for the production of a newsletter to serve the Network. A continuing committee has been meeting to plan a retreat for the Network which will be held (March 28-29 or April 4-5) in (Connecticut or Maine.) This is a quick and dirty effort at a "newsletter" designed to keep people up to date and to facilitate communication. Friends with access to the Internet are encouraged to monitor or participate in the Abolition Caucus, an e-mail network. Their address is: abolition-caucus@igc.org.

Networking Retreat/Advance March 28-29: The Continuing Committee (Olivia Abelson of Cambridge Peace Action, Sean Donahue of N.H. Peace Action, Joseph Gerson of AFSC, and Witt Larabee of Mass. Peace Action) have planned an all day meeting March 28 in Cambridge to review what we (collectively) are doing, ways and new ways of "going to the people," establishing the network more formally with people taking responsibility for it, communications, etc. Cambridge was selected as the site on the condition that the next gathering be held outside eastern Massachusetts!! Two representatives from each co-sponsoring organization and other interested organizations are welcome provided 1) they cover their costs and 2) one of the two is under thirty years of age. We will be happy to arrange accommodations in supporters' homes or to make hotel reservations for you if you provide us with adequate advance notice. (It would be helpful to hear from you by March 1, given the demand for hotel rooms in the Boston area.) Those who can spend the night are encouraged to bring musical instruments, videos, etc., and we'll do a public action on Sunday March 29. Please contact Mass. Peace Action or AFSC (Cambridge office) if your organization will be sending representatives and if accommodations will be needed.

Connecticut: On December 18, twenty-five people responded to a call from Ct. AFSC to hear Karina Wood and to take the next steps in planning a state-wide Abolition campaign. There's more work to be done, but an important second step was taken. One of their first public initiatives will be to run a 400 signature newspaper ad for abolition on January 24. Bruce

Martin, AFSC staff in Connecticut, will also be taking the lead role in organizing a nation-wide AFSC meeting in Philadelphia to further coordinate AFSC's nuclear and conventional disarmament work. Ct. AFSC also played the lead role in late November, organizing around the Land Mines Ban Bus, to keep the pressure on the Administration.

MAINE: Rosalie Paul of Maine Peace Action writes: PA Main'es Disarmament Committee plans to collect signatures on two Abolition 2000 petitions: a general one and one geared to the Portland City Council. They have already connected with one sympathetic City Council member. One of our committee members is interested in working tow4ard a resolution in his town of Winthrop, Maine. They are planning to work town by town as with the Freeze movement, and a statewide Abolition conference is planned for May 22.

Maine Peace Action have sent out a press release with several other peace groups that states: "We oppose any military action in the Persian Gulf. We call on the U.S. to relinquish its tactic of seeming to be part of a UN plan and instead to start listening to its allies and to act in concert with them in developing a plan for peace. They anticipate that such a course would lead to ending the blockade of food and medicine to Iraq and have called on the President and our Main Congressional Delegation to use their influence toward these ends." (PAM, Vets for Peace ME, WILPF ME, Let Cuba Live.]

Plowshares: You'll recall that Tom Lewis-Barbely, one of the Prince of Peace Plowshares defendants addressed the conference on the eve of their being sentenced. All six were sentenced with \$4,700.93 restitution. Susan Crane was sentenced to 27 months (including 3 months for refusing to stand for the judge), Phil Berrigan 24 months, Steve Kelley, S.J. 21 months, Steve Baggally and Mark Colville 13 months, and Tom Lewis-Barbely 6 months. All were also sentenced to 2yrs. of supervised probation, which could mean they will not be allowed to return to Jonah House or other Catholic Worker Homes. They have been sent to a number of jails around the country. Sean Donahue provided the following addresses, noting that financial assistance should be with money order and in person's name. Usually a paper back book may be received if sent in a regular brown envelope (no padding).

* Philip Berrigan #14850-056, FCI Petersburg, P.O. Box 1000, Petersburg, VA 23804-1000;

* Steve Baggally #03611-036, FCI Morgantown, P.O. Box 1000, Morgantown, WV 26507 (out date 2/2/98)

* Mark Colville #03610-036, LECE #1, P.O. Box 2000, Lewisburg, PA 17837

(out date 2/2/98)

* Susan Crane #87783-011, FCI Dublin, 5701 8th St., Dublin, CA 94568

* Tom Lewis-Borbely #03609-036, FPC Schuykill Camp 1, PO Box 670, Minersville, PA 17954

* Steve Kelly, SJ #97042-351, Santa Clara County Jail, 150 West Hedding St., San Jose, CA

95110-1706. Steve's address is only temporary until he receives his designated prison.

We anticipate the move any time between now and the next couple months.

A number of people who attended the conference committed civil disobedience around the sentencing, most of whom were sentenced to time served. Jessica and Audrey Stuart and Steve Cowan went back for another Plowshares action. Steve pleaded no contest and was sentenced to 80 hours of community service by a "not unsympathetic" judge. Audrey and Jessica are scheduled for trial

on January 29 in Bath, Maine. People wanting more information about coming up to support Audrey and Jessica or for further Aegis related demonstrations in February and Ash Wednesday should be in touch with Maine Peace Action: 207-772-0680.

Massachusetts: We could benefit from hearing more from people around Massachusetts - especially the Western part of the state.

WAND is working closely with Peace Action in organizing the Boston segment of the (counter) NATO expansion speaking tour. The main public event will be Wednesday, January 28 5-7 pm at the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Nortons Woods, 136 Irving St., Cambridge. General Sir Hugh Beach and Dr. George Rathjens will be joined on the panel by a pro-expansion speaker to be announced.

Mass Peace Action and AFSC devoted considerable energies to keeping up the pressure on the Land Mines Abolition Treaty, hosting the Ban Bus and its speakers, organizing related public events, including a display at the State House, and meeting with Sen. Kerry's staff. Cambridge Peace Action is talking about organizing a city-wide referendum for Abolition 2000.

AFSC staff in Cambridge concentrated on getting the initial post-conference mailing out, getting a number of the talks from the Boston College conference on its web page (<http://www.afsc.org/nero/nepeace.htm>). The Rotblat and Mian talks have finally been transcribed and will be posted there no later than the first week in January), and making plans to organize an AFSC Disarmament Working Group. Joseph Gerson participated in a conference in Yokohama, Japan - organized by the Pacific Campaign for Disarmament and Peace - which concentrated on the expanding role of the U.S.-Japan Military Alliance (analogous to the expansion of NATO in Europe) and alternative security structures, including a possible Northeast Asian Nuclear Weapons Free Zone. AFSC is currently soliciting signatures for an appeal to President Clinton urging him to honor the peace minded residents of Nago, Okinawa and to cancel the Pentagon's plans for the construction of yet another military base in Okinawa.

New Hampshire: N.H. Peace Action sponsored a rally and civil disobedience at Lockheed Sanders on December 10, Human Rights Day, to call attention to the role of Lockheed produced weapons in bloody conflicts around the world. Frances Crowe, one of the organizers honored at the Reaping What We Sow conference and Sean Donahue were arrested with ten others. Sean has also been active in support of the Prince of Peace Plowshares - see the report on Maine, below.

Rhode Island: Karina Wood is coordinating the national Peace Action speaking tour to build opposition to NATO Expansion as it approaches the Senate ratification process. The tour will be coming to New England at the end of January. For more information, contact Karina: 401-751-8172 or kwood@igc.apc.org.

Vermont: Vermont AFSC and WILPF are continuing their planning to take nuclear weapons abolition to Vermont town meetings in 1999. They plan to use the state capital as a laboratory. Rather than go directly to the Montpelier city council for an endorsement of the call for Abolition 2000, they will be going to the people of Montpelier to engage on the subject of abolition,

and only after they have developed a popular base will they go to the city council. They'll then apply lessons from Montpelier as they turn to communities across the state as they prepare the ground for town meetings in 1999. One other very important part of this campaign is the involvement of high school students. An impressive group of students, some of whom participated in the Boston College conference, have been working with Vt. AFSC in the anti-sweatshops campaign and are beginning to turn their imaginations and organizing abilities to the abolition campaign.

National/International/Resources

- The Nuclear Age Peace Foundation is calling for a Valentine's Day Campaign. They
 - are urging valentines calling for nuclear weapons abolition be sent to government officials. It's an easy action that can increase visibility and community spirit.
- Abolition 2000 has now been endorsed by more than 830 NGOs, and they are working to push the number past 1,000.
- Abolition buttons and (large) T-shirts ordered for the Boston College conference arrived in Cambridge in early December! But they are wonderful. Buttons (while they last) are .60 plus postage, and the shirts are \$12 plus postage.
 - Contact AFSC at 617-661-6130, afscamb@igc.apc.org, or 2161 Mass. Ave., Cambridge.
- Hiroshima & Nagasaki. Some of you will recall the mounted photographs from Hiroshima and Nagasaki which were on display during the conference at B.C. The display can be borrowed from AFSC for use in your school, community, etc. If you will have repeated opportunities to use it, you can also write directly
 - to the Japan Confederation of A- and H- Bomb Sufferers Organizations (Nihon Hidankyo): Gable Bldg. #902, 1-3-5 Shiba Daimon Minato-ku, Tokyo 105, Japan.

Policy-Wise:

- The United Nations General Assembly, on December 9, adopted a resolution welcoming the International Court of Justice Advisory Opinion on the Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons and calling for negotiations
 - to commence which would lead to the conclusion of a nuclear weapons convention consistent with the ICJ ruling.
- November President Clinton secretly signed new guidelines on the U.S. use of nuclear weapons. The hype is to be discounted. As they have for the past 50 years, the government has adjusted its strategic rationale to fit its arsenal which
 - remains designed primarily for use against 3rd. world challengers of U.S. hegemony and to contain Russia and China. The best critique so far is

Bill Arkin's in the December 29 edition of The Nation.

- The Pentagon came out with two other major policy statements in late November: an updated version of its counterproliferation policy and the Report of the Defense Review Panel. Both can be found on the Internet at <http://www.dtic.mil/defenselink>.

E-Mail & Computer Networking:

- To speed communication, alerts, etc. to activists throughout New England, and to
 - contain our costs, if you have an e-mail address, please send it to AFSC's Peace & Economic Security Program <afscamb@igc.apc.org> so that you can be added to our master list.
- During the closing session of the Boston College Conference, a computer whiz who
 - works for an insurance company volunteered to create a computer program whereby
 - we could communicate with all who were at the conference and who are on e-mail
 - while simultaneously printing out mailing labels for those who have yet to be - or
 - who are resisting - being wired. We had too many scraps of paper at the end of a long conference. Benefactor, please contact Joseph Gerson at the AFSC.

Organize and Keep In Touch:

- A great New Year's Resolution: "I'm going to do the organizing that I promised myself (and others!!) I'd do.
- A second great New Year's Resolution: "I'm going to let others in the New England Nuclear Weapons Abolition Network know what we're doing in my community (school, religious community, voting district....)" Until further notice, also resolve
 - to let people know by (until others take responsibility for this newsletter) contacting
 - AFSC's Peace and Economic Security Program:
afscamb@igc.apc.org or 2161 Mass. Ave., Cambridge. Ma. 02140
- And, special appreciation to Cathy Deppe, Lanie Pryor, and Tim Walter, all of whom
 - wrote articles about or following from the Abolition Conference for their local newspapers.

Published by AFSC, 2161 Mass. Ave., Cambridge, Mass. 02140 USA. Fax: 617-354-2832. E-mail: afscamb@igc.apc.org

On Monday, February 2nd, a statement calling for the abolition of nuclear weapons, signed by nearly 100 civilian leaders from throughout the world, will be released in Washington. General Butler will release the statement at the National Press Club and give a report on progress in the past year since the release of the statement by retired military leaders.

Alan Cranston has asked that we inform groups around the world working for nuclear abolition. Please consider spreading the information on the statement and its signers in your local press. If you are interested in conducting a simultaneous event, contact Barbara Webber at 301-390-1114.

David Krieger
NUCLEAR AGE PEACE FOUNDATION

A founding member of
and global contact point for the
Abolition 2000 Global Network for the
Elimination of Nuclear Weapons

1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 123
Santa Barbara, CA 93108-2794
Phone (805) 965-3443 * Fax (805) 568-0466
E- mailto:wagingpeace@napf.org
<http://www.wagingpeace.org>

At 02:23 PM 1/14/98 -0800, pat ramirez wrote:

>We received your order for the book entitled "Making Democracy Work,"
>however, we require prepayment on all orders. We do take Visa and
>MasterCard. The Books sells for \$21.95, plus \$3.00 for shipping and
>handling.

>

>If you have any further questions please call me at 510 642-6723 or e-mail
>me at pramirez@uclink2.berkeley.edu.

>

>###

Please charge this book to my Visa account: #4053 5942 0242 9817, exp. 06/99

Howard W. Hallman

Dear David:

We have advanced in our plans to hold a reception hosted by world religious leaders for NPT PrepCom delegates on Monday evening, April 27 in Geneva. Dr. Konrad Raiser, general secretary of the World Council of Churches, and Cardinal Danneels, president of Pax Christi International, have agreed to participate. Cardinal Danneels will seek representation from the Holy See.

I have drafted the attached statement for religious leaders to sign and send to heads of states and foreign ministers, if possible a couple of months before the PrepCom convenes.

We're seeking representatives of other religious faith and are a little behind schedule. I was hoping that Dwain Epps and others from the WCC would be able to help us. However, Dwain hasn't replied to my communications for over a month. Perhaps he is ill or swapped by other responsibilities.

If you could help us, we would appreciate it. We are asking these world religious leaders to sign the statement, and we would like one person from each major faith, preferably a person with world stature, to join in giving welcoming remarks to delegates at the reception and making a brief statement in behalf of abolitionist objectives. Before we issue such invitations, however, I want to touch base with Dr. Raiser through Dwain Epps and with Cardinal Danneels through Dave Robinson of Pax Christi USA, who is our contact person.

I'll appreciate any assistance you can offer.

Shalom,

Howard

###

A Statement by Religious Leaders on Nuclear Abolition
Draft of December 16, 1997

To: Heads of States and/or Foreign Ministers of Signatories of the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty [Proposed to be sent in February 1998, two months before the NPT PrepCom]

"The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof, the world and those who dwell therein." So says Psalm 24, sacred to Jews and Christians alike. The First Book of Moses, also known as Genesis, indicates that God made earth available to humankind to till and keep, that is, to use for mutual benefit and to preserve. [Add appropriate Islamic and Buddhist teachings.] It follows that all of us together have a responsibility to be good stewards of planet Earth.

Because nuclear weapons have the potential of doing grave harm to Earth and its inhabitants, our stewardship responsibility requires us to rid Earth of this perilous threat. The necessity of nuclear abolition is affirmed by numerous voices from the world's religious community, represented by several attached statements.

Already the nations of Earth are committed by Article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) "to the cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament." After reviewing this article at the request of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the International Court of Justice unanimously agreed that "There exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control."

The time has come to take this obligation seriously. Therefore, we ask you to instruct your delegation to the forthcoming meeting of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee, scheduled for April 27 to May 8, 1998 in Geneva, Switzerland, to come committed to setting the course resolutely for the abolition of all nuclear weapons on Earth.

To be specific, we call upon the NPT Preparatory Committee to establish a working group to begin the process of negotiating a Nuclear Weapons Convention that will outlaw and eliminate nuclear weapons by all possessors. Because such a convention serves the interests of all humanity and all nations on Earth, it is a task that can properly be taken up by an international body, such as the NPT Preparatory Committee, and not wait for nuclear weapon states to undertake, if and when they determine.

As a Nuclear Weapons Convention is being written, the nuclear weapon states should take steps to reduce the risk of nuclear war and make progress toward nuclear disarmament.

Such action should include:

- Declare a policy of no first use amongst themselves and non-use in relation to non-nuclear weapon states.
- Take nuclear forces off alert and remove warheads from delivery vehicles.
- Refrain from modernizing or increasing the number of deployed nuclear weapons.
- Continue bilateral reduction of nuclear weapons by the United States and Russia, but at a faster pace of reduction

These intermediate actions will combine with negotiations for a Nuclear Weapons Convention to set the stage for the world to enter the 21st century with a commitment to eliminating from Earth the scourge of nuclear weapons.

Names of Signers

Attachment: Statements by Religious Bodies and Religious Leaders on Nuclear Abolition

The Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches stated: "We believe that the time has come when the churches must unequivocally declare that the production and deployment as well as the use of nuclear weapons are a crime against humanity and that such activities must be condemned on ethical and theological grounds. Furthermore, we appeal for the institution of a universal covenant to this effect so that nuclear weapons and warfare are delegitimized and condemn as violations of international law." [or an alternative statement]

Speaking for the Holy See before the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly on October 15, 1997, Archbishop Renato Martino stated: "Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21st century. They cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation. The preservation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty demands an unequivocal commitment to their abolition....This is a moral challenge, a legal challenge and a political challenge. That multiple-based challenge must be met by the application of our humanity." [or a statement by Pope John Paul II or some other Catholic source]

[Quotations from other religious leaders and religious bodies.]

Drafted by Howard W. Hallman, Methodists United for Peace with Justice. Please send comments to him via e-mail at mupj@igc.org, or by fax to 301 895-0013 (USA), or by regular mail to 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036

Would you please provide me the e-mail address of Bev DeLong, National President, Lawyers for Social Responsibility. I receive a communication from her but didn't record her address. I want to reply.

Thanks,

Howard Hallman

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
Date: Thu, 15 Jan 1998 09:32:44 -0500 (EST)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: Civil Leaders Stmt. events
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igcb.igc.org id GAA02080

January 15

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball
RE: forum on nuclear abolition Feb. 5;
release of "Stmt on Nuclear Weapons by International Civilian Leaders" Feb.2

At the request of former Senator Alan Cranston, I am forwarding an invitation to an upcoming forum on nuclear weapons elimination at American University on February 5 (see announcement below). Among the speakers will be Jonathan Schell, who is the editor of a special issue of The Nation on nuclear weapons elimination, coming out this month.

Also, as many of you already are aware, a "Statement on Nuclear Weapons by International Civilian Leaders" will be released on February 2 in Washington. That statement is intended to have an effect similar to that which was produced by the earlier statement on nuclear weapons by the 61 military leaders. However, the civilian leaders' statement is more specific in its recommendations about addressing the nuclear threat than the 61 generals statement -- including a call for an end to nuclear testing and the CTBT. At Senator Cranston's request, I am also forwarding the media advisory about this event.

The Coalition will assist in distributing to NGOs (by fax and e-mail) a copy of the statement, its signatories, and related-materials in conjunction with press conference on the 2nd.

DK

"Making the Case for Nuclear Abolition"

with Jonathan Schell, author of The Fate of the Earth, and other special guests, including:

Alan Cranston, Former U.S. Senator, Chair, State of the World Forum
Robert McNamara, Former U.S. Secretary of Defense, Author, "In Retrospect"
Thomas Graham, Jr., President, Lawyers Alliance for World Security,
former Special Representative of the President for Arms Control,
Non-Proliferation & Disarmament for the Clinton Administration
Jody Williams, Nobel Peace Prize Winner -- tentative

Thursday February 5th, 12:30 - 1:30

The Mooers-Morella Auditorium
American University School of Law
4801 Massachusetts Ave., NW
Washington, DC

FREE of Charge

Sponsored by The Nation Institute and The Program on Law and Government
at American University.

C-SPAN is scheduled to cover the event.

For information call 212-242-8400, ext. 213 or e-mail:

General Lee Butler To Address National Press Club In Conjunction
With Release Of Nuclear Abolition Statement
Signed By World Leaders From Around The Globe

Nearly 100 Civilian Leaders, Including 36 Past or Present Heads of State,
To Call for Nuclear Weapons Elimination

Washington, D.C. — The National Press Club Newsmaker Luncheon on Monday, February 2, 1998 (lunch at 12:30 p.m., speech at 1:00 p.m.) will feature guest speaker General Lee Butler, USAF, (ret.), Commander-in-Chief, United States Strategic Air Command (1991-92); Commander-in-Chief, United States Strategic Command (1992-94). General Butler garnered worldwide headline news when he spoke last year at a National Press Club Luncheon, calling for the elimination of nuclear weapons. Sixty-two national and international retired military leaders joined his call by releasing a companion statement. This year's speech will be made in conjunction with the release of a statement by international civilian leaders.

General Butler's speech on February 2, 1998 will address progress achieved since last year's statements and core issues surrounding the future role of nuclear weapons. Butler will announce the release of a new statement by international civilian leaders calling for specific action to reduce the nuclear weapons threat and to move towards nuclear weapons abolition. The new statement is signed by a growing number — now approaching 100 — international civilian leaders, including former and current heads of states, Nobel Peace Laureates, defense ministers, national security leaders, and many individuals with nuclear responsibility during their careers.

(Other details on Butler's speech will be released in a forthcoming press advisory along with further information on the international statement.)

Press planning to cover Butler's speech, please call Barbara Webber at 301-390-1114. Lunch begins at 12:30, speech begins at 1:00 p.m. Press and

the public who wish to make lunch reservations should contact the National Press Club at 202-662-7501. Space is limited, so please make your reservations soon.

- 30 -

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
at Council for a Livable World Education Fund
110 Maryland Ave. NE #201
Washington DC 20002
p: (202)546-0795; fax: (202)546-5142
website: <http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/>

To: "David Krieger" <wagingpeace@napf.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Request for information
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear David:

Thanks for the "Sunflower" article. I have shared it with Church Women United, Episcopal Peace Fellowship, and United Methodist General Board of Church and Society. They will use it or adapt it for their publications. I'll try to find other outlets.

In looking for allies to support the CTBT, and beyond that Abolition 2000, I am exploring senior citizen organizations, such as Gray Panthers, which has previously supported nuclear disarmament, and the National Council of Senior Citizens. I have a recollection that there is a Grandmothers for Peace in California, but I can't find information on this group. Can you help me? Are there other senior citizen organizations that you think of which we might get involved with an informal network of "seniors for nuclear abolition"?

We seniors (for I'm one of them) remember when our own children hid under their school desks in air raid drills in the '60s. We would like to see a world where our grandchildren and great grandchildren don't have to live such a life of fear. So maybe this is a segment of the population that we can draw into the nuclear abolition movement.

Shalom,
Howard

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Thu, 15 Jan 1998 14:13:11 -0500 (EST)
From: LANLaction@aol.com
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: RE: ABOLITION ENDORSERS LIST
To: wagingpeace@napf.org
cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

You wrote:

Subj: Re: FW: Abolition 2000 Endorsements
Date: 22, Dec 1997 10:25 AM MST
From: wagingpeace@napf.org

877 organizations <http://www.wagingpeace.org/organizs.html>

167 municipalities <http://www.wagingpeace.org/municlist.html>

011 professional associations http://www.wagingpeace.org/organizs_prof.html

001 campuses <http://www.wagingpeace.org/campuslist.html>

1056 endorsing or signing entities.....

Sincerely,
Christoph Hanterman

Peggy Prince (LANLaction@aol.com) writes:

Dear Christoph;

I am proposing an amendment to the Platform of the New Mexico Green Party, which attained major party status in N.M. in 1994, based on the Abolition 2000 statement. The current Platform implies abolition, but as one of the Green county co-chairs and a member of A2000, I plan to fight hard if necessary for the full abolition statement to be added to the Platform.

I would appreciate if you could e-mail me the list of endorsers, as I cannot access the Web site. Since it is lengthy, it would be best to add the list as a download file to your message. It will be too long for my ancient computer to read as a text file, so if you can convert it to a Macintosh Clarisworks document that would be ideal! Otherwise, if you separate it into 2 or more text files that could work as well. Sorry to put you to this inconvenience but I really want to have supporting documentation so as to make the amendment a "slam dunk." Thank you for your great work.
Peace, Disarmament and Solidarity,

Peggy Prince, Los Alamos Action Network

Return-Path: <geowcpuk@gn.apc.org>
Date: Thu, 15 Jan 1998 20:39:18 GMT
X-Sender: geowcpuk@gn.apc.org
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
From: geowcpuk@gn.apc.org (George Farebrother)
Subject: Re: Nations blocking nuclear disarmament

GF/6344

At 07:02 14/01/98 -0800, Howard W. Hallman wrote:

>Dear George Farebrother:

>

>Thanks for circulating the speech of Miguel Marin-Bosch. It is a very
>helpful analysis.

>

>He says that 28 nations who voted against pro-disarmament resolutions
>"represent today the biggest obstacle to nuclear disarmament". Can you
>provide me a list of those 28 nations?

This would need a very complicated piece of research as there are at least 30 Nuclear Disarmament votes of the last 3 or 4 years and states vote differently in them. You might be able to find details on the UN Web at <http://www.un.org/ga/> but it would take all night. If anyone has done the sort of analysis required, it would be Alyn Web at Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy at LCNP@aol.com - or you might ask Miguel Marin Bosch himself on consulmex.bcn@apdo.com.

Although it took place after MM Bosch's speech, the UNGA vote on the Malaysian Resolution on the Advisory Opinion on December 9 1997 is the best guide and the most important Resolution. The states who voted against the Resolution as a whole are mainly from the NATO states or are under the Russian sphere of influence. There are 26 and they are:

Albania, Andorra, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, TFYR Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States.

However, the matter is more complicated than that as some of the above states voted differently in the Operative paragraphs. I have therefore sent you, as a separate mailing, an analysis of the voting pattern. >

>

>Is there anyone in the Abolition 2000 network who is coordinating such lobbying?

I just don't know of any lobbying outside state boundaries. It would be a good idea to put this question on to the Abolition 2000 network. If you don't know how this is done, send a message to abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org.

Hope this will be useful

George Farebrother (geowcpuk@gn.apc.org)

67, Summerheath Rd,
Hailsham
Sussex, BN27 3DR, England
Phone & Fax +44 (0)1323 844 269

The World Court Project is an international citizens' network which is working to publicise and have implemented the 8 July 1996 Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice which could find no lawful circumstance for the threat or use of nuclear weapons.

The World Court Project is part of Abolition 2000, A Global Network to Abolish Nuclear Weapons

Return-Path: <geowcpuk@gn.apc.org>
Date: Thu, 15 Jan 1998 20:39:12 GMT
X-Sender: geowcpuk@gn.apc.org
To: mupj@igc.apc.org
From: geowcpuk@gn.apc.org (George Farebrother)
Subject: Final Vote Assessment

>Return-Path: <katie@chch.planet.org.nz>
>X-Sender: katie@mail.chch.planet.org.nz
>Date: Wed, 10 Dec 1997 22:54:11 +1300
>To: geowcpuk@gn.apc.org
>From: Kate Dewes <katie@chch.planet.org.nz>
>Subject: Final Vote Assessment
>
>>
>* * *
>REVISED UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION L37
>
>FINAL VOTE: 9 December 1997
>
>Assessment by Rob Green & Kate Dewes
>
>On 9 December 1997, Malaysia's revised version of its 1996 UNGA resolution was
>adopted as Resolution 52/38 O entitled "Advisory Opinion of ICJ on Legality of
>Nuclear Weapons" in the closing plenary of the 1997 UNGA Disarmament
>Session.
>
>Unlike in the First Committee on 10 November, only three votes were taken.
>The one
>on preambular paragraph 10 was dropped after negotiations between Malaysia and
>Chile (Chile having called for the extra First Committee vote at short
>notice: this may
>help explain why China and South Africa had failed to vote - there had been
>no time
>for instructions). To recap on the remaining three votes:
>
>1) On operative paragraph 1, which equates to last year's operative
>paragraph 3:
>"Underlines once again the unanimous conclusion of the International Court
>of Justice
>that there exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a
>conclusion
>negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict
>and effective
>international control".
>
>2) On operative paragraph 2, updating last year's operative paragraph 4:
>"Calls once
>again upon all States to immediately fulfil that obligation by commencing
>multilateral
>negotiations in 1998 leading to an early conclusion of a nuclear weapons
>convention
>prohibiting the development, production, testing, deployment, stockpiling,

>transfer,
>threat or use of nuclear weapons and providing for their elimination".
>
>3) Finally the resolution as a whole was voted on.
>
>OPERATIVE PARAGRAPH 1
>
>This, signalling support for the ICJ decision, was carried by the biggest
>margin (152
>for, 5 against, 6 abstained, 22 did not vote). The "Yes" vote exceeded
>last year's by
>13, and the "No" vote dropped by 2 (Latvia and Romania moved to "Yes", while
>Russia's move to "No" from last year's abstention was balanced by the UK
>moving the
>opposite way. So a significant split in approach here between the UK and
>USA/Russia/France has been sustained. NB also that China again voted
>"Yes".)
>Abstentions dropped by 14 from last year; however, 3 more did not vote.
>
>For the lobbying teams, the good news is that the "Yes" vote was increased
>by 13 over
>the First Committee vote, all from countries which did not vote on 10
>November!
>Other new "Yes" votes - from abstentions - were Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Togo and
>Uzbekistan. These were countered by Benin inexplicably not voting in just
>this vote;
>Angola and Morocco did not vote at all this time; and tragically co-sponsor
>Lesotho
>again failed to vote at all.
>
>OPERATIVE PARAGRAPH 2
>
>This paragraph directly challenged the nuclear States to start negotiations
>leading to a
>nuclear weapons convention: hence the smallest majority (106 for, 34
>against, 24
>abstentions, 21 did not vote). Last year's equivalent plenary vote was: 110
>for, 27
>against, 29 abstained, 19 did not vote - so the majority was eroded by 11.
>It was good
>to see New Zealand and South Africa staying strong; but Russia hardened from
>abstention to "No", along with Andorra, Bulgaria, Israel, and Uzbekistan
>(the other
>new "No" votes were Albania and Greece). The lobbying teams did well to
>get 11
>countries to move from not voting on 10 November to "Yes"; but several NAM
>states
>failed to vote having supported this paragraph last year.
>
>THE RESOLUTION AS A WHOLE
>
>In the final third vote - the most important one - on the resolution as a
>whole, 116
>voted for, 26 against, 24 abstained, and 19 did not vote. The majority

>slipped by 3
>from last year's plenary vote (115 for, 22 against, 32 abstained, 16 did
>not vote).
>However, the good news is that Argentina, formerly a potential nuclear
>weapon State,
>and Ukraine moved from abstention to "Yes". China, Ireland, Malta, New
>Zealand,
>South Africa and Sweden again voted "Yes". On the other hand, Andorra,
>Bulgaria
>and Israel moved from abstention to "No"; and Greece from not voting last
>year to
>"No". However, NATO's Nordic rebels Denmark, Iceland and Norway sustained
>their
>abstention, as did Finland. Like last year, of the Asia-Pacific States
>which voted, the
>abstentions by Australia, Japan and South Korea were conspicuous,
>especially with
>Malaysia as leading sponsor of the resolution.
>
>The lobbying teams again did well to get 13 countries which did not vote in
>the First
>Committee to vote "Yes". In addition, Togo and Uzbekistan moved from
>abstention to
>support - which was slightly spoiled by Turkmenistan moving the opposite way.
>
>In sum, we held the line against what must have been heavy pressure from
>the USA in
>light of its attempt to exclude use of nuclear weapons from the draft
>statute of the
>International Criminal Court; and implicit support for the ICJ Advisory
>Opinion grew
>by 15 votes to an overwhelming majority of 147 UN member States, with only the
>USA, Russia, France, Israel and Monaco(!) opposing.
>
>ENDS
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

>
>

George Farebrother (geowcpuk@gn.apc.org)

67, Summerheath Rd,
Hailsham
Sussex, BN27 3DR, England
Phone & Fax +44 (0)1323 844 269

The World Court Project is an international citizens' network which is working to publicise and have implemented the 8 July 1996 Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice which could find no lawful circumstance for the threat or use of nuclear weapons.

The World Court Project is part of Abolition 2000, A Global Network to Abolish Nuclear Weapons

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: 15 Jan 1998 00:00:00 +0000
From: ippnw@VLBERLIN.comlink.de (IPPNW)
Organization: IPPNW Germany
Reply-To: ippnw@VLBERLIN.comlink.de (IPPNW)
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Re: Geneva meeting NGO comm. for disarmament
To: edibal@iprolink.ch
X-Gateway: ZCONNECT UC cl-hh.comlink.de [DUUCP BETA vom 15.08.1997]
X-ZC-Post: Koerstrasse 10

NGO COMMITTEE FOR DISARMAMENT (Geneva)
Planning for the NPT: an international seminar on disarmament
20-21 February 1998, Room IV, Palais des Nations, Geneva, Switzerland

AND

MEETING OF THE EUROPEAN ABOLITION 2000 NETWORK
22 February 1998, Church basement,
14 rue Baulacre, Geneva

Friday 20 February, 10.00 - 13.00:
Nuclear disarmament, NPT prospects; reports on the Conference on
Disarmament, etc. -- Ambassadors of Poland (Chair of PrepCom), South
Africa, others (invited).

Friday 20 February, 14.30 - 18.00:
New weapons, Louise Doswald-Beck of the International Committee of the
Red Cross (invited);
The work of UNIDIR (UN Disarmament Research Institute), Patricia Lewis,
new director (invited).

Saturday 21 February, 9.00 - 12.00:
Practical plans for the PrepCom period, briefings/panels;
Abolition 2000 events, logistics, media work, demonstrations, etc;

Saturday 21 February, 13.00 - 16.00:
Business meeting of the Special NGO Committee for Disarmament

Sunday 22 February, 9.00 - 13.00:
Meeting of the European Abolition 2000 Network
Communication, structure, European campaigning

!!!Please register for the meeting in the UN with Edith Ballantyne
(edibal@iprolink.ch) otherwise you won't get past the security!!!

Please relay any programme wishes for the Sunday meeting to me at
ippnw@vlberlin.comlink.de.

Xanthe Hall, European Regional Facilitator, Abolition 2000 Network

CrossPoint v3.11 R

Return-Path: <wagingpeace@napf.org>
X-Sender: napf@silcom.com
Date: Thu, 15 Jan 1998 15:40:07 -0800
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
From: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <wagingpeace@napf.org>
Subject: Re: Request for information

Dear Howard,

Earlier we sent you an article that contained a typo. The date of the ceremony in Ukraine was 1996 not 1994.

I am sure David will respond to your email at a later point.

Sincerely,

Christoph Hanterman

NUCLEAR AGE PEACE FOUNDATION

A founding member of
and global contact point for the
Abolition 2000 Global Network for the
Elimination of Nuclear Weapons

1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 123
Santa Barbara, CA 93108-2794
Phone (805) 965-3443 * Fax (805) 568-0466
E- mailto:wagingpeace@napf.org
<http://www.wagingpeace.org>

Return-Path: <wagingpeace@napf.org>
X-Sender: napf@silcom.com
Date: Thu, 15 Jan 1998 17:24:10 -0800
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
From: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <wagingpeace@napf.org>
Subject: Re: Request for information

Dear Howard,

Please be sure to notify the people you sent the Sunflower article to that the correct date for the ceremony in Ukraine was June 4, 1996 (instead of 1994).

You can contact Grandmothers for Peace by e-mailing Barbara Wiedman, the founder, at:
<mailto:wiednerb@aol.com>

I remember the drills, dropping under our desk and closing our eyes. What madness!

Dave

NUCLEAR AGE PEACE FOUNDATION

A founding member of
and global contact point for the
Abolition 2000 Global Network for the
Elimination of Nuclear Weapons

1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 123
Santa Barbara, CA 93108-2794

Phone (805) 965-3443 * Fax (805) 568-0466
E- <mailto:wagingpeace@napf.org>
<http://www.wagingpeace.org>

To: katie@chch.planet.org.nz
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: UN vote on Malaysian resolution
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Kate:

As a co-covener of the Religious Working Group on Nuclear Abolition, I am in the process of developing a statement for world religious leaders to issue in connection with the next NPT PrepCom meeting. I'm also trying to figure out how to get religious groups in various states to lobby their governments and delegations.

To figure out where to concentrate, it would be useful to have the list of states voting against, abstaining, and not voting on the Malaysian resolution. Your communication of December 10 summarized this data. Would you have handy a list of states in each category which you could share with me? If so, please send it.

Thanks,

Howard
Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice.

To: "Barbara Wiedner" <wiednerb@aol.com>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Inquiry
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Barbara Wiedner:

Methodists United for Peace with Justice, which I serve as chair, works for nuclear disarmament by supporting both intermediate steps, such as the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) and long-term measures, such as a nuclear weapons convention. For the first task we are part of the Monday Lobby, a coalition of Washington-based peace organizations. For the latter we are affiliated with Abolition 2000. In both instances we are constantly looking for allies

I'm also a senior citizen and a grandfather.

Recently I was in a discussion which stimulated me to think about how seniors might be more effectively mobilized to work for nuclear abolition, the CTBT, and related measures. Many in Washington look upon seniors as a special interest group, concerned mostly about their social security and medicare benefits. But we are also concerned about the future for our grandchildren and great grandchildren. For instance, we don't want them to go through air raid drills and hide under their school desks as our own children did in the 1960s.

This leads me to wonder whether there might be some kind of network of "seniors for nuclear abolition" to harness senior power for this mission. I am in the process of approaching the Gray Panthers and the National Council of Senior Citizens. I'm aware of Grandmothers for Peace, but I've lost track of what you do. Does your mission encompass the CTBT and the broader goal of nuclear abolition? How are you organized? What would you think of some kind of joint effort to get more seniors involved on these issues?

I will appreciate your ideas on this matter.

Shalom,

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

Return-Path: <pgs@web.net>
X-BlackMail: ts33-15.ott.istar.ca, p166mmx, pgs@web.net, 198.53.5.174
X-Authenticated-Timestamp: 10:24:01(EST) on January 16, 1998
From: "Debbie Grisdale" <pgs@web.net>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: Request for information
Date: Fri, 16 Jan 1998 10:17:48 -0500
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

Hi,

Bev Delong's address is:

5120 Carney Rd. NW
Calgary Alberta
T2L 1G2

email: <delong@nucleus.com>

Physicians for Global Survival
#208-145 Spruce St.,
Ottawa ON CANADA, K1R 6P1
tel: 613 233 1982/fax: 613 233 9028

> From: Howard W. Hallman <mupj@igc.apc.org>
> To: Debbie Grisdale <pgs@web.net>
> Subject: Request for information
> Date: Wednesday, January 14, 1998 7:53 PM
>
> Would you please provide me the e-mail address of Bev DeLong, National
> President, Lawyers for Social Responsibility. I receive a communication
> from her but didn't record her address. I want to reply.
>
> Thanks,
>
> Howard Hallman
>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Fri, 16 Jan 1998 15:35:47 GMT
From: Janet Bloomfield <jbloomfield@gn.apc.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: New Head of UN Disarmament Office
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

>From 106351.1634@compuserve.com Fri Jan 16 14:50:35 1998

Return-Path: <106351.1634@compuserve.com>

Received: from hil-img-1.compuserve.com [149.174.177.131](hil-img-1.compuserve.com [149.174.177.131])
by gn3.gn.apc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8/GN-1.0) with ESMTP id OAA10308;

Fri, 16 Jan 1998 14:50:33 GMT

Received: (from mailgate@localhost)
by hil-img-1.compuserve.com (8.8.6/8.8.6/2.10) id JAA05744;

Fri, 16 Jan 1998 09:40:12 -0500 (EST)

Date: Fri, 16 Jan 1998 09:38:57 -0500

From: Nigel Chamberlain <106351.1634@compuserve.com>

Subject: Important News

Sender: Nigel Chamberlain <106351.1634@compuserve.com>

To: Janet Bloomfield <JBLOOMFIELD@gn.apc.org>

Cc: CND <cnd@gn.apc.org>

Message-ID: <199801160939_MC2-2F88-576E@compuserve.com>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1

Content-Disposition: inline

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by gn3.gn.apc.org id OAA10308

Status: R

<http://guide-p.infoseek.com/Content?arn=a0238LBY260reulb-19980115&qt=%22nuclear+weapon%22+nuclear+nuke+&lk=ip-noframes&col=NW&nh=25&kt=A&ak=allnews>
Sri Lankan diplomat heads U.N. disarmament unit
02:21 a.m. Jan 15, 1998 Eastern

UNITED NATIONS, Jan 14 (Reuters) - A former Sri Lankan ambassador to Washington, Jayantha Dhanapala, was appointed on Wednesday to head the newly-established U.N. department of disarmament affairs.

Since 1992 a smaller center for disarmament affairs has functioned at U.N. headquarters under the department of political affairs. It is being upgraded as part of reforms being introduced by Secretary-General Kofi Annan.

Dhanapala, introduced to reporters by Annan, will be an under-secretary-general.

He is an expert in disarmament matters and won prominence in 1995 as president of a landmark U.N. conference that permanently extended the 1970 nonproliferation treaty designed to halt the spread of nuclear weapons. . . .

Copyright (c) 1994-98 Infoseek Corporation.

Return-Path: <Wiednerb@aol.com>
From: Wiednerb <Wiednerb@aol.com>
Date: Fri, 16 Jan 1998 11:48:10 EST
To: mupj@igc.apc.org
Subject: Re: Inquiry
Organization: AOL (<http://www.aol.com>)

Dear Howard,

How lovely to hear from you!

Your idea sounds great. We have been actively involved in the anti-nuclear movement for over 15 years. We have never officially "hooked up" with any other senior group, but work with our local Gray Panthers at times. Actually Gray Panthers as a national group has an interest in working for nuclear abolition if I am not mistaken, so you ought to be able to generate some interest there. We work with all of the major anti-nuclear groups in the country and lend our support to their efforts.

We have most certainly worked with a lot of wonderful Methodists!!

I will send you a copy of our latest newsletter via "snail mail", but I would suggest that you check out our website:

<http://pw1.netcom.com/~lorjacy/gfp/index.html>

I am aware of the "greedy geezer" attitude that prevails in D.C. about most senior groups. We are so clear in our mission that we have never had any problem with that.

In fact, the identity of "grandmother" has proven to be quite magical. We have generated a tremendous amount of press - which gives us the opportunity to "get the message out" - simply because we are grandmothers doing something "different". We are probably most effective helping to mobilize the "grassroots" to activism and in supporting the efforts of other groups. Just the presence of a few grannies in their shirts (we have a terrific logo) adds a certain "credibility" any effort we support. We are also in constant contact with our elected officials in Washington.

This weekend there will be grannies at protest of Project ELF (Extremely Low Frequency Signals to nuclear submarines) in Wisconsin; on Monday I leave to be present at actions to protest the proposed Sierra Blanca nuclear waste dump in El Paso, Texas; our Sacramento, CA group is sponsoring a meeting on Nuclear Waste Transport: and other members from our Atlanta, GA group will be present at the trial of those arrested at the School of the Americas in Ft. Benning, Georgia last November. Last month several of us were on trial in Florida for our non-violent act of civil disobedience at Cape Canaveral - attempting to stop the Cassini Launch (with 72 pounds of deadly plutonium on board) in October. Grandmothers for Peace led the demonstration (in our shirts and holding our banner) of 1000 people at that event.

We are all involved in writing, calling, faxing President Clinton, encouraging him to make strong statements in support of the CTBT in his State of the Union speech this month.

So, yes, we are alive and well and very active! (We also have a Men's Auxiliary!)

We would be happy to be part of any coalition if that is what you have in mind. I am delighted with your idea and will be supportive in any way I can.

I hope to hear from you again. Do check out our web site to get a better idea of who we are and what we do.

Blessings to you in the New Year!

Love & Peace,

Barbara Wiedner, founder/director
Grandmothers for Peace International
9444 Medstead Way
Elk Grove, CA 95758
Phone: (916) 684-8744 Fax: (916) 684-0394 E-Mail: wiednerb@aol.com

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>

Date: Fri, 16 Jan 1998 09:07:54 -0800 (PST)

From: Alice Slater <aslater@igc.apc.org>

X-Old-Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: NPT/Schedule

To: abolition-caucus@igc.org

X-Sender: aslater@pop.igc.org

Sender: majordomo@igc.apc.org

Dear Abolitionists,

Here is the latest information on the schedule of events we will propose for the NPT PrepCom. If you are planning a panel or event and it is not on the schedule, please let me know so we can figure out a timeslot. There is an NGO planning meeting in Geneva on February 20 and 21st sponsored by the NGO Committee in Disarmament and I would like to present our schedule at that time so they can begin to reserve rooms for the panels and have a good idea of what the needs of the Abolition 2000 Network will be during the PrepCom.

Hope to see you in Geneva next spring (April 26-May 8th) for the PrepCom.

Regards, Alice Slater

ABOLITION 2000

A Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons

Working Group for the NPT PrepComm

Schedule of 1998 NPT PrepComm Events

DAILY throughout the PrepComm:

8-9am Abolition 2000 Daily Caucus.

9-10am NGO Disarmament Committee daily briefings.

Sunday, April 26

Time TBA: NGO Disarmament Committee Orientation for all NGOs present.

Monday, April 27

Morning: 1998 NPT Prep Comm opens.

Morning/Afternoon: Abolition 2000 Public action/demonstration on the Place de Nations.

Evening: Reception and Meeting, Religious Working Group of Abolition 2000, including leaders of various faith communities. Ecumenical Centre.

Tuesday, April 28

Evening: Abolition 2000 with INESAP/IALANA : Towards a Nuclear Weapons Free World: Joseph Rotblat, Lee Butler, Mikhail Gorbachev, Nelson Mandela (invited).

Wednesday, April 29

Afternoon: Probable time for NGO presentations at the NPT Prep Comm. NOT CONFIRMED.

5-7pm Abolition 2000 Working Group: Beyond the CTB with Western States Legal Foundation:
Laboratory Testing and Article VI Obligation for Disarmament : Jackqueline Cabasso, Vladamir Iakmets, Lysianne Alezard, Ted Taylor, Andrew Licherman, Andre Gsponder (invited).

Thursday, April 30
5-7pm (provisionally): IPB to host meeting of landmines and nuclear disarmament activists on sharing of strategies and lessons to be learned from Ottawa process.

Friday, May 1
Afternoon: Abolition 2000 annual meeting (part 1).

Saturday, May 2
9-12pm Abolition 2000 annual meeting (part 2).

1-6pm Middle Power Initiativefor Nuclear Abolition - Launch and Formation of International Steering Committee (Doug Roche)

Monday, May 4
1-3pm Abolition 2000 Working Group on Health Effects of Radiation with The Atomic Mirror, Hiti Tau, and WEDO. The Toxic Legacy of the Nuclear Age: Pamela Meidell, Tricia Pritikin, Pamela Ransom and Gabriel Tetiarahi.

5-7pm: NATO Expansion (Cora Weiss, Moderator)

Tuesday, May 5
1-3pm Abolition 2000 with: International Association of Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms. Nuclear Strategies and the ICJ Opinion: John Burroughs, Alyn Ware, Hans Christensen, George Abi Saab, Merav Datan and Peter Weiss (invited).

Friday, May 8
1998 NPT Prep Comm closes.

Additional Proposed Panels Not Yet Scheduled:

Abolition 2000 Working Group on a Nuclear Weapons Convention with: INESAP. Beyond Technical Verification : Transparency, Verification, and Preventive Control for the Nuclear Weapons Convention.

Abotlition 2000 Working Group on Sustainable Energy with: Plutonium Free Future and GRACE Nuclear Energy and Environmentally Sustainable Alternatives: Claire Greensfelder, Mayumi Oda, Alice Slater, Ted Taylor.

Abolition 2000 Working Group on the Nuclearization of Space: Karl Grossman -

Abolition 2000 Working Group on Nuclear Waste, Colonialism, and Environmental Racism with:

Women for a Free and Independent Pacific (Myrla Baldonado, Gabriel Tetiarahi, Janine Rachel).

Alice Slater

Global Resource Action Center for the Environment(GRACE)

15 E. 26 St., New York, NY 10010

212-726-9161 (tel)

212-726-9160 (fax)

aslater@igc.apc.org

To: delong@nucleus.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Request for paper
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Bev:

Thanks for your summary of lessons of the landmines campaign. I would like to receive a copy of your paper on "The Ottawa Process on Nuclear Weapons". Our mail address is 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036.

On the use of photos, we don't have contemporary pictures similar to landmine victims. We can go back to Hiroshima and Nagasaki and also victims of nuclear testing, but the latter don't have the dramatic quality of child victims of landmines. I'm wondering if we might use photos of ground zero in cities where current strategic missiles are targeted, that is, crowded streets of Washington, New York, Chicago, San Francisco, Ottawa, Toronto, Montreal, London, Paris, Rome, Berlin, other European capitals, Moscow, capitals of former Soviet republics, Beijing, Tokyo, New Delhi, Karachi, Tehran, Baghdad, Amman, Damascus, Cairo, etc., etc. Especially the NATO countries need to be reminded that their lives are at risk by their blind loyalty to the United States, which could pull them into a nuclear war (as remote as it might seem).

I'm hoping that we will have a statement from world leaders to heads of states and foreign ministers by late February or early March, asking them to instruct their PrepCom delegates to support such measures as creation of a working committee to draft a nuclear weapons convention. When this statement is out, we want to contact religious organizations in various countries and ask them to contact their governments. In Canada who are the best contacts? Which religious organizations are likely to be most influential?

Shalom,
Howard

To: epf@igc.org, cwu_washington.parti@ecunet.org, lranck@igc.org

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

Subject: Sunflower article

Cc:

Bcc:

X-Attachments:

Dear Friends:

The "Sunflower" article I gave you has an error in a date. The ceremony in Ukraine took place on June 4, 1996 (not 1994).

Howard

To: "Ambassador Marin-Bosch" <consulmex.bcn@apdo.com>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Request for information
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Ambassador Marin-Bosch:

In your address on "Weapons of Mass Destruction" at the Pugwash Conference in August 1997, you stated that 28 nations represent the biggest obstacle to nuclear disarmament. Would you please provide me a list of those nations?

The Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition, which I serve as a co-convener, is mobilizing world religious leaders to influence the outcome of the next meeting of the NPT Preparatory Committee in Geneva, especially seeking initiation of a multilateral process to develop a nuclear weapons convention. In pre-meeting activities we want to encourage religious organizations in particular nations to contact their governments and urge support for this approach. We would like to concentrate on the 28 nations you describe.

With best regards,

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

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
Date: Fri, 16 Jan 1998 14:28:28 -0500 (EST)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: Test Ban News Release, 1/16
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igc7.igc.org id LAA14844

COALITION TO REDUCE NUCLEAR DANGERS

***** NEWS RELEASE *****

Coloradoans Support Ratification of Nuclear Test Ban Treaty:
New State Poll Shows 77% Approval

FOR RELEASE: January 16, 1998

CONTACTS: Daryl Kimball, Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, (202) 546-0795
x136

Sam Cole, Colorado Chapter of Physicians for Social Responsibility, (303) 298-8001

(January 16, 1998) A new poll shows that an overwhelming majority of Colorado voters support Senate approval of a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), one of the major national security matters to be addressed by the Congress in 1998. When asked if the United States Senate should approve or disapprove of a treaty signed by the United States and 140 other countries "which would prohibit nuclear weapons test explosions worldwide," 77% of respondents say the treaty should be approved, while only 14% do not feel such a treaty should be approved, while 9% said they "don't know."

The results are based on a survey of 400 registered voters in Colorado. Telephone interviewing was conducted December 15 to 17, 1997 by The Mellman Group, a respected national polling firm based in Washington, DC, for the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers. The statistical margin of error for the sample as a whole is plus or minus 4.9 percentage points at the 95% confidence level.

Beginning with President Dwight D. Eisenhower, U.S. presidents have sought to help prevent nuclear proliferation through a ban on nuclear testing. President Clinton has said the Treaty will "help to prevent the nuclear powers from developing more advanced weapons ... and will limit the possibilities for other states to acquire such devices." After over 1,030 U.S. nuclear explosions (including two conducted in Colorado), weapons scientists have determined that nuclear testing is not necessary to maintain the nation's arsenal.

Last September, the President transmitted the Treaty to the Senate for its advice and consent. Hearings on the Treaty are planned for next month and a vote is expected by some time in 1998. Colorado Senators Ben Nighthorse Campbell and Wayne Allard, both Republicans, have not yet declared their position on the Treaty. Support from moderate Republican Senators is considered necessary to secure the 67 votes needed for CTBT ratification. One key GOP leader on the issue, Pete Domenici (R-NM),

has said he is "leaning strongly in favor" of the treaty.

The Colorado poll shows that the CTBT enjoys strong bipartisan support. Although Independents (82% approve, 9% disapprove) and Democrats (79% approve, 12% disapprove) are most supportive of CTBT ratification, Republicans also support the proposal by a 50 point margin (70% approve, 20% disapprove). Even self-identified "conservatives" support the proposal by a 45 point margin (65% approve, 20% disapprove).

In fact, support for the approval of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty cuts across every demographic group. There are, however, some differences in the level of support for the Treaty across age levels. For example, "Generation Xers" are the most supportive of a nuclear test ban with 86% saying the Senate should approve the treaty and a mere 7% who say the Senate should not ratify the CTBT. Seniors are slightly less supportive of the ban (70% approve, 17% disapprove), although older voters still favor the treaty by more than a 50 point margin.

Support for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is strong in all areas of the state (Denver metro: 76% support, 15% oppose; Colorado Springs & Boulder: 78% approve, 13% disapprove; Eastern Plains & Western Slope: 76% support, 13% disapprove).

The results of the new survey of Colorado voters' opinions on the nuclear test ban issue are consistent with the results of the most recent national opinion survey on the CTBT (released on September 26, 1997), which showed 70% support for test ban treaty ratification and only 13.5% disapproval.

"What is striking about the results in Colorado, as in the nation as a whole, is the overwhelming nature of support for this Treaty. Indeed, far from being a partisan issue, support for a nuclear test ban treaty comes from all sides of the political spectrum," commented pollster Mark Mellman.

-- 30 --

The Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers is a national alliance of 16 leading arms control and disarmament organizations working together for a practical, step-by-step program to reduce nuclear dangers and prevent new threats from emerging. For more information on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty see the Coalition's web site.

Copies of Secretary of Energy Federico Peña's statement responding to the poll results are available by request by calling the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, 202-546-0795.

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
at Council for a Livable World Education Fund
110 Maryland Ave. NE #201
Washington DC 20002
p: (202)546-0795; fax: (202)546-5142
website: <http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>

Cc: petweiss@igc.org

Date: Fri, 16 Jan 1998 14:12:44 EST

From: LCNP <LCNP@AOL.COM>

Organization: AOL (<http://www.aol.com>)

Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: Draft sign-on letter on US Presidential Directive

To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

Jan 15. Draft sign-on letter on the Presidential Decision Directive

Send comments to lcnp@aol.com. Fax 212 674 6199

Letter will be finalized on January 21. Deadlines for sign-ons Jan 24.

January , 1998

President William Jefferson Clinton
The White House
1500 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington DC 20500

Dear Mr President,

We commend your decision to revise the 1981 nuclear doctrine on fighting a nuclear war. United States plans and policy to be able to wage a protracted nuclear war were unrealistic and totally out of date. However we regret that the PDD fails to adjust U.S. nuclear policy to the realities of the post-Cold War security environment, and to specific obligations.

The confirmation of the PDD, that the U.S. maintains the option and ability to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against states which may develop a capability to use chemical or biological weapons against the U.S., is both dangerous and illegal. If the U.S. deems it necessary to protect itself with nuclear weapons from the chemical or biological capabilities of, for example, Iraq, then certainly Iran which has already been the victim of Iraq's chemical weapons, as well as other neighboring states will claim the necessity for their own nuclear capability for protection. This undermines the goals of the NPT to curtail the spread of nuclear weapons capability.

Such a policy contravenes obligations the U.S. agreed to by signing the protocols of the Rarotonga, Pelindaba and Tlatelcolco Treaties, not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against members of the regional nuclear weapon free zones. It also contravenes pledges the U.S. made not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against parties to the Non Proliferation Treaty unless they attack the U.S. and are in alliance with a nuclear weapon state.

The PDD reaffirms the U.S. policy of first-use of nuclear weapons and makes no mention of taking nuclear weapons off alert. The unthinkable, a devastating nuclear exchange triggered by accident, miscalculation or intent, is thus as real as ever.

Finally, the PDD affirmation that the U.S. will continue to maintain nuclear weapons as the cornerstone of the nation's strategic defense, gives no hope for progress, and contravenes the NPT obligation, recently reaffirmed by the

International Court of Justice, to conduct negotiations in good faith on complete nuclear disarmament.

Two public opinion polls in 1997 indicated that negotiations for the abolition of nuclear weapons are supported by over 80% of the US public. The aim of nuclear abolition was also supported by 60 retired Generals and Admirals in a statement on nuclear weapons in December 1996.

Nuclear weapons threaten the security of all U.S. citizens and of humanity itself. We regret, therefore, that neither the Congress nor the public has been involved in the nuclear policy review, and we call for a new review including such democratic participation. We note that other countries, including Canada, are consulting with their legislatures and public in reviewing nuclear policies in light of current developments.

Yours sincerely,

Return-Path: <delong@nucleus.com>
Date: Fri, 16 Jan 1998 13:33:55 -0700
From: Bev Delong <delong@nucleus.com>
Reply-To: delong@nucleus.com
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
CC: eeregehr@waterv1.uwaterloo.ca
Subject: Re: Request for paper
References: <2.2.16.19980116150714.2977a66a@pop.igc.org>

Dear Howard,

Thank you so much for your message. The paper requested should be included in this transmission. (Sometimes the need for prayer arises....)

In Canada, a statement of the church leaders is being organized by Ernie Regehr with Project Ploughshares at eeregehr@waterv1.uwaterloo.ca Ploughshares is supported by the mainline churches (not the right wing) and thus has the support of the United Church of Canada, Lutheran Church, Mennonite, Anglicans, Roman Catholics, Quakers, Unitarians, and a few smaller groups. The largest mainline protestant churches are the United Church and the Anglicans. The Catholic church is represented on the Ploughshares Board by the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops (I may have the name incorrectly set out.)

Ernie hosted a meeting of these faith leaders in late November and apparently their policy statement on nuclear weapons is almost ready for public release. Do contact Ernie! I'm sure he'll be glad to hear from you!

Bev Delong

Howard W. Hallman wrote:

>
> Dear Bev:
>
> Thanks for your summary of lessons of the landmines campaign. I would like
> to receive a copy of your paper on "The Ottawa Process on Nuclear Weapons".
> Our mail address is 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036.
>
> On the use of photos, we don't have contemporary pictures similar to
> landmine victims. We can go back to Hiroshima and Nagasaki and also victims
> of nuclear testing, but the latter don't have the dramatic quality of child
> victims of landmines. I'm wondering if we might use photos of ground zero
> in cities where current strategic missiles are targeted, that is, crowded
> streets of Washington, New York, Chicago, San Francisco, Ottawa, Toronto,
> Montreal, London, Paris, Rome, Berlin, other European capitals, Moscow,
> capitals of former Soviet republics, Beijing, Tokyo, New Delhi, Karachi,
> Tehran, Baghdad, Amman, Damascus, Cairo, etc., etc. Especially the NATO
> countries need to be reminded that their lives are at risk by their blind
> loyalty to the United States, which could pull them into a nuclear war (as
> remote as it might seem).
>
> I'm hoping that we will have a statement from world leaders to heads of

> states and foreign ministers by late February or early March, asking them to
> instruct their PrepCom delegates to support such measures as creation of a
> working committee to draft a nuclear weapons convention. When this
> statement is out, we want to contact religious organizations in various
> countries and ask them to contact their governments. In Canada who are the
> best contacts? Which religious organizations are likely to be most influential?

>
> Shalom,
> Howard

THE "OTTAWA PROCESS" and Nuclear Weapons

How did it work?

The "Ottawa Process" of negotiating the Landmines Treaty was the subject of an extremely interesting one day workshop held in conjunction with the International Landmines Conference. Participants included diplomats, foreign service officers and members of nongovernmental organizations.

Traditional disarmament diplomacy starts with a UN resolution mandating the Committee on Disarmament (CD) to discuss a particular problem and then to negotiate and eventually conclude a treaty. This process can take 10 - 40 years until consensus is reached among participants. The CD is composed of only 60 or so of the U.N.'s 185 states so many voices remain outside the negotiations.

Clearly this traditional process posed a major obstacle to diplomats wishing a rapid response to the crisis of landmines. Diplomats and ngo's began to create a new process. Serious ngo lobbying resulted in early success: some 30 or so states took courageous first steps in unilaterally signalling their disapproval of mines by promising to end exports or use or destroy stockpiles.

The next significant step was the release by the ICRC of the expert study on the military utility of landmines. Military experts had reviewed the history of landmines use in 26 conflicts since the beginning of the Second World War. They concluded:

"anti-personnel mines have only rarely been deployed in accordance with the existing legal and military requirements. Even well-trained professional armies have found it extremely difficult to use mines correctly in combat situations. Furthermore, mines have increasingly been used as part of a brutal and systematic war against civilians, especially in the bitter internal conflicts that have come to characterize warfare in the late twentieth century." ('Banning Antipersonnel Landmines: the Ottawa Treaty Explained', International Committee of the Red Cross, 1997)

The military study concluded the use of antipersonnel mines was not justified due to the huge humanitarian costs associated with their use.

By the spring of 1996, a core group of states supportive of a ban became gradually identified. The need for a norm-building, as opposed to a regulatory treaty, was becoming understood. Mr. Lloyd Axworthy, Canada's Minister of Foreign Affairs, after an extremely dismal conference held in Vienna to consider amendments to the Convention on Certain Weapons, invited all interested states to come to Ottawa in October 1996 to discuss the matter of mines. This invitation likely marked the official start of the diplomatic portion of the "Ottawa Process". The Minister and his staff anticipated the participation of perhaps 10 to 12 states.

Through sheer serendipity, the disarmament agenda for the diplomatic community had cleared with the signing of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty in August 1996. Elections in several

states placed more supportive governments in power. With the Axworthy challenge, anti-mine activists in both government and ngo's swept into full gear, lobbying states around the world through personal visits, public education campaigns and agenda items at every forum Canada attended, including the Group of Eight, Commonwealth meetings, La Francophonie, NATO, APEC and so on. The O.A.S. pushed the movement a step further with its announcement in September 1996 of its determination to create a Central American Mines-Free Zone by 2000.

The Canadian government deliberately tried to get support from around the world and not to remain within its traditional western circle of states. States were encouraged, not bullied. Canadian missions around the world were supporting local activists with their anti-mine work. As states around the world put aside their egos, we gradually built a "new superpower" of middle power states supported by large and informed ngo networks.

By October 1996, the Landmines Conference had swelled to include over 50 states participated and another 20 attended as observers. It allowed another opportunity for ngo's to express their anxiety over the landmines situation. After hearing further about this problem, Mr. Axworthy decided to take a big risk: he invited the states to return to Ottawa in December of 1997 to sign a treaty. He would not wait until all states were on board and he would not be bound by a lowest common denominator approach. This invitation was greeted with joy by the ngo community but with derision by many in the diplomatic community. No one was threatened by the invitation however, it was simply open-ended for whichever states were interested.

Princess Diana swept the insider knowledge of this tragic problem into the living rooms of citizens worldwide. Her willingness to enter compassionately into the life of survivors of mine accidents played a huge role in solidifying public support on this clear moral issue.

Nongovernmental organizations in the International Campaign to Ban Landmines, particularly those with technical knowledge about the operation of landmines, kept a sharp eye on the drafting of the Treaty to encourage a product that would appropriately address the threat of antipersonnel landmines. Their goals remained sharply focused. The Campaign's negotiators were skilled. Activists around the world were notified if governments proposed unreasonable negotiating positions and the governments would be contacted through phone and faxes to protest such positions. Activists living far away from the seats of power were informed about ongoing negotiations. But even with the high level of support achieved, the goals of the mines activists were almost derailed in Oslo.

A government spokesman noted the ability of the Canadian government to expand its diplomatic power exponentially by working with the ngo community and encouraging civil society generally to support its work.

One ngo rep noted that it was a wonderful situation that Canadian ngo's were able to work with government officials who could be trusted and were cooperative. This is not the case around the world.

Another representative noted the strong response of women to the challenge posed by mines and the fact that almost all the national campaigns were headed by women. Gender analysis of the processes used by women in this campaign was encouraged.

The remarkable ability of the campaign to give voice to the poor, the injured, the families of those whose lives have been claimed, was noted. An extremely important role had been played by those survivors who had attended all the major diplomatic gatherings to courageously give witness to the destructive role mines had played in their lives. These survivors were powerful moral leaders in the campaign, sharing words of peace and encouragement rather than words of anger or despair.

The human face was further evidenced through the excellent work of several professional photographers who had travelled to mines affected areas to record the results of mines incidents.

The campaign was also able to assemble a group of experts who had gathered the information on levels of mining and mines injuries and deaths in almost 70 states. They had experts on military strategy who publicly refuted claims about the military utility of mines. The Campaign also had demining experts to explain the costs and methods of demining and to refute claims concerning the method of operation of various types of mines.

The foreign service officers within governments and the ngo leaders cooperated in sharing information about mines and about their progress in lobbying. Indeed they observed that many states were tired with the tedious nature of the traditional lobbying process and tired of the control over negotiations exercised in the past by the nuclear powers.

Could the Ottawa Process be applied to nuclear weapons?

Possibly. The landmines campaign had the "advantage", sadly, of high numbers of obvious victims of those weapons. It also had the benefit of state independence when it came to decisions on prohibitions on state production, sales and deployment of mines. When Belgium decided on no exports, it could do so. With a large alliance such as NATO relying on neighbouring states for nuclear "defence", the campaign becomes somewhat more difficult. Happily though, we are not dealing with 70 victim states and over 50 states producing nuclear weapons so in a sense our work can be more focused to pressuring the nuclear powers. We are also in a situation where there is already high levels of public understanding of the effects of nuclear weapons and accordingly high levels of public support for abolition.

Our success in rapidly achieving a Nuclear Weapons Convention will depend on whether we can:

- a. focus on a very specific goal, possibly defined by a series of steps
- b. build a functioning coalition of international ngo's
- c. build and support a coalition of friendly foreign service officers in middle power states
(ICBL encouraged meetings over meals during the Review Conference on landmines.)
- d. obtain the public support for that coalition key known ngo's such as the ICRC and UNICEF and the major faith groups
- e. make popularly available the key pieces of information needed by citizens to form an opinion on nuclear weapons: numbers of weapons, numbers of accidents, threats of use, results of use. It needs to be clear and reinforced over and over. (How many times have you heard there are 110 million landmines?)
- f. identify or create our own experts:
 - * to refute propaganda concerning the need for nuclear weapons
 - * to recount the number of nuclear threats of use (have we someone who participated in one of the "emergency decision-making sessions who can verify the risk level of nuclear deterrence?)
 - * to speak to accidents with nuclear weapons
 - * to propose workable steps in the disarmament process
 - * to serve as watchdogs during the negotiation of the treaty.

These experts are no doubt available now but must be identified to members of ngo's who can use them as speakers at public events and can make them available to the media to counteract the media work of the nuclear weapons states.

- g. gather people who can serve as witnesses to the human toll taken by nuclear weapons production, storage, transport and use and organize their participation on speakers' tours and at diplomatic conferences.
- h. engage numbers of popular artists, musicians, photographers and key media spokespeople to speak out against nuclear weapons
- i. identify small effective steps that nuclear and non-nuclear states can take to signal their support for eventual total disarmament

What could be done at the NPT meeting in Geneva? Could the ngo's work with friendly governments to host a panel on de-alerting and no-first-use? Might we encourage and fund the participation of nuclear victims at the NPT meeting in Geneva and announce their presence to the media and the diplomatic community. If a video could be made which records their experiences, this would be an invaluable public education tool. Photographs of the victims would also be useful for posters, etc. The public must know the victims are here and now. Might diplomats be invited to an interfaith celebration of peace?

Looking over the long-term, one participant at the Landmines process meeting urged that nongovernmental organizations be involved with the review of the decisions to commence research and manufacture of weapons with an eye to whether their eventual use - whether intended or accidental - would comply with international humanitarian law. We cannot be involved with a massive campaign such as this one to address each individual weapons system. We must be more mindful of the requirements of international law that disallow indiscriminate weapons and disallow weapons that cause unnecessary suffering. Perhaps we can inquire into the process of arms development in our own countries and get membership on appropriate committees. This process of warfare must end.

Bev Tollefson Delong, December 1997.

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>

Cc: petweiss@igc.org

Date: Fri, 16 Jan 1998 12:41:33 -0800 (PST)

From: Alice Slater <aslater@igc.apc.org>

X-Old-Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: Re: Draft sign-on letter on US Presidential Directive

To: LCNP <LCNP@aol.com>, abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

X-Sender: aslater@pop.igc.org

Sender: majordomo@igc.apc.org

Well done Alyn! Please sign me on for Global Resource Action Center for the Environment (GRACE) Thanks. Alice Slater

At 02:12 PM 1/16/98 EST, LCNP wrote:

>Jan 15. Draft sign-on letter on the Presidential Decision Directive

>Send comments to lcnp@aol.com. Fax 212 674 6199

>Letter will be finalized on January 21. Deadlines for sign-ons Jan 24.

>

>January , 1998

>

>President William Jefferson Clinton

>The White House

>1500 Pennsylvania Avenue NW

>Washington DC 20500

>

>Dear Mr President,

>

>We commend your decision to revise the 1981 nuclear doctrine on fighting a
>nuclear war. United States plans and policy to be able to wage a protracted
>nuclear war were unrealistic and totally out of date. However we regret that
>the PDD fails to adjust U.S. nuclear policy to the realities of the post-Cold
>War security environment, and to specific obligations.

>

>The confirmation of the PDD, that the U.S. maintains the option and ability to
>use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against states which may develop a
>capability to use chemical or biological weapons against the U.S., is both
>dangerous and illegal. If the U.S. deems it necessary to protect itself with
>nuclear weapons from the chemical or biological capabilities of, for example,
>Iraq, then certainly Iran which has already been the victim of Iraq=s chemical
>weapons, as well as other neighboring states will claim the necessity for
>their own nuclear capability for protection. This undermines the goals of the
>NPT to curtail the spread of nuclear weapons capability.

>

>Such a policy contravenes obligations the U.S. agreed to by signing the
>protocols of the Rarotonga, Pelindaba and Tlatelcolco Treaties, not to use or
>threaten to use nuclear weapons against members of the regional nuclear weapon
>free zones. It also contravenes pledges the U.S. made not to use or threaten
>to use nuclear weapons against parties to the Non Proliferation Treaty unless
>they attack the U.S. and are in alliance with a nuclear weapon state.

>

>The PDD reaffirms the U.S. policy of first-use of nuclear weapons and makes no
>mention of taking nuclear weapons off alert. The unthinkable, a devastating
>nuclear exchange triggered by accident, miscalculation or intent, is thus as

>real as ever.

>

>Finally, the PDD affirmation that the U.S. will continue to maintain nuclear
>weapons as the cornerstone of the nation's strategic defense, gives no hope
>for progress, and contravenes the NPT obligation, recently reaffirmed by the
>International Court of Justice, to conduct negotiations in good faith on
>complete nuclear disarmament.

>

>Two public opinion polls in 1997 indicated that negotiations for the abolition
>of nuclear weapons are supported by over 80% of the US public. The aim of
>nuclear abolition was also supported by 60 retired Generals and Admirals in a
>statement on nuclear weapons in December 1996.

>

>Nuclear weapons threaten the security of all U.S. citizens and of humanity
>itself. We regret, therefore, that neither the Congress nor the public has
>been involved in the nuclear policy review, and we call for a new review
>including such democratic participation. We note that other countries,
>including Canada, are consulting with their legislatures and public in
>reviewing nuclear policies in light of current developments.

>

>Yours sincerely,

>

>

Alice Slater

Global Resource Action Center for the Environment(GRACE)

15 E. 26 St., New York, NY 10010

212-726-9161 (tel)

212-726-9160 (fax)

aslater@igc.apc.org

Return-Path: <AAAlbergate@aol.com>
From: AAAlbergate@aol.com
Date: Fri, 16 Jan 1998 18:07:36 -0500 (EST)
To: mupj@igc.apc.org
Subject: Re: NPT PrepCom

Dear Mr. Hallman,

Thanks for your Jan. 14 response to my inquiry about the Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition and the NPT PrepCom. I will forward this information to our international organization (Soka Gakkai International).

Best wishes,
Al Albergate,
SGI-USA Director of Community Relations.

To: lcnp@aol.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Draft sign-on letter to President Clinton
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.org
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Alyn:

I'm glad you've initiated the sign-on letter to President Clinton regarding the revised presidential decision directive on nuclear weapons. However, I have a couple of problems with the present draft.

A similar letter was drafted and circulated among arms control and peace organizations based in Washington. Similar to your draft letter, it started "We applaud your decision...." Discussion revealed feelings that we shouldn't applaud, or commend, a vastly inadequate policy revision. Therefore, I suggest the following change for your first paragraph.

"We note the report that the United States has revised the presidential decision directive (PDD) on the use of nuclear weapons. Although it is step forward to remove unrealistic and outdated plans and policy to be able wage a protracted nuclear war, otherwise the PDD fails to adjust U.S. nuclear policy to the realities of the post-Cold War security environment, and to specific obligations."

In our discussion in Washington it was noted that the U.S. still retains deployed, first-strike capability. Therefore, I suggest revising the fourth paragraph to read as follows:

"The PDD reaffirms the U.S. policy of no-first used of nuclear weapons and maintains the deployment of first-strike weapons. At the same time it makes no mention of taking nuclear weapons off alert, a policy widely recommended by national security exports in the United States and abroad. Thus, the unthinkable, a devastating nuclear exchange triggered by accident, miscalculation, or intent is as real as ever."

If these changes were made, I would be willing to sign the letter in behalf of Methodists United for Peace with Justice.

Shalom,
Howard

Return-Path: <katie@chch.planet.org.nz>
X-Sender: kate@mail.chch.planet.org.nz
Date: Sun, 18 Jan 1998 18:51:25 +1300
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
From: Kate Dewes <katie@chch.planet.org.nz>
Subject: Re: UN vote on Malaysian resolution
Cc: LCNP@aol.com

Dear Howard,

Apologies for the slow reply: we've just returned from a week's holiday.

May we suggest you ask Alyn Ware of the Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy to fax the voting details to you, as he is the expert on the spot?
We're copying this to him.

Best wishes,
Kate & Rob

At 16:50 15/01/98 -0800, you wrote:

>Dear Kate:

>

>As a co-covener of the Religious Working Group on Nuclear Abolition, I am in
>the process of developing a statement for world religious leaders to issue
>in connection with the next NPT PrepCom meeting. I'm also trying to figure
>out how to get religious groups in various states to lobby their governments
>and delegations.

>

>To figure out where to concentrate, it would be useful to have the list of
>states voting against, abstaining, and not voting on the Malaysian
>resolution. Your communication of December 10 summarized this data. Would
>you have handy a list of states in each category which you could share with
>me? If so, please send it.

>

>Thanks,

>

>Howard

>Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice.

>

>

>

Date: Sun, 18 Jan 1998 02:19:07 -0800 (PST)
From: IGC Billing Department <billing@igc.org>
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: December use, acct: mupj
Sender: billing@igc.apc.org

Access1, our main provider for nationwide local access numbers, has upgraded their network and expanded into new areas. Please check for new and improved local access numbers by visiting our web site at <http://www.igc.org/igc/help/supptaccess.html>

***** INVOICE *****

Howard W. Hallman
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
1500 16th St., NW
Washington, DC 20036

December 1997 activity for your PeaceNet account
IGC Account: mupj Invoice date: 12/31/97
Invoice number: 9712-04553

Date	Time	Description	Qty	Cost	Taxable
12/01/97	0100	Majordomo list monthly fee abolition-religious		9.00	
12/01/97	0624	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00	
12/01/97	1024	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00	
12/01/97	1202	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00	
12/01/97	1218	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00	
12/01/97	1833	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00	
12/02/97	0629	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	19MN	0.00	
12/02/97	0804	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00	
12/02/97	1154	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00	
12/03/97	0613	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00	
12/03/97	0727	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00	
12/03/97	1335	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	2MN	0.00	
12/03/97	1852	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00	
12/03/97	1854	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00	
12/03/97	1859	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00	
12/04/97	0416	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00	
12/04/97	0423	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00	
12/04/97	0909	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00	
12/04/97	1136	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00	
12/04/97	1700	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00	
12/05/97	0415	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00	
12/05/97	1201	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00	
12/05/97	1222	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00	
12/06/97	0435	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00	
12/06/97	0441	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00	
12/06/97	1405	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00	

12/06/97 1409 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00
12/08/97 0422 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00
12/08/97 1035 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	2MN	0.00
12/08/97 1037 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	7MN	0.00
12/09/97 0625 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00
12/09/97 0835 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00
12/09/97 1256 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00
12/09/97 1411 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	3MN	0.00
12/09/97 1446 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00
12/10/97 0614 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00
12/10/97 0655 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00
12/10/97 1034 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00
12/10/97 1821 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00
12/11/97 0359 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00
12/11/97 0408 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00
12/11/97 1005 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00
12/11/97 1015 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00
12/11/97 1032 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	18MN	0.00
12/11/97 1735 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00
12/11/97 1748 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00
12/12/97 0616 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00
12/12/97 0841 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00
12/12/97 1024 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00
12/12/97 1417 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	22MN	0.00
12/13/97 1320 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00
12/15/97 0337 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00
12/15/97 0655 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00
12/15/97 0703 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00
12/15/97 0729 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	22MN	0.00
12/15/97 1015 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00
12/15/97 1556 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00
12/15/97 1602 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00
12/16/97 0627 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00
12/16/97 1015 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00
12/16/97 1428 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00
12/16/97 1551 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	14MN	0.00
12/16/97 1608 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00
12/17/97 0630 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00
12/17/97 1030 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00
12/17/97 1216 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00
12/18/97 0440 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00
12/18/97 0447 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	14MN	0.00
12/18/97 1150 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00
12/18/97 1206 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	3MN	0.00
12/19/97 0456 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	4MN	0.00
12/19/97 0507 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	21MN	0.00
12/19/97 0655 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	5MN	0.00
12/19/97 0940 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	30MN	0.00
12/19/97 1047 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	3MN	0.00
12/19/97 1050 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	12MN	0.00
12/19/97 1218 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	7MN	0.00
12/19/97 1230 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	6MN	0.00
12/19/97 1310 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	5MN	0.00
12/19/97 1320 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	4MN	0.00

12/19/97 1336 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	2MN	0.00
12/19/97 1343 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	17MN	0.00
12/19/97 1411 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	16MN	0.00
12/20/97 0839 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	18MN	0.00
12/20/97 0934 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	3MN	0.00
12/22/97 0413 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	7MN	0.00
12/22/97 1206 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	9MN	0.00
12/23/97 0421 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	6MN	0.00
12/23/97 0807 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	16MN	0.00
12/23/97 0936 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	2MN	0.00
12/23/97 1416 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	2MN	0.00
12/24/97 1022 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00
12/28/97 1401 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	2MN	0.00
12/28/97 1411 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	9MN	0.00
12/30/97 0700 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00
12/30/97 0827 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	2MN	0.00
12/30/97 0840 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00
12/31/97 1125 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	2MN	0.00
12/31/97 1136 Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	1MN	0.00
12/31/97 Storage fee	28KC	0.00
12/31/97 Jan 1997 monthly service fee		12.50

Total Current Charges 21.50

11/30/97 Previous Balance 0.00

Grand Total Due 21.50

Summary for this period: Minutes Hourly Charge
 rate

Extended Services		9.00
Storage fee		0.00
Subscription fee		12.50
Direct-dial	398	0.00
Totals:	398	\$ 21.50

Note: Payments received after this billing period will be reflected on your next invoice. If you receive a paper invoice, or your network usage is paid by your organization, this emailed invoice is for your information only.

If you have any questions about your invoice, please contact:

Billing Department, Institute for Global Communications
PO Box 29904, San Francisco, CA 94129-0904 USA
Phone: (415)561-6100 Fax: (415)561-6101 Email: billing@igc.org
A project of the Tides Center

Return-Path: <fredpax@online.no>
Date: Sun, 18 Jan 1998 13:08:29 +0100 (MET)
X-Sender: fredpax@sn.no
To: LCNP <LCNP@AOL.COM>
From: fredpax@online.no (Fredrik S. Heffermehl)
Subject: Re: Draft sign-on letter on US Presidential Directive
Cc: <mupj@igc.apc.org>

>Jan 15. Draft sign-on letter on the Presidential Decision Directive
>Send comments to lcnp@aol.com. Fax 212 674 6199
>Letter will be finalized on January 21. Deadlines for sign-ons Jan 24.
>

Dear Al

Let me/NPA-Norwegian Peace Alliance sign on and suggest you
***add some words

PDD is ????

ICJ - I now try to shift focus from the troublesome 7-7 point E and its difficult "extreme self-defense" words to the unanimous conclusion that also nws use or threat must comply with the international law on warfare, and that this unavoidably~ means that they cannot be used (NWSs unable to show or make probable any type of NW or use of it that would be legal - onus "of proof" now is on them).

"Howard W. Hallman" seems to have a point (no unreserved/undeserved praise).

Fredrik

>January , 1998

>
>President William Jefferson Clinton
>The White House
>1500 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
>Washington DC 20500
>
>Dear Mr President,
>
>We commend your decision to revise the 1981 nuclear doctrine on fighting a
>nuclear war. United States plans and policy to be able to wage a protracted
>nuclear war were unrealistic and totally out of date. However we regret that
>the PDD fails to adjust U.S. nuclear policy to the realities of the post-Cold
>War security environment, and to specific
**

legal obligations under international
law..

>

>The confirmation of the PDD, that the U.S. maintains the option and ability to
>use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against states which may develop a
>capability to use chemical or biological weapons against the U.S., is both
>dangerous and illegal. If the U.S. deems it necessary to protect itself with
>nuclear weapons from the chemical or biological capabilities of, for example,
>Iraq, then certainly Iran which has already been the victim of Iraq=s chemical
>weapons, as well as other neighboring states will claim the necessity for
>their own nuclear capability for protection. This undermines the goals of the
>NPT to curtail the spread of nuclear weapons capability.

>

>Such a policy contravenes obligations the U.S. agreed to by signing the
>protocols of the Rarotonga, Pelindaba and Tlatelcolco Treaties, not to use or
>threaten to use nuclear weapons against members of the regional nuclear weapon
>free zones. It also contravenes pledges the U.S. made not to use or threaten
>to use nuclear weapons against parties to the Non Proliferation Treaty unless
>they attack the U.S. and are in alliance with a nuclear weapon state.

>

>The PDD reaffirms the U.S. policy of first-use of nuclear weapons and makes no
>mention of taking nuclear weapons off alert. The unthinkable, a devastating
>nuclear exchange triggered by accident, miscalculation or intent, is thus as
>real as ever.

>

>Finally, the PDD affirmation that the U.S. will continue to maintain nuclear
>weapons as the cornerstone of the nation's strategic defense, gives no hope
>for progress, and contravenes the NPT obligation, recently reaffirmed by the
>International Court of Justice, to conduct negotiations in good faith on
>complete nuclear disarmament.

>

>Two public opinion polls in 1997 indicated that negotiations for the abolition
>of nuclear weapons are supported by over 80% of the US public. The aim of
>nuclear abolition was also supported by 60 retired Generals and Admirals in a
>statement on nuclear weapons in December 1996.

>

>Nuclear weapons threaten the security of all U.S. citizens and of humanity
>itself. We regret, therefore, that neither the Congress nor the public has
>been involved in the nuclear policy review, and we call for a new review
>including such democratic participation. We note that other countries,
>including Canada, are consulting with their legislatures and public in
>reviewing nuclear policies in light of current developments.

>

>Yours sincerely,

* Fredrik S. HEFFERMEHL *
* President, Norwegian Peace Alliance *
* Vice President, International Peace Bureau *
* Board/Directors, IA Lawyers Ag. Nuclar Arms *
* International Free Vanunu Committee *
* *
* N. Juels g. 28 A, N-0272 Oslo, Norway *

* Phone +47-2244 8003 (fax: +47-2244 7616) *

* E-mail: fredpax@online.no (NB - Note change!)*

Return-Path: <bkinsey@peacemission.org>
From: "Bob Kinsey" <bkinsey@peacemission.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>, <lcnp@aol.com>
Cc: <abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Draft sign-on letter to President Clinton
Date: Sun, 18 Jan 1998 05:35:36 -0700
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

I too support the suggested changes of Howard W. Hallman.
Bob Kinsey, UCC Rocky Mountain Peace and Justice Task Force

> From: Howard W. Hallman <mupj@igc.apc.org>
> To: lcnp@aol.com
> Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.org
> Subject: Draft sign-on letter to President Clinton
> Date: Saturday, January 17, 1998 11:47 AM
>
> Dear Alyn:
>
> I'm glad you've initiated the sign-on letter to President Clinton
regarding
> the revised presidential decision directive on nuclear weapons. However,
I
> have a couple of problems with the present draft.
>
> A similar letter was drafted and circulated among arms control and peace
> organizations based in Washington. Similar to your draft letter, it
started
> "We applaud your decision...." Discussion revealed feelings that we
> shouldn't applaud, or commend, a vastly inadequate policy revision.
> Therefore, I suggest the following change for your first paragraph.
>
> "We note the report that the United States has revised the presidential
> decision directive (PDD)on the use of nuclear weapons. Although it is
step
> forward to remove unrealistic and outdated plans and policy to be able
wage
> a protracted nuclear war, otherwise the PDD fails to adjust U.S. nuclear
> policy to the realities of the post-Cold War security environment, and to
>> specific obligations."
>
> In our discussion in Washington it was noted that the U.S. still retains
> deployed, first-strike capability. Therefore, I suggest revising the
fourth
> paragraph to read as follows:
>
> "The PDD reaffirms the U.S. policy of no-first used of nuclear weapons
and
> maintains the deployment of first-strike weapons. At the same time it
makes
> no mention of taking nuclear weapons off alert, a policy widely

recommended

> by national security exports in the United States and abroad. Thus, the
> unthinkable, a devastating nuclear exchange triggered by accident,
> miscalculation, or intent is as real as ever."

>

> If these changes were made, I would be willing to sign the letter in
behalf

> of Methodists United for Peace with Justice.

>

> Shalom,

> Howard

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Sun, 18 Jan 1998 17:35:20 -0500
From: Ross Wilcock <rwilcock@execulink.com>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Mikhail Gorbachev on Nuclear Abolition & nonviolence
To: "Abolition Caucus List (E-mail)" <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>

An interesting interview with Mikhail Gorbachev by Johnathan Schell from the Nation Feb 2/9 appeared on Johnson's Russia List.

The title is:

The Gift of Time: The Case for Abolishing Nuclear Weapons

For those interested, I have made it available at <http://www.pgs.ca/pages/a2/gorb980118.htm>

Ross Wilcock
rwilcock@web.net
<http://www.pgs.ca>

To: cfpa@cyberenet.net
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: Funding Contact for Methodists
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Bob,

I'm a fundseeker rather than a fundgiver, so I can't help you.

Shalom,
Howard

At 05:23 PM 1/17/98 -0500, you wrote:

>Howard,
>
>I'm on the religious committee of national Peace Action, and we are in
>the process of approaching potential funders throughout the religious
>community. We are approaching Mia Ajolly (sp?) of the Women's Division.
>Are there other key contacts we should approach? Are you one of them?
>Thanks for any help, contacts, advice you can offer.
>--
>Rev. Robert Moore, Executive Director, Coalition for Peace Action
>40 Witherspoon Street, Princeton, NJ 08542
>(609) 924-5022 voice, (609) 924-3052 fax
>cfpa@cyberenet.net
>
>

Return-Path: <iag@sabregroup.com>
Date: Mon, 19 Jan 1998 12:33:51 -0600
From: iag@sabregroup.com (iag)
To: MUPJ@igc.org
Subject: A Word of Thanks ...

Dear New Travelocity Member:

Welcome to Travelocity. Brought to you by SABRE Interactive - the company that pioneered on-line travel - Travelocity puts you in complete control of your travel planning and purchasing needs.

Each time you visit us at www.travelocity.com, you will enter your login name and password. Please keep this e-mail message for future reference.

Your login name is: HOWHALL

Your password is: WESLEY

Whether you are in the planning stage or you're ready to make a reservation and purchase a ticket, Travelocity puts the power of SABRE, the same reservation system used by over 100,000 travel professionals worldwide, at your fingertips 24 hours a day - 7 days a week!

At Travelocity, we are committed to making the process of travel planning and purchasing easy for you. With Travelocity, it's easy to:

- Find the lowest airfare using a variety of low fare search tools

- Reserve and purchase airline tickets securely. Travelocity provides today's best available means to safeguard your credit card transactions

- Specify the ticket delivery option best suited to your needs.

Travelocity even makes it simple to purchase your ticket from your SABRE travel agent!

- Reserve a hotel room or rental car

- keep up to date with the latest travel news

- And more ...

Thank you for becoming a member of Travelocity. We hope to see you on-line soon!

<http://www.travelocity.com>

e-mail - memberservices@amrcorp.com

To: lcnp@aol.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Nations opposing nuclear disarmament
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Alyn:

After George Farebrother circulated the speech of Ambassador Miguel Marin-Bosch on "Weapons of Mass Destruction", I wrote to the ambassador, asking him to identify the 28 governments which he said represent the biggest obstacle to nuclear disarmament. This is his reply:

"Strong opposition to UN General Assembly resolutions calling for nuclear disarmament measures has come from ten nations: Albania, Bulgaria, Latvia and Slovenia; Andorra, Canada, Iceland and Norway; and Denmark and Finland. Solid opposition (against all resolutions) has come from eighteen NATO members, aspirants or sympathizers: three NWS (France, UK and USA) and Belgium, Germany, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain and Turkey, as well as the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Slovak Republic and Monaco. And it is up to the citizens of these twenty-eight countries to pressure their respective governments and to insist on a moral compass in their approach to nuclear weapons."

Do you agree with Ambassador Marin-Bosch's assessment? Would you add or subtract any nations from this list?

What I'm looking for is a list of nations which can become the particular focus of Abolition 2000 as we build up support for our position at the upcoming NPT Prepcom.

Shalom,
Howard

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>

Date: Tue, 20 Jan 1998 16:25:53 GMT

From: acronym@gn.apc.org (Rebecca Johnson)

Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: Geneva: CD opens

To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

X-Sender: acronym@gn.apc.org

Acro email 1998.1

The CD today opened by adopting its agenda for 1998 (identical to last year's). In 1997 it took them several weeks to do this, despite the fact of a theological separation between the agenda (a wishlist based on the decalogue) is somewhat theological because of the separation made between agenda and programme of work (what they actually intend to do). However, in getting the agenda adopted at the first plenary of the year, the Swedish Chair (Lars Norberg) succeeded in removing a bureaucratic blockage. The other notable event at the first plenary was a very strong statement by South Africa (Jacob Selebi), who proposed a mandate for an ad hoc Committee on nuclear disarmament, as follows:

"1. The Conference on Disarmament decides to establish an Ad Hoc Committee on Nuclear Disarmament to deliberate upon practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons as well as to identify if and when one or more such steps should be the subject of negotiations in the Conference.

2. In discharging its function the Ad Hoc Committee will take into account existing proposals and views, as well as future initiatives on nuclear disarmament."

New Zealand, Canada and Brazil immediately welcomed the proposal. Myanmar recalled last year's non-aligned call for a nuclear disarmament committee with two working groups, dealing with nuclear disarmament and fissile materials respectively, but also said that it would show flexibility in exploring 'various mechanisms that would command consensus'.

The US Ambassador designate, Robert Grey, read a short message from President Clinton, viz: "As you resume your critical efforts to strengthen global security, I pledge the full support of the United States delegation in taking the next steps in the nuclear disarmament process and banning anti-personnel mines from the face of the earth. No issues are more important today to this body's work than a cut-off of fissile material production for nuclear explosives and a worldwide ban on the export of anti-personnel landmines. If the Conference can promptly conclude these accords, complementing deep bilateral reductions in nuclear arms and the Ottawa Convention, we will take important steps on the road to a world that is free of nuclear weapons and safe for children to tread. I am confident the Conference on Disarmament can meet the challenge." Grey has yet to be confirmed as CD Ambassador by the US Senate.

Earlier, a statement from UN General Secretary Kofi Annan was read: This "emphasized that nuclear disarmament must be pursued more vigorously,

particularly by nuclear weapon states, with a view to the progressive reduction and complete elimination of nuclear weapons at the earliest date" and also expressed "serious concern at the spread of various types of conventional weapons, especially landmines and small arms which are extensively used in regional and sub-regional conflicts."

Annan's statement also welcomed consensus on the reorganisation of the Secretariat and re-establishment of the Department for Disarmament Affairs, especially the fact that "a distinguished and experienced disarmament expert, Ambassador Dhanapala of Sri Lanka, has agreed to head the Department."

The agenda is as follows:

1. Cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament
2. Prevention of nuclear war, including all related matters
3. Prevention of an arms race in outer space
4. Effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon states against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons
5. New types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons; radiological weapons
6. Comprehensive programme of disarmament
7. Transparency in armaments
8. Consideration and adoption of the annual report and any other report, as appropriate, to the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Norberg also read into the record the following understanding 'If there is a consensus in the Conference to deal with any issues they could be dealt with within this agenda.'

This is identical with the statement made at the time of adoption of the agenda in 1997 and refers to landmines.

Despite this positive opening to 1998, the mood is rather pessimistic that anything very substantive will be agreed this year. There is still entrenched opposition to the main alternatives, although definitely a growing interest in looking at the militarisation of outer space.

Rebecca Johnson

The Acronym Institute
24, Colvestone Crescent, London E8 2LH, England.
telephone (UK +44) (0) 171 503 8857
fax (0) 171 503 9153

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.org, dkrieger@napf.org, petweiss@igc.org
Date: Tue, 20 Jan 1998 09:57:10 -0800 (PST)
From: john burroughs <jburroughs@igc.apc.org>
X-Old-Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Re: Draft sign-on letter on US Presidential Directive
To: LCNP <LCNP@aol.com>
X-Sender: jburroughs@pop.igc.org
Sender: majordomo@igc.apc.org

Hi Alyn - Thanks for initiating letter on PDD. Some suggestions follow.

I agree with Howard Hallman that the PDD should in no way be commended. As the letter reflects, the US is retaining the key elements of its posture, namely threatened first use and threatened massive retaliation. Moreover, threatened massive retaliation includes, as news reporting confirmed, "launch on warning" under nuclear attack. It also at least implicitly includes an option of a "disarming" or "damage-limiting" first strike to preempt a threatened nuclear attack. As former top official John Deutsch recently noted, US strategy has essentially been the same since it was described by Kissinger forty years ago. The PDD does nothing to change this. The dropping of "protracted nuclear war" doctrine serves only to allow moving to relatively smaller but still in an absolute sense insanely large arsenal sizes, and thus is a matter at best of "arms control", not "disarmament".

I would suggest explicitly identifying retention of the policy of threatened massive retaliation. Along with threatened first use, this policy is inconsistent with the ICJ's holding of general illegality. Both policies were also rejected by the NAS.

This is a matter of evaluation, on which reasonable persons could differ, but I would also put more emphasis on continued policies of threatened massive retaliation and threatened first use than on the threat of use against employment of weapons of mass destruction including by non-nuclear weapon states. While the latter threat obviously has been receiving more attention over the last few years in the US, it had never previously been explicitly ruled out by the US, and I believe it would always have been considered by states contemplating use of WMD. Nixon justified US entering into biological weapons convention on ground that US could always use nuclear weapons if a state violated that convention. Also, I regret to say that I do not think it is that clear that NPT commitments and regional nuclear weapon free zone treaties override the doctrine of nuclear reprisal against use of WMD (though we should certainly say this). I do think that humanitarian law prohibits or at a minimum very severely restricts the use of nuclear weapons in reprisal against use of WMD.

I would suggest revising statement of NPT obligation as follows: "...to achieve complete nuclear disarmament through good faith negotiation".

At 02:12 PM 1/16/98 EST, you wrote:
>Jan 15. Draft sign-on letter on the Presidential Decision Directive
>Send comments to lcnp@aol.com. Fax 212 674 6199

>Letter will be finalized on January 21. Deadlines for sign-ons Jan 24.

>

>January , 1998

>

>President William Jefferson Clinton

>The White House

>1500 Pennsylvania Avenue NW

>Washington DC 20500

>

>Dear Mr President,

>

>We commend your decision to revise the 1981 nuclear doctrine on fighting a
>nuclear war. United States plans and policy to be able to wage a protracted
>nuclear war were unrealistic and totally out of date. However we regret that
>the PDD fails to adjust U.S. nuclear policy to the realities of the post-Cold
>War security environment, and to specific obligations.

>

>The confirmation of the PDD, that the U.S. maintains the option and ability to
>use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against states which may develop a
>capability to use chemical or biological weapons against the U.S., is both
>dangerous and illegal. If the U.S. deems it necessary to protect itself with
>nuclear weapons from the chemical or biological capabilities of, for example,
>Iraq, then certainly Iran which has already been the victim of Iraq=s chemical
>weapons, as well as other neighboring states will claim the necessity for
>their own nuclear capability for protection. This undermines the goals of the
>NPT to curtail the spread of nuclear weapons capability.

>

>Such a policy contravenes obligations the U.S. agreed to by signing the
>protocols of the Rarotonga, Pelindaba and Tlatelcolco Treaties, not to use or
>threaten to use nuclear weapons against members of the regional nuclear weapon
>free zones. It also contravenes pledges the U.S. made not to use or threaten
>to use nuclear weapons against parties to the Non Proliferation Treaty unless
>they attack the U.S. and are in alliance with a nuclear weapon state.

>

>The PDD reaffirms the U.S. policy of first-use of nuclear weapons and makes no
>mention of taking nuclear weapons off alert. The unthinkable, a devastating
>nuclear exchange triggered by accident, miscalculation or intent, is thus as
>real as ever.

>

>Finally, the PDD affirmation that the U.S. will continue to maintain nuclear
>weapons as the cornerstone of the nation's strategic defense, gives no hope
>for progress, and contravenes the NPT obligation, recently reaffirmed by the
>International Court of Justice, to conduct negotiations in good faith on
>complete nuclear disarmament.

>

>Two public opinion polls in 1997 indicated that negotiations for the abolition
>of nuclear weapons are supported by over 80% of the US public. The aim of
>nuclear abolition was also supported by 60 retired Generals and Admirals in a
>statement on nuclear weapons in December 1996.

>

>Nuclear weapons threaten the security of all U.S. citizens and of humanity
>itself. We regret, therefore, that neither the Congress nor the public has
>been involved in the nuclear policy review, and we call for a new review
>including such democratic participation. We note that other countries,

>including Canada, are consulting with their legislatures and public in
>reviewing nuclear policies in light of current developments.

>
>Yours sincerely,
>
>

John Burroughs
Western States Legal Foundation
1440 Broadway, Suite 500
Oakland, California, USA 94612
Tel: +1 510 839 5877
Fax: +1 510 839 5397
E-mail: jburroughs@igc.apc.org
Western States is part of Abolition 2000:
A Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons

Return-Path: <VJAROSZE@MacArthu.macfdn.org>
From: VJAROSZE@MacArthu.macfdn.org
Date: Tue, 20 Jan 98 14:45:53 cst
Encoding: 51 Text
To: mupj@igc.apc.org
Subject: E-mail Acknowledgement/MacArthur Foundation

THE JOHN D. AND CATHERINE T. MACARTHUR FOUNDATION
Grants Management, Research and Information
Suite 1100
140 S. Dearborn Street
Chicago, IL 60603
312-726-8000
e-mail: 4answers@macfdn.org
<HTTP://www.macfdn.org>

To:
Mr. Howard W. Hallman
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
1500 16th St., NW
Washington, DC 20036-4479

Thank you for contacting the MacArthur Foundation. This is to acknowledge receipt of your correspondence, which is currently being reviewed.

Please refer to our tracking number 52137 in all related correspondence.

The MacArthur Foundation is currently revising its programs and, as a result, will be issuing new grant making guidelines early in 1998. Your material will be reviewed in terms of both the Foundation's continuing and emerging interests. In light of this, please understand that it may take somewhat longer than our normal six to eight weeks to respond to your request. When the MacArthur Foundation's new guidelines are complete, they will be posted on the Foundation's Internet home page (www.macfdn.org) and available by mail.

We will be in touch with you again as soon as possible. Thank you again for your interest.

Valentina Jaroszenko
Grants Administrator

To: "Jim Hipkins" <70761.2655@compuserve.com>, "Phil Miller" <72124.3602@compuserve.com>

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

Subject: Proposed letter

Cc:

Bcc:

X-Attachments:

Dear Trusted Advisers:

I'm moving along in my efforts to mobilize world religious leaders to influence the upcoming session of the NPT Preparatory Committee in Geneva. This includes an advance statement going to heads of states and foreign ministers and a reception for delegates the first day of the two-week session. To facilitate this, I want to go to an NGO planning session in Geneva on February 20-21 and also to the PrepCom session, April 27 to May 8. I've applied to the MacArthur Foundation for a grant to cover these expenses plus some of my time, but I have no idea whether we will get the grant. Meanwhile, I am buying plane tickets because there are bargains available, especially for the February trip.

Not being a rich person, I would like to raise some money for MUPJ to cover my travel costs, including hotel and meals in Geneva, and not wait for a decision from the MacArthur Foundation. As a start in this direction, I have included a special appeal in the attached draft membership renewal letter to 48 MUPJ members who last gave in December 1996. I'm not sure this is appropriate. I'm a little uncomfortable about making a request in which I am the direct beneficiary, but maybe it's all right.

An alternative would be to ask the two of you, as treasurer and Peace Leaf editor, to make a separate appeal and also include the 60 or so other MUPJ members (those who have contributed in the past year). A differently worded appeal might go to UM bishops, asking them to tap contingency funds or otherwise support this mission. There are few peace-oriented, local churches we might also approach.

I would like your advice on this matter.

Shalom,
Howard

#####

January 20, 1998

Dear Member:

It is time for us to ask you to renew your annual financial support of Methodists United for Peace with Justice. Your contribution helps supports our advocacy efforts in Washington, D.C. for the abolition of nuclear weapons and other important peace and justice issues. It also enables us to publish Peace Leaf four times of year and to send out other information to grassroots activists.

At the moment we are in the middle of the campaign to achieve Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), a long-sought objective of the peace movement. We have been serving as a catalyst to mobilize the religious community, both denominational offices and peace fellowships, and to link it with the broader CTBT ratification campaign. We are particularly focusing attention on 24 states with one or more senators considered to be swing votes.

On a broader front we are part of the international citizens movement known as Abolition 2000. As a co-convener of the Religious Working Group on Nuclear Abolition, I am in the process of getting the world religious community to focus on the upcoming session of the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty Preparatory Committee (NPT PrepCom), which

will meet in Geneva from April 27 to May 8. Abolition 2000 is urging the PrepCom to establish a working committee to start drafting a nuclear weapons convention that would eliminate nuclear weapons throughout the world. I am helping draft a statement to PrepCom delegates from world religious leaders. The Religious Working Group is organizing a reception in Geneva so that delegates can meet with and hear from these religious leaders. We have commitments from world Protestant and Catholic leaders and are seeking participation of persons from other faiths.

In Washington Methodists United for Peace with Justice participates in the Monday Lobby, a coalition of peace organizations, which orchestrates lobbying of Congress and the Clinton administration on issues of nuclear disarmament, arms trade, military spending, and UN financing. We continue to work closely with the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society.

Your financial support helps pay our expenses for telephone, fax, e-mail, office supplies, printing, and mailing. Basic dues are \$15, but many of our members contribute more. Your check for annual dues should be payable to "Methodists United for Peace with Justice" and is a non-tax deductible contribution.

You may also make a tax-deductible contribution to "MUPJ Education Fund", which helps pay the cost of publishing Peace Leaf and other educational activities.

In addition, this year we are seeking special contributions to the Education Fund to help pay my travel costs in connection with NPT PrepCom activities. This will entail two trips to Geneva this spring,. The first is to help plan PrepCom activities of non-governmental organizations and mobilize NGO support in their home countries prior to the session. The second trip will allow me to be in Geneva during the two-week PrepCom session where I will help stage the religious leaders reception and an ecumenical worship service and will be part of Abolition 2000 efforts to convince delegates to set up the working group to draft a nuclear weapons convention.

This is an extraordinary opportunity for Methodists United for Peace with Justice to exercise our influence at a crucial moment in the quest for nuclear abolition. Thus, a special contribution to "MUPJ Education Fund" from you, your local church, or some other organization would be most welcome.

With your continued support we will remain steadfast in our work on peace and justice issues.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Return-Path: <disarmament@igc.apc.org>
Date: Tue, 20 Jan 1998 16:16:33 -0500
From: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.apc.org>
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse
To: paprog@igc.org, panukes@igc.org, vision@igc.org, ledwidge@psr.org,
tperry@uscsusc.org, wandwill@clark.net, meldredge@igc.org,
mupj@igc.org, davidhart@igc.org
CC: dkimball@clw.org
Subject: Colo. Sample Letter

**Please distribute this to your members in Colorado. It is especially important to try to generate some pro-CTBT activity in Colorado, Springs, Fort Collins, Greeley, and Western Slope communities. Please let me know of any positive response.

Kathy

**ACTION ALERT FOR COLORADO
NEW STATE POLL SHOWS 77% OF COLORADOANS WANT CTBT
SAMPLE LETTER TO EDITOR**

A recent poll shows that an overwhelming majority of Colorado voters support Senate approval of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). (See NEWS RELEASE enclosed) For more details on the poll contact: Daryl Kimball, Executive Director of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers (202) 546-0795.

The Denver Post covered this story over the weekend.

This is useful information to included in your letters to Senators, media & public education work.

Below is a sample letter to the editor. We urge all Coloradans working for a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty Now to submit a letter to your local papers. For assistance and more that you can do for a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty Now, please contact:

Disarmament Clearinghouse
1101 14th Street NW #700
Washington DC 20005
Tel: 202 898 0150 ext. 232
Fax: 202 898 0172
<disarmament@igc.org>

SAMPLE LETTER TO EDITOR

Dear Editor:

A recent poll shows that Coloradoans overwhelmingly support ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). This treaty to prohibit nuclear weapons test explosions worldwide will be considered this year by the U.S. Senate. The CTBT has been sought for over 4 decades by [your organization] along with citizens worldwide seeking a permanent end to nuclear test explosions, and a significant step toward

nuclear disarmament. Beginning with President Eisenhower, U.S. Presidents have sought this treaty to help prevent nuclear proliferation. Nationwide polls through the years have consistently shown support for the CTBT. The most recent national poll showed 70% of U.S. citizens favor a treaty banning nuclear test explosions.

77% of Colorado voters said that the United States should approve the CTBT. After over 1,030 nuclear test explosions - two in Colorado- now is the time for the U.S. Senate to ratify this treaty. Senators Ben Nighthorse Campbell and Wayne Allard, should both declare their support for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and begin now to ensure that the CTBT is ratified this year.

COALITION TO REDUCE NUCLEAR DANGERS

***** NEWS RELEASE *****

Coloradoans Support Ratification of Nuclear Test Ban Treaty:
New State Poll Shows 77% Approval

FOR RELEASE: January 16, 1998
CONTACTS: Daryl Kimball, Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, (202) 546-0795
x136

Sam Cole, Colorado Chapter of Physicians for Social Responsibility, (303) 298-8001

(January 16, 1998) A new poll shows that an overwhelming majority of Colorado voters support Senate approval of a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), one of the major national security matters to be addressed by the Congress in 1998. When asked if the United States Senate should approve or disapprove of a treaty signed by the United States and 140 other countries "which would prohibit nuclear weapons test explosions worldwide," 77% of respondents say the treaty should be approved, while only 14% do not feel such a treaty should be approved, while 9% said they "don't know."

The results are based on a survey of 400 registered voters in Colorado. Telephone interviewing was conducted December 15 to 17, 1997 by The Mellman Group, a respected national polling firm based in Washington, DC, for the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers. The statistical margin of error for the sample as a whole is plus or minus 4.9 percentage points at the 95% confidence level.

Beginning with President Dwight D. Eisenhower, U.S. presidents have sought to help prevent nuclear proliferation through a ban on nuclear testing. President Clinton has said the Treaty will "help to prevent the nuclear powers from developing more advanced weapons ... and will limit the possibilities for other states to acquire such devices." After over 1,030 U.S. nuclear explosions (including two conducted in Colorado), weapons scientists have determined that nuclear testing is not necessary to maintain the nation's arsenal.

Last September, the President transmitted the Treaty to the Senate for its advice and consent. Hearings on the Treaty are planned for next month and a vote is expected by some time in 1998. Colorado Senators Ben Nighthorse Campbell and Wayne Allard, both Republicans, have not yet declared their position on the Treaty. Support from moderate Republican Senators is considered necessary to secure the 67 votes needed for CTBT ratification. One key GOP leader on the issue, Pete Domenici (R-NM), has said he is "leaning strongly in favor" of the treaty.

The Colorado poll shows that the CTBT enjoys strong bipartisan support. Although Independents (82% approve, 9% disapprove) and Democrats (79% approve, 12% disapprove) are most supportive of CTBT ratification, Republicans also support the proposal by a 50 point margin (70% approve, 20% disapprove). Even self-identified "conservatives" support the proposal by a 45 point margin (65% approve, 20% disapprove).

In fact, support for the approval of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty cuts across every demographic group. There are, however, some differences in the level of support for the Treaty across age levels. For example, "Generation Xers" are the most supportive of a nuclear test ban with 86% saying the Senate should approve the treaty and a mere 7% who say the Senate should not ratify the CTBT. Seniors are slightly less supportive of the ban (70% approve, 17% disapprove), although older voters still favor the treaty by more than a 50 point margin.

Support for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is strong in all areas of the state (Denver metro: 76% support, 15% oppose; Colorado Springs & Boulder: 78% approve, 13% disapprove; Eastern Plains & Western Slope: 76% support, 13% disapprove).

The results of the new survey of Colorado voters' opinions on the nuclear test ban issue are consistent with the results of the most recent national opinion survey on the CTBT (released on September 26, 1997), which showed 70% support for test ban treaty ratification and only 13.5% disapproval.

"What is striking about the results in Colorado, as in the nation as a whole, is the overwhelming nature of support for this Treaty. Indeed, far from being a partisan issue, support for a nuclear test ban treaty comes from all sides of the political spectrum," commented pollster Mark Mellman.

-- 30 --

The Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers is a national alliance of 16 leading arms control and disarmament organizations working together for a practical, step-by-step program to reduce nuclear dangers and prevent new threats from emerging. For more information on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty see the Coalition's web site.

Copies of Secretary of Energy Federico Peña's statement responding to the poll results are available by request by calling the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, 202-546-0795.

Return-Path: <disarmament@igc.apc.org>
Date: Tue, 20 Jan 1998 19:17:28 -0500
From: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.apc.org>
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse
To: dkimball@clw.org, cdavis@clw.org, disarmament@igc.org, bridget@fcnl.org,
73744.3675@compuserve.org, mupj@igc.org, meldrege@igc.org,
dculp@nrdc.org, paprog@igc.org, btiller@psr.org, ledwidge@psr.org,
vision@igc.org, tcollina@ucsusa.org, davidhart@igc.org,
wandwill@clark.net
Subject: NWWG Priorities

TO: NWWG
From: Kathy Crandall & Lisa Ledwidge
Date: Tues. January 20

Our Next Meeting: Thursday, Jan. 22 at 9:00 am at Mott House.

We decided at our last meeting that we would try to come up with concrete proposals for the structure of NWWG and make final decisions at this Jan. 22nd meeting. I have a few notes from the latter half of our last meeting, and a proposal from Fran Teplitz (Peace Action).

It would be extremely helpful if others could also make similar written proposals available. You can send them to Lisa or me and we will make sure that they are available for the meeting on Thursday. Even better - you can e-mail them to all NWWG participants ahead of time.

Notes from the last NWWG meeting. (People should feel free to correct proposals/ statements. I apologize in advance if I have grossly misrepresented anybody's position.):

Maureen Eldredge proposed that our work focus on legislation related to nuclear weapons complex issues and the budget process and nuclear weapons related treaties. Our work should be activist-oriented, geared toward mobilizing our activists in the field.

Bob Tiller noted that he valued being able to look at all aspects of one issue in the course of a meeting and that he also valued having enough time to do our work and would like to avoid cutting-short our meeting times.

Fran Teplitz noted that at the ATWG meetings people report on other issues and focus only on action components - which might be a useful model for our meetings.

Lisa Ledwidge endorsed Maureen's proposal and said that we need to clarify which we will actually act upon. We could have two categories - issues that we exchange information about, and issues that we collectively develop a strategy and work on. We should also designate a clear reporting system from other meetings - including one person who is responsible for taking notes at other meetings and reporting back to NWWG. Proposed a separate CTBT Grassroots Strategy meeting that

precedes/follows NWWG meetings - at the same place.

Howard Hallman noted that he comes to these meetings mainly to participate in the CTBT organizing.

Daryl Kimball proposed that clear, brief written reports from working groups should be brought to this meeting & that CTBT grassroots action needs to be discussed at NWWG meetings, and that we should do this without creating another meeting - but rather expand on an as-needed basis to deal with CTBT grassroots strategy

Lisa responded to Daryl and Howard - we have been trying to integrate CTBT grassroots strategy discussion into our NWWG meetings, but we don't seem to have a winning CTBT strategy and other priorities /issues of NWWG have been squeezed out.

David Culp offered 2 proposals. 1) Leave deep cuts and de- alerting to the Deep Cuts Working Group of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers and allow for 5 minutes on the agenda of the NWWG where one person will report on these issues and 2) NATO work should be left off of our agenda altogether.

Bill Eisenstein proposed that we e-mail our informational reports outside of NWWG meetings.

Maureen Eldredge: Endorsed David's proposals and supports a meeting to develop a coherent CTBT grassroots strategy.

Proposal from Fran Teplitz, Peace Action Ed. Fund

NWWG Content:

Based on the poll data compiled by Maureen, CTB, deep cuts/de- alerting and "stockpile stewardship" are at the top of the issue list. I would recommend that the NATO working group bring action items to NWWG but that no strategy on NATO be fleshed out at NWWG.

If there are urgent alerts concerning other nuclear issues, I recommend they be raised during the announcement section, and those seeking further info. or involvement meet separately with the announcer to make plans.

PAEF would like to see NWWG as a forum for fleshing out the work on the 3 subjects above - particularly grassroots work since we have so many grassroots/membership organizations in NWWG. NWWG would focus on strategies for specific states — and get groups to take assignments.

NWWG structure:

Meet weekly for one or one and one-half hours.

*brief issue update on CTB, deep cuts/de-alerting, "stockpile stewardship" (5-10 minutes)

*identify which issues require a strategy discussion that week. For some issues a strategy check-in may be enough (i.e., any progress or problems to report? Continue on same track?) This should be done by a quick show of hands — not debate!

*work on strategy details for the bulk of the meeting.

*announcements (5 minutes)

I think the bigger picture of CTBT strategy should be raised at the CTBT working group of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers. In our office we will keep thinking about this — I look forward to our next meeting.

Return-Path: <owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org>
CC: ledwidge@psr.org
Date: Tue, 20 Jan 1998 19:28:32 -0500
From: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.apc.org>
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse
Sender: owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org
Subject: PRESIDENTIAL ALERT
To: ctbt-organize@igc.org

Dear CTBT Organizers:

ONE WEEK BEFORE THE STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS, SEND A MESSAGE TO THE PRESIDENT: RATIFICATION OF THE CTBT MUST BE A TOP PRIORITY NOW.

When I originally put this action alert out, I mistakenly gave you the wrong fax number. Thank you very much to those of you who brought the error to my attention. The correct fax number to the White House is:
(202) 456 1121.

It is especially important for those of you in key states to keep the pressure on your Senators. If you would like assistance in formulating letters to your Senators, or effective strategies for meetings with Senators or their staffs, please contact the Disarmament Clearinghouse.

In the meantime, we also need to maintain pressure to ensure that President Clinton and his administration work very hard for this Treaty, so we urge you -especially those of you in states where you know your Senators will vote for the CTBT- to send this message to the President this week.

For more information or assistance with the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW campaign, please contact:

Disarmament Clearinghouse
Kathy Crandall, Coordinator
1101 14th Street NW #700
Washington, DC 20005
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232
FAX: 202 898 0172
<disarmament@igc.org>

The Disarmament Clearinghouse is a project of:
Peace Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Plutonium Challenge,
& Women's Action for New Directions

NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY NOW:

Many of you have already been actively engaged in the effort to achieve a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty Now. Early hearings on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) have already occurred in the U.S. Senate. Early in 1998 more hearings will occur, and the final debate and vote is expected this year.

Now is a crucial time for the Clinton Administration to work hard for the CTBT. Analysts say that without strong support from the President, the CTBT could get lost in the busy Senate schedule for this year. The longer we wait, the harder support for the CTBT in the Senate will be to attain.

President Clinton's upcoming State of the Union Address, on Tuesday, January 27, 1998, provides an opportunity for the President to state clearly his commitment to the CTBT. It also provides an opportunity for CTBT advocates nationwide - especially including states where Senators already clearly support the CTBT - to urge the President to work hard for a CTBT this year.

WHAT YOU CAN DO:

FAX a message to President Clinton asking him to declare his commitment to the CTBT, and work hard to support U.S. Senate Ratification this year.

PLEASE SEND THIS MESSAGE RIGHT NOW, SO THAT THE PRESIDENT RECEIVES MANY MESSAGES BEFORE HIS STATE OF THE UNION SPEECH ON JANUARY 27, 1998.

FAX YOUR MESSAGE TO: The Honorable William Jefferson Clinton
President of the United States of America
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington DC 20500
FAX: 202 456 1121

Sample Letter * Sample Letter * Sample Letter * Sample Letter

Dear Mr. President,

January 1998

Thank you for your commitment to the nuclear Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). We appreciate your leadership that was vital to ensuring the Treaty's completion in 1996. We are proud that the United States was the very first country to sign the CTBT.

Now the time has come for the U.S. to lead the charge toward implementing the CTBT. We hope that you and your administration will work vigorously with the Senate this year to ensure that the CTBT is considered and ratified in 1998.

When signing the CTBT on September 24, 1996, you said: "By overwhelming global consensus we will make a solemn commitment to end all nuclear tests for all time." This year you stated in your address to the United Nations General Assembly opening, "Our common goal should be for the CTBT to enter into force as soon as

possible." (At the United Nations General Assembly Opening Sept. 22, 1997.) It is essential that the United States lead the way toward this goal, and follow-through on our solemn commitment to end all nuclear tests for all time.

We were also encouraged by your remarks at the signing of the CTBT that " [the CTBT] points us toward a century in which the roles and risks of nuclear weapons can be further reduced and ultimately eliminated." We urge further steps on this path in 1998.

We are counting on you, Mr. President, to ensure that this longest-sought, hardest-fought treaty is implemented and is a significant step toward a nuclear weapons-free 21st Century.

For more information or assistance with the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW campaign, please contact:

Disarmament Clearinghouse
Kathy Crandall, Coordinator
1101 14th Street NW #700
Washington, DC 20005
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232
FAX: 202 898 0172
<disarmament@igc.org>

The Disarmament Clearinghouse is a project of:
Peace Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Plutonium Challenge,
& Women's Action for New Directions

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Wed, 21 Jan 1998 10:02:13 +100
From: Appel des Cent <appel100@worldnet.fr>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: TR: new website for abolition 2000
To: "'abolition-caucus@igc.org'" <abolition-caucus@igc.org>
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igcb.igc.org id EAA03309

For those who are interested in practising their french and know a bit more about the french issues linked with Abolition 2000, please take notice of this web site
<http://home.worldnet.fr/~appel100>

For those who are listed among the favourite sites, it's would be nice and convenient that it's based on reciprocity
Ben Cramer.

De : Administrateur système
Date d'envoi : mardi 20 janvier 1998 11:26
A : Appel des Cent
Objet : Non remis: new website for abolition 2000

Certains des destinataires ou tous les destinataires n'ont pas reçu votre message.

Objet : new website for abolition 2000
Date d'envoi : 19/01/98 13:07:27

Impossible d'atteindre le(s) destinataire(s) suivant(s) :

'aboliton-caucus@igc.org' le 20/01/98 11:26:21
Aucun fournisseur de transport n'était disponible pour la remise à ce destinataire.

Return-Path: <owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org>

Date: Wed, 21 Jan 1998 10:01:21 -0500

From: disarmament@igc.org

Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse

Sender: owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org

Subject: Clinton to CD

To: ctb-followers@igc.org

MSNBC/ Reuters January 20, 1998

THE UNITED States, China and Russia have been under fire from other members of the international community for declining to join the 121 states which last month signed the Ottawa Treaty banning anti-personnel landmines. The weapons are blamed for killing 25,000 people a year.

The 61-member CD grouping, sponsored by the United Nations, opened its 1998 session on Tuesday amid multiple calls for launching substantive negotiations on both landmines and fissile material after a year of impasse.

The five declared nuclear powers — Britain, China, France, Russia and the United States — have been locked in a row with non-aligned countries who have demanded they also engage in negotiations aimed at total elimination of nuclear weapons.

"As you resume your critical efforts to strengthen global security, I pledge the full support of the United States delegation in taking the next steps in the nuclear disarmament process and banning anti-personnel landmines from the face of the earth," Clinton said in a brief statement.

"No issues are more important today to this body's work than a cut-off of fissile material production for nuclear explosives and a worldwide ban on the export of anti-personnel landmines."

Clinton said he was confident that the CD would meet the challenge, adding: "If the Conference can promptly conclude these accords, complementing deep bilateral reductions in nuclear arms and the Ottawa Convention, we will take important steps on the road to a world that is free of nuclear weapons and safe for children to tread."

Grey, the new U.S. envoy to the forum, returns to Washington next week for hearings at the Senate, which is being asked to confirm him as disarmament ambassador in Geneva.

U.N. Secretary-General Kofi Annan, in a message to the talks, called for launching negotiations to translate the Ottawa Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines into a global ban.

"It is now for your Conference, comprising all relevant states, to play its role in achieving the desired goal of ensuring universal adherence to a total ban on landmines," Annan said. "It is for you, finally, to rid the world of the scourge of anti-personnel landmines."

But both fissile material and landmines remain inextricably caught up in demands by non-aligned to launch negotiations for total disarmament, according to diplomats.

Sweden's ambassador Lars Norberg, who serves as CD chairman this month and next, has been conducting intensive consultations with

key delegations to try to identify common ground.

On Tuesday, he said there seemed to be "prospects for an emerging consensus on certain issues," but he was not specific.

South African ambassador Jacob Selebi, a major voice among non-aligned countries, proposed setting up an adhoc committee on nuclear disarmament which would "deliberate upon practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons as well as to identify if and when one or more such steps should be the subject of negotiations in the Conference."

Both the New Zealand and Canadian envoys took the floor to endorse the South African initiative. But diplomats said major powers would have trouble accepting any body on nuclear disarmament.

FROM: Disarmament Clearinghouse

1101 14th Street NW #700

Washington DC 20005

TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232

FAX: 202 898 0172

<disarmament@igc.org>

To: eeregehr@waterv1.uwaterloo.ca
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Statements by religious leaders
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Ernie Regehr:

I am writing to you at the suggestion of Bev DeLong, who has shared with me her analysis, "The Ottawa Process and Nuclear Weapons."

As a co-convenor of the Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition, I have taken the lead in organizing a reception of world religious leaders for delegates of the NPT Preparatory Committee, to be held on April 27, the first evening of the PrepCom session in Geneva. Dr. Konrad Raiser, general secretary of the World Council of Churches, and Cardinal Danneels, president of Pax Christi International, have agreed to serve as hosts, make welcoming remarks, and offer ideas on what the PrepCom can accomplish. Cardinal Danneels is seeking official representation from the Holy See, and we are looking for representations from other religious faiths.

Prior to the PrepCom we hope to send a statement to heads of states and foreign ministers with the above persons as signers, urging them to instruct their delegates to go to the session with a commitment to advance the cause of nuclear disarmament, especially to support the Marshall Island proposal to set up an intersessional working group to start drafting a nuclear weapons convention. The draft statement emphasizes Earth stewardship and indicates that non-nuclear weapons states, out of their responsibility to all of humankind and Earth itself, should go ahead with this effort even if the nuclear weapons states won't participate initially. If that statement can go out by the end of February or early March, we hope that religious bodies in various nations will approach their governments, endorsing this perspective.

Bev DeLong indicates that you are developing a policy statement on nuclear weapons, to be issued by leaders of major denominations in Canada. This sounds as if we are moving in the same direction. I would like to receive a copy of your statement when it is ready, and I'll send you the one by world religious leaders that I am working on as soon as it is approved.

Many of us hope that Canada will be one of the nations to step out in front on nuclear disarmament, as it did on land mines, in spite of counter pressures from the United States. I would think that the faith community can be an influence in that direction.

Let's keep in touch.

Shalom,

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

To: edibal@iprolink.ch
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: PrepCom preparations
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Edith:

I have several matters I want to discuss with you.

1. I have decided to go to Geneva for the February 20-21 NGO planning meeting for the NPT so that the Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition will be represented. I'll go a day early so that I can work out details for our reception and other matters. I notice that the European Abolition 2000 Network is meeting on Sunday, February 23. Would I be able to attend as an observer?
2. I would like suggestions for accommodations for the nights of Wednesday, February 18 through Sunday, February 22. Something not too expensive. (I've heard that Geneva is high cost.) I would share a room if some one else wants to reduce his costs in this manner.
3. We have written to Ambassador Wyzner, inviting him and other delegates to the reception put on by religious leaders, and asking if our date of April 27 will not interfere with any reception that he might be hosting. Jonathan Dean has also given him a copy of our letter. As you know, we have space available at the Ecumenical Centre, but we have been advised that a reception at Palais des Nations makes it easier to attract more delegates. Do you have any clarification whether this would be possible? Also, I want your advice on numbers. If we invite the delegates and NGO representatives (say, one per organization), how many would we expect to attend? 200? 300? What would be the cost? We will be able to raise the money, but we need a budget.
4. We have talked about having an ecumenical worship service during the second week of the PrepCom and now want to work out plans. I'm told such services have been held during other meetings of this kind. What time of day would be best? Can this be worked into the NGO calendar without conflicting with any other event? I assume it would be held at the Ecumenical Centre.

I greatly appreciate what you and others in Geneva are doing to work out arrangements for NGO participation in the PrepCom.

Shalom,
Howard

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.org
Date: Wed, 21 Jan 1998 13:07:40 -0800 (PST)
From: Alice Slater <aslater@igc.apc.org>
X-Old-Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: International/NPT Minutes
To: warpeace@interport.net, kcantw9473@aol.com, falvo@nymc.edu,
myriamm@aol.com, sfraser@igc.org, HKH522@ix.netcom.com,
cmtinnitus@aol.com, gkarlsson@igc.apc.org, nypaxchristi@igc.apc.org,
peggy_kerry@pipeline.com, jklotz@ibm.net, wrl@igc.apc.org,
jem@igc.apc.org, paintl@igc.apc.org, metropeace@aol.com,
worldfed@igc.apc.org, crramey@igc.apc.org, wedo@igc.apc.org,
psrnyc@igc.apc.org, paz4jus@aol.com, esrmetro@aol.com,
disarmtimes@igc.apc.org, ptasso@pipeline.com, tovish@aol.com,
lcnp@aol.com, srfnyusa@igc.apc.org, johnanne@ctconverge.com,
tinabell@walrus.com, EEnloe@afsc.org, flick@igc.apc.org
X-Sender: aslater@pop.igc.org (Unverified)
Sender: majordomo@igc.apc.org

MINUTES

TO: Abolition 2000 Working Group for the NPT
FROM: Alice Slater
DATE: January 21, 1998

Present: Present: Alyn Ware (Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy), Tina Bell (NY Metro WILPF & Oxford Research Group), Roger Smith (NGO Committee on Disarmament), Alice Slater (GRACE), Chris Nye (World Resisters League), Bruna Nota (WILPF), Lucy Webster (ECAAR), Tracy Moavereo (Peace Action), Chris Mulready (Pax Christi), Selma Brackman (War and Peace Foundation), Gloria Lawrence (Gloria Lawrence Assoc.), Chris McCavitt (GRACE)

NEXT MEETING: Wed., Feb. 25th, 12-2 PM, GRACE, 15 E. 26th St., 10th floor, bring lunch, coffee and tea will be served. RSVP: Chris West, 212-726-9161

NPT PREP COM

Alice Slater reported that she will be in Geneva on February 19-20th for a planning meeting with the NGO Committee on Disarmament in Geneva for the NPT Prepcom. It was agreed that it would be extremely beneficial to have a large NGO contingent at the Prepcom, but that it was also important to have people working in their home countries in case immediate contact with governments was necessary as a result of events at the NPT.

The following panels are planned but not yet scheduled:
Nuclearization of Space (Tina Bell will speak with Karl Grossman about organizing the panel; Rosalie Bertel was suggested as a participant)
INESAP/IALANA panel on the Nuclear Weapons Convention and Technical Verification (Alyn will speak to Merav Datani about new title and date)
Nuclear Waste, Colonialism, and Environmental Racism (Myrla Baldonado)

Gaby Tetriahari, Titi Hau, Tahiti is likely to come to Geneva and could be on the waste and health panels. Tina Bell said that more speakers were needed for the nuclear space issue, and Bill Sulzberger was suggested. Alice reported that there was no Abolition 2000 funds for travel to Geneva,

but the Transition Team is making certain inquiries to raise travel money for some of the participants. IF YOU HAVE SUGGESTIONS ON HOW TO FUND SOME TRAVEL, PLEASE LET US KNOW.

Alice Slater reported that the letter written to Ambassador Strulak on NGO participation was forwarded to Ambassador Eugeniusz Wyzner, who will be Chairing the PrepCom.. Wyzner has been transferred to New York as the Polish Ambassador to the UN, and Alice has requested a meeting for a delegation of Abolition 2000 members to discuss our requests for broader NGO participation at the PrepCom. Roger Smith reported on a meeting he and members of the NGO Committee on Disarmament had with Wyzner last week, who seemed sympathetic to NGO concerns. Roger corrected his report of Jonathan Dean's proposal at that meeting, which had been posted to the Abolition-Caucus on 1-15. Dean suggested that IN ADDITION to the NGO presentation session, there should be a SEPARATE panel discussion with selected delegates and NGOs which would allow for more give and take. We discussed our request of October 10, 1997 in our letter to Ambassador Strulak (forwarded to Wyzner) for 15 NGO presentations in two hours. Since then we learned from Roger's meeting that Ambassador Wyzner is proposing a full three hour session for NGO presentations to the delegates. Bruna Nota cautioned about not giving too many speeches, urging that we try to synthesize the talks, which could be more powerful. We thought we would follow a similar process used at the 1997 PrepCom for condensing the number of speeches (this time with more advanced planning), but would still follow up with Wyzner on the original request we had made.

Lucy Webster noted that the UN meeting room in Geneva is much more accessible to NGOs than in New York. She pointed out the need in Geneva for adequate copying facilities in the UN building. We need a systematic way for distributing NGO and Delegates papers back and forth. Lucy will set up a meeting with the Secretary of the PrepCom , Hannelore Hoppe who is here in New York, to discuss these issues. Tina Bell suggested that the NGO Liasion Service may be of help with logistics.

NUKES IN SPACE

Tina reported that WILPF is due to produce a two page fact sheet on space issues and a list of delegates whom it would be useful to visit and would like help with visits. WILPF is planning a public meeting with Karl Grossman on Saturday, January 31, 12:00 Noon, UN Church Center, 777 UN Plaza, 44 & 1st.(bring lunch - coffee provided)

HEALTH & RADIATION

Tina reported that the United Nations Scientific Committee on the effects of Atomic Radiation will soon produce a report on low level radiation. She will post information about the report and we will try to do some grassroots follow-up.

THE NATION MAGAZINE ABOLITION ISSUE

Jonathan Schell has a long article on nuclear abolition which takes almost an entire double issue of The Nation Magazine (Feb.2/9, 1998). (Abolition 2000 put an ad in that issue on how to join our Network). Tracy Mauvero is going to the DC press conference Feb. 5th at American University, Washington DC, 12:30 -2:00. For more information, visit www.TheNation.com, the website of the magazine. MS/NBC will also feature Schell's essay on its web site ,

www.MSNBC.com, where there will be an interactive quiz to test your knowledge of nuclear weapons and a chat session with Schell. It was suggested that a strategy for putting the issue in the hands of government leaders and other decision makers be considered.

GENERAL LEE BUTLER ABOLITION PRESS CONFERENCE

General Butler is releasing a statement by nearly 100 Civilian world leaders in support of Abolition on Feb. 2 in Washington DC. Alice will call his press secretary to see if there is anything we can do to follow-up here.

STOCKPILE STEWARDSHIP - US CONGRESSIONAL SIGN-ON LETTER

We need to get members of Congress to sign on to Congresswoman Lynne Woolsey's Dear Colleague letter to President Clinton asking him to change the Stockpile Stewardship Program from one that will enable the continued design of new nukes with subcritical tests to a passive curatorship of the arsenal while it awaits dismantlement

Gloria Lawrence and Alyn Ware will contact Charles Schumer (D, NY)

Tracy will contact Peace Action to follow-up.

Tina said that WILPF is going to make the letter the focus of a letter writing campaign.

Chris Mulready will contact her metropolitan Pax Christi network

CLINTON'S PRESIDENTIAL DECISION DIRECTIVE ON NUCLEAR POLICY

Alyn reported on the new Presidential Decision Directive on nuclear arms policy. The last PDD was issued in 1981. It is not available and so it is difficult to know exactly what is in it, but from leaks in the press we know it is AWFUL. Clinton now says that the US reserves the right to use nuclear weapons against biological and chemical weapons and will continue to rely on nuclear deterrence. Alyn Ware has written a letter to the President urging a public debate of the PDD and has posted it to the abolition-caucus for sign-ons by NGOs. Gloria will speak with Senator Moynihan (D, NY) to call for a public disclosure of the policy and a Senate Debate on post-cold war US nuclear policy. Alice will follow up with Admiral Eugene Carroll, who had offered to contact Senator Bumpers. Lucy will contact Jonathan Dean and the PNSR network. Tracy will speak with Peace Action. Selma Brackman will publish an article in the War and Peace newsletter which Alice will write.

Chris Nye will contact Betty Bumpers

MIDDLE POWER INITIATIVE. Alice reported on the Middle Power Initiative, proposed by Doug Roche to organize key states for the purpose of putting pressure on the nuclear weapons states to move towards abolition. The MPI will launch its International Steering Committee during the NPT PrepCom, on May 2nd from 1:00 to 6:00 PM in Geneva.

UNA GLOBAL POLICY PROJECT ON ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT

This UNA project aims to involve a wide range of citizens to consider disarmament issues. Alyn is chair of the sub-committee on nuclear disarmament and invited abolitionists to a meeting on Thurs. Jan. 22, 7:30pm, at UNA, 801 2nd Ave., 2nd floor. Written submissions are also welcome. Contact Alyn at lcnp@aol.com; 212-674-7790(tel); 212-674-6199(fax)

SUSTAINABLE ENERGY AGENCY

Alice and Alyn are exploring a draft treaty to establish a Sustainable

Energy Agency, comparable to the IAEA.

UN DISARMAMENT COMMISSION

Roger reported on the NGO Disarmament Committee's plans during the April meeting of the UN Disarmament Commission which starts April 6th and will address the Treaty on Outer Space on April 14-15th. Topics for NGO panels will be conventional arms control, nuclear free zones, and the possibility of a 4th Special Session on Disarmament. Roger has been asked to organize a nuclear/space oriented event, and asked for help. The meeting overlaps with the first week of the Sustainable Development Committee meeting.

MODEL NUCLEAR WEAPONS CONVENTION.

Alyn Ware said that our model treaty is now an official UN document, # A/C.1.52/7 Congratulations to our Network!!!

Alice Slater
Global Resource Action Center for the Environment(GRACE)
15 E. 26 St., New York, NY 10010
212-726-9161 (tel)
212-726-9160 (fax)
aslater@igc.apc.org

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Comments: Authenticated sender is <ialana@mail.antenna.nl>
Date: Thu, 22 Jan 1998 13:45:59 +0000
From: "Francisca van Holthoorn" <ialana@mail.antenna.nl>
Organization: antenna
Reply-to: ialana@mail.antenna.nl
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: IALANA annual report
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

International Association of Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms

1997 ANNUAL REPORT

Introduction:

1997 has been an eventful year for IALANA, both for the national affiliates and the international secretariat. After its major success on 8 July 1996, when the International Court of Justice (ICJ) issued its Advisory Opinion on the question of the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons, IALANA has not remained idle. It has actively promoted the legal and political implications of this Opinion and it has launched a draft Nuclear Weapons Convention. Moreover, it has taken up a key organizing role in the Hague Appeal for Peace 1999 project, which will culminate in a large-scale international peace conference in the Hague in May 1999, marking the centennial of the First Hague Peace Conference of 1899.

This annual report is a compilation of a series of monthly internal updates which were circulated among IALANA members in 1997. If you would like to receive more details on the following report, please contact the IALANA Office in the Hague.

PUBLICATIONS

The German affiliate has published the book Atomwaffen vor dem Internationalen Gerichtshof (ISBN 3-8258-3243-0) This book contains a series of articles in English and German on the World Court Project which resulted in the issuance of the ICJ Opinion on the question of the legality of threat or use of nuclear weapons. It sketches the background of this project, provides legal analysis of the ICJ Advisory Opinion and provides information on the German as well as the international political arena with respect to the issue on nuclear weapons. The book can be ordered at the IALANA International Secretariat or the German IALANA office for \$7,50 (including shipping). John Burroughs, a US attorney who was commissioned by IALANA to write a book about the Advisory Opinion, has published The (il)legality of Nuclear Weapons: A guide to the Historic Opinion of the International Court of Justice. The book is a comprehensive, accessible analysis of the Advisory Opinion. The book can be ordered at the IALANA office (for \$7,50 including shipping) or from the

Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy, 666 Broadway #625, New York
10012, USA, e-mail: lcnp@aol.com or fax. +1-212-6746199.

OUTREACH

Website: <http://www.ddh.nl/org/ialana>

IALANA has created a homepage which contains the following

information: A short description of IALANA's main activities, text of the ICJ Advisory Opinion and separate/dissenting opinions, text of the model Nuclear Weapons Convention, text of the draft convention on the Limitation and Abolition of the International Arms Trade, bibliography on the ICJ Advisory Opinion and Miscellaneous

Brochure

IALANA has published a new brochure on its objectives and projects.

Copies of this brochure can be ordered from the IALANA office.

Archive

The IALANA office has started to systematically collect articles and books on the ICJ Advisory Opinion. Details of the material gathered so far can be found on the IALANA website or obtained at the IALANA office.

POLITICAL WORK

Due to sustained and effective pressure by IALANA and other citizens organisations a number of important resolutions which refer to the Advisory Opinion have been adopted by the UN General Assembly and the European Parliament: On 10 December 1996 the UN General Assembly adopted resolution 51/45M. This resolution, which was introduced by Malaysia, was adopted with an overwhelming majority. The resolution i.a. 'Underlines the unanimous conclusion of the Court that there exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and international control' and 'Calls upon all states to fulfil that obligation immediately by commencing multilateral negotiations in 1997 leading to an early conclusion of a nuclear weapons convention prohibiting the development, production, testing, deployment and stockpiling, transfer, threat or use of nuclear weapons and providing for their elimination'. On 13 March 1997 the European Parliament adopted resolution which, i.a., welcomes the ICJ Opinion and called for member states to support the commencement of negotiations in 1997 leading to the conclusion of a convention for the abolition of nuclear weapons. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 137 in 138. On 9 December 1997, the UN General Assembly adopted resolution 52/40. Costa Rica has agreed to send the model Nuclear Weapons Convention

INTERNATIONAL EVENTS

On 27 February IALANA held a seminar at the European Parliament on the subject of the 'Eurobomb' and the question whether a European nuclear force would violate the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT). The seminar was attended by IALANA affiliates and members the European parliament. Keynote speeches were given by Jan Wi em Bertens (President of the European Parliament Subcommittee on Security and Disarmament), Dieter Deiseroth (German IALANA) and Ottfried von Nassauer (Project European Nuclear Non-proliferation). On 2 September 1997 Phon van den Biesen (IALANA Secretary) briefed the European Parliament Subcommittee on Security and Disarmament on the ICJ Advisory Opinion. In June 1997 IALANA took part in the European NGO Conference on a Non- Nuclear Europe in Burg Schlaining, Austria. IALANA is one of the co-signers of the Schlaining Manifesto. In September 1997 Francisca van Holthoorn (IALANA Executive Director) attended and addressed a government conference in Tashkent (Uzbekistan) on the establishment of a Nuclear Weapon Free Zone in Central Asia.

MODEL NUCLEAR WEAPONS CONVENTION

During the NPT Preparatory Conference in April 1997, the Model Nuclear Weapons Convention was publicly launched. Keynote speeches were given by Abdullah Ahmad (special envoy of Malaysia to the United Nations), Merav Datan (US IALANA Affiliate), Jonathan Schell (author), Jurgen Scheffran (International Network of Engineers an Scientists). In August 1997 the US IALANA affiliate, International Network of Engineers and Scientists Against Proliferation, International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War and the International Peace Bureau organised a roundtable discussion on the Model Nuclear Weapons Convention and a reception for delegates of the UN Conference on Disarmament. Costa Rica agreed to distribute the Model Nuclear Weapons Convention within the UN as a discussion document (see section on Political Work)

COMPREHENSIVE ARMS RESTRAINT PROJECT

The draft Limitation and Limitation of the International Arms Trade (LAIA) Convention has become part of the larger Comprehensive Arms Restraint Project. This project is co-sponsored by IALANA, the World Order Models Project, International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, International Network of Engineers a Scientists, International Peace Bureau and the NGO Committee on Disarmament. In April 1997 Saul Mendlovitz (World Order Models Project), Peter Weiss (IALANA Co-president) and Merav Datan (US IALANA affiliate) had consultations on the LAIA draft Convention with a number of UN delegates.

NEWS FROM THE IALANA AFFILIATES:

In addition to the routine IALANA work, several IALANA affiliates made special contributions to the work of the organisation:

Canada: Lawyers for Social Responsibility (Canadian IALANA Affiliate) participated in the organisation of a national Implications Seminar'to consider the implications of the ICJ Opinion for Canadian foreign and defence policy. Moreover, LSR participated in the landmines campaign and assisted at the International Landmines Conference in Ottawa in December 1997. Beverley Delong wrote a booklet

entitled Canada and Nuclear Weapons. On 18 March 1997 David Matas participated in a hearing on the Advisory Opinion at the Canadian Parliament. The minutes of this hearing can be ordered from the IALANA Office. United States: The Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy has been particularly active this year in completing and promoting the first public draft of the Model Nuclear Weapons Convention. Moreover, it actively campaigned for the inclusion of the Use and Threat of Use of Nuclear Weapons as a warcrime in the statutes of the International Criminal Court. Germany: The German affiliate published the book Atomwaffen vor dem Internationalen Gerichtshof (see publications). In July 1997 Peter Becker participated in a press conference on NATO enlargement. Dieter Deiseroth wrote a paper on NATO enlargement and international law. This paper can be ordered from the IALANA affiliate or it can be down-loaded from the IALANA website. Japan: Japanese IALANA (JALANA) has translated the entire ICJ Advisory Opinion) into Japanese. JALANA is organising a speaking tour for former ICJ Judge Shahabudeen. The tour is scheduled for 1998. The Netherlands: The Dutch Affiliate (VJV) continued to work on the Proceedi United Kingdom: The UK affiliate organised a seminar at King's Norway: The Norwegian affiliate has written letters to all fore

HAGUE APPEAL FOR PEACE 1999:

Since October 1996 the IALANA in the Hague has served as one of the two secretariats of the Hague Appeal for Peace 1999, the large-scale peace campaign which will culminate in a 5-day peace conference in the Hague in May 1999. This conference will commemorate the First Hague Peace Conference of 1899. A prospectus detailing the organization and key agenda items and an update on latest developments can be obtained from the IALANA Office. The Hague Appeal for Peace 1999 Website can be found at <http://www.haguepeace.org>

UPCOMING EVENTS

At the end of January, Phon van den Biesen (IALANA Secretary) will give a presentation on the Advisory Opinion at the European Parliament.

In April/May 1998 IALANA will take part in the citizens' forum around the NPT Prepcom in Geneva.

In June 1998 IALANA will celebrate its 10th anniversary with a 2-day preparatory conference for the Hague Appeal for Peace 1999.

Return-Path: <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>
Date: Thu, 22 Jan 1998 08:36:34 -0500
From: "Phillip H. Miller" <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>
Subject: Proposed letter
Sender: "Phillip H. Miller" <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>,
"Jim Hipkins" <70761.2655@compuserve.com>,
"Phil Miller" <72124.3602@compuserve.com>
Content-Disposition: inline
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igc7.igc.org id FAA28989

It's my recollection that the Board at its last meeting voted to support your efforts in the area of nuclear disarmament without any limitations. As the proposed travel is timely and significant to this work, I think you should proceed.

In the proposed letter, you might strike the "my" in line 2 of the paragraph starting "In addition, this year we are seeking. . . . The word made the travel, which is really on behalf of the organization, seem too personal. On the other hand, I didn't react the same way when later in the paragraph you write, "...will allow me to be in Geneva. . . . The latter allusion to yourself is obvious since you will be the one representing MUPJ in the meetings.

For your information, the Foundry Peace Mission intends to donate \$250 to MUPJ in conjunction with your discussion of nuclear disarmament issues at its peace class in March.

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
Date: Thu, 22 Jan 1998 13:24:26 -0500 (EST)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: Helms' Committee priorities

TO: Coalition members and friends

FR: Daryl Kimball, Director

RE: Helms on Kyoto; ABM; CTBT

In a letter to President Clinton, Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chair Jesse Helms urges the Administration that: " I will be prepared to schedule Committee consideration of the CTBT only after the Senate has had the opportunity to consider and vote on the Kyoto Protocol and the amendments to the ABM Treaty."

This is clearly the beginning of bargaining over what will come up on the Senate's agenda this year. In my view, Helms' position is not surprising, nor is it unmanagable, if the White House is willing to play hardball.

DK

22 January 1998

CONGRESSIONAL REPORT, THURSDAY, JANUARY 22, 1998

(Helms letter to Clinton on 1998 priorities) (1190)

HELMS WRITES TO CLINTON ON TREATIES AND SFRC PRIORITIES

Senator Jesse Helms (Republican-North Carolina) wrote to President Clinton January 21 to outline the agenda of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which Helms chairs, with respect to treaties and committee priorities during the 1998 year.

Helms told Clinton that the Committee's "first priority when Congress reconvenes will be to work with you and Secretary Albright to secure Senate ratification of NATO expansion.

"The expansion of the Atlantic Alliance to include Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic is of critical importance," Helms said, "and we have come a long way in resolving some of the concerns that I, and other Senators, had raised about various details of this expansion (e.g., ensuring an equitable distribution of costs, limiting Russian influence in NATO decision making, et. al.).

"While much work remains to be done," Helms said, "I am confident that if we continue to work together, the Senate will vote to approve the expansion of

the Atlantic Alliance early this Spring.

"Following the vote on NATO expansion," he said, "the Committee will turn its attention to several other critical treaties which could affect both the security of the American people and the health of the United States' economy. Chief among these are the agreements on Multilateralization and Demarcation of the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty, and the Kyoto Protocol to the U.N. Convention on Climate Change.

"Mr. President, I feel obliged to make clear to you my concern that your Administration has been unwisely and unnecessarily engaged in delay in submitting these treaties to the Senate for its advice and consent."

Following is the text of the letter:

(begin text)

January 21, 1998

The President
The White House
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. President:

As Congress prepares to reconvene shortly, I am convinced that it is important to share with you the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's agenda relating to consideration of treaties during the second year of the 105th Congress.

There are a number of important treaties which the Committee intends to take up during 1998, and we must be assured of your Administration's cooperation in making certain that these treaties receive a comprehensive examination by the Senate.

Mr. President, the Committee's first priority when Congress reconvenes will be to work with you and Secretary Albright to secure Senate ratification of NATO expansion. The expansion of the Atlantic Alliance to include Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic is of critical importance, and we have come a long way in resolving some of the concerns that I, and other Senators, had raised about various details of this expansion (e.g., ensuring an equitable distribution of costs, limiting Russian influence in NATO decision making, et. al.).

While much work remains to be done, I am confident that if we continue to work together, the Senate will vote to approve the expansion of the Atlantic Alliance early this Spring.

Following the vote on NATO expansion, the Committee will turn its attention to several other critical treaties which could affect both the security of the American people and the health of the United States' economy. Chief among these are the agreements on Multilateralization and Demarcation of the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty, and the Kyoto Protocol to the U.N. Convention on Climate Change.

Mr. President, I feel obliged to make clear to you my concern that your Administration has been unwisely and unnecessarily engaged in delay in submitting these treaties to the Senate for its advice and consent.

Despite your commitment, made nearly eight months ago, to submit the amendments to the ABM Treaty to the Senate, we have yet to see them. As our current stand-off with Iraq clearly demonstrates, the danger posed by rogue states possessing weapons of mass destruction is growing -- and, with it, the need for a robust ballistic missile defense.

The Senate has not had an opportunity to consider the rationale behind the ABM Treaty since that treaty was ratified nearly 26 years ago, in the midst of the Cold War. The world has changed a great deal since then. It is vital that the Senate conduct a thorough review of the ABM Treaty this year when it considers and votes on the ABM Multilateralization and Demarcation agreements.

Similarly, the Senate is forced to continue to wait for any indication that your Administration intends to submit the Kyoto Protocol for the Senate's advice and consent. Indeed, I have heard a great deal of discussion from supporters of this treaty indicating that the Administration may attempt to circumvent both the Senate -- and the American people -- by simply imposing the treaty's requirements on U.S. businesses by executive order. Mr. President, I must respectfully counsel this would be extremely unwise.

This treaty dearly requires the advice and consent of the Senate. Further, because the potential impact of the Kyoto Protocol on the American economy is so enormous, we owe it to the American people to let them know sooner, rather than later, whether they will be subject to the terms of this treaty.

Ironically, while the Administration has delayed in submitting these vital treaties to the Senate, some in your Administration have indicated that the White House will press the Senate for swift ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), immediately following the vote on NATO expansion.

Such a deliberate confrontation would be exceedingly unwise because, Mr. President, the CTBT is very low on the Committee's list of priorities. The treaty has no chance of entering into force for a decade or more. Article 14 of the CTBT explicitly prevents the treaty's entry into force until it has been ratified by 44 specific nations. One of those 44 nations is North Korea, which is unlikely to ever ratify the treaty. Another of the 44 nations -- India -- has sought to block the CTBT at every step: vetoing it in the Conference on Disarmament so that it could not be submitted as a Conference document. India has opposed it in the United Nations. And, India has declared that it will not even sign the treaty.

By contrast, the issues surrounding the ABM Treaty and the Kyoto Protocol are far more pressing (e.g., the growing threat posed by nuclear, biological, or chemical-tipped missiles, and the potential impact of the Kyoto Protocol on the U.S. economy).

Mr. President, let me be clear: I will be prepared to schedule Committee

consideration of the CTBT only after the Senate has had the opportunity to consider and vote on the Kyoto Protocol and the amendments to the ABM Treaty.

When the Administration has submitted these treaties, and when the Senate has completed its consideration of them, then, and only then, will the Foreign Relations Committee consider the CTBT.

Mr. President, please let's work together, beginning with the effort to secure Senate ratification of NATO expansion this Spring, and then with your timely transmittal of these treaties.

Sincerely and respectfully,

Jesse Helms

(end text)

John Isaacs
President
Council for a Livable World
110 Maryland Avenue, NE Suite 409
Washington, DC 20002

V: (202) 543-4100
F: (202) 543-6297

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
at Council for a Livable World Education Fund
110 Maryland Ave. NE #201
Washington DC 20002
p: (202)546-0795; fax: (202)546-5142
website: <http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Cc: disarmament@igc.apc.org, peace-caucus@igc.apc.org, petweiss@igc.apc.org
Date: Fri, 23 Jan 1998 01:02:40 EST
From: LCNP <LCNP@aol.com>
Organization: AOL (<http://www.aol.com>)
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Presidential Decision Directive Letter
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

Dear Friends,

Attached is the final version of a letter to President Clinton criticizing the Presidential decision Directive. This letter is intended as complimentary to the one drafted by the Coalition to reduce Nuclear Dangers.

Thank you to everyone who sent comments on the first draft. We have tried to incorporate them into this draft with the exception of the request that we do not commend President Clinton, as there is nothing in the PDD to commend. However the letter only commends the fact that the President acknowledged that it was time to review the old PDD. It does not commend any parts of the new PDD.

We have decided to hold the letter open for a few weeks in order to have time to get more signatures, particularly from heads of organizations and other known people. Any assistance you could offer getting such names would be appreciated.

Yours in peace
Alyn Ware

President William Jefferson Clinton
The White House
Washington DC

Mr. President:

We commend your decision to revise the 1981 nuclear doctrine on fighting a prolonged nuclear war. This policy was always unrealistic and is now totally out of date. We regret, however, that the policy embodied in the new Presidential Decision Directive (PDD) fails to adjust nuclear policy to the realities of the post-Cold War security environment, to specific legal obligations and to the manifest desire of the overwhelming majority of people in this country and throughout the world to be rid, once and for all, of the danger of catastrophic nuclear destruction.

Based on reports in the media which, in the absence of access to the PDD itself, we assume to be accurate, we submit the following comments:

1. The PDD's proclaimed option to use nuclear weapons for protection against biological and chemical weapons cannot but stimulate efforts by other countries to develop a nuclear capability for the same reason. It also violates the negative security assurances contained in the NPT and various

regional nuclear-free zone treaties to which the United States is a party.

2. The failure to announce a no-first-use policy or steps to take nuclear weapons off alert is a grave disappointment and enhances the risk of accidental nuclear war in an increasingly unstable nuclear environment.

3. The secrecy in which the new policy was developed and in which it continues to be wrapped runs counter to the American tradition of public debate on issues of vital interest. No single policy could have more devastating effects if it misfires, yet the Congress and the public have been and continue to be totally excluded from the process.

4. Finally, continuing, indefinite reliance on nuclear weapons as the cornerstone of United States defense strategy is a clear violation of the nuclear disarmament obligation in Article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which was described in the 1996 Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice as an obligation "to bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects."

Two public opinion polls conducted in 1997 confirmed that the aim of nuclear weapons abolition is supported by over 80% of the U.S. public. This aim is also endorsed by 60 retired admirals and generals in their statement of December 1995 and by a group of distinguished world leaders in a statement about to be released.

We therefore urge you, Mr. President, to call for a public debate on this vital question and, as a first step, to release the text of the PDD.

Yours sincerely,

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>

Cc: peace-caucus@igc.apc.org

Date: Fri, 23 Jan 1998 01:02:42 EST

From: LCNP <LCNP@aol.com>

Organization: AOL (<http://www.aol.com>)

Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: UNA Global Policy Study

To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

United Nations Association of the United States of America

GLOBAL POLICY PROJECT

ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

UNA-USA is conducting a Global Policy Project on Arms Control and Disarmament for the 21st Century. The project's aim is to involve a wide range of citizens in considering these issues and in proposing policies for addressing them.

UNA-USA has produced a briefing book which is available for \$10 from:

UNA-USA, 801 Second Avenue, New York, NY 10017. Phone 212 907 1300.

New York residents interested in participating in the project are invited to contact Richard Diesing phone 212 874 2675. The New York Chapter of UNA-USA is considering focusing on landmines, small arms and nuclear disarmament.

New York Chapter Sub-Committee on Nuclear Disarmament

A sub-committee on nuclear disarmament has been formed and will consider particularly the desirability and feasibility of reaching zero nuclear weapons. Anyone interested is invited to make submissions to the committee or to join its meetings.

Contact: Alyn Ware, 666 Broadway #625, New York, NY 10012.

Phone 212 674 7790. Fax 212 674 6199. Email lcnp@aol.col

Next meeting of the nuclear disarmament sub-committee:

Wednesday 28 January

6:00 pm

801 Second Avenue, 2nd floor

New York.

Return-Path: <owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org>

Date: Fri, 23 Jan 1998 08:48:13 -0500

From: disarmament@igc.org

Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse

Sender: owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org

Subject: De-MIRVing

To: ctb-followers@igc.org

Washington Post

The Next Nuclear Step: De-MIRV Submarines

By Jeremy J. Stone and Paul C. Warnke

Thursday, January 22, 1998; Page A21

Notwithstanding the collapse of the Soviet Union and the new presidential guidelines that were recently announced, U.S. strategic force posture continues to emphasize time-urgent targeting of Russian strategic forces and command-and-control sites. This policy, which could be implemented as a first strike -- or launch-on-warning attack designed to disarm the other side -- is completely unnecessary in the post-Cold War era. It can lead to accidents because it requires quick judgments of what to do. And it induces the Russian command to set its decaying and accident-prone forces to fire on warning (which also means that a disarming attack by the United States would be likely to fail anyway).

Moreover, maintaining a launch-on-warning/disarming attack capability might preclude disarmament below the approximately 1,000 deployed ballistic missile warheads necessary to maintain and implement the capability. And so long as the Defense Department can argue that it is instructed to maintain such a capability on a minute-to-minute basis, the "de-alerting" of most of these warheads will also be precluded, since de-alerting, by definition, does not leave weapons available at a moment's notice.

The United States should resolve these problems by relying on a deterrent-only force, which, lacking a disarming attack capability, would provide little incentive for a preemptive launch and would ride out attacks before retaliating. But how best to organize the decision?

Should we look toward a formal presidential proclamation after a study by a blue-ribbon panel? Or should we seek an informal resolution through a series of de-alerting measures that try to peel away the strategic force onion until the warheads on minute-to-minute alert are insufficient to permit the disarming attack option to be carried out without re-alerting?

There is a third way. It would have the instruct the Defense Department to design an acceptable START III proposal to

eliminate all sea-based MIRVs (missiles with multiple warheads, each of which has its own target) on both sides and to reduce the overall number of deployed ballistic missile warheads to about 500 (e.g., 150 warheads on land-based Minuteman III missiles and 336 warheads on 14 Trident submarines). Such a proposal would precipitate the debate in a context of prospective bilateral disarmament. And the debate would focus on a weapon whose unfortunate characteristics (vulnerability on land and short flight times at sea) were well advertised even before Al Gore championed criticisms of MIRV back when he was a member of the House.

START II implementation will eliminate all land-based MIRVs. From every point of view, the most natural -- and politically the most acceptable -- way to eliminate additional large numbers of deployed ballistic missile warheads in START III is to de-MIRV" the U.S. and Russian submarine forces. (If both sides desired, this could probably be done quickly on an interim basis by having U.S.-Russian teams of inspectors make inoperative or unusable all but one warhead per missile before the missile is sealed into its tube on the submarine. This would finesse, in a secure fashion, current Russian backlogs in dismantling and storing warheads and would jump-start START.)

his kind of disarmament would require no major change in naval deployments. The Navy now has almost 3,500 warheads on its 432 missiles and would be permitted 1,750 even under START II. De-MIRVed and reduced to the 14 submarines the Navy is planning to hold, it would have only 336 warheads, with 224 of them vulnerable at sea even in non-crisis periods -- more than enough to deter any conceivable future enemy.

But this same force -- complemented by 150 land-based Minuteman III missiles -- would not be enough to constitute a realistic threat to a suitably composed 500-missile Russian force of fixed and mobile land-based missiles and missile-firing submarines, combined with dozens of command posts and bombers with their dispersal bases, all of which would have to be attacked. And such a secure Russian force structure is one to which Russia could naturally move.

Also, for reasons of cost, the Russians want to move below the level of 2,000-2,500 warheads on bombers and missiles combined that was agreed upon at Helsinki in March 1997 for START III. They have already indicated a desire to reduce these overall limits at least to 1,500, and a further reduction to 1,000 would produce the 500-ballistic-missile warhead total if, for example, missile warheads and bombs were in equal number.

Such a U.S. offer to cut and de-MIRV could help secure Russian ratification of START II, itself in great difficulty in the Russian Duma, by reducing Russian fears that the United States intends to maintain a first-strike capability indefinitely. And to the extent that this proposal requires some comparable action from other nuclear powers to limit and de-MIRV their forces, these forces could and

should be included. De-MIRVed, the British and French submarines would be equally secure but would carry only 48 and 64 ballistic missile warheads, respectively, rather than 160 and 384. (The Chinese now have approximately 100 ballistic missile warheads on un-MIRVed missiles and could agree not to MIRV and/or to stay below some specified number.)

To provide public support for the abandonment of a posture that few experts believe is still necessary, the president should declassify documents showing the realities of a president's having to decide within 10 minutes whether to attempt a preemptive attack upon receiving warning of an adversary's attack.

Today's nuclear Gordian knot can best be cut by putting forward an attractive and far-reaching disarmament proposal that abandons prospectively an anachronistic U.S. policy requirement for a launch-on-warning/disarming attack capability. To help persuade the Russians to ratify START II -- and to make it possible for reciprocal de-alerting measures here and in Russia to be expanded into core capabilities -- we should orchestrate today, within the U.S. government, a suitable offer to cut ballistic missile warheads to about 500 and to ban MIRVs at sea just as START II banned MIRVs on land.

Jeremy Stone is president of the Federation of American Scientists. Paul C. Warnke is a former director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and chief arms control negotiator.

FROM: Disarmament Clearinghouse

1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington DC 20005

TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232

FAX: 202 898 0172

<disarmament@igc.org>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
CC: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Date: Fri, 23 Jan 1998 16:16:46 -0800
From: Lysiane Alezard <mvtpaix@globenet.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: international petition
To: aslater@igc.apc.org, wslf@igc.apc.org
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igcb.igc.org id HAA26461

To Alice Slater and Jackie Cabasso

Dear Friends,

Thank you very much for your extensive mail on Abolition 2000 activities, including the international petition. Like many NGOs, we believe inspiration should be taken from the experience of the anti-landmine campaign. Indeed, based on what we have achieved so far, the time has come to give a new impetus to the network. Obviously, the international petition, with its three simple and clear objectives will be a very good basis for that. We will do our utmost to contribute to reaching 3 million signatures.

Last Saturday, we held our National bureau and decided to support it fully and include it in our own campaign for 1998. This week, we shall write to all French organizations of Abolition 2000 and invite them to exchange together on how to use the petition best, and the kind of steps to take in view of the prepcom.

With the new political situation in France, we aim at pushing for radical changes also in terms of security and disarmament. This means starting by putting an end to laboratory testing and to new generation weapons.

A suggestion was made to take advantage of the participation of many international NGOs in Geneva to hold a major press conference and present the international petition in a dramatic way.

We also suggest that a major event be organized on the occasion of the NPT prepcom in Geneva, with all the local groups in the region. This could consist in a national day of action on the eve of the prepcom for instance, with delegations coping to Geneva. This initiative could take place at the end of the first week of the prepcom. What would you think of such a possibility ?

In the new situation in France, our campaign will consist in a peace caravan throughout the country, from March to December. A new generation "missile" will open the way and visit a number of places, including nuclear sites such as Bordeaux, Brittany... The international petition will be our means to reach people and raise the question of elimination in a public way.

As the new Defense minister intends to make consultations on how to continue (or not) with the five-year military programme, in the coming

days, we will request to meet with him and deliver a memo on what we believe should be France's policy of disarmament, an idea supported by a growing majority of public opinion.

We shall keep you informed of future events.

Congratulations for your hard and excellent work.

Looking forward to hearing from you,

Yours in peace,

Lysiane Alezard

Daniel Durand

--

* Lysiane ALEZARD - Mouvement de la Paix *

* mvtpaix@globenet.org *

* Tel 33 1 40 12 09 12 - Fax 33 1 40 11 57 87 *

* The Mouvement de la Paix is a member of Abolition 2000,*

* International Peace Bureau, World Peace Council *

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Cc: kirsten.osen@basalmed.uio.no, wslf@igc.org, pmeidell@igc.org,
dkrieger@napf.org, zia@princeton.edu, jbloomfield@gn.apc.org,
ippnwbos@igc.org, jburroughs@igc.org, disarm-abolish@igc.org
Date: Fri, 23 Jan 1998 17:39:21 +0100 (CET)
From: Martin Kalinowski <dh3m@hrzpub.tu-darmstadt.de>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Re: A-2000 NGO delegation
To: aslater@igc.apc.org (Alice Slater), scheffran@hrzpub.tu-darmstadt.de,
r.braun@lilly.ping.de, wagingpeace@napf.org,
kalinowski@hrzpub.tu-darmstadt.de
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igcb.igc.org id IAA15973

Dear Kirsten, dear Alice,

On Tuesday I visited the German Ambassador, Guenther Seibert, in Geneva. I explained to him the idea to have an NGO delegation. He reacted with sympathy for this idea. However, he pointed out the most important difference between the Ottawa process and the NPT Review Process: The landmine ban negotiations were carried out among like-minded states. None of them had to fear to speak in a way that might expose them to severe criticism from the NGOs in the plenary and in the public. Whereas in the NPT PrepCom some states and notably the NWSs are likely to take positions that we don't like. Therefore, they will strongly object against an NGO delegation. On the other hand, if we are successful and can take part with observers, there is the danger that discussions among governments will be not as open and constructive because ambassadors might wish not to expose themselves to our criticism.

When talking to anybody about our proposal, we should demonstrate that we know about the consequences and necessities. Especially we should point out that the Rules and Procedures for the NPT Review Process need to be amended. Point (b) Methods of work, (ii) Participation includes a passage related to NGOs and to representatives of specialized agencies and regional inter-governmental organizations. The wording for the latter resembles very much the wording for the NGOs, i.e. we are now demanding higher rights than those of observers of e.g. the IAEA have. We should be aware of this.

Next week, I will talk to the German Foreign Ministry again about our request for an NGO delegation.

Best regards,
Martin

> Dear Friends,
> If you really believe that NGOs can make a difference in achieving nuclear
> abolition, then please follow up on this request with your own foreign
> minister. If not us, then who? Please write a letter! Love, Alice [My
> letter to Secretary Albright is posted below.]
>
>>Return-Path: <kirsten.osen@basalmed.uio.no>
>>Date: Tue, 20 Jan 1998 05:58:56 +0100 (MET)
>>X-Sender: kiros@pons.uio.no (Unverified)
>>To: Alice Slater <aslater@igc.apc.org>

>>From: Kirsten Osen <kirsten.osen@basalmed.uio.no>
>>Subject: Re: A-2000 NGO delegation
>>Cc: dh3m@hrzpub.tu-darmstadt.DE, steinar.westin@medisin.ntnu.no,
>> kurt.hanevik@ikb.uib.no, andreas.skulberg@helsetilsynet.dep.telemax.no,
>> kristian.hagestad=37278661@fax.uio.no, h.p.b.prydz@biotek.uio.no,
>> nei.til atomvapen@sn.no, fredpax@online.no, agrieg@online.no

--

Martin B. Kalinowski, IANUS

Hochschulstr. 10, 64289 Darmstadt, Germany

Tel.: +49-6151-163016 FAX: +49-6151-166039

Internet, private: KALINOWSKI@HRZPUB.TU-DARMSTADT.DE

Internet, group: IANUS@HRZPUB.TU-DARMSTADT.DE

<http://www.tu-darmstadt.de/ze/ianus/welcome.htm> and .../inesap.htm

Please mind the change in our postal address!

Please mind the slight change in the internet address: tu instead of th !

To: aslater
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: PrepCom
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Alice:

Thanks for the work of your PrepCom Working Group and for sharing the minutes.

I've decided to go to Geneva for the February 20-21 planning meeting and arrive a day early so that I can work out arrangements for the reception to be hosted by world religious leaders. I have written to Ambassador Wyzner, inviting him and other delegates to the reception and double-checking to determine that our proposed date does not interfere with a reception he might be planning. If it does, we would reschedule. But my guess is that Monday, April 27 will remain okay for ours.

If NGOs are given time to make presentations to the PrepCom, I'm assuming that our Religious Working Group will take the lead in identifying a speaker to offer a religious and moral perspective.

Shalom,
Howard

To: relctbt
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: CTBT Meeting, January 28
Cc: wetekam@juno.com
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

To: Faith Community Campaigners for the CTBT

The next meeting to discuss the grassroots campaign for CTBT ratification will take place from 12:30 to 2:00 p.m., Wednesday, January 28 in the Methodist Building, Room 3. Our special guest will be Ivo Spalatin, Director of Congressional Affairs, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. He will offer the Administration's perspective on treaty ratification. We will be able to tell him about the grassroots network we are developing.

We will also review the postcard alert for seven states with key members on the Senate Foreign Relations, which Jim Wetekam of 20/20 Vision has developed. If you haven't yet told him of your willingness to participate in this joint alert, please call him at 202 833-2020.

With Congress about to reconvene, we need to increase the intensity of our grassroots campaign. Senator Jesse Helms has written President Clinton on priorities of the Foreign Relations Committee. "Mr. President, let me be clear," wrote Helms, "I will be prepared to schedule Committee consideration of the CTBT only after the Senate has had the opportunity to consider the vote on the Kyoto Protocol and the amendments to the ABM Treaty." However, neither of these has been submitted to the Senate. So the battle lines are drawn. On Wednesday, we can map out our response.

This week executive directors of several peace organizations initiated discussion of comprehensive grassroots strategy for CTBT ratification. This discussion will continue at 11:00 a.m., Thursday, January 29 in the conference room of the Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street, N.E. All of you are invited to participate if you want to.

Shalom,

Howard

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
Date: Fri, 23 Jan 1998 13:25:03 -0500 (EST)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: The Nation on nuclear abolition

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

This month issue of The Nation (February 2-9, 1998) focuses on the subject of nuclear weapons and prospects for their elimination. The special issue was edited by Jonathan Schell.

The Nation has also created a web site: "The Gift of Time: The Case for Abolishing Nuclear Weapons." It includes excerpts from interviews with prominent world leaders and experts including former U.S. Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara, former Soviet Premier Minister Mikhail Gorbachev, 1995 Nobel Peace Prize winner Joseph Rotblat, and U.S. Strategic Command General George Lee Butler.

You can check it out at <www.TheNation.com> or reach it through the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers web site <www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/>

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
at Council for a Livable World Education Fund
110 Maryland Ave. NE #201
Washington DC 20002
p: (202)546-0795; fax: (202)546-5142
website: <http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Fri, 23 Jan 1998 10:31:01 -0800 (PST)
From: Alice Slater <aslater@igc.apc.org>
X-Old-Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: International Petition
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igc3.igc.apc.org id KAA18857
X-Sender: aslater@pop.igc.org

Dear Friends,

Listed below is the Abolition 2000 Petition referred to in recent e-mail from France by Lysianne Alezard and Daniel Durand. Our goal is to have 3,000,000 signatures by the NPT PrepCom meeting-Apr. 27-May 8th in Geneva!

Thanks for your help. Alice Slater

Abolition 2000
A Global Network for the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons

ABOLITION 2000 INTERNATIONAL PETITION
MISSILES TO SUNFLOWERS
A New Commitment for a New Century

We call upon all states, and particularly the nuclear weapons states, to make the following commitment for a new century:

1. END THE NUCLEAR THREAT. End the nuclear threat by withdrawing all nuclear weapons from foreign soil and international waters, separating warheads from delivery vehicles, committing to unconditional no first use of nuclear weapons, and ceasing all nuclear weapons tests, including laboratory tests and "subcriticals."
2. SIGN THE TREATY. Sign a Nuclear Weapons Convention by the year 2000, agreeing to prohibit and eliminate all nuclear weapons within a time-bound framework.
3. REALLOCATE RESOURCES. Reallocate resources to ensure a sustainable global future and to redress the environmental devastation and human suffering caused by nuclear weapons production and testing, which have been disproportionately borne by the world's indigenous peoples.

Name: _____ Email*: _____
Address: _____

Name: _____ Email*: _____
Address: _____

Name: _____ Email*: _____

Address: _____

Name: _____ Email*: _____

Address: _____

Name: _____ Email*: _____

Address: _____

The results of this petition will be delivered to the United Nations General Assembly, the United Nations Conference on Disarmament, the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conferences, the Human Rights Commission, and the governments of nuclear weapons states and nuclear threshold states.

*By providing your e-mail address, you will receive periodic updates on Abolition 2000.

Please return Abolition 2000 International Petitions to:

Abolition 2000
c/o Nuclear Age Peace Foundation
1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 123 · Santa Barbara, CA 93108 ·
Tel: (805) 965-3443 · Fax: (805) 568-0466
e-mail: wagingpeace@napf.org

Alice Slater
Global Resource Action Center for the Environment(GRACE)
15 E. 26 St., New York, NY 10010
212-726-9161 (tel)
212-726-9160 (fax)
aslater@igc.apc.org

Return-Path: <owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org>
Date: Fri, 23 Jan 1998 14:41:49 -0500
From: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.apc.org>
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse
Sender: owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org
Subject: Helms on CTBT
To: ctbt-organize@igc.org

To: ctbt-organize
From: disarmament
Subject: Helms on CTBT

Washington Times
Friday, Jan. 23, 1998
p. A 15

Helms Sets Conditions for Allowing Test Ban Treaty Vote

By Ben Barber

The chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee warned President Clinton yesterday that he will not allow a vote to ratify the nuclear test ban treaty until the White House first submits pacts on the environment and missile controls to the Senate.

"Let me be clear: I will be prepared to schedule committee consideration of the CTBT only after the Senate has had the opportunity to consider and vote on the Kyoto [environment] Protocol and the ABM treaty," Sen. Jesse Helms, North Carolina Republican, said in a letter.

Mr. Helms opposes all three treaties, a Helms spokesman said.

Considering the environment and Anti-Ballistic Missile treaties before the administration can win key environmental concessions from developing nations and secure Russian ratification of the START II arms control accord will reduce their chance of passage in the Senate.

"The administration has no intention of submitting the Kyoto protocol until there is meaningful participation from developing countries" and they agree to cut back their fossil fuel burning, a White House spokesman said yesterday.

Mr. Helms wrote to the president that he fears the administration might try to enforce the Kyoto cuts in U.S. emission of global-warming gases "by simply imposing the treaty's requirements on U.S. business by executive order."

"I must respectfully counsel this would be extremely unwise," Mr. Helms wrote.

In December, 160 nations voted in Kyoto, Japan, for an accord under

which 34 industrial countries would cut green house gas emissions. The United States is to reduce its emissions 7 percent below 19990 levels by 2012; Europe will cut by 8 percent and Japan by 6 percent.

"This treaty clearly requires the advice and consent of the Senate," Mr. Helms wrote. "Further, because the potential impact of the Kyoto Protocol on the American economy is so enormous, we owe it to the American people to let hem know sooner rather than later, whether they will be subject to the terms of the treaty."

Congressional sources indicate that Republicans believe Mr. Clinton will make the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) a major issue in his State of the Union address Tuesday and pressure the Republican majority in Congress to approve it.

"Chairman Helms has been supportive of the need for nuclear testing to guarantee the reliability of the nuclear stockpile," said the Helms spokesman. "Every Republican administration from Nixon to Bush has testified on the need for continue testing."

Mr. Helms also opposes the 1972 ABM treaty with the Soviet Union which limits deployment of missiles to shoot down incoming ballistic missile warheads. He also opposes proposed amendments to the treaty that would take into account the breakup of the Soviet Union and outlaw very high-speed interceptor missiles.

"The chairman believes that the ABM treaty is an anachronistic arm control agreement," said his spokesman. "The Cold War logic underpinning the treaty is no longer valid. The ABM treaty cannot constrain the ability of the United States to protect its citizens from ballistic missile attacks."

Opponents of the ABM treaty hope to defeat it to clear the way for building anti-missile defenses that could destroy warheads armed with nuclear, chemical or biological material launched by a rogue nation.

FROM: Disarmament Clearinghouse
1101 14th Street NW #700
Washington, DC 20005
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232
FAX: 202 898 0172
<disarmament@igc.org>

>From aslater Fri Jan 23 13:59:11 1998
Return-Path: <aslater@igc.apc.org>
Date: Fri, 23 Jan 1998 13:59:05 -0800 (PST)
X-Sender: aslater@pop.igc.org
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>, wslf@igc.org, pmeidell@igc.org,
dkrieger@napf.org, zia@princeton.edu, jbloomfield@gm.apc.org,
ippnwbos@igc.org, jburroughs@igc.org, lcnp@aol.com
From: Alice Slater <aslater@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: PrepCom

Dear Howard,

I'll look forward to seeing you in Geneva. I'm forwarding your message about presentations to the Transition Team which expects to take this issue up next week on our conference call. Many thanks. Alice

At 11:34 AM 1/23/98 -0800, Howard W. Hallman wrote:

>Dear Alice:

>

>Thanks for the work of your PrepCom Working Group and for sharing the minutes.

>

>I've decided to go to Geneva for the February 20-21 planning meeting and
>arrive a day early so that I can work out arrangements for the reception to
>be hosted by world religious leaders. I have written to Ambassador Wyzner,
>inviting him and other delegates to the reception and double-checking to
>determine that our proposed date does not interfere with a reception he
>might be planning. If it does, we would reschedule. But my guess is that
>Monday, April 27 will remain okay for ours.

>

>If NGOs are given time to make presentations to the PrepCom, I'm assuming
>that our Religious Working Group will take the lead in identifying a speaker
>to offer a religious and moral perspective.

>

>Shalom,

>Howard

>

>

>

Alice Slater

Global Resource Action Center for the Environment(GRACE)

15 E. 26 St., New York, NY 10010

212-726-9161 (tel)

212-726-9160 (fax)

aslater@igc.apc.org

To: joe@fcnl.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Proposed letter to Senator Helms
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Joe:

I believe that the religious community should immediately respond to Senator Helm's assertion that he will not bring up the CTBT until the Kyoto Protocol and AMB amendments have passed the Senate. Therefore, I have drafted the attached response. We should be able to get signers from the 20+ religious groups who are working for CTBT ratification.

What do you think of this idea and this draft?

Shalom,
Howard

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Sat, 24 Jan 1998 20:25:46 GMT
From: geowcpuk@gn.apc.org (George Farebrother)
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Deterrence: an insider view
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
X-Sender: geowcpuk@gn.apc.org (Unverified)

Dear Abolitionists

I hope you will agree that the following document is very useful to us. The writer, Sir Michael Quinlan, is a nuclear insider. In 1992 he retired as Permanent Under Secretary (chief civil servant) at the Ministry of Defence.

The letter was written in reply to one from a World Court Project Supporter who wanted to know why his recent book, "Thinking About Nuclear Weapons" contained no reference to the ICJ Advisory Opinion.

We have been writing systematically to the Government about the Opinion and have received guarded replies. However, the style of Quinlan's letter suggests that this reflects what supporters of nuclear deterrence are really saying to each other. There is no doubt that his views carry considerable weight in government circles.

There is a great deal which is incorrect and some of what he says is quite breathtaking. We shall reply in due course, but any comments would be very welcome.

George Farebrother

.....
Dear Ms Soane

You must please forgive my not having replied earlier to your letter of 5 January - I have been abroad.

My study does mention law, briefly, on page 80. But I accept entirely that this does not feature significantly in my analysis. My reasons for that are at two levels.

The first level is that the ICJ did not in fact cast much if any new light on these grave matters. Most of their findings are "an anodyne asseveration of the obvious" - not my phrase but that of Judge Stephen Schwebel, then Vice-President and later President of the Court. To characterise their work as "tremendous" is, to be frank, absurd hyperbole. They gave advisory opinions - consultative, non-binding - and not findings on any concrete situation. They plainly found the task set them difficult and uncomfortable. (You probably know that Judge Oda from Japan argued strongly that the Court should entirely decline service of the question posed, as being the political manoeuvre it undoubtedly was.) The responses of the various judges, and their argumentation, are all over the place, as you will know if you have read through their - by my count - 265 pages, much of the content plainly high-flown if worthy rhetoric, not legal analysis or argument; the Bedjaoui passage

your pamphlet cites is a rich example. By much the same token, one can pick out selective quotation to suit almost any viewpoint. On the central question, they reached their view (paragraph 2E) by the narrowest possible margin (split seven: seven, and on the casting vote of the Algerian President); and even then their pronouncement is ultimately a fudge - "generally", and unable to conclude definitively about extreme circumstances. (What state, one might ask, now contemplates the use of nuclear weapons in other circumstances?) Further yet, you are doubtless aware that Rosalyn Higgins herself severely criticised that finding as deficient both in supporting argument and in definition of its key qualifying language.

You invoke the Court's opinion about negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament. They did indeed recall unanimously (and I suspect with some relief, having found an easy thing to agree upon) what is already there in the text of Article VI of the 1968 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. You can gather the reality of their perfunctory examination of this from the attached copy of what is said on the matter in the statement by Stephen Schwebel. I do not know whether you recall the detail of Article VI - it is quoted in full on page 42 of my study - but you will observe that it sets nuclear disarmament in parallel with "general and complete disarmament". The Court did not in any way address that parallelism or its implications. There is in the Treaty no difference between the two components of obligation. What do you suppose to be the timetable, probability and instrumentality of "general and complete disarmament"? The nuclear powers have already done appreciably more about the nuclear component of the obligations than the international community as a whole has about the general component; and there is a serious further nuclear agenda being tackled. No-one can now tell, and the Court did not make (nor could it reasonably have made) any attempt to prescribe, the pace or means by which the Article VI nuclear obligation should be pursued beyond that, or when or under what wider political conditions total abolition ought to be achieved.

That brings me to my second and more basic level of comment. I should like, as obviously you would too, to live in a world where international affairs were as effectively and fully regulated by international law as domestic ones are by domestic law. But we do not live in such a world and are not near doing so; we lack, especially in respect of situations as extreme and dire as the use or imminent threat of nuclear weapons would inescapably imply, both the political consensus and the enforcement capacity and will that are crucial in the latter environment. Even if relevant and comprehensive legal constraints could be agreed in adequately operational terms - and the ICJ's labours have shown that they cannot - the means of enforcement in such situations simply do not credibly exist. The reality is analogous to that reviewed in my discussion (pp 50-54) of No-First-Use promises. Suppose Israel is about to be overwhelmed by Islamist aggression; will it really let its actions be directed by what the ICJ says? and what is the ICJ or the international law-enforcement community going to do if it does not? The underlying truth is that we shall not genuinely advance the cause of our international-law system by attempting to impose on it burdens which in political reality it is as yet incapable of

discharging.

You are welcome if you wish to show this letter to Rosalyn Higgins, with my regards. (I sent her a copy of my study when it was published.)

Yours sincerely

SIR MICHAEL QUINLAN

>From Separate Opinion of ICJ Judge Schwebel

Article VI of the NPT

Finally, I have my doubts about the Court's last operative conclusion in Paragraph 2F: "There exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control."

If this obligation is that only of "Each of the Parties to the Treaty" as Article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty states, this is another anodyne asseveration of the obvious, like those contained in operative Paragraphs 2A, 2B, 2C and 2D. If it applies to States not party to the NPT, it would be a dubious holding. It would not be a conclusion that was advanced in any quarter in these proceedings; it would have been subjected to no demonstration of authority, to no test of advocacy; and it would not be a conclusion that could easily be reconciled with the fundamentals of international law. In any event, since Paragraph 2F is not responsive to the question put to the Court by the General Assembly, it is to be treated as dictum.

(Signed) Stephen M. SCHWEBEL

George Farebrother (geowcpuk@gn.apc.org)

67, Summerheath Rd,
Hailsham
Sussex, BN27 3DR, England
Phone & Fax +44 (0)1323 844 269

The World Court Project is an international citizens' network which is working to publicise and have implemented the 8 July 1996 Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice which could find no lawful circumstance for the threat or use of nuclear weapons.

The World Court Project is part of Abolition 2000, A Global Network to Abolish Nuclear Weapons

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Sun, 25 Jan 1998 00:54:48 EST
From: DavidMcR <DavidMcR@aol.com>
Organization: AOL (<http://www.aol.com>)
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Re: Deterrence: an insider view
To: geowcpuk@gn.apc.org, abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

Thanks to George Farebrother for passing this on. The response from Michael Quinlan very neatly sums up the problem - so long as the actual power resides in the nation states they will continue to behave as they do. In part we need to address the almost utopian problem of finding some new international governmental forms. But a more pressing problem is to create the kind of massive, determined, stubborn, broad-based pressure in as many countries as possible so that Sir Michael Quinlan, being a good analyst of reality, will read the court's decision in a different light.

Reason is wonderful. It is on our side. But unless it is organized as a political force it remains abstract - Sir Quinlan has done us a marvelous help by making this so clear.

(Even the point about Israel, is, on examination suspect - since the use of nuclear weapons is not a "discriminate and limited" use of force but would destroy a good chunk of Israel, Arabs and Jews alike, in addition to the unnamed "Islamist" invader, and, of course, have fatal consequences on peoples living in nations not involved. All that his point has done is remind us that NO nation, including particularly the United States, has the moral or legal right to use such weapons "in its own defense". A pity this wasn't entirely clear to Sir Quinlan).

Sincerely,
David McReynolds

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
Date: Mon, 26 Jan 1998 09:25:12 -0500 (EST)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: Conf. on Disarm. developments

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball
RE: new states back committee to discuss disarmament at CD

In keeping with an emerging pattern in disarmament matters, two Western states have broken with the U.S. by supporting the creation of discussions on nuclear disarmament at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva.

Meanwhile the U.S. continues to back the fissile material ban a the major nuclear arms control item for the CD's agenda. In a statement from Bill Clinton delivered to the CD last week by the U.S. representative, the President said " If the Conference can promptly conclude [the fissile materials cutoff] we will take important steps on the road to a world that is free of nuclear weapons."

Related wire stories from last week are below.

DK

Reuters 01/22 0856

Support builds for UN talks on nuclear disarmament

GENEVA- In a bid to break a year-long logjam, states including Japan and Canada on Thursday backed a South African proposal for the Conference on Disarmament to set up a committee to at least talk about nuclear disarmament.

Mexico, Ireland, Belgium and Chile also took the floor at the United Nations-backed talks to welcome Pretoria's proposal, arguing it offered a reasonable middle ground for dialogue.

But diplomats said the five known nuclear powers -- Britain, China, France, Russia and the United States -- would have great difficulty in accepting the compromise at the 61-member talks.

The five have blocked all previous moves by non-aligned states to set up a nuclear disarmament committee in Geneva, saying cuts should continue to be negotiated between the United States and Russia before widening the process to include the other three.

The nuclear powers say the next priority in nuclear disarmament should be multilateral negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament to halt production of nuclear bomb-making fissile material.

On Tuesday, South African ambassador Jacob Selebi presented a proposal to establish a committee to "deliberate" on ways to eliminate nuclear weapons and "identify if and when one or more steps should be the subject of negotiations in the conference."

"I suspect it will garner a lot of support. But I don't think the Americans or Russians will be able to accept it," one Western diplomat said. "It won't fly," predicted another envoy.

At the same time, Egypt -- a major voice among non-aligned countries -- repeated its call to set up a committee with a mandate to negotiate total elimination of nuclear weapons.

Pretoria's plan may also fail to satisfy India and Pakistan -- both nuclear "threshold" states and key non-aligned players -- who have also demanded negotiations on total nuclear disarmament within a fixed timetable, diplomats said.

The Conference on Disarmament began its 1998 session on Tuesday amid calls for launching substantive negotiations after a year of impasse.

In a message to the talks, U.S. President Clinton called for negotiating a landmines export ban and a halt to production of fissile material -- plutonium and highly enriched uranium.

On Thursday, Japan's ambassador Akira Hayashi and Canada's Mark Moher expressed support for South Africa's proposal and also called for launching negotiations on fissile material.

"Nuclear disarmament is Japan's invariable priority in disarmament. In this respect, my delegation welcomes very much the concrete proposal made by South Africa for the establishment of an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament," Hayashi said.

Moher, noting there were more than 36,000 nuclear warheads on launchers or in storage worldwide, said the "stakes and interests" of non-nuclear weapon states should not be ignored.

However, he said Canada did not believe the conference should have a mandate to negotiate nuclear weapon reductions. Talks on nuclear weapon cuts should continue to be conducted bilaterally between the United States and Russia, he added.

Moher called South Africa's plan a "valuable contribution." He urged the conference to "proceed to substantive discussion of nuclear disarmament issues with a view to identifying one or more possible issues for multilateral negotiation."

Belgium's envoy Andre Mernier said South Africa's proposal could permit a new dialogue but said making nuclear disarmament an issue for multilateral talks was a "dangerous illusion."

Ambassador Antonio de Icaza of Mexico agreed with Pretoria's plan to set up a committee which he said was aimed at "promoting steps toward a progressive

elimination of nuclear arms."

Egypt's ambassador Mounir Zahran said the committee should have a mandate to negotiate total elimination of nuclear weapons within a fixed timeframe. "It is indispensable to pursue the objective of complete and general nuclear disarmament."

South Africa, the only country to build a secret arsenal of nuclear weapons and then dismantle them, was responsible for forging the compromise that led to an indefinite extension of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty in 1995.

20 January 1998

TEXT: U.S. STATEMENT TO CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

(Clinton urges CD to conclude global landmine ban) (000)

Geneva -- President Clinton has urged the Geneva-based Conference on Disarmament (CD) to begin negotiating a global ban on anti-personnel landmines.

Clinton's message was read to the conference's 1998 opening session by Robert T. Grey, Jr., the new United States representative to the CD.

"As you resume your critical efforts to strengthen global security, I pledge the full support of the United States Delegation in taking the next steps in the nuclear disarmament process and banning anti-personnel landmines from the face of the earth," Clinton said in the message.

The president also urged the conference to begin negotiating a cutoff of production of the fissile material used for nuclear explosives.

"If the conference can promptly conclude these accords, complementing deep bilateral reductions in nuclear arms and the Ottawa Convention, we will take important steps on the road to a world that is free of nuclear weapons and safe for children to tread. I am confident that the Conference on Disarmament can meet the challenge," he said.

Grey, who spoke in his first address to the CD as head of the U.S. delegation, said he was hopeful that the CD will be able to move forward with its work and reassume "its rightful place as an effective multilateral disarmament negotiating forum."

Following is the text of Grey's prepared statement, which includes the president's message:

(begin text)

First, may I congratulate you on your assumption of the Presidency, and assure you of my full cooperation and that of my delegation in your important efforts to begin the Conference's work this year. I

would also like to thank you for your warm words of welcome as I take up my duties as the United States Representative to the Conference on Disarmament.

Mr. President, I have asked for the floor this morning to deliver to the Conference a statement from the President of the United States upon the occasion of the opening plenary of the 1998 session.

The text is as follows:

"As you resume your critical efforts to strengthen global security, I pledge the full support of the United States Delegation in taking the next steps in the nuclear disarmament process and banning anti-personnel landmines from the face of the earth. No issues are more important today to this body's work than a cutoff of fissile material production for nuclear explosives and a worldwide ban on the export of anti-personnel landmines. If the Conference can promptly conclude these accords, complementing deep bilateral reductions in nuclear arms and the Ottawa Convention, we will take important steps on the road to a world that is free of nuclear weapons and safe for children to tread. I am confident the Conference on Disarmament can meet the challenge."

(end of statement)

Mr. President, most of us -- I would hope all of us -- desire to begin work in the Conference as soon as possible on the pressing security issues that confront the international community. I begin my tenure at the head of the U.S. Delegation with the hope that we can quickly resolve our differences and place the practical security concerns of the world's peoples at the forefront of our agenda. At the 1997 session of the United Nations First Committee, we all heard many lamentations about the inability of the Conference to do any work last year as well as fears that the Conference would fade into irrelevance if this situation remained unchanged. President Clinton's statement, which I just read out, points us in the right direction to correct this very unfortunate state of affairs. I hope that we can work together to achieve the goals set forth in the statement and to restore the Conference to its rightful place as an effective multilateral disarmament negotiating forum.

Thank you, Mr. President.

(end text)

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
at Council for a Livable World Education Fund
110 Maryland Ave. NE #201
Washington DC 20002
p: (202)546-0795; fax: (202)546-5142
website: <http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/>

Return-Path: <owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org>
Date: Mon, 26 Jan 1998 09:35:28 -0500
From: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.apc.org>
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse
Sender: owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org
Subject: Pacific Northwest Event
To: ctbt-organize@igc.org

**NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY NOW
ACTIVIST TRAINING CONFERENCE**
Join with others in the Northwest to develop a strategy to
win ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty

WHEN: Saturday, February 21st, 1998, 10:00 am - 3:00 pm

WHERE: Bellevue, Washington
American Income Life, 15440 Bellevue-Redmond Rd.

Peace Action of Washington and Northwest Disarmament Coalition invite all nuclear disarmament advocates and concerned citizens in the Pacific Northwest region to join us in a training conference to kick off a grass-roots campaign to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). The CTBT will be considered in the U.S. Senate this year, and your efforts can ensure that the United States leads the way to the permanent end to nuclear weapons test explosions. After over 2,000 nuclear weapons tests that have had devastating environmental and health effects worldwide, it is time for a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW!

The Pacific Northwest is especially crucial to this campaign. We need your help to secure the leadership of your Senators on this vital disarmament and non-proliferation treaty.

You will receive the information that you will need to become an effective part of this campaign. Issue experts from Washington, DC and local peace organizations will report on the status of the test ban in the Senate and issues surrounding the treaty.

Strategy workshops will include: Lobbying, Media Strategies, Public Outreach and more

The Conference is FREE and open to all who want to work for a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW! Breakfast and Lunch will be provided. As a service to participants coming from distant areas, overnight housing and other assistance will be available.

Please let us know that you will join us. Your advanced registration will help us to plan an effective conference.

Please return the following form to Fred Miller at Peace Action (Seattle, WA address below) or Kathy Crandall at the Disarmament Clearinghouse <disarmament@igc.org>

For more information, or if you cannot attend, but want to participate in the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty Now Campaign, please contact Fred Miller at Peace Action of Washington, (206) 527-8050 or Kathy Crandall at the Disarmament Clearinghouse, Washington DC (202) 898-0150 ext. 232.

Sponsored by Peace Action of Washington, the Northwest Disarmament Coalition & The Disarmament Clearinghouse: a project of Peace Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Plutonium Challenge and Women's Action for New Directions.

NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY NOW ACTIVIST TRAINING CONFERENCE

Join with others in the Northwest to develop a strategy to win ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty

WHEN: Saturday, February 21st, 1998, 10:00 am - 3:00 pm

WHERE: Bellevue, Washington
American Income Life, 15440 Bellevue-Redmond Rd.

Yes, I want to attend the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW Activist Training Conference!

NAME: _____

ORGANIZATION/AFFILIATION:

ADDRESS _____

TEL: _____ **FAX:** _____

E-MAIL:

Do you need housing and travel assistance?

RETURN THIS FORM TO: Fred Miller, Peace Action of Washington

TEL: (206) 527-8050 FAX: (205) 527-9985

5828 Roosevelt Way NE
Seattle, WA 98105

or Kathy Crandall, Disarmament Clearinghouse
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext.232 FAX: 202 898 0172

<disarmament@igc.org>
1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington DC 20005

Sponsored by Peace Action of Washington, the Northwest Disarmament Coalition & The Disarmament Clearinghouse: a project of Peace Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Plutonium Challenge and Women's Action for New Directions.

Return-Path: <eeregehr@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca>
From: "Ernie Regehr" <eeregehr@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca>
To: "<Howard Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Statement by religious leaders
Date: Mon, 26 Jan 1998 09:30:49 -0500
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

Dear Howard Hallman,

It was great to hear from you and to hear about the various initiatives coming out of the religious working group. We are in the final stages of sending a statement by Canadian church leaders on nuclear weapons to the Prime Minister. The letter is approved and signed by most denominations in the Canadian Council of Churches, as well as some others. We hope to send it this week and then to release it shortly thereafter (the timing depending on the success of our efforts to seek a meeting with the prime minister to discuss the letter). I will get it to you as soon as the process is completed.

It would be particularly helpful if a Canadian church leader could participate in the events related to the Prep Com in April. We'll explore that.

We would also be keen to work with Canadian church leaders and other faith communities to mobilize support for your planned letter.

I will be in touch as soon as our letter is available for release and look forward to hearing further from you.

Best wishes,
Ernie
Ernie Regehr
Policy and Public Affairs Director
Project Ploughshares
Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies
Conrad Grebel College
Waterloo, Ontario
Tel: 519-888-6541 x263
Fax: 519-885-0806

>From meldredge Mon Jan 26 13:42:28 1998
Return-Path: <meldredge@igc.apc.org>
Date: Mon, 26 Jan 1998 13:40:19 -0800 (PST)
X-Sender: meldredge@pop.igc.org
To: kathy@fcnl.org, wandwill@clark.net, ledwidge@psr.org, vision@igc.org,
disarmament@igc.org, jsmith@clw.org, mupj@igc.org, paprog@igc.org,
bmorse@igc.org, dculp@nrdc.org, dkimball@clw.org, btiller@psr.org,
bridget@fcnl.org, cdavis@clw.org, 73744.3675@compuserve.com,
tperry@ucsusa.org, tcollina@ucsusa.org, paexec@igc.org,
tom.clements@wdc.greenpeace.org, ieer@ieer.org, anitas@ieer.org,
panukes@igc.apc.org, cpaine@nrdc.org, syoung@basicint.org,
billeisen@rocketmail.com

From: maureen eldredge <meldredge@igc.apc.org>

Subject: SSM strategy meeting

Just a reminder - we will have a strategic planning meeting for those working on stockpile stewardship tomorrow (TUESDAY) at 9:00 AM at PSR (1101 14th St. NW). There will be coffee and donuts. Please be ready to make commitments to tasks.

-Maureen

Attached is the outline of the strategy. DO NOT DISTRIBUTE!!!!!!!

STOP NUCLEAR WEAPONS FOREVER MULTI-YEAR CAMPAIGN

Goals:

Develop the social and political climate necessary to end the SSM program as currently defined

Educate Congress and Get Congressional leaders for SSM Opposition

Cut the SSM budget by targeting specific systems/facilities

Obtain Administration support for alternative and cheaper method of stewardship

Get the University of California to divest from weapons work; get businesses to divest

A. Generate Widespread Opposition to SSM.doc

Goal: Develop the social and political climate necessary to end the SSM program as currently defined

1. Develop opposition statements

2. Outreach to church groups

3. Get strong opposition in California

4. Media Efforts

5. Grassroots organizing materials and actions

6. Develop dbase of activists outside of normal networks

7. International Pressure

Congress and the Administration

B. Congressional Strategy.doc

Goal: Educate Congress and Get Congressional leaders to oppose current SSM program

1. Educate the Congress

2. Make Support of SSM a campaign issue

3. Develop Leadership

4. CTBT Ratification

5. Cut the Budget

A. Cutting the Budget.doc

Goal: Cut the SSM budget by targeting specific systems/facilities

Focus: On the House

1. Green Scissors '98

2. FY99 Committee Budget Cut

3. FY2000 Floor Vote

4. General Momentum Development

5. Authorization Efforts

B. Administration Campaign.doc

Goal: Obtain Administration support for alternative and cheaper method of stewardship

1. Budget Angle

2. Policy Angle

C. University Campaign

Business and University Campaign.doc

Goal: To get the University of California and other Universities to divest from weapons work

Short-term Goal: To raise awareness and concern about the fact of university involvement

1. Get University Systems to withdraw from DOE contracts on weapons

a. University of California campaign

b. Other Univ. -Illinois, New Mexico, New York, Massachusetts

Maureen Eldredge

Program Director

Alliance for Nuclear Accountability

1801 18th St. NW, Suite 9-2

Washington, DC 20009

202-833-4668/fax: 202-234-9536

(formerly the Military Production Network)

A national network of watchdog organizations
working on DOE's nuclear weapons complex.

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: 26 Jan 1998 00:00:00 +0000
From: ippnw@VLBERLIN.comlink.de (IPPNW)
Organization: IPPNW Germany
Reply-To: ippnw@VLBERLIN.comlink.de (IPPNW)
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: 2nd List of Who's who
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
X-Gateway: ZCONNECT UC cl-hh.comlink.de [DUUCP BETA vom 15.08.1997]
X-ZC-Post: Koertestrasse 10

This is the 2nd attempt at putting together a comprehensive list of the e-mail subscribers on the abolition-caucus. If there any new subscribers to the list since then, please introduce yourselves. Some of the addresses may be "dead" and that is why we are not receiving an answer as to who they are. I would still welcome any help as to filling in the blanks.

Yours,

Xanthe

ABOLITION 2000 EMAIL ADDRESSES:
254 subscribers as of 12/97:

102464.1110@compuserve.com
Dietrich Fischer
Transcend: Peace and Development
Network, USA

106351.1634@compuserve.com
Nigel Chamberlain
Cumbria & N.Lancashire Peace Groups, UK

A.Malten@net.HCC.nl
Ak Malten,
Global Anti Nuclear Alliance

aam@trecom.tomsk.su

abeier@igc.apc.org
Ann Beier

abol@amok.antenna.nl

abolition@motherearth.agoranet.be
For Mother Earth
Abolition Days/ List serve address

abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

Abolition Caucus / List-serve address

abolition-
caucus@mailer.wisewire.com

achin@avk.unv.ernet.in
Achin Vanaik,
Trustee INREP, N.Delhi, India

acronym@gn.apc.org
Rebecca Johnson
Acronym Institute, UK

act@web.net
Saul Chernos,
ACT for Disarmament, Canada

afscamb@igc.apc.org
Joseph Gerson,
AFSC - New England, USA

agrieg@online.no
Anne Grieg
IPPNW Norway

akiramed@pop01.odn.ne.jp

aldavisjones@juno.com

alicherman@igc.apc.org

amok@amok.antenna.nl
Karel Koster
AMOK, Netherlands

anidecker@bluewin.ch
Andi Nidecker
PSR/IPPNW Switzerland

appel100@worldnet.fr
Anick Sicart,
Appel des Cent, Paris, France

aslater@igc.apc.org
Alice Slater,
Global Resource Action Center for the
Environment (GRACE), USA

astrauß@netrunner.net

atwood@pop.unicc.org
David Atwood
Quakers

azaluar@undp.org

bent@math.uio.no
Bent Natvig
Scientists for Responsibility, Norway

bernard.dewitte@ping.be

BERNAS@frcpn11.in2p3.fr

beukes@aft.sn.no

WILPF Norway

bjack8@3-cities.com

bkinsey@peacemission.org
Bob Kinsey

bplumley@igc.apc.org

bries11@mail.euronet.nl

bstedman@igc.apc.org

btiller@psr.org

Bob Tiller,
Physicians for Social Responsibility, USA

btree@osk.threewebnet.or.jp

cathpete@camtech.net.au
Cathy Picone

cfpa@cyberenet.net

chiapski@aol.com
Francis Chiappa
Cleveland Peace Action, USA

civiak_r@a1.eop.gov

clarkg2@rpi.edu

cloudflowers@igc.org

cnd@gn.apc.org

Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, UK

cnic-jp@po.ijinet.or.jp
Mika Ohbayshi
Citizen's Nuclear Information Center, Japan

contia@dvol.com
Rich Conti

cppnw@web.net

PGS Canada

crazymail@technologist.com

crramey@igc.apc.org

crusader@fpm.bsu.unibel.by
Andrew Tumas,
Int'l Sakharov Institute on Radioecology

crypt.keeper@arena.leba.net

ctb@igc.apc.org
Bruce Hall,
CTB Clearinghouse, USA

cxj15621@niftyserve.or.jp

danfine@igc.apc.org
Dan Fine

dave@paxchristiusa.org
Dave Robinson
Pax Christi, USA

davidmcr@aol.com
David McReynolds
War Resisters League

dcortright@igc.apc.org
David Cortright
Fourth Freedom Forum, USA

DCulp@nrdc.org
David Culp

ddur@FranceNet.fr
Daniel Durand
Mouvement de la Paix, France

decowan@acs.ucalgary.ca

dellsberg@igc.apc.org
Dan Ellsberg

Dgracie@afsc.org
David Gracie

dh3m@hrzpub.th-darmstadt.de

Jürgen Scheffran?
INESAP

dh3o@hrzpub.th-darmstadt.de

disarmtimes@igc.apc.org
Roger Smith
NGO Comm on Disarmament

dkimball@igc.apc.org
Daryl Kimball
Coalition for a Nuclear Free Future, USA

dolly@giasdla.vsnl.net.in
Dr. Abha Shankar
New Delhi, India

dpflanz@cedar.alberni.net
Dolores Pflanz

driscoll@the-hermes.net
William Driscoll

drtd@compuserve.com

e.jacobsen@psyc.canterbury.ac.nz

ebk@a0370.aetat.no

ecaaras@igc.apc.org

ECAAR, USA

edibal@iprolink.ch
Edith Ballantyne
WILPF

edshaff@web.net

epic1934@aol.com

epp92@antenna.nl
Dirk Jan Dullemond
Nederlandse Kernstop Coalitie, Netherlands

EricMoon@juno.com

erippy@compuserve.com
Ed Rippy

fboyle@law.uiuc.edu

fbp@igc.apc.org
John M. Miller
Foreign Bases Project, USA

fcpj@afn.org

flick@igc.apc.org
Felicity Hill

flprop1@gate.net

fm2melfn@lucano.uco.es
Klaus Melf
IPPNW Germany

foesydney@peg.apc.org

FOE Sydney, Australia

fornatl@igc.apc.org

forum.abolition@alinks.se

SLMK/IPPNW Sweden list serve

fredpax@online.no
Frederik Heffermehl
IALANA Norway/IPB

freedom@peg.apc.org

freezone@hookele.com

friedman@uconnvm.uconn.edu

frtjs@fy.chalmers.se

INESAP

ftb@argonet.co.uk

gdaniell@wt.com.au
Graham Daniell
Towards a nuclear-free millenium, Australia

gekegaerd@nn.apc.org

gensuikin@igc.apc.org
Masa?
Gensuikin, Japan

georg.schoefbaenker@jk.uni-linz.ac.at
Georg Schöfbänker
Burg Schlaining Peace Centre, Austria

geowcpuk@gn.apc.org
George Farebrother,
World Court Project UK

GHewison@manukau.govt.nz
Grant Hewison

global2000@t0.or.at
Andrea Paukovits

goodwill@indigo.ie
John Goodwillie
Irish Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament

greensfelder@igc.apc.org
Claire Greensfelder
Plutonium Free Future

grinberg@wamani.apc.org

guardian@peg.apc.org

guerilla@tky0.attnet.or.jp

guster2@leland.Stanford.EDU

gw@ss.gu.se
Gunnar Westberg
SLMK, IPPNW Sweden

henrik.arnell@klingen.uu.se
Henrik Arnell
SLMK, IPPNW Sweden

herniels@sn.no
Hermann Nielsen
Nei til Atomvapen/No to Nuclear Weapons,
Norway

hgw@scruznet.com
Jennifer Olaranna Viereck,
Healing Global Wounds Alliance, USA

hhagelun@online.no

iakim@glas.apc.org
Vladimir Iakimets

ialana@antenna.nl
Francis van Holtoon
IALANA

ic3t-kwt@asahi-net.or.jp

ike@swva.net
Ike Jeanes

info@nuclearfreeworld.org

ipb@gn.apc.org
Colin Archer, Chris Bross
International Peace Bureau

ipis@igc.apc.org
Paul F. Walker
Global Green, USA

ippnw@vlberlin.comlink.de
Xanthe Hall
IPPNW Germany

irss@igc.apc.org

ishihara@okiu.ac.jp

jan.vande.putte@diala.greenpeace.org
Jan van de Putte
Greenpeace Belgium

jbloomfield@gn.apc.org
Janet Bloomfield
Oxford Research Group, UK

jburroughs@igc.apc.org
John Burroughs,
Western States Legal Foundation, USA

Jenny.WMCND@btinternet.com

West Midlands CND?

JGG786@aol.com
Jonathan Granoff,
NGO Committee on Disarmament

jim@merical.mhs.compuserve.com

jklotz@walrus.com

jlonn@undp.org

jloretz@medglobe.tiac.net
John Loretz
Medicine and Global Survival, USA

johnpike@fas.org

jopax@juno.com
John Owen,
L.A. No Nukes, USA

jsp-sls@pacbell.net
Sandy Shartz
Marin Peace News, USA

jsteinbach@igc.apc.org
John Steinbach & Louise
Franklin-Ramirez

jtlowe@aol.com
Colby Lowe,
Nuclear Task Force, Peace Action, USA

kaibraat@online.no

kalinowski@hrzpub.tu-darmstadt.de
Martin Kalinowski
INESAP

kataoka@mcai.med.hiroshima-u.ac.jp

Kathy4Paz@aol.com

kathy-s@k2nesoft.com

katie@chch.planet.org.nz
Kate Dewes
Rob Green
NZ Foundation for Peace Studies
World Court Project, UK

kawapic@sag.bekkoame.or.jp

ke3k-tknm@asahi-net.or.jp

kekula@hookele.com

kgrossman@hamptons.com
Karl Grossman

kliu@chaminade.edu

kurt.hanevik@ikb.uib.no
Kurt Hanevik
IPPNW Norway

kwood@igc.apc.org
Karina H. Wood,
NATO Expansion Speakers Tour, USA

LANLaction@aol.com
Peggy Prince
Los Alamos Action Network, USA

lasg@igc.apc.org

lcapt@efn.org

lcnp@aol.com
Alyn Ware,
Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy, USA

ledwidge@psr.org
Lisa Ledwidge
Physicians for Social Responsibility, USA

lennart.bernram@swipnet.se

leumasbj@juno.com

lforrow@igc.apc.org

Lachlan Forrow

IPPNW

liebert@hrzpub.th-darmstadt.de

Wolfgang Liebert

INESAP

liz.westmorland@Leeds.Gov.Uk

Liz Westmorland

Nuclear Free Local Authorities, UK

lorjacy@ix.netcom.com

lwirbel@igc.apc.org

Loring Wirbel,

Citizens for Peace in Space, USA

magoo@giasdl01.vsnl.net.in

Brigadier Vijai K Nair,

Forum for Strategic & Security Studies, India

mailserv@insync.net

Case Black

mapw@ozemail.com.au

Greg Barber

Medical Association for the Prevention of

War, IPPNW Australia

margetts@iinet.net.au

Dee Margetts

Green Senator for West Australia

martinez@servidor.unam.mx

maryl@mt.arias.net

marylia@igc.apc.org

Marylia Kelley

Tri-Valley CARES in Livermore, USA

maternatura@ax.apc.org

mcasper@physics.carleton.edu

mcken1@student.monash.edu.au

medact@gn.apc.org
Gillian Reeve
MEDACT, IPPNW UK

meldredge@igc.apc.org

melinda@stimson.org

mfrisch@gn.apc.org

millerl@duke.usask.ca

mkantola@kaapeli.fi
Malla Kantola
Peace Union of Finland

mlist@parsecweb.com

morganth@hooked.net

Morten.Bremer.Maerli@nrpa.no

mpbovy@mail.allia-com.fr
Marie-Pierre Bovy
Stop Essais, France

mupj@igc.apc.org
Howard Hallman,
Methodists United for Peace with Justice,
USA

mvtpaix@globenet.org

Lysiane Alezard
Mouvement de la Paix, France

nan@gn.apc.org
Sharon Riggle
Nato Alerts Network, Belgium

nbutler@basicint.org
Nicola Butler
BASIC, UK

nde@igc.apc.org
Pamela Meidell
Nevada Desert Experience, USA

neuneck@math.uni-hamburg.de
Götz Neuneck
ISFH, Germany

nfpb@gn.apc.org
Philip Austin
Northern Friends Peace Board (Quakers), UK

NFPC@phil.gn.apc.org
address not functioning

nfznsc@gn.apc.org
Stewart Kemp
Nuclear Free Local Authorities, UK

nhpeaceact@igc.apc.org

nirsnet@igc.apc.org
Michael Mariotte,
NIRS, USA

npc@gn.apc.org

National Peace Council, UK

nukeresister@igc.org
Felice & Jack Cohen-Joppa
The Nuclear Resister, USA

nvmpsecr@antenna.nl
Hans van Iterson
NVMP, IPPNW Netherlands

okamoto@shudo-u.ac.jp
Mitsuo Okamoto
(Hiroshima Shudo University)

P.Low@fren.canterbury.ac.nz

pacar@t3.rim.or.jp

pacific@rainbow.net.au

panukes@igc.apc.org

paprogr@igc.apc.org
Fran Teplitz,
Peace Action Education Fund

paweb@igc.apc.org

pbidwai@pb.unv.ernet.in

peacedepot@y.email.ne.jp

PeaceFirst@aol.com

pff@igc.apc.org
Mayumi Oda, etc.
Plutonium Free Future

pgs@web.net
Debbie Grisdale
PGS Canada

philr@sonic.net

plough@waterv1.uwaterloo.ca
Bill Robinson
Project Ploughshares, Canada

ploughshares@igc.apc.org

pma@xtra.co.nz

pmeidell@igc.apc.org

Pamela Meidell,

Atomic Mirror, USA

pohlmeie@uke.uni-hamburg.de

Lars Pohlmeier

IPPNW Germany

prcsandiego@igc.apc.org

Carol Jahnkow

Peace Resource Center of San Diego, USA

prior@wnmeds.ac.nz

Ian Prior

IPPNW New Zealand

PROOSE@oberlin.edu

prop1@prop1.org

Ellen & Wm Thomas

Proposition One Committee, USA

psrnatl@igc.apc.org

Physicians for Social Responsibility, USA

psrnyc@igc.org

Carol Garman,

PSR/NYC, USA

psrsm@igc.apc.org

psrsm@psr.org

Jonathan Parfrey,

PSR/LA (Santa Monica)

psysrusa@interserv.com

Anne Anderson

Psychologists for Social Responsibility, USA

quercus@concentric.net

rc@vom.com
Robert Cherwink

redoak999@aol.com
Ray Somerville,
Le Poco

regina.hagen@jugendstil.da.shuttle.de
Regina Hagen
Darmstaedter Friedensforum/"Stoppt
Cassini"-Kampagne, Germany

rene.moi@mailbox.swipnet.se

r-grayle@msn.com
Ron Gray/Irene Gale
Australian Peace Committee, S. Australian
Branch

riegle@tardis.svsu.edu
Rosalie Riegler

rush@hnrc.tufts.edu
David Rush
PSR, USA

rwilcock@execulink.com
Ross Wilcock
PGS Canada

salvador@hawaii.edu

sbrackman@igc.apc.org
Selma Brackman
War and Peace Foundation, USA

schertze@ccr.jussieu.fr
Daniel Scherzter
IWOSP, France

serfo@tornado.be (Serfo)

sfcny@igc.apc.org
Diane Swords
Peace Action of Central New York

sfr@nn.apc.org

shundahai@radix.net
Corbin Harney, etc.
Shundahai Network , USA

shundahai@intermind.net

sinhas@cognos.com

spearce@igc.apc.org

srfnyusa@igc.apc.org

stephen@congress.demon.co.uk

stopnuketest@igc.org

stuwhis@enter.net

Summer summer@iname.com

sys21@nuri.net

TDRozman@aol.com

Tilruff@aol.com
Tilman Ruff
MAPW, IPPNW Australia

tinabell@walrus.com

Tina Bell,
Oxford Research Group, USA Office

t-midori@mx6.meshnet.or.jp

tobdam@aol.com
Tobias Damjanov
DFG-VK, Germany

TracyMM@aol.com

tsbrueni@wheel.dcn.davis.ca.us

uphc01@uxp1.hrz.uni-dortmund.de
Reiner Braun
INES

veiluvawslf@igc.apc.org

vsidel@igc.apc.org
Vic Sidel
Co-President, IPPNW

wagingpeace@napf.org
David Krieger,
Christoph Hantermann
Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, USA

wandwill@clark.net
Deborah Walden,
WAND, USA

warehams@ozemail.com.au
Susan Wareham
MAPW, IPPNW Australia

wcp@antenna.nl

World Court Project

weavepaz@wco.com

Weissdor@aol.com
Dorrie Weiss

NGO Comm on Disarmament

wfm@igc.apc.org
William Pace,
World Federalist Movement

womensleague@gn.apc.org

worldpeace@gn.apc.org
Albert Beale
Houseman's World Peace Database and
Directory, UK

wrl@igc.apc.org
Chris Ney
War Resisters League, USA

wslf@igc.apc.org
Jackie Cabasso,
Western States Legal Foundation, USA

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Cc: fnb-l@tao.ca
Date: Tue, 27 Jan 1998 06:59:01 -0500
From: Peace through Reason <prop1@prop1.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Fwd: emailing congress: how to email every u.s.
congressperson in ten seconds or less
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
X-Sender: prop1@prop1.org

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

Date: Mon, 26 Jan 1998 13:18:09 -0800 (PST)
From: "P. Myers" <mpwr@u.washington.edu>
To: hpn@aspin.asu.edu

from another list. Pat Myers

+++++(FWD Follows+++++
Subject: emailing congress: how to email every u.s. congressperson in ten
seconds or less

<http://funnelweb.utcc.utk.edu/~smiile/congress/congres.htm>

HOW TO EMAIL EVERY MEMBER OF CONGRESS IN TEN SECONDS OR LESS

I wrote this program a couple years ago and recently decided to make it shareware. There are a number of issues that irritate me enough to use this program several times a year. The introduction reads,

"The First Amendment is not a suggestion.' Although members of congress give greatest consideration to correspondence from their own constituents, there are often matters of pressing national importance where you might wish to express your opinion to every member of congress. It's your constitutional right. This free program will make it easy for you."

"The limits of tyrants are prescribed by the endurance of those whom they oppress."

Frederick Douglass

To: nwwg
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: CTBT Grassroots Meeting, January 28
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Colleagues:

Here is the proposed agenda for the January 28 meeting on the CTBT grassroots campaign for persons from the religious community and others involved in grassroots activities.
Ivo Spalatin from ACDA is the special guest.

Shalom,
Howard

#####

Meeting on Grassroots Campaign for CTBT Ratification
12:30 to 2:00 p.m., Wednesday, January 28, 1998
Methodist Building, Room 3

Agenda

1. Introductions
2. Prospects for Ratification: The Administration's Perspective
 Ivo Spalatin, Director, Office of Congressional Affairs
 Arms Control and Disarmament Agency
3. Focus on Senate Foreign Relations Committee
 Postcard alert from religious community
 Sign-on letters responding to Senator Helms
4. Other foci for contacts
5. Hill visits
6. Suggested letter for heads of communion
7. Regional workshops
8. Coming events in Washington
 Interreligious Legislative Briefing
 Other
9. Other matters
10. Meeting schedule for coming months
11. Announcements
 Meeting on CTBT grassroots strategy: 11:00 a.m., Thursday, January 29,

FCNL Conference Room
Other

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Tue, 27 Jan 1998 07:42:30 -0800 (PST)
From: Alice Slater <aslater@igc.apc.org>
X-Old-Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Re: PNG apologises to Bougainville
To: Kate Dewes <katie@chch.planet.org.nz>, abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
X-Sender: aslater@pop.igc.org

Hi Katie,

Any chance of someone in New Zealand following up on Kirsten Osen's initiative to call for an Abolition 2000 NGO observer delegation at the PrepCom? Thanks. Love,

Alice Slater

Global Resource Action Center for the Environment(GRACE)

15 E. 26 St., New York, NY 10010

212-726-9161 (tel)

212-726-9160 (fax)

aslater@igc.apc.org

To: relctbt
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: January 28 meeting on CTBT grassroots campaign
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Colleagues:

Here is the agenda for the meeting on Wednesday, January 28 at 12:30 on the grassroots campaign for CTBT ratification. I hope that you will be able to participate.

The latest flurry on the CTBT is a letter from Senator Helms to President Clinton in which Helms lays down the gauntlet on the CTBT. Helms states: "Mr. President, let me be clear: I will be prepared to schedule Committee consideration of the CTBT only after the Senate has had the opportunity to consider and vote on the Kyoto Protocol and the amendments to the ABM Treaty." Since the Administration hasn't submitted either treaty, waiting for them would delay consideration of the CTBT until 1999.

I propose that we respond with letters from religious organizations to (1) Senator Helms, (2) other members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, (3) Senator Lott as majority leader, and (4) other members of the Senate. Drafts of the first two are attached. I'll have the other two drafts and Senator Helms full letter available at our Wednesday meeting.

Shalom,
Howard

#####

Meeting on Grassroots Campaign for CTBT Ratification
12:30 to 2:00 p.m., Wednesday, January 28, 1998
Methodist Building, Room 3

Agenda

1. Introductions
2. Prospects for Ratification: The Administration's Perspective
Ivo Spalatin, Director, Office of Congressional Affairs
Arms Control and Disarmament Agency
3. Focus on Senate Foreign Relations Committee
Postcard alert from religious community
Sign-on letters responding to Senator Helms
4. Other foci for contacts
5. Hill visits
6. Suggested letter for heads of communion
7. Regional workshops

8. Coming events in Washington
Interreligious Legislative Briefing
Other

9. Other matters

10. Meeting schedule for coming months

11. Announcements

Meeting on CTBT grassroots strategy: 11:00 a.m., Thursday, January 29,
FCNL Conference Room
Other

#####

Draft Letter for Religious Organizations

The Honorable Jesse Helms, Chairman
Senate Committee on Foreign Relations
450 Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510-6225

Dear Mr. Chairman:

For the sake of the children of the United States and other parts of the globe, we request you to reverse your position that you will not schedule committee consideration of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) until the Senate has voted on the Kyoto Protocol and amendments to the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty. The CTBT is an important instrument in the quest to achieve a world in which our children and grandchildren can live free from the threat of nuclear weapons. It is too important a treaty to hold hostage to other legislative agendas.

The CTBT makes important contributions to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. First, it prevents non-nuclear weapon states from carrying out tests required to field a nuclear arsenal. Second, by prohibiting any nuclear weapon test explosions and all other nuclear explosions, the treaty limits the ability of nuclear weapon states, including the Russian Federation and China, to build new nuclear weapons.

The United States is one of 44 nations which must ratify the CTBT before it can enter into force. Therefore, it is important that the U.S. Senate not become an obstacle to making the treaty an effective instrument of nuclear non-proliferation and world peace. Although you may speculate about whether India or North Korea will ratify the CTBT, your responsibility lies with the U.S. ratification process. That is something you can effect directly and positively if you choose.

The other measures you are interested in -- the Kyoto Protocol and amendments to the ABM treaty -- have not been submitted to the Senate and will not be until the Administration completes its preparations for submission. In contrast, the CTBT is already before the Senate, and other committees have started hearings. Therefore, waiting for these other treaties would cause unnecessary delay in the global halt of nuclear weapons testing.

Therefore, we urge you to promptly schedule committee hearings on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and to bring treaty to a vote by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as soon as possible. This will give the whole Senate, representing the American people, an opportunity to vote on this important treaty.

Sincerely yours,

Signers from the religious community

#####

Draft Letter for Religious Organizations

To Members of Senate Foreign Relations Committee, individually

Dear Senator _____:

We notice that Senator Jesse Helms, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, has laid down the gauntlet to President Clinton, saying that he will not schedule consideration of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) until the Senate has considered and voted on the Kyoto Protocol and amendments to the ABM Treaty. Since neither of these measures have been submitted to the Senate, Senator Helms is saying in effect that he will not allow the Foreign Relations Committee to consider the important Test Ban Treaty until 1999 or later. We believe that this is a grievous error and urge you to exercise your responsibility as a member of the committee to assure that the CTBT is given prompt consideration.

Major beneficiaries of the CTBT are the children of the United States and the rest of the world. That's because the CTBT is an important instrument for the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. It is a major step in the quest to achieve a world in which our children and grandchildren can live free from threat of nuclear weapons.

The CTBT contributes to the nuclear non-proliferation in two ways. First, it prevents non-nuclear weapon states from carrying out tests required to field a nuclear arsenal. Second, by prohibiting any nuclear weapon test explosions and all other nuclear explosions, the treaty limits the ability of nuclear weapon states, including the Russian Federation and China, to build new nuclear weapons.

The United States is one of 44 nations which must ratify the CTBT before it can enter into force. Therefore, it is important that the U.S. Senate not become an obstacle to making the treaty an effective instrument of nuclear non-proliferation and world peace. Although Senator Helms and others have doubts about whether India or North Korea will ratify the CTBT, the responsibility of the U.S. Senate lies first and foremost with the U.S. ratification process. That is something you and your colleagues can effect directly and positively if you choose.

A 1997 Mellman Group public opinion survey found that 70 percent of the American public believes that the Senate should ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. Only 13 percent opposed. We don't want to see public desires once again thwarted by a committee chairman who won't even provide for a fair hearing and a vote on a measure that has overwhelming public support. That's bad for the reputation of the U.S. Senate and is bad for American democracy.

Therefore, we ask you to assure that the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty receives prompt hearings and a committee vote as soon as possible.

Sincerely yours,

Signers from religious organizations.

To: "Edith Ballantyne" <edibal@iprolink.ch>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Reception on April 27
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Edith:

I want to share you the reply from Ambassador Wyzner regarding the reception on April 27, to be hosted by world religious leaders. You will note that he accepts our invitation and indicates that he knows of no other activities planned for that evening.

Therefore, we can go ahead with our plans. First, we need to pin down where it will be. We can use the Ecumenical Centre, but, as I've noted before, I've been told we might draw more delegates if the reception was at Palais des Nations. Can you advise us on this? Then we can go on with other arrangements.

Shalom,
Howard

###

Republic of Poland
Permanent Mission to the United Nations
9 East 66th Street, New York, New York 10021

21 January 1998

Dear Mr. Hallman:

Thank you for your letter of 10 January 1998 in which you invited me to the reception, which the Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition in cooperation with other world religious organizations is planning to hold on 27 April in connection with the second session of the Preparatory Committee for the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear weapons.

It is with pleasure that I accept your invitation. I am not aware, at this stage, of any other activities planned for that evening.

I wish to thank you for your good wishes for success for the forthcoming second session of the Preparatory Committee and look forward to a continued dialogue and cooperation with your organization.

Yours sincerely,

Eugeniusz Wyzner
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary
Permanent Representative of the Republic of Poland
to the United Nations

Mr. Howard W. Hallman
Chair of the Board of Directors
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
1500 16th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

To: "Dwain Epps" <dce@wcc-coe.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: PrepCom arrangements
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Dwain:

As the attached letter indicates, we have cleared the April 27 reception with Ambassador Wyzner, chair of the session, who accepts our invitation and indicates that he knows of no other activities planned for that evening.

Now we need to start working out the details for the reception. Place: We know that the Ecumenical Centre is available, but we have received a suggestion that we might draw more delegates at Palais des Nations. I have inquired with Edith Ballantyne of WILPF, who is the NGO coordinator, about that possibility. We need a decision soon so we can plan a menu, budget, and other arrangements.

We need to identify other world religious leaders to join Dr. Raiser and Cardinal Danneels at the reception. I am pursuing other contacts to get suggestions for Jewish, Islamic, Buddhist, Hindu, and perhaps Baha'i leaders, but we want help from you folks in Geneva. In November you mentioned Salpy Eskidjian as a person who might assist us. How can I get in touch with him?

We need to tie down the language of the statement, which I sent you in December. In case you have misplaced it, I am attaching a slightly edited copy.

The NGO community is having a planning meeting for NGO participation in the PrepCom on February 20-21. I plan to attend. I will arrive in Geneva at mid-day on February 18. I would like to meet with you and others on Thursday, February to discuss arrangements and other matters. I could even squeeze in some time the afternoon of February 18 if necessary.

Can you advise me of any modest-priced hotel or other kind of accommodations?

I hope to hear from you soon and then confer with you in Geneva on February 19.

Shalom,
Howard

###

Republic of Poland
Permanent Mission to the United Nations
9 East 66th Street, New York, New York 10021

21 January 1998

Dear Mr. Hallman:

Thank you for your letter of 10 January 1998 in which you invited me to the reception, which the Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition in cooperation with other world religious organizations is planning to hold on 27 April in connection with the second session of the Preparatory Committee for the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear weapons.

It is with pleasure that I accept your invitation. I am not aware, at this stage, of any other activities planned for that

evening.

I wish to thank you for your good wishes for success for the forthcoming second session of the Preparatory Committee and look forward to a continued dialogue and cooperation with your organization.

Yours sincerely,

Eugeniusz Wyzner
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary
Permanent Representative of the Republic of Poland
to the United Nations

Mr. Howard W. Hallman
Chair of the Board of Directors
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
1500 16th Street, N.W.

###

A Statement by Religious Leaders on Nuclear Abolition
Draft of January 27, 1998

To: Heads of States and/or Foreign Ministers of Signatories of the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty [Proposed to be sent in February 1998, two months before the NPT PrepCom]

"The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof, the world and those who dwell therein." So says Psalm 24, sacred to Jews and Christians alike. The First Book of Moses, also known as Genesis, indicates that God made earth available to humankind to till and keep, that is, to use for mutual benefit and to preserve. [Add appropriate Islamic, Buddhist, and other teachings.] It follows that all of us together have a responsibility to be good stewards of planet Earth.

Because nuclear weapons have the potential of doing grave harm to Earth and its inhabitants, our stewardship responsibility requires us to rid Earth of this perilous threat. The necessity of nuclear abolition is affirmed by numerous voices from the world's religious community, represented by several attached statements.

Already the nations of Earth are committed by Article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) "to the cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament." After reviewing this article at the request of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the International Court of Justice unanimously agreed that "There exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control."

The time has come to take this obligation seriously. Therefore, we ask you to instruct your delegation to the forthcoming meeting of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee, scheduled for April 27 to May 8, 1998 in Geneva, Switzerland, to come committed to setting the course resolutely for the abolition of all nuclear weapons on Earth.

To be specific, we call upon the NPT Preparatory Committee to establish a working group to begin the process of negotiating a Nuclear Weapons Convention that will outlaw and eliminate nuclear weapons by all possessors. Because such a convention serves the interests of all humanity and all nations on Earth, it is a task that can properly be taken up by an international body, such as the NPT Preparatory Committee, and not wait for nuclear weapon states to develop, if and when they determine.

As a Nuclear Weapons Convention is being written, the nuclear weapon states should take steps to reduce the risk of nuclear war and make progress toward nuclear disarmament.
Such action should include:

- Declare a policy of no first use amongst themselves and non-use in relation to non-nuclear weapon states.
- Take nuclear forces off alert and remove warheads from delivery vehicles.
- Refrain from modernizing or increasing the number of deployed nuclear weapons.
- Continue bilateral reduction of nuclear weapons by the United States and Russia, but at a faster pace of reduction

These intermediate steps will combine with negotiations for a Nuclear Weapons Convention to set the stage for the world to enter the 21st century with a commitment to eliminating from Earth the scourge of nuclear weapons.

Names of Signers

Attachment: Statements by Religious Bodies and Religious Leaders on Nuclear Abolition

The Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches stated: "We believe that the time has come when the churches must unequivocally declare that the production and deployment as well as the use of nuclear weapons are a crime against humanity and that such activities must be condemned on ethical and theological grounds. Furthermore, we appeal for the institution of a universal covenant to this effect so that nuclear weapons and warfare are delegitimized and condemn as violations of international law." [or an alternative statement]

Speaking for the Holy See before the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly on October 15, 1997, Archbishop Renato Martino stated: "Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21st century. They cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation. The preservation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty demands an unequivocal commitment to their abolition....This is a moral challenge, a legal challenge and a political challenge. That multiple-based challenge must be met by the application of our humanity." [or a statement by Pope John Paul II or some other Catholic source]

[Quotations from other religious leaders and religious bodies.]

Drafted by Howard W. Hallman, Methodists United for Peace with Justice. Please send comments to him via e-mail at mupj@igc.org, or by fax to 301 895-0013 (USA), or by regular mail to 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036

>From srhodes Tue Jan 27 14:06:00 1998
Return-Path: <srhodes@igc.apc.org>
Date: Tue, 27 Jan 1998 14:05:55 -0800 (PST)
X-Sender: srhodes@pop.igc.org
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>, cchurn@deltanet.com,
brucedward@aol.com, 70761.2655@compuserve.com, jmardock@nrdc.org,
72124.3602@compuserve.com, srhodes@igc.org
From: Schuyler Rhodes <srhodes@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: Board meeting on February 27 & 28
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igc3.igc.apc.org id OAA20892

Dear Howard,

By now you may have heard that I have relocated to the west coast. It looks as though I will miss this meeting because I am attending another conference for the GBCS. My new address is Wesley Foundation, 2398 Bancroft Way, Berkeley, CA 94704.
phone # is 510-549-1244, fax is 510-649-1405 and emailm, of course, is the same.

Blessings and Peace,

Schuyler Rhodes

At 06:51 AM 1/13/98 -0800, Howard W. Hallman wrote:

>To: Board of Directors
>
>The Board of Directors of Methodists United for Peace with Justice will meet
>on Friday and Saturday, February 27 and 28, 1998 at Foundry United Methodist
>Church, 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, D.C. The Friday session will run
>from 9:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., and the Saturday session will run from 9:00
>a.m. to 1:00 p.m.
>
>The agenda will encompass such items as the following:
>. A full review of the work I am doing for nuclear abolition, including the
>grassroots campaign for ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.
>. Other issues of public policy of interest to Methodists United.
>. Peace Leaf, including content and distribution list.
>. Membership.
>. Finances
>. Annual election of officers..
>
>Please let me know whether or not you plan to attend. If you need host
>housing, please let me know.
>
>I hope to see you on February 27 and 28.
>
>Shalom,
>
>Howard
>
>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Tue, 27 Jan 1998 13:50:21 -0800
From: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <wagingpeace@napf.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: A2000/Valentine's message
To: abolition-2000@mail.agoranet.be, abolition-caucus@igc.org
X-Sender: napf@silcom.com

Dear Abolitionists,

Here is a draft Valentine's message that can be sent to President Clinton and other leaders of nuclear weapons states. If you send a message by regular mail, try to include an image of a sunflower.

ABOLITION 2000
VALENTINE'S DAY GREETING
TO LEADERS OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS STATES

This 1998 Valentine's Day greeting
comes to you as a symbol
of the power of love and commitment
to a world free of war
and weapons of mass destruction.

If you love this planet, please help lead the way
to a world that is safe, secure
and nuclear weapons free.
Begin negotiations now
for a treaty to be signed
by the year 2000
that will eliminate
all nuclear weapons
early in the next
century.

We have e-mail addresses only for leaders of the U.S., UK, and Israel. These are:

United States: <mailto:president@whitehouse.gov>
United Kingdom: <mailto:tony.blair@geo2.poptel.org.uk>
Israel: <mailto:likud1@likud.org.il>

Does anyone have e-mail addresses for the leaders of other NWS?

Complete information on leaders of NWS:

China
Premier Li Peng
Office of the Premier
25 Chaoyangmennei Dajie Dongsi,
Beijing,
P. R. China

France
President Jacques Chirac
Office of the President

Palais De L'Elysee, 55-57 rue du Faubourg
St. Honore 75008 Paris, France
Tel: +33-1-4292-8100
Fax: +33-1-4742-2465 Telex: 650127

India
Prime Minister I. K. Gujral
Prime Minister's Office
South Block, New Delhi 110011, India
Tel: +91-11-3013040 Fax: +91-11-3016857
Telex: 3161876

Israel
Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu
Office of the Prime Minister
3 Rehov Kaplan, Hakiryia, Jerusalem 91007,
Israel
Tel: +972-2-705555 Fax: +972-2-664838
e-mail: likud1@likud.org.il

Pakistan
President Farooq Ahmed Khan Leghari
President's House
Islamabad, Pakistan
Tel: +92-51-214029
Telex: 5742

Russia
President Boris Yeltsin
Office of the Government
Krasnopresenskaya 2, Moscow, Russia
Tel: +7-095-925-3581
Fax: +7-095-205-4219

United Kingdom
Prime Minister Tony Blair
Prime Minister's Office
10 Downing Street,
London, SW 1A 2 AA, Britain
Tel: +44-171-270-3000
e-mail: tony.blair@geo2.poptel.org.uk

United States of America
President William J. Clinton
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Ave.,
Washington, DC 20500, U.S.A.
Tel: +1-202-456-1111
Fax: +1-202-456-2461
e-mail: president@whitehouse.gov

Current as of December 30, 1997.

Please check to make sure that no changes have occurred since then.

This information can also be retrieved from:

http://www.wagingpeace.org/nuclear_weapons_states.html

NUCLEAR AGE PEACE FOUNDATION

A founding member of
and global contact point for the
Abolition 2000 Global Network for the
Elimination of Nuclear Weapons

1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 123
Santa Barbara, CA 93108-2794
Phone (805) 965-3443 * Fax (805) 568-0466
E- mailto:wagingpeace@napf.org
<http://www.wagingpeace.org>

Return-Path: <owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org>

Date: Tue, 27 Jan 1998 20:19:31 -0500

From: disarmament@igc.org

Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse

Sender: owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org

Subject: Civilian Leaders for Abolition

To: ctb-followers@igc.org

Dear Nuclear Disarmament Advocates,

Please stay tuned for the actual statement on February 2nd, along with suggestions for what you can do to publicize and use this statement in your work toward a nuclear weapons-free 21st century.

Press Release:

Embargoed for 2 PM Monday, February 2, 1998

Webber Professional Media Consulting

Over 100 Current or Past International Heads of State & Civilian Leaders
Call for Immediate Action to Reduce Nuclear Threat, Abolish Nuclear
Weapons

Signers Include Carter, Gorbachev, Schmidt, Rocard, Callaghan and others

Washington, D.C. — General Lee Butler and Senator Alan Cranston will hold a brief news conference at 2:00 p.m. at the National Press Club in Washington, DC on Monday, February 2, 1998 immediately following Butler's 1:00 p.m. speech at the National Press Club. General Lee Butler, USAF, (ret.), Commander-in-Chief, United States Strategic Air Command (1991-92); Commander-in-Chief, United States Strategic Command (1992-94) and former U.S. senator Alan Cranston, Chair of the State of the World Forum, will release an international statement signed by over 100 past or present heads of state and civilian leaders calling for immediate action to reduce the nuclear threat and abolish nuclear weapons. This same day, former President Mikhail Gorbachev will hold a news conference to release this statement in Russia. Cranston headed the effort to obtain the signatures from these worldwide leaders. The statement is signed by men who led their nations through the darkest days of the Cold War and who believe that we can now move to reduce the threat nuclear weapons pose in the world today.

Included among the over 100 signers are representatives from all five nuclear weapons nations (U.S., U.K., Russia, France and China) and the nations under the nuclear umbrella (Japan, Germany and South Korea). Five former prime ministers of Japan, two former vice prime ministers, and the current Jimmy Carter, former President of the U.S., Helmut Schmidt, former Chancellor of Germany, Mikhail Gorbachev, former President of the Soviet Union, Ego Gaidar, former Prime Minister of the Soviet Union, Lord James Callaghan, current Member of the House of Lords and former Prime minister of the United Kingdom, Michel Rocard, former Prime Minister of France, Sin Hyon-Hwak, former Prime Minister of the

Republic of Korea, F.W. DeKlerk, former President of South Africa, Jose Figueres, President of Costa Rica, and Pierre Trudeau, the former Prime Minister of Canada.

The statement calls for removing nuclear weapons from alert status and placing them in national storage, ending nuclear testing, launching immediate U.S./Russian negotiations towards further, deep reductions of their nuclear arsenals irrespective of START II ratification, commitment by other declared and undeclared nuclear weapon states to join the reduction process within an international system of inspection, verification and safeguards, and to the final goal of elimination of nuclear weapons. The statement also calls for immediate steps on No First Use, banning production and possession of large long-range ballistic missiles and accounting for all materials needed to produce nuclear weapons, placing them under international safeguards.

Butler and Cranston will review progress achieved since last year's statement by international generals and admirals (see page two) as well as release figures on U.S. spending on nuclear weapons to be published in an upcoming book, Atomic Audit, by the Brookings Institute Press.

Since the statement by sixty-two international generals and admirals was released in December of 1996, which followed powerful abolition statements by the Stimson Center and Canberra Commission, the following significant events have occurred:

The National Academy of Science, America's most prestigious scientific institution, issued a detailed report advocating prohibition of nuclear weapons.

A poll conducted by the respected Mellman Group for the Stimson Center found that 77% of the American people believe the world would be safer without nuclear weapons, 76% expect a nuclear attack on the U.S. by terrorists, and 24% believe that reducing the danger of nuclear war is one of the most important legacies President Clinton could leave.

Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin agreed at Helsinki to seek reduction in U.S. and Russian arsenals down to the 2000-2500 in START III, and increasing agreement developed among security experts that cutting further to only 100-200 for each nuclear power is an acceptable goal.

A study by the U.S. Joint Chiefs suggested a range of de-alerting options that are now under inter-agency review, and Foreign Secretary Primakov stated that Russia is committed to "lowering the alert status of nuclear weapons."

The recently established NATO-Russian Permanent Joint Council brought together the defense and foreign ministers of the four Western nuclear powers and other European nations, and created an experts working group on nuclear weapon issues including doctrine and strategy — the first such joint undertaking by these nations since the dawn of the nuclear age.

U.K. elections brought to power for the first time in the West a government of nuclear nation unequivocally committed to worldwide abolition. China reiterated its longtime declared goal of abolition.

The U.N. General Assembly for the first time adopted an abolition resolution supported by all five nuclear powers. Offered by Japan, it called upon the nuclear nations to systematically pursue reductions "with the ultimate goal of eliminating these weapons."

Nuclear-Weapons-Free-Zones spread further around the globe. With entry into force of the Southeast Asia N.W.F.Z., the entire land area of the southern hemisphere achieved weapon-free status. The foreign ministers of five C.I.S. nations including Kazakhstan, a former possessor of nuclear weapons, met to work on a treaty to establish a Central Asia N.W.F.Z.

FROM: Disarmament Clearinghouse

1101 14th Street NW #700

Washington DC 20005

TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232

FAX: 202 898 0172

<disarmament@igc.org>

Return-Path: <owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org>
Date: Tue, 27 Jan 1998 22:32:12 -0500
From: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.apc.org>
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse
Sender: owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org
Subject: STATE OF UNION
To: ctbt-organize@igc.org

To: CTBT-Organizers
From: disarmament
Subject: STATE of THE UNION on CTBT

PRESIDENT CLINTON ASKS FOR CTBT RATIFICATION THIS YEAR

Excerpted from White House Background for the State of the Union
Address:

COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN TREATY: President's call for Senate ratification of the CTBT will allow America to maintain a safe and reliable nuclear deterrent while constraining the proliferation of nuclear material and technology to rogue states' weapons programs. CTBT will improve America's ability to detect and deter nuclear explosive testing. CTBT's global network of sensors will strengthen America's ability to monitor nuclear explosive testing across the globe, as well as deter any nation from believing it can conduct a nuclear explosive test undetected by the international community.

RTna 01/27 2106 Clinton asks Congress to move on foreign agenda

WASHINGTON (Reuters) - President Clinton asked Congress Tuesday to approve NATO enlargement, extend the U.S. peacekeeping mission in Bosnia, pay the U.S. debt to the United Nations and ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

In his annual State of the Union address, overshadowed this year by allegations he had an adulterous affair in the White House, Clinton picked out these four requests for action from his administration's foreign policy agenda.

The president said his foreign policy goals were peace and security and the enemies were extreme nationalism, "terrorists," international criminals and drug traffickers, especially if they acquired weapons of mass destruction.

"To meet these challenges, we are helping to write international rules of the road for the 21st century, protecting those who join the family of nations, isolating those who do not," he said in the advance text of his address to Congress and the nation.

"Within days I will ask the Senate for its advice and consent to make Hungary, Poland and the Czech Republic the newest members of NATO," he said. "I ask the Senate to say yes to them -- our new allies."

The Senate is widely expected to approve this first phase of NATO expansion, after the Clinton administration gave assurances that it will not cost too much and that the United States will not be taking on too great a security burden. . .

** More than 140 countries signed the comprehensive treaty banning nuclear tests at the United Nations in September 1996 but by late last year only four legislatures had ratified it.

Sen. Jesse Helms of North Carolina, the Republican chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, told Clinton last week he would stall action on ratifying the treaty until the White House submits an even more contentious bill on global warming.

Helms, who controls the first stage of the ratification process, also asked the Clinton administration to send his committee its amendments to a 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, which the majority Republicans also oppose.

Clinton noted that four former chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff had endorsed the test ban treaty. "I ask the Senate to approve it -- this year," the president added.** . . .

REUTERS

APn 01/27 2228 Clinton-Text

By ending nuclear testing, we can help to prevent the development of new and more dangerous weapons and make it more difficult for non-nuclear states to build them.

I'm pleased to announce that four former chairmen of the joint chiefs of staff -- Generals John Shalikashvili, Colin Powell, and David Jones and Admiral William Crowe -- have endorsed this treaty. And I ask the Senate to approve it this year.

Thank you... .

In his the Republican reply, Lott emphasized National Missile Defense (STAR WARS), but made no mention of the CTBT

APO 01/27 2234 Text of the GOP Response-3

Of course, there are dangers in today's world that demand strong national leadership. Just last week, Pope John Paul's visit to Cuba reminded us that, despite the collapse of communism, tonight the future remains very uncertain over much of the globe.

.....
By the same token, we will ask the president to work with us in considering ways to stop the threats of terrorism, international narcotics and the spread of weapons of mass destruction.

As hard as it is to believe, right now our country has no national defense against missiles carrying nuclear, chemical or biological warheads.

Those who hate America most -- in Iraq, Iran and elsewhere --they know that.

President Clinton, I urge you to reconsider your opposition to defending America from missile attack. Join us in taking the steps that will actually deploy a missile defense system for the United States.

...

FROM: Disarmament Clearinghouse

1101 14th Street NW #700

Washington DC 20005

TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232

FAX: 202 898 0172

<disarmament@igc.org>

Return-Path: <okamoto@shudo-u.ac.jp>
X-Sender: mokam@pop4.ibm.net
Date: Wed, 28 Jan 1998 11:56:31 -0500
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
From: OKAMOTO Mitsuo <okamoto@shudo-u.ac.jp>
Subject: Re: NPT PrepCom; NGO strategy
Cc: aslater@igc.apc.org, geowcpuk@gn.apc.org, katie@chch.planet.org.nz,
afscamb@igc.apc.org

Dear Howard,

Excellent! All what you say and intend is super. But what if they just ignore us at Geneva as they did at Madrid on July 8 last year?

We need a momentum like the one we had at Amsterdam in November 1981, in June 1982 in New York. I was there in NY as well as Amsterdam. Today, we still do not have this momentum.

I am reading Jonathan Schell's "The Gift of Time" in The Nation, but I am not sure if this can create the momentum which he did partially with his classic The Fate of the Earth.

I already posted a similar thought on this mailing list without significant result. I don't have power to mobilize people but some one has to do this.

I am CC'ing this only to a selected few in order not to discourage the whole of Abolition 2000 community.

Respectfully,

Mitsuo

At 07:30 98/01/28 -0800, you wrote:

> Dear Abolitionists:
>
> I would like to offer some thoughts on our preparations for the NPT PrepCom
> session in Geneva.
>
> 1. The Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition is proceeding with
> plans for a reception to be hosted by world religious leaders for PrepCom
> delegates on Monday evening, April 27. NGO representatives will also be
> invited. We have commitments for participation by Dr. Konrad Raiser,
> general secretary of the World Council of Churches, and Cardinal Danneels,
> president of Pax Christi International. We are seeking participation from
> leaders of other faiths. We have cleared the date with Polish Ambassador
> Wyzner, designated chair for the PrepCom, and he accepted our invitation to
> come to the reception. We will send invitations to other delegates in their
> home countries in advance of their going to Geneva.
>
> 2. We are developing a statement by world religious leaders, which we will
> send to foreign ministers prior to the PrepCom session, urging them to
> instruct their delegates to be prepared to take significant action in
> Geneva. The current draft of this statement emphasizes stewardship of

> Earth, for which all nations and all peoples have responsibility. It asks
> the PrepCom to establish a working group to start drafting a nuclear weapons
> convention (NWC), whether or not the nuclear weapons states will agree to be
> part of the process initially.

>
> 3. We will encourage religious organizations in various countries to be in
> touch with their governmental leaders, urging them to be supportive of such
> action by the PrepCom.

>
> 4. We want to focus our attention particularly on nations which can be
> influential in the outcome of the PrepCom but which presently seem to oppose
> creation of a NWC working group or are reluctant to step forward in support
> of such action. We hope to join with others from Abolition 2000 who also
> intend to lobby various nations prior to the PrepCom.

>
> Along those lines, I was interested in the speech of Mexican Ambassador
> Miguel Marin-Bosch, which George Farebrother posted on abolition-caucus.
> Among other remarks, Ambassador Marin-Bosch indicated that "twenty-eight
> nations represent the biggest obstacle to nuclear disarmament." I wrote him
> for a list, and he replied as follows.

>
> "Strong opposition to UN General Assembly resolutions calling for nuclear
> disarmament measures has come from ten nations: Albania, Bulgaria, Latvia
> and Slovenia; Andorra, Canada, Iceland and Norway; and Denmark and Finland.
> Solid opposition (against all resolutions) has come from eighteen NATO
> members, aspirants or sympathizers: three NWS (France, UK and USA) and
> Belgium, Germany, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain
> and Turkey, as well as the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Slovak
> Republic and Monaco. And it is up to the citizens of these twenty-eight
> countries to pressure their respective governments and to insist on a moral
> compass in their approach to nuclear weapons."

>
> In December when the United Nations General Assembly voted on the Malaysian
> Resolution entitled "Advisory Opinion of ICJ on Legality of Nuclear
> Weapons", 23 of the 28 voted "no" and five abstained (Denmark, Finland,
> Iceland, Latvia, and Norway). Other negative votes came from Israel, the
> Russian Federation, and TFYR Macedonia. The essential challenge for
> abolitionists is to break through the solid opposition of NATO members,
> aspirants, and sympathizers.

>
> At the same time we need to find allies who will press the case for a
> nuclear weapons convention. Malaysia and Marshall Islands have been
> providing leadership. Some in Abolition 2000 want South Africa to play a
> significant role. In a telephone conservation I had with Doug Roche of
> Canada, he suggested Australia, Canada, Ireland, Japan, New Zealand, and
> Norway as possibilities.

>
> I'm not sure how Abolition 2000 comes to conclusions, but I hope we can work
> out a division of responsibility on who will make contacts with potential
> allies and who will work on opponents we want to win over. On the latter,
> it appears that our European colleagues need to be out in front in an effort
> to find NATO members which will break away from U.S. dominance on this
issue.

>

> 5. There are several ways we can make our case, such as follows:

>

> (a) All of us are stewards of Earth and have a responsibility for the well-being of its inhabitants. Because nuclear weapons are a threat to all humankind and to Earth itself, every nation has a responsibility to support nuclear disarmament. If the possessors of nuclear weapons are not willing to embark upon an acceptable course of action, other nations can and should develop a fair and workable plan for the global elimination of nuclear weapons. They can then use persuasion and other methods (how about a global boycott of Coca-Cola, Pepsi, and McDonald's?) to bring the nuclear weapons states into cooperation.

>

> (b) Nuclear abolition is particularly beneficial to children, offering them a new century free from the threat of nuclear weapons.

>

> (c) Many of the opponents of a nuclear weapons convention are themselves vulnerable to nuclear destruction if nuclear war breaks out. The official U.S. policy on use of nuclear weapons allows for use against any other nation possessing nuclear weapons and any nation allied with such possessors. If Russia has the same policy, Russian nuclear weapons could be used not only against the United States, Great Britain, France, and China but also against all other NATO members, Japan, South Korea, members of the British Commonwealth, and others. If China has the same policy, Chinese nuclear weapons could be used against Japan, South Korea, and other U.S. allies.

>

> To summarize, a concern for children, Earth stewardship, and vulnerability of allies of nuclear weapons states provide three arguments for persuading NATO members and others to support NPT PrepCom action to establish a working group for a nuclear weapons convention.

>

> (6) These ideas might be put together in Europe in a joint statement of notables (scientists, retired military leaders, political leaders, clergy, physicians, lawyers, other professionals, media stars, etc.), addressed to NATO members and aspirants, urging them to support a CWC working group of the NPT PrepCom out of a concern for children, the well-being of humankind, and the vulnerability of geographic in-between nations should conflict break out between the United States and Russia. The statement could stress that loyalty to humankind is more important than loyalty to the United States on this political issue.

>

> (7) Finally, persons who participated in the land mines treaty campaign have noted the effective use of visual material, especially children with a leg missing due to a land mine explosion. Some have wondered whether photographs of victims of nuclear weapons (Hiroshima and Nagasaki survivors and downwinders from nuclear testing) might be used in our campaign. Perhaps. Another approach would be a series of photographs of people, preferably school children, at ground zero of nuclear weapon targets: in Washington, D.C. at the White House and on the Capitol steps, at the Houses of Parliament in London, on the Eiffel Tower in Paris, at the Kremlin, and in similar, recognizable locations in all the other capitals of NATO, in Beijing, Tokyo, Seoul, New Delhi, Karachi, Tehran, Baghdad, Damascus, Cairo, and elsewhere. The point would be that none of these cities and their people is secure as long as nuclear weapons are deployed by the nuclear

> weapon states. These photos could be displayed at NGO headquarters in
> Geneva. A booklet of photos might be published and given to PrepCom
delegates.

>
> I would be interested in what you think of these ideas.

>
> Shalom,

>
> 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

>
>
>
>

Mitsuo Okamoto (Hiroshima Shudo University)
Human Rights Program
Pound Hall 401
Harvard Law School
1563 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02138 USA
Email okamoto@shudo-u.ac.jp

Tel +1-617-496-2824 (office, direct)
Tel +1-617-661-6609 (residence)
Fax +1-617-495-1110 Entire (!) H.L. School

If you want peace, prepare for peace (Si vis pacem para pacem).

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Cc: djroche@gpu.srv.ualberta.ca, dce@wcc-coe.org
Date: Wed, 28 Jan 1998 07:30:56 -0800 (PST)
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
X-Old-Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: NPT PrepCom; NGO strategy
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
X-Sender: mupj@pop.igc.org

Dear Abolitionists:

I would like to offer some thoughts on our preparations for the NPT PrepCom session in Geneva.

1. The Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition is proceeding with plans for a reception to be hosted by world religious leaders for PrepCom delegates on Monday evening, April 27. NGO representatives will also be invited. We have commitments for participation by Dr. Konrad Raiser, general secretary of the World Council of Churches, and Cardinal Danneels, president of Pax Christi International. We are seeking participation from leaders of other faiths. We have cleared the date with Polish Ambassador Wyzner, designated chair for the PrepCom, and he accepted our invitation to come to the reception. We will send invitations to other delegates in their home countries in advance of their going to Geneva.
2. We are developing a statement by world religious leaders, which we will send to foreign ministers prior to the PrepCom session, urging them to instruct their delegates to be prepared to take significant action in Geneva. The current draft of this statement emphasizes stewardship of Earth, for which all nations and all peoples have responsibility. It asks the PrepCom to establish a working group to start drafting a nuclear weapons convention (NWC), whether or not the nuclear weapons states will agree to be part of the process initially.
3. We will encourage religious organizations in various countries to be in touch with their governmental leaders, urging them to be supportive of such action by the PrepCom.
4. We want to focus our attention particularly on nations which can be influential in the outcome of the PrepCom but which presently seem to oppose creation of a NWC working group or are reluctant to step forward in support of such action. We hope to join with others from Abolition 2000 who also intend to lobby various nations prior to the PrepCom.

Along those lines, I was interested in the speech of Mexican Ambassador Miguel Marin-Bosch, which George Farebrother posted on abolition-caucus. Among other remarks, Ambassador Marin-Bosch indicated that "twenty-eight nations represent the biggest obstacle to nuclear disarmament." I wrote him for a list, and he replied as follows.

"Strong opposition to UN General Assembly resolutions calling for nuclear disarmament measures has come from ten nations: Albania, Bulgaria, Latvia and Slovenia; Andorra, Canada, Iceland and Norway; and Denmark and Finland.

Solid opposition (against all resolutions) has come from eighteen NATO members, aspirants or sympathizers: three NWS (France, UK and USA) and Belgium, Germany, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain and Turkey, as well as the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Slovak Republic and Monaco. And it is up to the citizens of these twenty-eight countries to pressure their respective governments and to insist on a moral compass in their approach to nuclear weapons."

In December when the United Nations General Assembly voted on the Malaysian Resolution entitled "Advisory Opinion of ICJ on Legality of Nuclear Weapons", 23 of the 28 voted "no" and five abstained (Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Latvia, and Norway). Other negative votes came from Israel, the Russian Federation, and TFYR Macedonia. The essential challenge for abolitionists is to break through the solid opposition of NATO members, aspirants, and sympathizers.

At the same time we need to find allies who will press the case for a nuclear weapons convention. Malaysia and Marshall Islands have been providing leadership. Some in Abolition 2000 want South Africa to play a significant role. In a telephone conversation I had with Doug Roche of Canada, he suggested Australia, Canada, Ireland, Japan, New Zealand, and Norway as possibilities.

I'm not sure how Abolition 2000 comes to conclusions, but I hope we can work out a division of responsibility on who will make contacts with potential allies and who will work on opponents we want to win over. On the latter, it appears that our European colleagues need to be out in front in an effort to find NATO members which will break away from U.S. dominance on this issue.

5. There are several ways we can make our case, such as follows:

(a) All of us are stewards of Earth and have a responsibility for the well-being of its inhabitants. Because nuclear weapons are a threat to all humankind and to Earth itself, every nation has a responsibility to support nuclear disarmament. If the possessors of nuclear weapons are not willing to embark upon an acceptable course of action, other nations can and should develop a fair and workable plan for the global elimination of nuclear weapons. They can then use persuasion and other methods (how about a global boycott of Coca-Cola, Pepsi, and McDonald's?) to bring the nuclear weapons states into cooperation.

(b) Nuclear abolition is particularly beneficial to children, offering them a new century free from the threat of nuclear weapons.

(c) Many of the opponents of a nuclear weapons convention are themselves vulnerable to nuclear destruction if nuclear war breaks out. The official U.S. policy on use of nuclear weapons allows for use against any other nation possessing nuclear weapons and any nation allied with such possessors. If Russia has the same policy, Russian nuclear weapons could be used not only against the United States, Great Britain, France, and China but also against all other NATO members, Japan, South Korea, members of the British Commonwealth, and others. If China has the same policy, Chinese nuclear weapons could be used against Japan, South Korea, and other U.S. allies.

To summarize, a concern for children, Earth stewardship, and vulnerability of allies of nuclear weapons states provide three arguments for persuading NATO members and others to support NPT PrepCom action to establish a working group for a nuclear weapons convention.

(6) These ideas might be put together in Europe in a joint statement of notables (scientists, retired military leaders, political leaders, clergy, physicians, lawyers, other professionals, media stars, etc.), addressed to NATO members and aspirants, urging them to support a CWC working group of the NPT PrepCom out of a concern for children, the well-being of humankind, and the vulnerability of geographic in-between nations should conflict break out between the United States and Russia. The statement could stress that loyalty to humankind is more important than loyalty to the United States on this political issue.

(7) Finally, persons who participated in the land mines treaty campaign have noted the effective use of visual material, especially children with a leg missing due to a land mine explosion. Some have wondered whether photographs of victims of nuclear weapons (Hiroshima and Nagasaki survivors and downwinders from nuclear testing) might be used in our campaign. Perhaps. Another approach would be a series of photographs of people, preferably school children, at ground zero of nuclear weapon targets: in Washington, D.C. at the White House and on the Capitol steps, at the Houses of Parliament in London, on the Eiffel Tower in Paris, at the Kremlin, and in similar, recognizable locations in all the other capitals of NATO, in Beijing, Tokyo, Seoul, New Delhi, Karachi, Tehran, Baghdad, Damascus, Cairo, and elsewhere. The point would be that none of these cities and their people is secure as long as nuclear weapons are deployed by the nuclear weapon states. These photos could be displayed at NGO headquarters in Geneva. A booklet of photos might be published and given to PrepCom delegates.

I would be interested in what you think of these ideas.

Shalom,

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

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
Date: Wed, 28 Jan 1998 12:21:38 -0500 (EST)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: more on JCS chairs and CTBT

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

The text of the one-page statement of the four former JCS chairs will be released by the White House/NSC later this afternoon. You might also expect a "White House CTBT Working Group" fax blast in the next day or two.

The following "issue brief" summarizes the fundamental point of their statement and also responds to recent arguments by Helms and others for delaying action on the CTBT. A hard copy is also being fax-blasted this afternoon to the news media and Senate.

DK

COALITION TO REDUCE NUCLEAR DANGERS

IS S U E B R I E F -- VOL. 3, NO. 6, JANUARY 28, 1998

"Former Joint Chiefs Chairmen Back Nuclear Test Ban Treaty:
President Calls for Ratification in 1998"

PROGRESS TOWARD RATIFICATION of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) gained substantial momentum as four former Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff -- General John Shalikashvili (1993-1997); General Colin Powell (1989-1993); Admiral William Crowe (1985-1989); and General David Jones (1978-1982) -- endorsed ratification of the Treaty. In conjunction with the State of the Union address, the President announced the support of the four Chairman of the JCS, who, after their careful consideration, have stated that: "With [the safeguards under which the United States will enter into the Treaty,] we support Senate approval of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty."

In his second term as President, General Dwight D. Eisenhower also sought to help prevent nuclear proliferation and to cap the nuclear arms race through a ban on nuclear testing. The value of the test ban is no less important today. When he transmitted the CTBT to the Senate on September 22, 1997, President Clinton said the Treaty will "help to prevent the nuclear powers from developing more advanced weapons ... and will limit the possibilities for other states to acquire such devices."

Ratification in '98 Is In America's Security Interests

In his address, President Clinton also called upon the Senate to provide its advice and consent for ratification of the Treaty this year. A few Senators

have suggested that the Senate should put off consideration of the CTBT until a later time. Such arguments ignore the CTBT's value in strengthening our nation's effort to curb the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the importance of U.S. ratification prior to a special conference of leading nations designed to expedite entry-into-force.

Valuable New Intelligence Asset: The test ban treaty provides America with invaluable intelligence and diplomatic tools necessary to check the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The CTBT would provide access to crucial seismic, hydroacoustic, and radionuclide data through the Treaty's extensive monitoring and verification system. With the entry-into-force of the Treaty, the U.S. will be able to exercise the right to conduct on-site inspections and other confidence-building measures to investigate "ambiguous seismic events." Clearly, the United States' capability to detect a nuclear test explosion and clandestine nuclear weapons activities would be greater with the CTBT than without the CTBT.

Global Implementation: U.S. ratification of the CTBT in 1998 would also lead the way for ratification by other nations and expedite its entry-into-force. The CTBT, which bans all "nuclear weapon test explosions and all other nuclear explosions," has been signed by 149 countries, including all five of the declared nuclear weapons states. The Treaty will go into effect after a group of 44 nuclear-capable countries ratify the Treaty, some of which may not ratify in the near future. Until the CTBT enters into force, each signatory is legally bound not to conduct nuclear test explosions under a common reading of international law.

Nevertheless, early entry-into-force of the Treaty is in the clear national security interest of the nation. It is also possible that the Treaty may be put into effect without the formal ratification of the few states who may not sign and ratify. If, by March 1999, all 44 countries have not ratified the Treaty, a special conference of states parties may be convened to consider ways to "expedite" entry-into-force, including the possibility of "provisional" entry-into-force.

To be part of the solution rather than part of the problem, the U.S. must ratify the CTBT this year.

Delay Ratification? Renew Testing? Americans Support an End to Testing Now

Despite the substantial negative effect of delay, Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chair Jesse Helms has suggested that the CTBT should wait, calling for Senate consideration of the Kyoto Climate Change Protocol and the ABM protocols before the CTBT. And, despite the adverse international security ramifications of renewed testing, despite the fact that current U.S. nuclear weapons are "safe and reliable," and despite the fact that numerous independent reports and weapons testing data indicate that further nuclear test explosions are not needed to maintain the remaining arsenal, Helms suggests that the United States should resume nuclear testing. In a January 23 article in The Washington Times, a Helms spokesperson said "Chairman Helms has been supportive of the need for nuclear testing"

These opinions stand in stark contrast to the common sense view of the vast

majority of ordinary Americans. For decades, the American public has consistently supported a nuclear test ban treaty. A recent national public opinion survey shows that over 70% of the American public supports Senate ratification of the test ban treaty (The Mellman Group, September 1998). It will be very difficult and would be unwise for the Senate to ignore the public's support for a permanent end to testing.

#

The Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers is a non-partisan alliance of 17 of the nation's leading arms control and disarmament organizations working together for a practical, step-by-step program to reduce nuclear dangers and prevent new threats from emerging. See the Coalition's new Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty web site for more information.

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
at Council for a Livable World Education Fund
110 Maryland Ave. NE #201
Washington DC 20002
p: (202)546-0795; fax: (202)546-5142
website: <http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/>

>From aslater Wed Jan 28 09:57:37 1998

Return-Path: <aslater@igc.apc.org>

Date: Wed, 28 Jan 1998 09:57:33 -0800 (PST)

X-Sender: aslater@pop.igc.org

To: mupj@igc.org

From: Alice Slater <aslater@igc.apc.org>

Subject: Catholic Bishops

Hi Howard,

Thanks for keeping me posted on Ambassador Wyzner. We have a meeting with him and some members of our A-2000 Working Group for the PrepComnext week to discuss our requests for NGO participation. (He's now Polish Ambassador to the UN, stationed here in NY.) I'm delighted that he accepted your invitation in Geneva! Thought you might be interested in this snippet from the UK parliament's debate transcript which was forwarded to me from BASIC.

Regards, Alice

Nuclear Weapons

Lord Jenkins of Putney asked Her Majesty's Government:

In relation to their goal of eliminating nuclear weapons, what response they will make to the Catholic Bishops' Conference of England and Wales, which called on the Government "to declare what steps it is taking towards the attainment of its own stated goal and what further steps it is proposing for the years leading up to the Millennium".

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, Foreign and Commonwealth Office (Baroness Symons of Vernham Dean): My Lords, we are withdrawing Britain's free-fall nuclear bomb from service. We hope to ratify the comprehensive test ban treaty this year. The Government are examining a range of nuclear issues in the strategic defence review and hope to be able to present the conclusions of the review to Parliament in the first part of this year.

Lord Jenkins of Putney: My Lords, I am grateful to the Minister for that Answer. Does my noble friend recall that at the end of a statement the bishops announced their intention of seeking to engage in a constructive dialogue on this subject with members of the Government? Will my noble friend be able to find

26 Jan 1998 : Column 7

time during her busy programme during the next week or two to engage in a constructive dialogue on the subject with me?

Baroness Symons of Vernham Dean: My Lords, since the Government took office on 1st May, the noble Lord has

submitted two Questions for Written Answer and three Oral Questions on the issue. We had a debate on 17th December. The noble Lord has two more Questions in the pipeline. I believe that I have been engaged in constructive debate with my noble friend on the issue on a number of occasions. I shall of course be delighted to see him in the course of the next week if he has something new to add to the debate.

Lord Chalfont: My Lords, is the Minister aware that in the report referred to by the noble Lord, Lord Jenkins of Putney, the Catholic bishops said that international treaties oblige states to promote the elimination of nuclear weapons. Will the noble Baroness confirm that there is no international agreement which calls upon anyone to promote the elimination of nuclear weapons except in the context of general and complete disarmament?

Is the noble Baroness also aware that the statement of the bishops states that the International Court of Justice had supported that view? Will she confirm that in its advisory opinion in July 1996, the International Court of Justice said that,

"the Court cannot conclude definitively whether the threat or use of nuclear weapons would be lawful or unlawful in an extreme circumstance of self-defence, in which the very survival of a State would be at stake"?

If the noble Baroness engages in further constructive dialogue with anyone concerned in this matter, will she be prepared to advise that this casual and selective approach to the facts surrounding a most important international issue can be seriously misleading?

Baroness Symons of Vernham Dean: My Lords, we should be in no doubt in your Lordships' House that Her Majesty's Government are for global elimination of nuclear weapons. We shall ensure that British nuclear weapons are included in multilateral negotiations when we are satisfied with verified progress towards that goal.

The noble Lord also refers to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice. Her Majesty's Government welcome the court's recognition of the importance of the obligations under the non-proliferation treaty including nuclear weapon states' obligation on nuclear disarmament. The ICJ opinion does not require a change in the United Kingdom's entirely defensive deterrence policy. We would only ever consider the use of nuclear weapons in the extreme circumstance of self-defence which includes the defence of our NATO allies. The court was unable to conclude definitively whether the threat or use of nuclear weapons would be lawful or unlawful in an extreme circumstance

26 Jan 1998 : Column 8

of self-defence in which the very survival of the state would be at stake. On that point the noble Lord is entirely right.

Nicola Butler
BASIC
Carrara House
20 Embankment Place
London, WC2N 6NN
tel: +44-171-925 0862; fax: +44-171-925 0861;
email: nbutler@basicint.org

Alice Slater
Global Resource Action Center for the Environment(GRACE)
15 E. 26 St., New York, NY 10010
212-726-9161 (tel)
212-726-9160 (fax)
aslater@igc.apc.org

To: lawrence@bgsm.edu
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Postcard alert
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Ms. Lawrence:

I am following up my letter, asking whether you could distribute a postcard action alert on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty in North Carolina. We are trying to finalize the number of cards to print for each state. Therefore, I would appreciate a reply by Thursday afternoon, January 29 if you want to place an order.

Shalom,

Howard

To: pwjm@ix.netcom.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: CTBT Alert
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Hi Carol!

Did you get my letter with a sample postcard alert? We're working on five members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, including Senator Hagel, to press Chairman Helms to hold hearings on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. If you can use a set of postcards for a mailing in Nebraska, we need to know the number right away so that they can be part of the printing order.

Shalom,

Howard

To: Stephen Young <syoung@basicint.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: Apologies
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Steve:

That's all right. I'm not a member of the Coalition, so I won't be there Friday. I'll call you so that we can set another time to meet, or have a fairly long telephone conversation.

Howard

At 05:49 PM 1/28/98 -0500, you wrote:

>Dear Howard,
>
>I realized too late that I not going to be able to make our post-Monday
>lobby meeting, and then I have neglected to call you and apoligize
>sooner, so I am doing so now!
>
>My schedule has been quite hectic of late - are you planning to go the
>Coalition meeting on Friday? Perhaps we could talk briefly after that.
>
>Again, my apologies.
>
>Stephen Young
>
>

Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>
Date: Thu, 29 Jan 1998 01:20:48 -0500
From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility
To: dkimball@clw.org, disarmament@igc.org, joe@fcnl.org, bridget@fcnl.org,
kathy@fcnl.org, mupj@igc.org, meldredge@igc.org, susangordon@igc.org,
stevenraikin@delphi.com, paexec@igc.org, dculp@nrdc.org,
vision@igc.org, tperry@ucssusa.org, tcollina@ucssusa.org,
wandwill@clark.net
CC: bmusil@psr.org, ledwidge@psr.org
Subject: Draft grassroots strategy document

Here is the draft CTBT grassroots strategy paper, which we will discuss at 11:00 a.m. on Thursday, January 29th, at FCNL.

Please come ready to make commitments! See you there.

Shalom,
Bob Tiller

THE FINAL CTBT COUNTDOWN CAMPAIGN

A DOCUMENT ON GRASSROOTS STRATEGY

prepared by Physicians for Social Responsibility
January 28, 1998

NOT FOR CIRCULATION

I. Introduction

The CTBT Treaty is the absolutely necessary next step to secure any further progress toward nuclear disarmament. It is the key symbolic and practical disarmament achievement of the 1990s and of the Clinton Administration that, if defeated in the Senate, will signal further full scale assaults and even roll back efforts on the arms control milestones of the past generation.

Gaining the signature of President Bill Clinton on the CTBT on September 24, 1996 at the United Nations was an historic victory for disarmament organizations and their allies, and was achieved only after sustained, sophisticated and vigorous efforts. Now that victory is at risk and political circumstances have begun to shift. National disarmament groups were able to gain a testing moratorium and, ultimately, signature on a CTBT because only a majority of the US Senate had been needed to prevail in legislative battles. At the same time, opponents had been faced with the task of gaining 67 votes to override potential vetoes from President Clinton. Thus, a major focus of CTBT campaigns had been to engage and motivate the Clinton Administration while maintaining a slim Senate CTBT majority composed of Democrats and a handful of liberal Republicans led by Mark Hatfield. Under these conditions, intense Washington lobbying and coordination along with

attention to major national media, backed by only a modest level of grassroots organizing in friendly and populous states was sufficient to prevail.

The situation is now reversed. It is CTBT proponents who need 67 Senate votes to secure ratification, including some 18-25 moderate and conservative Republican Senators. Additionally, if the CTBT is not ratified before October, 1998 when the Senate adjourns for the election, the next Senate is likely to be even more conservative and anti-arms control with key CTBT leaders and allies retiring or threatened by strong opponents.

Further, if the CTBT is not ratified by March, 1999, the United States will not be eligible to participate in the special sessions in September, 1999, to decide under what revised conditions the CTBT can enter into force. In short, the fate of the CTBT and attendant progress in non-proliferation and disarmament will be decided within the next nine months. Recent preoccupation by the Clinton Administration with allegations of misconduct in office have only served to make the situation more difficult.

The Clinton Administration supports ratification but lacks bipartisan leadership, fears defeat and is now preoccupied. Additionally, the CTBT is bottled up in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the grassroots have been focusing on other disarmament issues and even begun to question the necessity and value of the CTBT itself. Sen. Jesse Helms has also recently indicated that he intends to deal with NATO expansion and issues such as global climate change before turning to the CTBT. What is required, then, in addition to traditional Washington lobbying and educational work is an intense, short-term, highly coordinated grassroots campaign including the grassroots chapter, affiliate, and member networks of national groups and nationwide grassroots coalitions focused on states where there is potential support from Republican Senators. Such a campaign would complement ongoing efforts by national coalitions and organizations who focus primarily on Washington and national media.

II. The overall goal of the FINAL CTBT COUNTDOWN CAMPAIGN is to obtain Senate ratification in 1998. If we do not have a vote in sight by early summer, we might want to set September 24th as our publicly-announced deadline. Objectives (or sub-goals) include:

* Build enthusiasm for the CTBT among grassroots activists as the key necessary, though not sufficient, step toward nuclear disarmament.

* Identify key states for coordinated campaigns to gain Republican Senate support (and leaders) for the CTBT fight, and obtain statements of support for CTBT from some of those Senators.

* Educate and involve non-disarmament constituencies, especially those likely to swing Republican Senators into the campaign — physicians and other health care professionals, business groups, women's organizations, religious bodies, environment groups, civic clubs, Native American

tribes, labor unions, veterans organizations and so forth.

- * Gain media visibility in key states for the CTBT as a leading political issue to be resolved in 1998 or perhaps lost for a generation.
- * Reframe the debate and refocus attention on some Republican Senate leaders, especially Senator Jesse Helms, as reactionary, out-of-touch, key obstacles to US security needs and the national political will.
- * Secure sufficient funds for an intense and successful short-term grassroots campaign.

III. Components of a Strategy

The overall strategy is to create a nationally coordinated campaign for the CTBT, using highly public events and media events in key states, involving highly visible celebrity and entertainment figures. We will schedule local events in key states that build to a National CTBT week in D.C. This could be the first week in May — with a national lobby day and media events involving the PSR National Conference and ANA's D.C. Days -- or it could be in July as a stand-alone event. The strategy will focus pressure on key Republican swing states, also on Senator Helms and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Concentrated Effort in Targeted States: These strategies are written with the assumption that they will be targeted to states with swing Senators. We need to undertake our grassroots work in layers or segments, beginning with swing states whose Republican Senators are the most likely or necessary CTBT supporters. On Jan. 16th people agreed that the first round of four states (five Senators) would be: OR, ME, PA, OH. Our specific strategies should be implemented in those first four states immediately, then in other swing states. (The religious community agreed to concentrate early efforts on a completely different set of seven states: NC, DE, TN, IN, KS, NE, WY --- all members of the SFRC.) Three months from now we need to be working in all of the states with swing votes; that list has 20 to 27 states, depending on who is drawing it up.

Note: It has been proposed that coordination of grassroots organizing, including grassroots lobbying and media work, will occur in the Nuclear Weapons Working Group, which meets each Thursday morning. Administration-related work, DC-based lobbying and national media efforts will be dealt with in the CTBT Working Group (of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers) and in the Ad Hoc CTBT Lobby Group, both of which meet on the fourth Friday of each month. It is essential that grassroots strategies be coordinated with DC strategies: Hill, Administration, media.

Strategy 1: Keep activists informed about and part of CTBT ratification developments.

Continue and expand "ctbt-organize" electronic list-serve and post information frequently. (Disarmament Clearinghouse)

Provide weekly updates to activists through the list-serve and other means.

Post materials to the abolition caucus.

Establish a web-site or web-link of CTBT grassroots action items (PSR)

Mail the newsletter Disarmament Clearinghouse Update to 300+ activists each month. (Disarmament Clearinghouse)

Maintain links between national groups and those who agreed to be state contacts for effective communication (Plutonium Challenge, PSR, Peace Action, Disarmament Clearinghouse, Veterans for Peace, Council for a Livable World, FCNL, 20/20 Vision, United Methodist Church, various local groups)

Provide packets on CTBT from interested organizations to its own activists.

Write about CTBT in organizational newsletters.

Strategy 2: Plan state and local caucuses (organizing/training events)

The state and local caucuses will be short training events (2 or 3 hours) to stimulate a locus of activity for CTBT ratification in key state, working with activists who want a shot in the arm. They will serve to build relationships between DC and local organizers and also among activists in key states. They will help to catalyze and strategize for state-wide organizing for Senate support of CTBT ratification and will generate media coverage. They may also provide opportunities for outreach with local media work.

Each organization would volunteer to take responsibility for organizing one to three such events, using both its own activists and those of other organizations. One or two DC organizers would travel to each location and provide the CTBT campaign's national perspective and inside-the-beltway intelligence.

The caucuses would invigorate traditional groups and activists but would also aim to involve unconventional allies, like service organizations, women's groups, faith-based groups, student groups. Depending on resources available and local needs, the caucuses could also include skills workshops: media, coalition-building, lobbying, organizing.

Suggested locations:

Alaska -- Anchorage

Delaware -- any location

Indiana -- Evansville, Indianapolis, South Bend

Iowa — Iowa City, Council Bluffs (Joe Volk?)

Kansas -- Wichita, Topeka

Maine -- Portland, Bangor, Augusta

Nebraska -- Omaha, Lincoln (Bruce Hall Feb. 21?)

North Carolina — Chapel Hill, Greensboro, Charlotte, Asheville

New York -- Rochester, Albany

Ohio — Cincinnati, Columbus, Cleveland

Oregon — Portland, Eugene, Salem

Pennsylvania — Harrisburg, State College

Tennessee -- Memphis, Nashville, Knoxville

Utah -- Salt Lake City

Virginia — Richmond, Roanoke

Washington -- Bellevue (CTBT Activists Meeting Feb. 21)

Wyoming — Cheyenne, Casper

Strategy 3: Work with local media.

Those who go out to lead state and local caucuses (see above) could, along with key local activists, also participate in local media outreach, for instance:

editorial board meeting (NSNS to provide contacts and informational support)

radio interview (20/20 to help)

write and place an op-ed (Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers to help?)

Create samples of, distribute, and help activists publish, pro-CTBT op-eds and letters- to-the-editor. (Disarmament Clearinghouse, PSR, Peace Action, 20/20, others?) Keep a flow of such samples, using new angles.

Provide suggestions and guidelines to activists for participating in radio talk shows.

Provide sample press releases and news leads to activists, especially relating to the religious activities, the bus tour, etc.

Create a special media emphasis in North Carolina to show that Jesse Helms is unwilling to move us away from the nuclear abyss.

Work with CDI to create America's Defense Monitor on CTBT.

Strategy 4: Promote letters and calls to Republican Senators from constituents.

Postcards and Action Alerts to activists, both now and later. (20/20, PSR)

Seek additional people in swing states who will write letters, and send info to them.

Set up phone banks to activists a few weeks before the likely vote date.

Strategy 5: Promote delegation visits with Republican Senators during recesses.

At least four recesses are available for home state delegations to meet with Senators: Presidents' Day, Easter, Memorial Day, and July 4th — and probably the August recess as well.

Identify local leaders -- perhaps through the state contacts already named -- who will (a) seek an appointment, (b) be persistent, (c) put together a broad-based delegation, (d) conduct a good visit. It does not hurt to have more than one person seeking such an appointment.

Provide materials and tips to those seeking appointments. Help them to find the "strange bedfellows" needed.

Gather reports on the delegation visits.

Strategy 6: Produce pro-CTBT materials for grassroots that are clear and helpful.

Arguments for CTBT, rebuttals to opposition (Done - CLW, Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers?)

CTBT Myth and Reality (Done - FCNL)

Why is CTBT ratification important and urgent?

Why is the CTBT good for national security?

Quotes by prominent Americans on the CTBT

What can I do to end nuclear testing?

Revised version of PSR Monitor on CTBT (to be published in February).

Profiles of every Senator: politics, voting, donors, religion, etc.; distribute to activists.

Strategy 7: Promote city council resolutions endorsing CTBT.

Identify key cities (in swing states) with city council members who would push a CTBT resolution within the next six months.

Obtain organizational commitments to work with those city council members.

Draft a sample resolution for distribution to friendly city council members.

Compile a list of all CTBT resolutions passed by city councils, and circulate to media, top grassroots and to the Senate.

Strategy 8: Promote special CTBT efforts among religious groups.

Mailing to activists in many denominations, urging letters to Senators (in process).

Identify a weekend for churches and synagogues to emphasize CTBT ratification.

Develop materials and suggestions for religious activists, e.g. preach sermons, ring bells, hold special processions.

Develop a distribution system for these materials, and get them out well in advance.

Organize a sign-on letter for "bishop-types" in each state to go to that state's Senator.

Provide media tips to local religious groups for publicizing their events.

Work with denominational staff to identify summer conferences programs where a CTBT emphasis could be made.

Strategy 9: Reach out to groups that do not traditionally work on peace issues, including "strange bedfellows."

National organizations outreach

-Make a list of organizations (Done - CLW and CRND, looking for additions)

-Take assignments for contacting them about cooperative efforts.

>Possible resolution of support or statement by CEO

>Possible newsletter article or Action Alert

>Possible chapter outreach

>Possible lobbying efforts

-Hold media events for the "strange bedfellows" to declare their CTBT support.

-Compile a master list of all national organizations endorsing CTBT, distribute to Senate, take out newspaper ads.

Local outreach: Press core CTBT activists to go to leaders of local groups and develop cooperation, especially those that cooperate nationally..

-Use all national resolutions and statements.

-Get people from wide array of organizations to go on delegation visits to Senators (see above).

-Encourage broad-based local coalitions to place newspaper ads.

-

-

Strategy 10: Develop a speakers tour, including entertainment celebrities, politicians, and nuclear experts.

Recruit possible speakers — Admirals Carroll and Shanahan, Tom Graham, Jonathan Dean, Sandy Gottlieb, Indigo Girls, Bonnie Raitt, Martin Sheen, Tracy Chapman, Jackson Browne, Cher, Bob Dole, Jimmy Carter.

Develop a budget and raise money.

Recruit local groups as hosts and sponsors.

Set up public events.

Set up media interviews and events.

Strategy 11: Develop a tour for a "test ban bus."

Get a bus, a driver and some other folks to travel for a couple of weeks.

Pick dates.

Recruit some atomic veterans and thyroid cancer victims to go on the bus.

Recruit some celebrities and speakers to give a day to the bus tour.

Recruit some generals e.g. Lee Butler) to give a day to the bus tour.

Plan a route through cities and towns on swing states -- maybe Salt Lake City to Maine would work (going through UT, CO, NM, KS, NE, MO, IA, IN, OH, KY, TN, VA, PA, NY, RI, NH, ME). However, It might be best to start some of in our key states, e.g. OH, PA.

Recruit local groups as hosts and sponsors of public events and media in each city.

Develop a budget and raise money.

Produce publicity materials and send out to media and activists.

Produce visuals and handouts.

Strategy 12: Use already-planned events to educate/motivate grassroots on CTBT.

National

- Peace Action, March 13-17
- Interfaith Impact, March 29-April 1
- PSR, May 1-4
- ANA, May 3-6

-

-

Regional and local

-

-

Strategy 13: Conduct a national lobby day (or days) on CTBT in May or July.

Select dates.

Develop a budget and raise money.

Obtain commitments from organizations to recruit people.

Strategy 14: Reach out to colleges and universities.

This must be done early for all states, because most students are not on campus after early May. Efforts can be resumed in August.

Work with groups like Student Pugwash and Student PSR chapters.

Find out what resources they want and provide them.

Strategy 15: Press the White House to invite local leaders for conversation and photos on CTBT (if we think the White House is still an asset).

Identify some cities/states as targets.

Identify local civic leaders, clergy, environmentalists, etc. for the White House.

IV. Coordination and record-keeping --- some steps necessary to implement the strategies:

Someone to gather feedback from Senate staffers and Senators

Someone to gather Senators' letters to constituents

Someone to gather information about Senators' speeches

Someone to keep a master list of our trips and speaking engagements

Someone to gather copies of organizational endorsements, both national

and local, also including city councils

V. Timeline ---Key Dates and Opportunities

Feb.1 Undertake strategy steps in first round of swing states.

Mar. 15 Undertake strategy steps in second round of swing states.

May 1 Undertake strategy steps in all swing states.

1st wk Feb NSNS renews CTBT editorial board outreach

1st wk. Feb. Updated Nuclear Test Ban Treaty Now Activist Packets available

Feb. Updated 20/20 Coalition postcards

Feb. Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, hearing on the CTBT and the nuclear weapons stockpile (est.)

Feb. UK ratification of CTBT (estimate)

Feb. 12 Energy Secretary Pena speaks on CTBT, Nat'l Press Club

Feb. 14-22 Congressional Presidents Day recess — opportunity for meetings with Senators

Feb. Joe Volk in Iowa, Kathy Guthrie in Indiana,

Feb. 21 Bellevue, WA Regional CTBT Summit

Feb. 21 Nebraskans for Peace Conference, Bruce Hall attending

March Sandy Gottlieb to speak in Indiana

March Gore-Chernomyrdin Commission meeting, Washington (estimate)

March Subcritical, "Stagecoach"(est.)

Mar 13-16 Peace Action National Meeting & Lobby Days

Mar. 29-Apr. 1 Interfaith Impact Briefing in D.C.

April 4-19 Senate spring recess — opportunity for meetings with Senators

April 10-13 Spring Healing Global Wounds gathering, Nevada Test Site

April 22 Earth Day

March/April or later Spring?? - 20/20 sponsors a National Conference Call

May Possible CTBT Week?

May 1-4 Physicians for Social Responsibility national conference and lobby day

May 3-6 Alliance for Nuclear Accountability D.C. Days

May 23-31 Congressional Memorial Day recess — opportunity for meetings with Senators

May President Clinton visits Moscow (estimate)

June 10 35th anniversary of President Kennedy's nuclear testing speech at American Un.

June 27-July 5 Senate July 4th recess — opportunity for meetings with Senators

July Possible CTBT Week?

July 1 30th anniversary of the signing of the Non-Proliferation Treaty

July 16 53rd anniversary of the first nuclear test, "Trinity," at Alamogordo, N.M.

July 29 Second anniversary of the last nuclear test, Lop Nor, China

Summer DOE Nevada Test Site, subcritical test "Bagpipe" (estimate)

Aug. 1 or 8 Senate summer recess begins

 August 5 35th anniversary of the signing of the Limited Test Ban Treaty by the US, Soviet Union and UK at Moscow

August 6 Hiroshima Day

August 9 Nagasaki Day

Sept. 7 Senate summer recess ends

Sept. 21 Congressional Rosh Hashanah recess

Sept. 21 President Clinton addresses the U.N. General Assembly, New York (est)

Sept. 24 Second anniversary of the signing of the CTBT at New York

Sept. 24 Target date for CTBT ratification victory!!!!

September IPPNW International Symposium on nuclear weapons testing and development

October 9 Congressional adjournment target date

October 20-24 NGO Committee on Disarmament, Disarmament Week symposium, United Nations, New York (tentative)

November 3 U.S. congressional elections

November President Clinton visits China (estimate)

VI. Next steps

This is intended as a first cut, to be given further shape and detail by the groups involved in the grassroots efforts. It should be seen as a living document -- to be added to, modified and adapted as the CTBT struggle intensifies.

But the key question is not whether we can think up more activities for grassroots folks across the country. We can all generate ideas and suggest components for a grassroots strategy. The key question is how will the proposed activities be carried out? Or perhaps is should be phrased as: who will step forward and take responsibility for the various components of the grassroots strategy?

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
Date: Thu, 29 Jan 1998 16:36:14 -0500 (EST)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: White House Test Ban News, 1/28/98

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

The following is the text of the latest White House CTBT Working Group blast fax, which includes the statement from the former Chairmen of the JCS supporting approval of the CTBT.

DK

January 28, 1998
The White House, No. 4
Test Ban News

"President asks for Senate to approve CTBT this year:
Former Joint Chiefs Chairmen endorse Test Ban Treaty"

President Clinton, in his State of the Union address last night, urged the Senate to approve the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty this year.

The President called broadly for exercising responsibility "not just at home, but around the world." He said the United States must help to "write the international rules of the road for the 21st Century, protecting those who join the family of nations and isolating those who do not."

One of those international rules is the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, about which President Clinton said:

"I ask Congress to join me in pursuing an ambitious agenda to reduce the serious threat of weapons of mass destruction. This year, four decades after it was first proposed by President Eisenhower, a comprehensive nuclear test ban is within reach.

"By ending nuclear testing, we can help to prevent the development of new and more dangerous weapons and make it more difficult for non-nuclear states to build them.

"I'm pleased to announce that four former chairmen of the joint chiefs of staff -- Generals John Shalikashvili, Colin Powell, and David Jones and Admiral William Crowe -- have endorsed this treaty. And I ask the Senate to approve it this year."

The former Chairmen in a statement said:

"On September 22, 1997, President Clinton submitted the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty to the United States Senate for its advice and consent, together with six Safeguards that define the conditions under

which the United states will enter into this Treaty. These Safeguards will strengthen our commitments in the areas of intelligence, monitoring and verification, stockpile stewardship, maintenance of our nuclear laboratories, and test readiness. They also specify the circumstances under which the President would be prepared, in consultation with the Congress, to exercise our supreme national interest rights under the CTB to conduct necessary testing if the safety or reliability of our nuclear deterrent could no longer be certified. With these Safeguards, we support Senate approval of the CTB Treaty."

John Shalikashvili
Colin Powell
David Jones
William Crowe

Produced by the White House Working Group on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty
For more information on the CTBT, Phone: 202-647-8677 FAX: 202-647-6928

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
at Council for a Livable World Education Fund
110 Maryland Ave. NE #201
Washington DC 20002
p: (202)546-0795; fax: (202)546-5142
website: <http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/>

>From aslater Thu Jan 29 16:03:16 1998
Return-Path: <aslater@igc.apc.org>
Date: Thu, 29 Jan 1998 16:03:11 -0800 (PST)
X-Sender: aslater@pop.igc.org
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>, abolition-caucus@igc.org
From: Alice Slater <aslater@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: NPT PrepCom; NGO strategy
Cc: djroche@gpu.srv.ualberta.ca, dce@wcc-coe.org

Dear Howard,

Thank you for your very thoughtful proposal for action and for the great work you are doing in organizing the Abolition 2000 Religious Working Group. I suggest we set some time aside in Geneva to discuss the proposal. The European Abolition Network is meeting on Sunday, Feb. 22nd and I hope you can come to that meeting and see what support you can gather from that group of abolitionists in advance of the NPT in April-May if they can make some time on the agenda. Xanthe Hall of Ippnw is one of the lead organizers.

(ippnw@VLBERLIN.comlink.de) The Transition Team of the Network recently discussed posting a call for proposals to be presented at the General Membership Meeting on May 1-2 in Geneva and perhaps there we can divide the responsibility for making contacts with potential allies and trying to influence opponents to shift position, if we haven't begun the process at the European Network meeting on 2/22.

VISUALS

I would also seek the support of the Europeans to organize the visual presentation you suggested. We might also list a general call for materials to be included on this abolition-caucus. In addition to former devastation, I think we might be able to show the present toxic legacy--tons of nuclear waste, devastated landscapes from processing nuclear materials, testing nuclear weapons, mining uranium as well as some material on health effects from radioactive contamination caused by the manufacture of nukes. I think we need to show that even if the weapons haven't been used since Hiroshima and Nagasaki, they've continued to wreak nuclear havoc on the world just in the making and spreading of lethal radioactive materials.

BOYCOTT

I think the idea of a global boycott of Coca-Cola, Pepsi, and/or McDonald's is a wonderful idea and I suppose the best way to do it is just to announce it on every e-mail network and hope it flies like the boycott of French wine and cheese took off during the French nuclear tests in the Pacific. I'm personally partial to a boycott of MacDonald's because of the awful environmental devastation and brutality to animals caused by factory farms to raise Big Macs, together with the total unsustainability of beef production in general. But maybe we can do them all.

Thanks again for putting these good ideas out. Regards,

Alice Slater

Global Resource Action Center for the Environment(GRACE)
15 E. 26 St., New York, NY 10010
212-726-9161 (tel)
212-726-9160 (fax)

aslater@igc.apc.org

Return-Path: <lawrence@isnet.is.bgsm.edu>
Date: Thu, 29 Jan 1998 08:21:08 -0500 (EST)
From: Janet Lawrence <lawrence@bgsm.edu>
X-Sender: lawrence@isnet
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: Postcard alert

I did not receive a letter on this, but I am interested in reviewing it.
My address has changed recently, which means some mail just doesn't reach
me. Try me again at 406 Country Lane, Winston-Salem, NC 27107.

Thanks.

Janet Lawrence

On Wed, 28 Jan 1998, Howard W. Hallman wrote:

> Dear Ms. Lawrence:
>
> I am following up my letter, asking whether you could distribute a postcard
> action alert on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty in North Carolina. We are
> trying to finalize the number of cards to print for each state. Therefore,
> I would appreciate a reply by Thursday afternoon, January 29 if you want to
> place an order.
>
> Shalom,
>
> Howard
>
>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Cc: kalinowski@hrzpub.tu-darmstadt.de, basalmed.uio.no@ulrik.uio.no,
ippnw.campaign@conf.igc.apc.org, ippnwbos@igc.apc.org,
abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, djroche@gpu.srv.ualberta.ca,
edibal@iprolink.ch

Date: Thu, 29 Jan 1998 19:47:14 +0100 (CET)

From: Martin Kalinowski <dh3m@hrzpub.tu-darmstadt.de>

Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: Re: A-2000 NGO delegation

To: kirsten.osen@basalmed.uio.no (Kirsten Osen)

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igc7.igc.org id KAA03835

Dear Kirsten,

Today I talked to Dr. Blankenstein, a representative of the German Foreign Ministry.

The right to speak for NGOs seems to be the point which raises most concerns.

I draw the conclusion that we have to demonstrate in the NGO session at the NPT PrepCom plenary that we can and want really contribute with information and arguments that really serve the delegations in their business. My view is that some part of our talks in New York last year where too much of general nature to be really of interest for the delegates.

Mr. Blankenstein made the point that the whole PrepCom is fairly transparent because we can talk to all delegates after the closed sessions. I answered that it is a waste of time for everybody, if we have to be briefed about the discussions before we can contribute our advice. He agreed with me that NGO representatives in the past demonstrated that they can contribute with knowledge and advice that is of help for the delegates. He personally made this experience in New York in 1995.

Best regards,
Martin

Martin B. Kalinowski, IANUS

Hochschulstr. 10, 64289 Darmstadt, Germany

Tel.: +49-6151-163016 FAX: +49-6151-166039

Internet, private: KALINOWSKI@HRZPUB.TU-DARMSTADT.DE

Internet, group: IANUS@HRZPUB.TU-DARMSTADT.DE

<http://www.tu-darmstadt.de/ze/ianus/welcome.htm> and .../inesap.htm

Please mind the change in our postal address!

Please mind the slight change in the internet address: tu instead of th !

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Cc: cmj_msp6@gwis2.circ.gwu.edu
Date: Thu, 29 Jan 1998 17:00:03 -0800
From: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <wagingpeace@napf.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: PDD Op-ed
To: abolition-2000@mail.agoranet.be, abolition-caucus@igc.org,
INESnet@fy.chalmers.se
X-Sender: napf@silcom.com

What follows is a short opinion article on the Presidential Decision Directive.

David Krieger

**NEW U.S. GUIDELINES ON NUCLEAR WARFARE
SHOULD BE RELEASED TO PUBLIC**
by David Krieger*

New guidelines for the use of U.S. nuclear weapons were signed by the president in November 1997. These guidelines, which are contained in a four-page Presidential Decision Directive (PDD), have not been released to the public. Aspects of the guidelines, however, were leaked to the press and confirmed by administration officials. What is known about the new guidelines include the following:

- they were developed entirely in secret without any public, or even Congressional, discussion;
- they replace guidelines developed in 1981 during the Reagan presidency;
- they provide that the U.S. will continue to rely on nuclear arms as the cornerstone of its national security for the indefinite future;
- they no longer include a plan to fight and "win" a protracted nuclear war;
- they reserve the right for the U.S. to be the first to use nuclear weapons;
- they retain the option of massive retaliation to a nuclear attack, including by launch on warning;
- they give the Pentagon increased flexibility to deter or retaliate against smaller states that might use chemical or biological weapons against the U.S. or its allies;
- they provide for the U.S. to maintain a triad of nuclear forces consisting of bombers, land-based missiles, and submarine-based missiles;
- they call for the U.S. to retain options to use nuclear weapons against Russia; and
- they provide for increasing the number of sites to be targeted in China.

1/28/98

On the positive side, the new guidelines have eliminated the foolish and hopeless idea that it was possible to fight and win a nuclear war. This is an idea that has been thoroughly discredited, even by President Reagan who stated publicly that "nuclear war cannot be won, and must never be fought." It must also be considered positive that, due to the leak, we now know something about these guidelines, and can respond to what has been released. The negative aspects of these guidelines, on the other hand, are substantial. The fact that they were developed in secrecy from the public and Congress is in the best tradition of a totalitarian state. On an issue of such major public importance as strategy for using nuclear weapons, it is reprehensible that no attempt would be made to solicit public or Congressional views.

By indicating that the U.S. will continue to rely for the indefinite future on nuclear weapons for national security, the U.S. is demonstrating its hypocrisy in relation to its promise in 1995, when the Non-Proliferation Treaty was extended indefinitely, to pursue "systematic and progressive efforts to reduce nuclear weapons globally, with the ultimate goal of eliminating those weapons...." Further, the International Court of Justice ruled in 1996 that the nuclear weapons states had an obligation to "bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects...." Indefinite reliance upon these genocidal weapons is not consistent with their ultimate elimination, nor with the obligation to conclude negotiations for complete nuclear disarmament.

China was strongly critical of the new U.S. policy which increases U.S. targeting of China. A Chinese foreign ministry spokesman stated, "Now that the Cold War is already over, the international situation has eased a lot. The

United States still possesses a large arsenal of nuclear weapons. It stubbornly sticks to its policy of nuclear deterrence. It goes against the trends of peace, cooperation and development in our world."

The new guidelines reflect the continuation of U.S. policy to rely upon nuclear weapons as a central instrument of national security. These guidelines have not changed our policies of threatened first use or massive retaliation, which at their core are policies of nuclear genocide. First use, when coupled with launch on warning, commits us to risky, hair-trigger deployment of our nuclear arsenal with potentially catastrophic consequences.

The Presidential Decision Directive demonstrates a lack of commitment to the elimination of our nuclear arsenal, as called for by international agreements and international law. The new guidelines will undoubtedly be heavily criticized by the international community, particularly by many of the other 185 parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty when they meet in Geneva in April and May 1998.

It would be appropriate for President Clinton to release in full the four-page Presidential Decision Directive so that the U.S. public can fully consider and debate the policy. U.S. citizens have a right to informed consent on decisions and policies that affect their security and well-being, as this policy surely does. The public and Congress should be involved in the process of determining whether or not the new policy is consistent with basic U.S. values as well as our obligations under international law and the new geopolitical reality brought on by the end of the Cold War. At the same time, it would be instructive to the public to be provided with targeting information for the U.S. nuclear arsenal. This would allow U.S. citizens to know what populations are being threatened with mass murder in our names.

While it may be appropriate and desirable for the President to keep details of his personal life from public view, the same cannot be said for policies related to nuclear arsenals that affect the life and future of every U.S. citizen as well as every other person in the world.

*David Krieger is president of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation. He can be contacted at 1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 123, Santa Barbara, CA 93108, or by e-mail at dkrieger@napf.org.

NUCLEAR AGE PEACE FOUNDATION

A founding member of
and global contact point for the
Abolition 2000 Global Network for the
Elimination of Nuclear Weapons

1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 123
Santa Barbara, CA 93108-2794
Phone (805) 965-3443 * Fax (805) 568-0466
E- mailto:wagingpeace@napf.org
<http://www.wagingpeace.org>

\$*\$\$*\$\$*\$\$ 5 LINES REFORMATTED BY POPPER AT igc.apc.org \$*\$\$*\$\$*\$\$

Return-Path: <dwhite11@edgenet.net>
Date: Thu, 29 Jan 1998 22:58:22 -0600
From: dale white <dwhite11@edgenet.net>
Reply-To: dwhite11@edgenet.net
To: mupj@igc.apc.org
Subject: CTBT

Dear Howard:

Thanks for all of the Website addresses for sources of information on the Treaty. I was able to pull up more than 50 pages of information within an hour. Lee Ranck has the article you suggested that I write. I told him you might be helpful if he wants a last-minute up-date, especially on the number of countries that have ratified. The President gave it a good push in his State of the Union address, as I am sure you saw. Thanks for your faithfulness over the years on nuclear disarmament.

Cordially, Dale

To: jmatlack@erols.com, washofc@aol.com, cwu_washington.parti@ecunet.org, tom.hart@ecunet.org, crramey@igc.org, mark.brown@ecunet.org, mknolldc@igc.org, ncc_wshington@ecunet.org, dave@paxchristiusa.org, barbara_green@pcusa.org, gpowers@nccbuscc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Sign-on letter in response to Senator Helms
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Colleagues:

At Wednesday's meeting on the Grassroots CTBT Campaign, we reviewed the proposed letter to members of the Senate in response to Senator Helm's announcement that he intends to delay hearings on the CTBT. Several suggestions were made about changes in the letters. The drafts are open for further comments until the end of the workday, Friday, January 30. I will send out a revised version on Monday with a request for sign-ons by heads of Washington offices for those based in D.C. (or whoever else you choose). Thus, my deadline for comments can be stretched to messages I receive by 10:00 a.m., Monday, February 1.

I will soon have a more complete report on Wednesday's meeting and on a meeting held Thursday by peace organizations on CTBT grassroots strategy.

Shalom,

Howard

To: "Chris Bross" <ipb@gn.apc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Hotel accommodations
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Chris:

Thanks for the the accommodation listing. You noted that a list of inexpensive hotels is also available. Does that mean that the list you sent is of pensions that would have common bathrooms? I don't necessarily mind that, but I want to be aware of what I'm getting into. Buy if that's the case, would you please send me the listing of inexpensive hotels that provide for private baths? That will give me more choice.

Thanks,

Howard

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
Date: Fri, 30 Jan 1998 10:46:16 -0500 (EST)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: Deep Cuts Working Group Meeting Minutes, 1/14/98

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball & Jenny Smith

RE: Deep Cuts Working Group Meeting Minutes

Next meeting is: February 25, 3:30-5:00pm at UCS, 3rd floor mtg. rm. 1616 P
St. NW

DK & JS

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
Deep Cuts Working Group Meeting

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 14, 1998
4:00 PM - 5:30 PM
at UCS 3rd floor library
1616 P Street NW

NEXT MEETING: 3:30 - 5:00 PM on February 25, 1998 at UCS, 1616 P Street, NW.

ATTENDEES: Tom Collina (UCS), David Culp (Plutonium Challenge), Jonathan Dean (UCS), Bill Eisenstein (NSNS), Howard Hallman (Methodists United for Peace with Justice), Daryl Kimball (Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers), Andrew Koch (CDI), Jack Mendelson (ACA), Dan Plesch (BASIC), Kim Robson (WAND), Jenny Smith (Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers), Jeremy Stone (FAS), Bob Tiller (PSR), Robert Vandervier (Fund for New Priorities), Aryn Wrubel (PSR), Stephen Young (BASIC).

AGENDA:

1. Update and Discussion on Status of START II:

Jack Mendelson of the Arms Control Association suggested that START II may be ratified by the Russian Duma in the next 3 to 4 months, and START III will probably be concluded in the year 2000. He said that if the START II Treaty returns to the U.S. for a vote, the Administration will have to make a decision of whether to bring it up for a vote before or after the CTBT. There is an Entry Into Force deadline for START II, but not for CTBT. He proposed that the Administration will probably choose to bring up START II for a vote before CTBT because of the deadline and the unusual treaty package that will accompany START II.

2. Update and Discussion on De-Alerting Initiatives:

Jonathan Dean noted that the Administration is considering making an announcement on de-alerting U.S. nuclear weapons, and that a letter to the President encouraging far reaching de-alerting measures might be timely. Dean suggested that it might be helpful to send a Coalition letter to the President (proposed originally last October but postponed until more timely) encouraging the U.S. to announce plans to de-alert our forces down to 2,000 as soon as START II is ratified if that would compliment the work by Blair and others.

Daryl Kimball raised two points for consideration: 1) what is our reaction to a possible announcement by the President on de-alerting? and, 2) is there anything we can do to about START II in Russia? Several people responded, most of whom felt we should congratulate the White House on any move toward de-alerting and that there isn't much we can do to move the Duma to act, except possibly to encourage a U.S. initiative on de-alerting that also might be in Russia's interest.

Kathy Crandall announced that the Disarmament Clearinghouse has drafted an NGO-sign on letter to the Duma encouraging them to ratify the START II Treaty now. Please contact her for details.

3. Proposal on Removing MIRV Warheads from Nuclear Submarines:

Jeremy Stone presented a proposal to "de-MIRV" nuclear submarines, meaning to remove all warheads but one on each submarine, with the purpose of removing the U.S. first strike capability. The proposal is printed in their January/February 1998 FAS Public Interest Report and was published in the Washington Post on January 22 as an Op-Ed by Jeremy Stone and Paul Warnke. Kimball suggested that the Coalition might organize a "roundtable" forum for NGOs and interested members of the media for the purpose of looking more carefully at the FAS proposal and at the de-alerting options.

4. The Upcoming NPT PrepCom -- issues and potential Coalition Activities:

Stephen Young of BASIC suggested that the Coalition actively pursue the following goals at the NPT PrepCom in 1998: 1) encourage the President to submit a "program of action" on nuclear disarmament; 2) encourage the President to view a de-alerting agreement as an achievement at the PrepCom, and 3) begin now to draw up a revised list of principles and objectives of the PrepCom for the year 2000.

He proposed the Coalition begin an Op-Ed campaign, meet with Administration officials in February, and send a letter to the President, which BASIC has offered to write, on this issue. The group asked Stephen to draft a set of talking points that might be the basis for a meeting with Administration officials; a letter; and/or a statement at the PrepCom.

5. Report on status of draft Coalition letter on the PDD:

Daryl Kimball reported that the January 9 draft Coalition letter on the

President's

recent PDD on nuclear policy has been revised since the December 18 draft to incorporate important comments and criticisms that were received from 7 Coalition member organizations. The deadline for signatures on the January 9 draft letter on the PDD is no later than January 16. (The letter was subsequently completed and sent on 1/26.)

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
at Council for a Livable World Education Fund
110 Maryland Ave. NE #201
Washington DC 20002
p: (202)546-0795; fax: (202)546-5142
website: <http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/>

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
Date: Fri, 30 Jan 1998 11:43:22 -0500 (EST)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: CTBT Wkg. Grp. mtg. notes & activities

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball and Tom Collina
RE: Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Working Group Meeting Notes & Activities,
1/23

The next CTBT Working Grou meeting will be held on Friday, Feb. 27 from
9:30-11:00am.

Please note the summary of CTBT working group activities to see if you have
any assignments.

Please contact Tom Collina (tcollina@ucsusa.org) or Daryl Kimball
(dkimball@clw.org) if you have any questions about the meeting or
suggestions for the agenda of the next meeting.

COALITION TO REDUCE NUCLEAR DANGERS

Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Working Group Meeting Minutes

FRIDAY, JANUARY 23, 1998
9:30 AM - 11:00 AM
at NRDC, 1200 NEW YORK AVE., NW

NEXT MEETING DATES: 9:30 - 11:00 AM on the following Fridays at UCS, 1616 P Street, NW, 7th Floor Conference Room: February 27, March 27, April 24, May 22, and June 26.

ATTENDEES: Tom Collina (UCS), Kathy Crandall (Disarmament Clearinghouse), David Culp (Plutonium Challenge), Bill Eisenstein (NSNS), Maureen Eldredge (Alliance for Nuclear Accountability), Corey Gay (ISIS), Kathy Guthrie (FCNL), Howard Hallman (Methodists United for Peace with Justice), Spurgeon Keeny (ACA), Daryl Kimball (Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers), Bridget Moix (FCNL), Todd Perry (UCS), Marie Reitman (20/20 Vision), Frank Rose (SAIC), Andrei Shoumikin (Moscow Public Science Foundation), Jenny Smith (Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers), Jeremy Stone (FAS), Fran Teplitz (Peace Action), Bob Tiller (PSR), Rick Ubelhart (SAIC), Robert Vandevier (Fund for New Priorities).

AGENDA:

1. Update on Recent and Anticipated CTBT Developments: Tom Collina reported that as the President prepares for his State of the Union message, the

Administration is making the CTBT a priority for action in 1998. On the eve of the State of the Union, Senator Jesse Helms (R-NC) has issued a statement to the President advising that other treaties are of higher priority to him than the CTBT, including the ABM Treaty and the Kyoto Protocol. Hearings are expected in the Armed Services, Intelligence and possibly Foreign Relations Committees this spring. As of January 13, 1998, 149 states have signed and 8 have ratified the CTBT.

2. Media activities on the CTBT: Daryl Kimball reported that on the morning before the State of the Union, the Coalition is faxing out a media advisory on the CTBT, nuclear arms reductions and ballistic missile defenses, in order to connect the press with the Coalition's nuclear security issues experts. On the heels of the President's address, the Coalition will fax blast an issue brief on his mention of the CTBT to the press and Senate staff. In February, the Coalition is tentatively planning a second press breakfast on the CTBT. Bill Eisenstein reported that to follow up on the President's address to the nation, NSNS will send out a small mailing next week, and is planning next month to send a large Editorial Board mailing on the CTBT, as well as a reaction to Senator Helms' remarks.

3. Field Activities/Outreach Update: Laura Kriv and others reported that a special meeting to develop a grassroots strategy on the CTBT was held on January 16 at PSR. Several organizations have decided to make the CTBT the major focus of their work in early 1998. This strategy will feed into the overall effort.

Kathy Guthrie reported that the Pittsburgh CTBT Regional Summit on Saturday, January 17 included approximately 40 people from the region, and the group was addressed by Tom Collina. Many working group organizations are involved in activities over the next few weeks. Howard Hallman reported that religious organizations are responding to the Helms' statement with a letter to the Senate. Bob Tiller reported that there will be a strategy meeting on nuclear weapons maintenance on Thursday, January 29 at FCNL. Disarmament Clearinghouse will hold a conference on the CTBT in Washington State in mid- February. Peace Action is organizing a CTBT "spring cleaning" meeting for activists March 13- 15. PSR's national conference will be held May 1-4, and Alliance for Nuclear Accountability will hold a conference May 3-6 this year.

Daryl Kimball reported for John Isaacs that an outreach letter on the CTBT signed by six former members of Congress will be mailed to non-governmental organizations nationwide asking for their support. The Council for a Livable World and the Coalition requested assistance in following up with NGOs and in reviewing our database. David Culp, Tom Collina, Maureen Eldredge, Kathy Guthrie, Howard Hallman, Laura Kriv, Fran Teplitz and Bob Tiller volunteered in this endeavor.

4. Next Steps: Tom Collina handed out the timeline of when activities should take place on the CTBT over 1998. Daryl Kimball handed out a summary of current activities of the CTBT Working Group (see attachment). This list will be updated regularly.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Summary of Current Activities of Comprehensive Test Ban Working Group
(January 23, 1998)

Media Work:

- * possible Coalition press briefing (early-Feb)
- * placing op-eds around time of State of the Union speech, Jan. 27 (all)
- * press release/issue brief and media advisory around State of Union (Kimball)
- * drafting of long-term media plan (Kimball, Collina, Sommer, Stimson,
NSNS, others)
- * editorial board mailing (NSNS, early-Feb?)
- * collecting pro-CTBT editorials on Coalition web site (Jenny, CRND)

Polling:

- * deliver and release Colorado poll results (Kimball, Jan. 16)
- * poll on CTBT in two other states (Kimball, February-March)
- * national CTBT poll by Mellman/Wirthlin by February-March or later

Outreach to other constituencies:

- * Nobel Laureates letter in support of CTBT (Slakey of APS, finalized by March-April)
- * Scientists and defense experts letter (UCS)
- * outreach letter for organizations and individuals in support of CTBT (Jenny, CLW)
- * followup with organizations on outreach letter (David Culp, Tom Collina, Maureen Eldredge, Kathy Guthrie, Howard Hallman, Laura Kriv, Fran Teplitz and Bob Tiller)
- * gathering support of medical associations (PSR?)
- * developing the Hollywood connection

Analysis and Briefing Materials:

- * Coalition brochure on CTBT (Collina, Kimball and wkg. group reviewers, Jan. 30)
- * additional issue briefs for fax-blast on key CTBT subjects (Kimball & exp. adv. grp.)
- * Council for a Livable Wld. briefing book for Senate staff (J. Isaacs and Chris Davis)
- * short Coalition report on verification issues (Tom Collina & exp. adv. grp., Jan. 30)
- * coordination of quick response to CTBT opposition statements (ISIS and others, ongoing)

The Executive Branch:

- * regular contact with NSC and CTBT IWG (Collina, Kimball, others)
- * Coalition meeting with ACDA's John Holum (Tom Collina)
- * Coalition meeting with DOE's Sandy Specter, Dorothy Donnelly (Culp)
- * Coalition meeting with State Dept. officials (Kimball)
- * meeting with OSTP's John Gibbons (APS?)
- * meeting with DoD's CTBT team (Collina, others)

The Senate: Ad Hoc Hill Wkg. Group (Collina; Isaacs; Culp; Slakey; Brooks; Kriv; Teplitz; Tiller; Robson; others)***

- * master file on Senate positions (Isaacs)
- * maintain swing list (Culp)
- * profiles on individual Senators (Culp)
- * meetings with key Senate staff

* coordination with state visits by activists (Nuclear Weapons Working Grp. organizations, Am. Phys. Soc.)

***This group meets after each CTBT Working Group Meeting

Grassroots Outreach and Education: grassroots educational work in key areas (PSR, Peace Action, David Culp, WAND, 20/20 Vision, Disarmament Clearinghouse, FCNL, Methodists United for Peace with Justice)***

- * postcards; letter; phone calls; e-mail to Senate offices
- * local coalition building
- * state visits with Senators
- * DC visits with Senator in conjunction with PSR, Peace Action, WFA, MPN meetings in the spring

*** These and other grassroots organizations discuss CTBT field strategy at the Nuclear Weapons Working Group Meeting and monthly meetings involving the broader religious community.

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
at Council for a Livable World Education Fund
110 Maryland Ave. NE #201
Washington DC 20002
p: (202)546-0795; fax: (202)546-5142
website: <http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Fri, 30 Jan 1998 10:49:05 -0500
From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility
References: <34D10A9A.7EFA@psr.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Re: Nukes against Iraq
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

I can answer my own inquiry. My intern found the press conference transcript on the Pentagon's website. Here are the quotes about Iraq from Kenneth Bacon's press conference of 1-27-98:

"Q. I just wanted to check, has the President ruled out a response to weapons of mass destruction with our own weapons of mass destruction?

"A. The Adminstration's policy on this is very clear. We will respond decisively with devastating force.

"Q. The reason I ask is because if some of these targets are buried targets, the best weapons to get after them are the nuclear penetrating bombs. Has that been ruled out?

"A. I don't think we've ruled anything in or out in this regard. Our position is that we would respond very aggressively."

* * *

I think we need a public response to this. How about letters to the President, Secretary Cohen and General Shelton with copies to Senators and Representatives? Also, how about letters to the editor in newspapers all across the country?

Shalom,
Bob Tiller
Physicians for Social Responsibility

Bob Tiller wrote:

>
> One of my board members called with some shocking news. He read in
> yesterday's Springfield (Mass.) Journal that Pentagon spokesperson
> Kenneth Bacon said, when questioned, that the U.S. would not rule out
> using nuclear weapons against Iraq. The article was written by Patrick
> Sloyan and was distributed by the Newsday news service.
>
> I have not seen other references to such a quote from Bacon. Has anyone
> seen this quote, either in the Sloyan article or elsewhere? If so,
> please post it. If he really said that, shouldn't we be raising some
> heavy protest? Planning for first-use of nuclear weapons is an
> outrageous act of arrogance.
>

> Shalom,
> Bob Tiller
> Physicians for Social Responsibility

To: sylcar@aol.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: arrival time
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Saturday, January 31, 1998

Dear Sylvia,

Guess what? E mail!

I will arrive 26 Feb 98, Thursday, at Minneapolis-St. Paul Main terminal on flight 623
at 10:19 a.m..

I will leave at 2 Mar. 98, Monday at 1:05 p.m. .

I will take my warmest clothes. See you soon.

Love,

To: sylcar@aol.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Carlee's arrival
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Hi Sylvia!

When I printed out Carlee's letter on her arrival time, I noticed that she forgot so say she is coming on Northwest Airline.

Shalom,

Howard

To: relctbt
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Notes on two meetings
Cc: wetekam@juno.com
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Colleagues:

I want to share with you notes on two meetings that took place recently on grassroots strategy for CTBT ratification. These notes are for your reading but not broad circulation.

I. Gathering of religious representatives and others, Wednesday afternoon, January 28, 1998

Ivo Spalatin of ACDA provided us a perspective on prospects for CTBT ratification. Polls show broad public support for the CTBT but not necessarily deep support. Opinion leaders (elites, decision-makers, including religious leaders) tend to be international activists and are stronger in support than general public; they should be brought fully into the campaign. A lesson from ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention is don't take support for granted; rather mobilize it and create strong, steady pressure until the Senate votes.

The Administration wants committee hearings (Foreign Relations, Armed Services, Intelligence) on the CTBT after NATO and wants a Senate vote in July or September at the latest. Committee staff briefings have started. The Helms letter is a shot across the bow; it deals with legislative process not substance of the treaty. The Republican legislative schedule is not firm. Senator Lott is a key; he should be approached through people in his state. The internationalist wing of the Republican party (such as Dole) should be brought in. Grassroots support from the religious community is essential.

Jim Wetekam reported that the postcard alert to states with members on the Foreign Relations Committee is ready to go with eleven sponsoring organizations. It will go to Delaware, North Carolina, Tennessee, Indiana, Nebraska, Kansas, Wyoming, and Oregon (the latter added the next day). Approximately 7,000 cards will be printed, and FCNL will have a separate mailing.

As a follow up activity, it was suggested that an effort be made to get a sign-on letter of top religious leaders in each of the eight states to senators on the committee. Jim Wetekam agreed to draft a letter with David Culp's assistance.

In addition to these states, an effort is underway to get the two Maine senators and Senator Specter to become early endorsers of the CTBT. Religious organizations can help.

There was support for a Washington sign-on letter in response to Senator Helms' letter to President Clinton. Different versions would go to Helms, Lott, Foreign Relations Committee members, and other senators. There were several comments on the draft letters. Revised versions will be circulated during the week of February 2 for signing by heads of Washington offices (or whoever else is chosen). It was suggested that a friendly senator be asked to put this letter in the Record.

Consideration was given to a suggestion from Joe Volk to have a sign-on letter to senators from heads of communions. A consensus favored this, with the possibility of individual letters going, too. FCNL agreed to take responsibility for drafting and circulating such a letter in the next few weeks.

The WISC Military and Foreign Policy Task Force will be organizing Hill visits on the CTBT in the coming months. Volunteers will be accepted. The Task Force also wants to have a workshop on the CTBT at the Interfaith Legislative Briefing (March 29-April 1). It was suggested that CTBT also be brought up at denominational briefings at that event.

It was agreed that religious representatives working on the CTBT, plus advisers from peace organizations, should meet

on the second Wednesday of each month from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. from March through July. The dates are March 11, April 8, May 13, June 10, and July 8. They will take place at the FCNL conference room. Please put these meetings on your calendar.

II. Meeting on grassroots strategy for CTBT ratification, midday Thursday, January 29

On January 16 representatives of some of the peace organizations met to discuss grassroots strategy for CTBT ratification. Afterwards Bob Tiller of PSR pulled together the ideas into a draft strategy document. This draft was the point of departure for further discussion on January 29. Participants include representatives of Alliance for Nuclear Accountability (formerly Military Production Network), Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, Disarmament Clearinghouse, Friends Committee on National Legislation, Methodists United for Peace with Justice, Peace Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Plutonium Challenge, 20/20 Vision, and Women's Action for New Directions.

There was a strong feeling that we should push hard to achieve CTBT ratification by the end of July 1998. The campaign would divide into three phases: I. Tilling the ground between now and the spring recess (which runs from April 4-19). II. Blossoming into fully developed campaign from mid-April through June. III. Harvesting the yield with hard work and a successful vote in July.

Considerable discussion was given to priority states during Phase I. Particular attention will be given to three clusters. (1) States with potential early endorsers of the CTBT: Maine (Collins, Snowe); Pennsylvania (Specter); Ohio (DeWine). (2) States with swing-vote members on Foreign Relations Committee: Tennessee (Frist), Indiana (Lugar), Nebraska (Hagel), Kansas (Brownback), Wyoming (Thomas), Oregon (Smith). (3) Other opportunities: Alaska, Iowa, Utah, Washington. There was a division of responsibility of individuals going from Washington, D.C. to various states to help strengthen grassroots efforts. The list doesn't preclude work in other states, but for the most part this can wait until later in the legislative calendar.

It was suggested that there might be a call-in day at an appropriate moment to Senator Lott's office, asking for speedy floor consideration.

There are series of planned events taking place in Washington: Peace Action, March 13-17; Interfaith Legislative Briefing (March 29-April 1); PSR, May 1-4; ANA, May 3-6. The CTBT will be the main focus of some, one of a number of focuses of others.

To keep track of information and feedback from the campaign, the following division of responsibility will occur: Feedback from senators and their staff on senators' position on CTBT: John Isaacs, Council for a Livable World. Swing list of senators: David Culp, Plutonium Challenge. Senators' letters to constituents: 20/20 Vision. Endorsers: national - Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers; local - Disarmament Clearinghouse. Master list of field trips and speaking engagements: Kathy Crandall, Disarmament Clearinghouse. Grassroots contacts, state by state: Disarmament Clearinghouse, 20/20. Editorials: National Security News Service. Letters to the editor: 20/20.

The next meeting on overall CTBT grassroots strategy will take place on Thursday, February 26 at 10:30 or 11:00 a.m. All organizations involved in the grassroots campaign are welcome to send a representative.

Other meetings related to the CTBT are: CTBT Working Group (deals mostly with Washington issues but receives grassroots report), 4th Friday of each month, 9:30 to 11:00 a.m., followed by separate meeting on Hill lobbying, at National Resource Defense Council. Meeting involving religious organizations working on CTBT grassroots campaign, 2nd Wednesday of each month, 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. at FCNL. Nuclear Weapons Working Group of Monday Lobby (weekly details of CTBT grassroots campaign and Stockpile Stewardship), 9:00 to 10:30 a.m., Mott House. All of these meetings are open to all organizations involved in the CTBT ratification campaign. Because most religious organizations can't have representatives at all of them, I will share notes or have minutes sent on the meetings.

III. Conclusion

We may have too many meetings, but the CTBT ratification campaign is a complex endeavor. If we do all the things we are setting out to accomplish, I'm convinced that we will achieve our goal by the end of July.

Shalom,

Howard

Return-Path: <owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org>

Date: Mon, 02 Feb 1998 10:49:27 -0500

From: disarmament@igc.org

Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse

Sender: owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org

Subject: Civil Leaders for Abolition

To: "undisclosed-recipients:;"

Stay Tuned for the text of the statement this afternoon.

Washington Post, Feb. 2, 1998 p. A15

To: ctb-followers

X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.0 (Win95; I)

Carter, Gorbachev Join Call To Reduce Nuclear Threat

By Bradley Graham

Washington Post Staff Writer

Monday, February 2, 1998; Page A15

More than 100 former or current heads of state and civilian leaders from around the world, including ex-presidents Jimmy Carter and Mikhail Gorbachev, have signed a statement that calls for removing nuclear weapons from alert status and other measures aimed at the eventual elimination of atomic arsenals.

The statement, scheduled for release today, echoes a similar appeal by 60 generals and admirals in late 1996. It reflects mounting support for the cause of nuclear abolition among those who have had direct responsibility for atomic weapons programs.

"The world is not condemned to live forever with threats of nuclear conflict, or the anxious fragile peace imposed by nuclear deterrence," the document says, according to a copy made available in advance. "Such threats are intolerable and such a peace unworthy. The sheer destructiveness of nuclear weapons invokes a moral imperative for their elimination."

Endorsing the message are 117 prominent individuals from 46 nations, including 47 past or present presidents and prime ministers. Among them, in addition to Carter and Gorbachev, are former German chancellor Helmut Schmidt, former French prime minister Michel Rocard, former British prime minister Lord James Callaghan, former

Canadian prime minister Pierre Trudeau and former South African president F.W. DeKlerk.

To hasten the disappearance of nuclear weapons, the signatories advocate placing all atomic warheads in storage away from launchers, halting production of fissile materials for nuclear weapons and initiating U.S.-Russia talks immediately to achieve deeper reductions in arsenals despite the ongoing Russian delay in ratifying START II, which would reduce the number of strategic warheads.

They also urge serious consideration be given to repatriating nuclear weapons deployed abroad, adopting a policy of "no

first use" of atomic weapons and banning production and possession of long-range ballistic missiles.

Accompanying release of the statement here, retired Gen. George Lee Butler, who commanded U.S. nuclear forces from 1991 to 1994, plans to deliver a speech at the National Press Club denouncing the concept of nuclear deterrence that underpinned U.S. strategic thinking in the Cold War and that remains part of the official rationale for retaining thousands of atomic weapons today. The speech goes further than the one Butler delivered in December 1996, when he stunned the national security community by joining the nuclear abolition movement after a 37-year military career during which he helped draft U.S. nuclear war plans.

"It is distressingly evident that for many people, nuclear weapons retain an aura of utility, of primacy and of legitimacy that justifies their existence well into the future, in some number, however small," Butler says, according to a prepared text.

He is critical of the revised nuclear targeting guidelines issued by President Clinton in November for reflecting more continuity than change. Clinton dropped the Cold War requirement for U.S. forces to be prepared to win a protracted nuclear war, but he affirmed that the United States will continue to rely on nuclear arms as a cornerstone of its national security.

With an eye toward the prospect of renewed conflict with Iraq, Butler also lambastes the administration for leaving open the possibility of nuclear retaliation in the event Iraq unleashes chemical or biological weapons. "What better illustration of misplaced faith in nuclear deterrence than the persistent belief that retaliation with nuclear weapons is a legitimate and appropriate response to post-Cold War threats posed by weapons of mass destruction," he says.

FROM: Disarmament Clearinghouse
1101 14th Street NW #700
Washington, DC 20005
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232
FAX: 202 898 0172
<disarmament@igc.org>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Mon, 2 Feb 1998 17:21:06 +0000
From: "Clayton Ramey" <crramey@igc.apc.org>
Organization: F.O.R.
Reply-to: crramey@igc.apc.org
X-Old-Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: (Fwd) An appeal to the President of the United States of America
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, Karen Hooks-Roon <HOOKS_ROON@gkc.com>, Ross Wilcock <rwilcock@execulink.com>, ifor@gn.apc.org, "Barry Gan" <bgan@sbu.edu>, "Ingrid Askew" <askew1@jun>
X-Old-Sender: <crramey@pop.igc.apc.org>

----- Forwarded Message Follows -----

From: Self </crramey>
To: president@whitehouse.gov
Subject: An appeal to the President of the United States of America
Reply-to: crramey@igc.apc.org
Date: Mon, 2 Feb 1998 14:45:54

Dear President Clinton:

In the Name of the Lord of Creation;

In the name of Jesus the Messiah;

In the name of each of the 600,000 Iraqi children already killed by "economic sanctions";

In the name of those who would be killed by any further U.S. military actions against Iraq;

In the name of your love for your own daughter Chelsea, and for the young people of Iraq who would certainly perish in another war;

In the name of your understanding of the cold logic of politics, which must be telling you that a military attack on Saddam will strengthen, not weaken, his position in Iraq;

And most of all, Mr. President, in the name of nonviolence and moral decency;

I appeal to you, as Commander In Chief of the Military forces of the United States of America, to STOP THE ECONOMIC VIOLENCE AGAINST THE IRAQI PEOPLE AND THE PREPARATION FOR THE ARMED VIOLENCE THAT YOU ARE THREATENING TO UNLEASH AGAINST THEM.

Please. In the name of God. Turn away from war and destruction. And give nonviolence more of a chance for success.

Prayerfully, and in Hope,

Clayton Ramey

Peace and Disarmament Program Coordinator
Fellowship of Reconciliation, USA

Return-Path: <owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org>
Date: Mon, 02 Feb 1998 14:42:04 -0500
From: disarmament@igc.org
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse
Sender: owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org
Subject: Civilian Leaders STATEMENT
Subjetc: Civilian Leaders STATEMENT
To: ctb-followers@igc.org

Dear Disarmament Advocates:

Today a statement calling for nuclear weapons abolition signed by 117 civilian leaders, including 47 past or present heads of state has been released. Former President Jimmy Carter signed for the U.S. This is an extremely useful tool for all of us working to draw public attention to the importance and urgency of nuclear weapons abolition.

If you would like a copy of all signers, please let me know. (It is about 10 pages long) I am happy to provide this to you via fax, e-mail or "snail" mail.

The press conference which included a statement by General Butler and Alan Cranston was covered by C-Span and National Public Radio.

The entire statement is also on the web site of the State of the World Forum at:
<http://worldforum.org/about-newscont.html>

Former President Mikhail Gorbachev held a news conference to release this statement in Russia.

Congratulations and thanks to the State of the World Forum for this very important and successful effort!

Please contact me for more information and assistance in using this fabulous statement in your work for nuclear weapons abolition.

Thanks to Daryl Kimball at the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers in helping us to have prompt access to this statement.

WHAT YOU CAN DO:
in the near term here are some action suggestions...

1) Watch for local news coverage, Fax news clips to the White House (include a brief note about your efforts for nuclear abolition)

The Honorable William Jefferson Clinton
President of the United States of America
1600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Washington DC 20500
Attention: Samuel Berger, National Security Advisor
(202) 456-1121

- 2) Fax the same news clips to your Senators and Representatives.
- 3) Respond with a letter to the editor.
- 4) Make copies of the statement available at upcoming meetings and events - such as the NO to Nato Expansion tours.

If you are in a key state for CTBT ratification, Don't forget to point out in your letters and faxes, the importance of a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW as an essential step toward nuclear abolition.

For assistance in responding to and using this fabulous statement, please contact:

The Disarmament Clearinghouse
1101 14th Street NW #700
Washington, DC 20005
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232
FAX: 202 898 0172

STATEMENT ON NUCLEAR WEAPONS BY INTERNATIONAL CIVILIAN LEADERS

February 2, 1998

The end of the Cold War has wrought a profound transformation of the international political and security arena. Ideological confrontation has been supplanted by burgeoning global relations across every field of human endeavor. There is intense alienation but also civilized discourse. There is acute hostility but also significant effort for peaceful resolution in place of violence and bloodshed.

Most importantly, the long-sought prospect of a world free of the apocalyptic threat of nuclear weapons is suddenly within reach. This is an extraordinary moment in the course of human affairs, a near miraculous opportunity to realize that noble goal. But it is also perishable: the specter of nuclear proliferation cannot be indefinitely contained. The urgent attention and best efforts of scholars and statesmen must be brought to bear.

Leader of the nuclear weapon states, and of the de facto nuclear nations, must keep the promise of nuclear disarmament enshrined in the Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1970 and clarified and reaffirmed in the 1995 in the language codifying its indefinite extension. They must do so by commencing the systematic and progressive reduction and marginalization of nuclear weapons, and by declaring unambiguously that their goal is ultimate abolition.

Many military leaders of many nations have warned that all nations would be more secure in a world free of nuclear weapons. Immediate and practical steps toward this objective have been arrayed in a host of

compelling studies, most notably in the Report of the Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons. Among these proposals, we, the undersigned, fully subscribe to the following measures:

1. Remove nuclear weapons from alert status, separate them from their delivery vehicles, and place them in secure national storage.
2. Halt production of fissile materials for nuclear weapons.
3. End nuclear testing, pending entry into force of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.
4. Launch immediate U.S.-Russian negotiations toward further, deep reductions of their nuclear arsenals, irrespective of START II ratification.
5. Unequivocal commitment by the other declared and undeclared nuclear weapon states to join the reduction process on a proportional basis at the U.S. and Russia approach their arsenal levels, within an international system of inspection, verification, and safeguards.
6. Develop a plan for eventual implementation, achievement and enforcement of the distant but final goal of elimination.

The foregoing six steps should be undertaken immediately.

The following additional steps should be carefully considered, to determine whether they are presently appropriate and feasible:

- * Repatriate nuclear weapons deployed outside of sovereign territory.
- * Commit to No First-Use of nuclear weapons.
- * Ban production and possession of large, long-range ballistic missiles.
- * Account for all materials needed to produce nuclear weapons, and place them under international safeguards.

The world is not condemned to live forever with threats of nuclear conflict, or the anxious, fragile peace imposed by nuclear deterrence. Such threat are intolerable and such a peace unworthy. The sheer destructiveness of nuclear weapons invokes a moral imperative for their elimination. That is our mandate. Let us begin.

FROM: Disarmament Clearinghouse
1101 14th Street NW #700
Washington, DC 20005
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232
FAX: 202 898 0172
<disarmament@igc.org>

Return-Path: <owner-sunflower-napf@igc.org>
Date: Fri, 30 Jan 1998 21:02:56 -0800
From: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <wagingpeace@napf.org>
Sender: owner-sunflower-napf@igc.org
Subject: The Sunflower, February Issue
To: sunflower-napf@igc.org
X-Sender: napf@silcom.com

THE SUNFLOWER
free electronic monthly newsletter
No. 9, February 1998
NUCLEAR AGE PEACE FOUNDATION

The Sunflower is an educational newsletter providing information on nuclear weapons abolition and other issues relating to peace in the Nuclear Age.

IN THIS ISSUE

NEWS

CIVILIAN LEADERS CALL FOR NUCLEAR WEAPONS ELIMINATION UN RELEASES MODEL NUCLEAR WEAPONS CONVENTION FRENCH SHIP NUCLEAR WASTE TO JAPAN COST OF NATO EXPANSION

NEWS BRIEFS

ACTIONS YOU CAN TAKE

FEBRUARY DATES TO REMEMBER

IMPORTANT EVENTS

BOOK REVIEW

FOUNDATION NEWS

NEWS

-----~

CIVILIAN LEADERS CALL FOR NUCLEAR WEAPONS ELIMINATION

On Monday, February 2nd, a statement calling for the abolition of nuclear weapons, signed by nearly 100 civilian leaders from throughout the world (including 36 past or present heads of state), will be released in Washington. General Butler will release the statement at the National Press Club and give a report on progress in the past year since the release of the statement by retired military leaders.

UN RELEASES MODEL NUCLEAR WEAPONS CONVENTION (MNWC) A blueprint for an international treaty which would abolish nuclear weapons

has now been released by the United Nations. Costa Rica had submitted the document that sets forth legal, technical and political issues that should be considered in order to ban nuclear weapons. The blueprint was drafted by an international group of lawyers, scientists, disarmament experts and a working group within the Abolition 2000 Network. In 1996 the International Court of Justice, the UN court in the Hague, confirmed that there exists a binding legal obligation to negotiate a ban against nuclear weapons. -- The United Nations circulation of this model convention is a major step forward for Abolition 2000, a citizens' campaign for a treaty by year 2000 for the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

-- > For the MNWC see: <http://www.bullatomsci.org/IALANA.html>

FRENCH SHIP NUCLEAR WASTE TO JAPAN

France has shipped some 25 tons of radioactive nuclear waste to Japan on the British-flagged "Pacific Swan." This is the third shipment from the French state firm Cogema which reprocesses spent nuclear fuel from Japanese reactors into reusable uranium and plutonium and radioactive waste. The two previous shipments from France in 1995 and 1997 raised safety concerns among countries along the shipping routes, and environmental groups protested against the secrecy surrounding the shipments. The current shipment is the first such voyage routed through the Caribbean and the Panama Canal. The waste could spill into the sea or be seized by terrorists. (AP 9801)

COST OF NATO EXPANSION

The once-certain entry of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic is now clouded by weakening public support in the Czech Republic where the Czech economy is suffering. Cost estimates for the first planned round of expansion range from \$1.5 billion to \$125 billion over the next decade. The Clinton Administration is pushing for admission of up to a dozen or more former Eastern bloc nations over the next decade, which could cost U.S. taxpayers up to \$250 billion out of a total \$500 billion cost to NATO countries. (Karina Wood, 1998)

-----\----oOo~-----
/#/ NEWS BRIEFS
-----\----oOo~-----

UNITED STATES: According to Human Rights Watch, the United States "single-handedly" is blocking international efforts to prevent the recruitment of child soldiers. Currently, the U.S. accepts 17 year-olds as voluntary recruits into the military, and is thus opposed to establishing 18 as the minimum age for voluntary recruitment into government forces. Seventeen year-olds make up only a fraction of U.S. troops.

-- > More info at: <http://www.hrw.org/hrw/campaigns/crp/crp-cmp1.htm>

UNITED STATES: The Pentagon plans the creation of a new agency -- the Agency for Defense Cooperation -- that combines functions of the Defense Security Assistance Agency and the office of international cooperation run by the undersecretary of defense for acquisition and technology.

UNITED STATES: The chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Jesse Helms (R-NC) warned President Clinton that he will allow a vote to ratify the Comprehensive Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) only after

considering the Kyoto (climate) Protocol and the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) treaty, both of which he opposes. (WT 980123)

RUSSIA/PRC: Russia and China made final at the end of December a deal worth \$3.5 billion in a joint venture to build two 1,000 MW nuclear reactors at Lian-yungang, a coastal city about 250 miles north of Shanghai. China plans to construct 100 reactors in the next 50 years. (LAT 971230)

RUSSIA: Moscow urgently needs foreign help to clean up nuclear waste from more than 100 scrapped nuclear submarines sitting in northern and Far Eastern ports. Together with the Barents Euro-Atlantic Council of Nordic countries, Russia asked the international community to intensify its help in clean-up efforts. (AP 980122)

RUSSIA: The end of the cold war has produced an alarming nuclear irony. Russia is now more dependent on its nuclear weapons than ever and at the same time those weapons are more vulnerable. This increases the chances that in a severe crisis Moscow might consider using them. (NYT 980112)

-----~oOo~-----
ACTIONS YOU CAN TAKE
-----~oOo~-----

1. FIND OUT MORE ABOUT ABOLITION 2000.

-- > Go to: <http://www.wagingpeace.org/abolition2000.html>

2. SEND A VALENTINE'S GREETING CARD to President Clinton and other leaders of nuclear weapons states and urge them to sign a treaty banning nuclear weapons -- when they love this Earth. Following are some e-mails:

United States: mailto:president@whitehouse.gov

United Kingdom: mailto:tony.blair@geo2.poptel.org.uk

Israel: mailto:likud1@likud.org.il

For a complete list of these and other leaders, contact the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, or go to
http://www.wagingpeace.org/nuclear_weapons_states.html

3. JOIN THE "MISSILES TO SUNFLOWERS" CAMPAIGN. Add your name to the Abolition 2000 International Petition calling for ending the nuclear threat, signing a treaty banning nuclear weapons, and reallocating resources from military purposes to meeting human needs. A copy of the petition is available from Abolition 2000, c/o Nuclear Age Peace Foundation or on the web at <http://www.wagingpeace.org/intlpetition.html>.

4. HELP ORGANIZE efforts to have your municipality pass a resolution in support of achieving the abolition of nuclear weapons. Ask us for a sample resolution or go to: <http://www.wagingpeace.org/ab2000city.html>

5. PROTEST THE USE OF CHILD SOLDIERS BY THE UNITED STATES

Contacts:

President William J. Clinton Fax:202 456 2461

E-mail: president@whitehouse.gov

Secretary of Defense William Cohen Fax:703 695 1219

Hon. Madeleine K. Albright, Secretary of State

E-mail: secretary@state.gov

First Lady Hillary Clinton Fax:202 456 2461
E-mail: first.lady@whitehouse.gov

YOUR SUPPORT WILL MAKE A DIFFERENCE!

Please send copies of your letters to the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation at
the address listed below or to mailto:wagingpeace@napf.org

6. JOIN OUR ACTION ALERT NETWORK: ACT NOW!

To subscribe to "Act Now!" please send a message

To:majordomo@igc.org

Subject: <leave empty>

subscribe act-now-napf <your email address here>

7. FORWARD THIS NEWSLETTER TO A FRIEND

FEBRUARY DATES TO REMEMBER

FEBRUARY

4 February 1952: U.N. Disarmament Commission holds first meeting.

10 February 1990: Nelson Mandela, leader of the African National Congress, released after 27 years in prison.

13 February 1945: Massive Allied bombing creates fire-storm for second time in history.

13 February 1960: France explodes its first atomic bomb in the Sahara desert of Southern Algeria.

20 February: NONVIOLENT RESISTANCE DAY. Norwegian teachers begin successful nonviolent strike against Nazification of schools (1942).

27 February 1973: American Indian Movement (AIM) members occupy Wounded Knee, South Dakota in protest against Bureau of Indian Affairs.

28 February 1989: The Nevada-Semipalatinsk Movement to stop all nuclear testing is founded.

IMPORTANT EVENTS

February 3: Santa Barbara, California

"Safe Passage to the 21st Century: Eliminating Nuclear Weapons"

Lecture by Douglas Roche, O.C.

WHERE: University Club - Alumni Room

February 5: Washington, D.C.

"Making The Case For Nuclear Abolition." With Jonathan Schell, Alan Cranston, Robert McNamara, and Thomas Graham, Jr.

WHERE: The Mooers-Morella Courtroom, American University School of Law
4801 Massachusetts Ave. N.W., Washington D.C.

WHEN: 12:30 to 1:30

--> for information call (212) 242-8400, ext. 213 or
e-mail: mailto:prothberg@thenation.com

February 5: New York, New York

Peace vs. Justice: Reconciling Accountability for Human Rights

Atrocities with Conflict Resolution

WHERE: The Great Hall of the House of the

Association of the Bar of the City of New York
42 West 44th Street, New York, New York
WHEN: 7pm

February 13-15: Dortmund, Germany
INES Student Congress for information
--> e-mail Reiner Braun at mailto:r.braun@lilly.ping.de

February 14
Valentine's Action Day: Abolition 2000 postcards will be mailed to the leaders of Nuclear Weapons States

February 14-15: Berkeley, California
13th Annual South Asia Conference
Center for South Asia Studies, International and Area Studies,
University of California, Berkeley, USA
--> <http://www.ias.berkeley.edu/southasia/conference.html>

February 20-21: Geneva, Switzerland
Planning for the NPT, Palais des Nations,
International Seminar on Disarmament
Information: NGO Committee for Disarmament, Edith Ballantyne
--> mailto:edibal@iprolink.ch

February 21: Hiroshima, Japan
On behalf of Abolition 2000, David Krieger, President of the Foundation, will receive 10 million signatures on the Abolition 2000 International Petition, collected by Soka Gakkai, a lay Buddhist organization.

14-22 March:
European Week of Action Against Racism
For information contact UNITED for Intercultural Action
--> mailto:united@antenna.nl
or go to <http://www.xs4all.nl/~united>

March 27-28: Amsterdam, The Netherlands
1998 spring meeting of the European Network Against Arms Trade (ENAAT)

April 4: Santa Barbara, California
Jody Williams, coordinator of the International Campaign to Ban Landmines and 1997 Nobel Peace Laureate, will receive the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation Distinguished Peace Leadership Award

-----~oOo~-----
BOOK REVIEW
-----~oOo~-----

THE ULTIMATE EVIL: THE FIGHT TO BAN NUCLEAR WEAPONS. By Douglas Roche.
Toronto: James Lorimer, 1997. 126p.

This is an excellent overview of the struggle to achieve a nuclear weapons free world. Douglas Roche, O.C., a former Canadian Ambassador for Disarmament, is presently a Visiting Professor at the University of Alberta. The book is \$19.95 as paper back. ISBN 1-55028-589-0

-----~oOo~-----
FOUNDATION NEWS

-----~oOo~-----

* Our ACTION ALERT has been transformed into a listserve.

To subscribe to "ACT NOW!," please send a message

To:majordomo@igc.org (mailto:majordomo@igc.org)

Subject: <leave empty>

subscribe act-now-napf <your email address here>

OR go to <http://www.wagingpeace.org/action.html>

* Back issues of THE SUNFLOWER are now accessible on the web at:

http://www.wagingpeace.org/the_sunflower.html

* OTHER RESOURCES

AUDIO TAPES (\$8.00 each plus \$3.00 s&h)

- "The Social Responsibility of Scientists" by Joseph Rotblat

- "A World Without War" by Joseph Rotblat

- "Musicians Don't Make War" by Lord Yehudi Menuhin

FREE OF CHARGE

- "The Challenge of Our Time," by David Krieger

- Sample Valentine's Card to leaders of nuclear weapons states

- Information packet on Abolition 2000

-----~oOo~-----
FEEDBACK
-----~oOo~-----

Anonymous appraisals of our web-site:

"I really enjoy your purpose and goals and think it is a wonderful movement."

"So far I only read the "Why we Should Phase Out Nuclear Power " article and I enjoyed it. I am doing a debate on any nuclear related topic for my government class. I am on the side that is anti-nuke. This site looks like it will be very helpful."

PLEASE SEND US YOUR QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS
<mailto:wagingpeace@napf.org>

-----~oOo~-----
EDITORS
-----~oOo~-----

David Krieger, J.D., Ph.D. - Christoph Hanterman, Ph.D.

-----~END~-----

To subscribe to "The Sunflower," please send a message

To:majordomo@igc.org

Subject: <leave empty>

subscribe sunflower-napf <your email address here>

To unsubscribe to "The Sunflower," just send a message

To:majordomo@igc.org

Subject: <leave empty>

unsubscribe sunflower-napf <your email address here>

NUCLEAR AGE PEACE FOUNDATION

A founding member of
and global contact point for the
Abolition 2000 Global Network for the
Elimination of Nuclear Weapons

1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 123
Santa Barbara, CA 93108-2794
Phone (805) 965-3443 * Fax (805) 568-0466
E- mailto:wagingpeace@napf.org
<http://www.wagingpeace.org>

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
Date: Tue, 3 Feb 1998 09:36:43 -0500 (EST)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: Clinton in NM, pt.2

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball
RE: Clinton in NM, pt. 2

This story follows a Feb. 2 afternoon White House press briefing led by Bob Bell concerning the CTBT, the 6 safeguards, and the President's trip to Albuquerque and Los Alamos.

DK

February 3, 1998

Clinton Views Nuke Test Simulation

Filed at 3:22 a.m. EST

By The Associated Press

WASHINGTON (AP) -- To help his argument for a ban on nuclear testing, President Clinton wants to see for himself whether a computer can give scientists the same results they used to get by detonating bombs in the desert.

The president will visit the Los Alamos National Laboratory in New Mexico today to see a supercomputer simulation of a nuclear test. He wants to ``speak from first hand experience'' when he proposes a comprehensive test ban treaty to the Senate this year, said Robert Bell, Clinton's senior director for defense policy and arms control.

In his State of the Union address, the president said that a ban would prevent the creation of more dangerous nuclear weapons and make it harder for unfriendly nations to develop them.

``The point of the treaty is to 'ban the bang,' not to 'ban the bomb,'" Bell said. ``Ratification by the United States and others will constrain non-signatories to this treaty ... by, in effect, establishing an international norm against testing."

By going to Los Alamos, Clinton wants to underscore the U.S. effort to maintain a safe, reliable nuclear stockpile without tests. The Los Alamos laboratory, along with two others in Albuquerque and California, play a pivotal role in meeting some of the safeguards the president will submit to the Senate with the proposed treaty, Bell said.

Among the safeguards is maintaining the ability to resume testing ``should the treaty no longer be enforced, for whatever reason, in the future," Bell said. The last nuclear test was conducted in 1992.

``If we were to fail at this task ... of maintaining very high confidence in our nuclear weapons through stewardship, absent nuclear

testing, the president, in consultation with Congress, would be prepared to withdraw from the (comprehensive test ban) under the Supreme National Interest clause," Bell said.

Clinton will be briefed on the objectives of the Stockpile Stewardship Program: to keep the nuclear stockpile safe and reliable as the weapons age; to enhance the ability to replace weapons components as needed; to train new weapons scientists; and to ensure there is a way to repair and remake weapons over time.

After his stop in Los Alamos, Clinton will go to Albuquerque to highlight his balanced budget plan at a rally.

New Mexico is home state of Sen. Pete Domenici, the Republican chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, who made clear on Monday that the debate will be over whether to give Americans a tax break, as the GOP wants, or create ``more government" under Clinton's plan.

White House spokesman Mike McCurry said Clinton would not back down in the face of that resistance.

"If the Republicans wish to oppose the president's efforts ..., it's obviously a fight the president will welcome, cherish, can't wait to have happen," McCurry said.

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
at Council for a Livable World Education Fund
110 Maryland Ave. NE #201
Washington DC 20002
p: (202)546-0795; fax: (202)546-5142
website: <http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/>

Return-Path: <bridget@fcnl.org>
Date: Tue, 3 Feb 1998 10:32:34 -0500 (EST)
X-Sender: bridget@local.fcnl.org
To: mupj@igc.apc.org
From: Bridget Moix <bridget@fcnl.org>
Subject: sign-on letters

Howard,

Please sign FCNL on to the religious community letters calling for action on the CTBT, as:

Joe Volk
Executive Secretary
Friends Committee on National Legislation

Thanks!

Bridget

To: relctbt
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Sign-on letter
Cc: mupj@igc.org
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Colleagues:

Here are the revised sign-on letters in response to Senator Helms' assertion that he intends to delay consideration of the CTBT. Please excuse the length, but I want to vary the message. Signers will be representatives of religious organizations working together for CTBT ratification.

If you or someone else in your office wants to sign-on, please reply to me by the close of business on Friday, February 6. I would like name, title, organization. My phone/fax is 301 896-0013. E-mail is mupj@igc.org.

The letterhead will consist of the names of signing organizations. As a return address at the end, I will use "CTBT Advocates", 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036. If you have any questions, please call me.

Shalom,
Howard

###

The Honorable Jesse Helms, Chairman
Senate Committee on Foreign Relations
450 Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510-6225

Dear Mr. Chairman:

We respectfully request you to reverse your position that you will not schedule committee consideration of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) until the Senate has voted on the Kyoto Protocol and amendments to the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty. The CTBT is an important instrument in the quest to achieve a world in which all of us, especially our children and grandchildren, can live free from the threat of nuclear weapons. Therefore, this treaty, which has broad public support, should not be held hostage to other legislative agendas.

The CTBT makes important contributions to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. First, it prevents non-nuclear weapon states from carrying out tests required to field an advanced nuclear arsenal. Second, by prohibiting any nuclear weapon test explosions and all other nuclear explosions, the treaty limits the ability of nuclear weapon states, including the Russian Federation and China, to build new types of nuclear weapons.

The United States is one of 44 nations which must ratify the CTBT before it can enter into force. Accordingly, the U.S. Senate should not become an obstacle to making the treaty an effective instrument of nuclear non-proliferation and world peace. Because the United States is a world leader, prompt action by the Senate will encourage other nations to ratify.

The Kyoto Protocol and amendments to the ABM treaty have not been transmitted to the Senate and will not be until the Administration completes its preparations for transmission. In contrast, the CTBT is already before the Senate, and other committees have started hearings. Waiting for these other treaties would cause unnecessary delay in the global halt of nuclear weapons testing.

Therefore, we urge you to promptly schedule committee hearings on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and to bring

treaty to a vote by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as soon as possible. This will give the whole Senate, representing the American people, an opportunity to vote on this important treaty.

Sincerely yours,

Signers from the religious community

###

To Members of Senate Foreign Relations Committee, individually

Dear Senator _____:

We notice that Senator Jesse Helms, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, has recently indicated to President Clinton that he will not schedule consideration of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) until the Senate has considered and voted on the Kyoto Protocol and amendments to the ABM Treaty. Since neither of these measures has been transmitted to the Senate, Senator Helms is saying in effect that he will not allow the Foreign Relations Committee to consider the important Test Ban Treaty until 1999 or later. We believe that this is a grievous error and urge you to exercise your responsibility as a member of the Committee to assure that the CTBT is given prompt consideration.

The CTBT is an important instrument for the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. It is a major step in the quest to achieve a world in which all of us, especially our children and grandchildren, can live free from threat of nuclear weapons.

The CTBT contributes to the nuclear non-proliferation in two ways. First, it prevents non-nuclear weapon states from carrying out tests required to field an advanced nuclear arsenal. Second, by prohibiting any nuclear weapon test explosions and all other nuclear explosions, the treaty limits the ability of nuclear weapon states, including the Russian Federation and China, to build new types of nuclear weapons.

The United States is one of 44 nations which must ratify the CTBT before it can enter into force. Accordingly, the U.S. Senate should not become an obstacle to making the treaty an effective instrument of nuclear non-proliferation and world peace. Because the United States is a world leader, prompt action by the Senate will encourage other nations to ratify.

A September 1997 national public opinion survey by the Mellman Group found that 70 percent of the American public believes that the Senate should ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. Only 13 percent opposed. We don't want to see public desires once again thwarted by a committee chairman who won't even provide for a fair hearing and a vote on a measure that has overwhelming public support. That would be harmful to the reputation of the U.S. Senate and would be contrary to the public's desire for bipartisan cooperation.

Therefore, we ask you to assure that the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty receives prompt hearings and a committee vote as soon as possible.

Sincerely yours,

Signers from religious organizations.

###

The Honorable Trent Lott
S.230 U.S. Capitol
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Lott:

We notice that Senator Jesse Helms, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, has recently indicated to President Clinton that he will not schedule consideration of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) until the Senate has considered and voted on the Kyoto Protocol and amendments to the ABM Treaty. Since neither of these measures has been transmitted to the Senate, Senator Helms is saying in effect that he will not allow the Foreign Relations Committee to consider the important Test Ban Treaty until 1999 or later. We believe that this is a grievous error. Therefore, we urge you as Majority Leader to facilitate prompt consideration of the CTBT by the Foreign Relations Committee so that the Senate can debate and vote on the treaty in 1998.

The CTBT is an important instrument for the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. It is a major step in the quest to achieve a world in which all of us, especially our children and grandchildren, can live free from threat of nuclear weapons.

The CTBT contributes to the nuclear non-proliferation in two ways. First, it prevents non-nuclear weapon states from carrying out tests required to field an advanced nuclear arsenal. Second, by prohibiting any nuclear weapon test explosions and all other nuclear explosions, the treaty limits the ability of nuclear weapon states, including the Russian Federation and China, to build new types of nuclear weapons.

The United States is one of 44 nations which must ratify the CTBT before it can enter into force. Accordingly, the U.S. Senate should not become an obstacle to making the treaty an effective instrument of nuclear non-proliferation and world peace. Because the United States is a world leader, prompt action by the Senate will encourage other nations to ratify.

A September 1997 national public opinion survey by the Mellman Group found that 70 percent of the American public believes that the Senate should ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. Only 13 percent opposed. We don't want to see public desires once again thwarted by a committee chairman who won't even provide for a fair hearing and a vote on a measure that has overwhelming public support. That would be harmful to the reputation of the U.S. Senate and would be contrary to the public's desire for bipartisan cooperation.

That is why we turn to you as Majority Leader and ask you to let the Foreign Relations Committee know that Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty deserves prompt hearings and a committee vote as soon as possible.

Sincerely yours,

Signers from religious organizations.

###

To Senators not on Senate Foreign Relations Committee (form letter)

Dear Senator:

We notice that Senator Jesse Helms, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, has recently indicated to President Clinton that he will not schedule consideration of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) until the Senate has considered and voted on the Kyoto Protocol and amendments to the ABM Treaty. Since neither of these measures has been transmitted to the Senate, Senator Helms is saying in effect that he will not allow the Foreign Relations Committee to consider the important Test Ban Treaty until 1999 or later. We believe that this is a grievous error and urge you to ask your colleagues on the Foreign Relations Committee to give the CTBT prompt consideration.

The CTBT is an important instrument for the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. It is a major step in the quest to achieve a world in which all of us, especially our children and grandchildren, can live free from threat of nuclear weapons.

The CTBT contributes to the nuclear non-proliferation in two ways. First, it prevents non-nuclear weapon states from carrying out tests required to field an advanced nuclear arsenal. Second, by prohibiting any nuclear weapon test explosions and all other nuclear explosions, the treaty limits the ability of nuclear weapon states, including the Russian Federation and China, to build new types of nuclear weapons.

The United States is one of 44 nations which must ratify the CTBT before it can enter into force. Accordingly, the U.S. Senate should not become an obstacle to making the treaty an effective instrument of nuclear non-proliferation and world peace. Because the United States is a world leader, prompt action by the Senate will encourage other nations to ratify.

A September 1997 national public opinion survey by the Mellman Group found that 70 percent of the American public believes that the Senate should ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. Only 13 percent opposed. We don't want to see public desires once again thwarted by a committee chairman who won't even provide for a fair hearing and a vote on a measure that has overwhelming public support. That would be harmful to the reputation of the U.S. Senate and would be contrary to the public's desire for bipartisan cooperation.

Therefore, we ask you to assure that the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty receives prompt hearings and a committee vote as soon as possible.

Sincerely yours,

Signers from religious organizations.

To: Dwain, dave@paxchristiusa.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Draft statement for religious leaders
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Dwain and Dave:

So far none of my leads has produced any names of potential Jewish, Muslim, Buddhist and Hindu leaders to participate in our Geneva event. I'll keep trying and want your suggestions.

The last draft I wrote of the proposed advance statement drew upon Jewish/Christian scripture with room for references from other religions. Because the latter aren't forthcoming, I've decided to rewrite the first part to deal with the subject more generically. We need to move to closure. Is this a statement that Dr. Raiser and Cardinal Danneels would sign? Do you have any suggestions for changes in the draft?

I still would like to obtain principal signers from other faiths. Dwain, what about an Orthodox Christian? When I'm in Geneva on February 18-20 I could make some contacts if appropriate.

After we obtain our principal signers, we might reach out for a broader group. Dwain, is this something we could go with to WCC heads of communions? Dave, could we obtain Catholic signers from various countries, such as Pax Christi leaders and other leading Catholics?

I look forward to your replies.

Shalom,
Howard

To: "Xanthe Hall" <ippnw@vlberlin.comlink.de>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: European A2000 Meeting
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Xanthe:

I'm going to Geneva for the planning session for the NPT PrepCom on February 20 and 21. I notice that the European Abolition 2000 Network is meeting on Sunday, February 23. Would it be all right if I sat in as an observer?

I'm not sure what language you use in your meetings. I've studied German and French without developing fluency, and both have deteriorated. But maybe it'll be English since that is the language of abolition-caucus.

I look forward to meeting you in Geneva.

Shalom,
Howard

To: Dwain, dave@paxchristiusa.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Draft letter
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Dwain and Dave:

I forgot to attach the draft letter. Here it is.

Howard

###

A Statement by Religious Leaders on Nuclear Abolition
Draft of February 3, 1998

To: Foreign Ministers of Signatories of the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty [Proposed to be sent in February or early March 1998, prior to the next session of the NPT PrepCom.]

The convening of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee in Geneva from April 27 to May 8, 1998 offers a valuable opportunity to make substantial progress in the quest to rid Earth of nuclear weapons. Vigorously pursuing this goal is essential for the sake of peace and justice. It is necessary to fulfill our stewardship responsibility for Earth.

The use and threatened use of nuclear weapons is morally wrong. As an instrument of mass destruction, nuclear weapons would kill large numbers of people indiscriminately and leave many more with lingering ailments. Moreover, their use would have a devastating effect on the environment near and far. As long as the threat of nuclear weapons exists, there can be no enduring peace.

Justice requires elimination of nuclear arms. Noncombatants constituted most of the victims the two times nuclear weapons were used in warfare. Indigenous peoples have been most seriously effected in the testing of nuclear weapons during the past fifty years. If nuclear weapons are ever used again, innocent civilians will inevitably be foremost among the victims.

The planet Earth is ours not to recklessly exploit and destroy but rather to use for mutual benefit and to preserve. Because nuclear weapons have the potential of doing grave harm to Earth and its inhabitants, we as good stewards must rid Earth of this perilous threat.

Already the nations of Earth are committed by Article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) "to the cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament." After reviewing this article at the request of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the International Court of Justice unanimously agreed that "There exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control."

The time has come to take this obligation seriously. Therefore, we ask you to instruct your delegation to the forthcoming meeting of the NPT Preparatory Committee to come committed to setting the course resolutely for the abolition of all nuclear weapons on Earth.

To be specific, we call upon the NPT Preparatory Committee to establish a working group to begin the process of negotiating a Nuclear Weapons Convention that will outlaw and eliminate nuclear weapons by all possessors. Because such a Convention serves the interests of all humanity and all nations on Earth, it is a task that can properly be taken up

by an international body, such as the NPT Preparatory Committee. Although nuclear weapon states must be involved in implementation, drafting the Convention can commence even if they are not yet ready to participate.

As a Nuclear Weapons Convention is being written, the nuclear weapon states should take steps to reduce the risk of nuclear war and make progress toward nuclear disarmament. Such action should include:

- Declare a policy of no first use amongst themselves and non-use in relation to non-nuclear weapon states.
- Take nuclear forces off alert and remove warheads from delivery vehicles.
- Refrain from modernizing or increasing the number of deployed nuclear weapons.
- Continue bilateral reduction of nuclear weapons by the United States and Russia, but at a faster pace of reduction

These intermediate steps will combine with negotiations for a Nuclear Weapons Convention to set the stage for the world to enter the 21st century with a commitment to eliminating from Earth the scourge of nuclear weapons.

Names of Signers

Attachment: Statements by Religious Bodies and Religious Leaders on Nuclear Abolition

The Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches stated: "We believe that the time has come when the churches must unequivocally declare that the production and deployment as well as the use of nuclear weapons are a crime against humanity and that such activities must be condemned on ethical and theological grounds. Furthermore, we appeal for the institution of a universal covenant to this effect so that nuclear weapons and warfare are delegitimized and condemn as violations of international law." [or an alternative statement]

Speaking for the Holy See before the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly on October 15, 1997, Archbishop Renato Martino stated: "Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21st century. They cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation. The preservation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty demands an unequivocal commitment to their abolition....This is a moral challenge, a legal challenge and a political challenge. That multiple-based challenge must be met by the application of our humanity." [or a statement by Pope John Paul II or some other Catholic source]

[Quotations from other religious leaders and religious bodies.]

Drafted by Howard W. Hallman, Methodists United for Peace with Justice. Please send comments to him via e-mail at mupj@igc.org, or by fax to 301 895-0013 (USA), or by regular mail to 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036

Return-Path: <network@igc.apc.org>
Date: Tue, 3 Feb 1998 13:16:46 -0800 (PST)
X-Sender: network@pop.igc.org (Unverified)
To: mupj@igc.apc.org (Howard Hallman)
From: Lora Wedge <network@igc.apc.org>
Subject: religious orgs sign on letters

Howard,

We, at NETWORK, are wondering if you have had a chance to redraft the letters for religious organizations to sign on to regarding CTBT. One of our members who is part of the national level Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility would like to have a copy this week to sign on to if that is acceptable. My impression at the last meeting was that all faith based groups would be welcomed to sign on, but if that is not so, I will let her know. If you are still redrafting, I will send her a copy as a draft (they are having a large 4-5 day meeting).

Thank you for your work!
Lora Wedge, Field Associate

NETWORK, A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby
801 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE, Suite 460
Washington, DC 20003-2167
Tel. 202-547-5556
FAX 202-547-5510
network@igc.apc.org
www.igc.apc.org/network

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
X-Authentication-Warning: igc2.igc.apc.org: majordomo set sender to owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org using -f
Date: Tue, 3 Feb 1998 15:16:24 -0800 (PST)
From: NGO Committee on Disarmament <disarmtimes@igc.apc.org>
X-Old-Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: U.N. Forum transcripts on web
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org

"THE FUTURE OF DISARMAMENT" ON THE WEB

Transcripts of the 1997 U.N. Disarmament Week symposium,
entitled "The Future of Disarmament," are now available on
the website of the NGO Committee on Disarmament at the U.N. --

<http://www.peacenet.org/disarm/>

Panels on nuclear disarmament, the Comprehensive Test Ban
Treaty, land mines (with 1997 Nobel Peace Laureate Jody Williams),
small arms, human development, and the role of the U.N. in
disarmament.

Following is an excerpt from this electronic publication, by a
U.N. official who has been very much in the news of late.

NGO Committee on Disarmament
777 U.N. Plaza #3B, New York NY 10017, USA
tel 1.212.687.5340 fax 1.212.687.1643
e-mail disarmtimes@igc.apc.org

* * * * *

"The Evolving Role of the U.N. and Disarmament" (excerpt)
Amb. Richard Butler
Director, U.N. Special Commission on Iraq
Disarmament Week symposium, 23 October 1997, U.N. Headquarters

The Charter of the UN did envisage disarmament. I do not think it mentioned it strongly enough, but there is an awareness in the Charter that if we are to do the things that motivated the founding fathers - not enough mothers, I'm afraid - but the founding people in San Francisco, the main thing that motivated them was to prevent the scourge of war from recurring. There is an awareness in the Charter that one of the ways that needs to be done is through disarmament. The Security Council and the Military Staff Committee are supposed to put together proposals for the regulation of armaments. I don't think those references in the Charter are, in and of themselves, strong enough. But nevertheless, I would argue that there is a recognition in the Charter that the fundamental purpose of the new international organization to maintain international peace and security, to prevent the scourge of war, could be well served by the regulation of armaments.

In addition, having said the language is not strong enough, I would make large of the fact that the Charter does insist upon the peaceful settlement of disputes. There is the clue to what we have seen happen subsequently with respect to disarmament, and what we must see happen further in the future. The Charter's reference to the peaceful settlement of disputes is absolute. It assumes that there will be disputes in human society. I think it is very important that we recognize that.

Human beings will not always agree what is to be done, what is right or wrong, and indeed, who owns what, whether ownership is of territory, or resources, or rivers or goods and services. There will always be arguments within the human family. I think it is important that we remember that is inevitably the case.

The absolute injunction of the Charter says that when you have your arguments, you must settle them peacefully. Our common enemy is war, and the settlement of disputes peacefully, it seems to me, gets to the very heart of what we who are devoted to disarmament - and I am proud to be devoted to disarmament - are about. It is this: we recognize that yes, there will be arguments within the human family, but we utterly insist that none of those arguments will be more easily or better solved if someone puts a gun on the table. The instant that that happens, that argument becomes a fight. That difference of opinion, that conflict of interest, whether it is about land or territory or goods and services, contracts, whatever, will be transformed from a dispute within the human family, where there can be differences of opinion, into a fight. Blood will be shed, murder will take place.

That is the inevitable consequence of someone saying, I am sick of this discussion, I want to settle it this way, and putting a gun on the table. That is what disarmament is about - the peaceful settlement of disputes, and is about the depth of the conviction that we all have that nothing will be made easier when you introduce a gun or a weapon into the situation.

Weak though the references to disarmament in the Charter were, I would insist that those references, together with the Charter's absolute injunction that disputes must be settled peacefully, means that part of the business of living in the age of the United Nations must be the evolution and continual development of disarmament.

How has the UN done in that evolution? I think better recently than it did initially. In the period of the Cold War, things were far slower than they should have been, with one fantastic and notable exception; namely, in 1954 the conference on the statute of an International Atomic Energy Agency, which led to the creation of that agency in 1956.

The UN's role as it has evolved has had three main parts. One is the development of law, mainly through treaties regulating or eliminating arms. Secondly, the provision of verification of the obligations established in that law, and thirdly, the tough business, when that law is not observed, of enforcing it.

That, in particular, is the business of the Security Council. The Security Council will adopt a resolution today on the disarmament of Iraq. The first line of the operative part of the resolution will say, "Acting under Chapter VII of the Charter." Everything in Chapter VII is about enforcement. Then the measures will be spelled out. That is the third part of the UN's role in disarmament. One, to make the law; two, to verify the keeping of its obligations and three, when they are not kept, to enforce the law.

How is it done? In practical terms, I have already mentioned the IAEA, to which we should now add the Organization for the Prevention of Chemical Weapons in the Hague, the Organization in Vienna on a Test Ban Treaty, and may I say, my organization, the United Nations Special Commission. The laws involved that have given rise to these structures have been the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the

Chemical Weapons Convention, the various laws and resolutions of the Security Council with respect to elimination of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction. Then there are other laws in the corpus of UN disarmament law that do not have a particular organizational outcome, such as the IAEA with respect to NPT. There are laws such as the Biological Weapons Convention, the Seabed Treaty, the various agreements with respect to zones free of weapons of mass destruction, nuclear weapons, and of course, most recently, the land mines treaty.

I have probably left out some relevant laws or treaties. The CTBT I did not mention. This corpus of law, of which I mentioned the big ones - there are other bits as well - constitute an outstanding record. It has been slow in some ways. It is a frustrating business. It has been a bit slower than we would have wanted it to be, but, in the past decade, as we got toward the end of and out of the Cold War period, the amount of law-making has been very impressive.

We now have on our statute books - this is the main point I want to make - the response of the UN, in hard codified law, to some of the major weapons problems that the second half of the 20th century has faced, regarding nuclear weapons, chemical weapons, biological weapons and soon land mines. We have made the required law, and, on the whole, it is good law....

Date: Tue, 03 Feb 1998 14:45:00 -0800
From: Marci Lockwood <execdirector@igc.org>
To: mupj@igc.apc.org
Subject: News from IGC

Dear IGC Member,

I want to fill you in about upcoming improvements to your IGC Internet service. Starting in March, you'll be able to get unlimited flat rate email and Internet access for just \$19.98 a month.

As you may know, we had hoped to be able to launch our new flat rate service in January, however, I felt that it was necessary to delay the launch. We wanted to make certain that the new IGC/Netscape software that we will be providing to you was adequately tested.

The new IGC Internet service will include a free copy of the latest Netscape Communicator 4.0 software for Windows 95 and Mac Power PC users and Netscape 3 for Windows 3.1 users. For those of you currently running our Interact/Eudora software, we are working on a downloadable conversion program that will help you convert all those stored emails and addresses to Netscape.

The new IGC Internet will allow you to log on from more than 700 local phone numbers across the country (no more access charges as long as you're using one of those local numbers). Yes, we'll also be providing 800 number service (for an additional charge) for those of you traveling or in extremely remote locations without a convenient local access number. You'll also be able to take advantage of the faster 56k access to the Web if you have a 56kflex modem.

The new \$19.98 per month rate will require that you use the new IGC/Netscape software (there's a lot of technical reasons for that). Netscape 4 for Windows 95 requires a 486DX processor or higher, 16mg of RAM, about 30mg of hard drive space and a CD to load the software. Mac Power PC users will need a 7.53 or higher machine with 16mg of RAM and 30mg of hard disk space and a CD to load the software. For Windows 3.1 users, we will be providing Netscape 3. You'll need a 486 processor, 8mg of RAM and 10 mg of hard drive space. A CD would be the best way to install the program but we will provide floppies (a lot of them) of Netscape 3 for a small additional duplicating charge. All CD's will be provided free of charge for any current IGC user.

Unfortunately, for technical reasons, we won't simply be able to switch your current billing to the flat rate. Of course, we will continue to support our existing customers who choose not to switch right away or need more time to decide.

In response to your suggestions, technical support hours will also be increasing later this year -- longer hours every day, and weekend support.

We'll also be inviting you to get free service - 1 free month for every

new user you get to sign up for IGC Internet!

As the new services become available, we'll let you know by e-mail.

Your comments and suggestions help make IGC work better, so please send them to me at execdirector@igc.org.

Thanks you for giving IGC the opportunity to provide your internet service and your patience as we work to provide you with cheaper, more reliable connections.

Marci Lockwood
IGC Executive Director

To: Marci Lockwood <execdirector@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: News from IGC
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

At 02:45 PM 2/3/98 -0800, you wrote:

>Dear IGC Member,
>
>I want to fill you in about upcoming improvements to your IGC Internet
>service. Starting in March, you'll be able to get unlimited flat rate
>email and Internet access for just \$19.98 a month.....

Dear Marci:

Thanks for the notification of your change in service. I have some questions.

A few weeks ago when I was having a mailbox problem with Eudora, I used Netscape for e-mail for a few days, and I didn't like it as well as Eudora. I may not have understood all the options, but apparently I couldn't go off line to read messages as you can in Eudora. With a flat fee, there would be no extra cost for staying on line with Netscape. However, as a small operation, I use one phone line for phone, fax, and e-mail, and I don't want to preclude incoming calls when I'm reading my e-mail. Usually I wait until evening to use the web in order to keep the phone line open during the day.

Also, Eudora seems to have more features than Netscape e-mail, at least as I understand it. Such as nicknames, filtering.

Is there more about Netscape that I don't understand? Will you provide a manual that explains how to use Netscape?

Alternatively will it be possible to stay on Interact/Eudora with the same fee structure? (I have yet to go over the minimum.)

I manage a list-serve. Will that be effected?

Since joining IGC a little over a year ago, I have appreciated the service and the help provided by your technical support department. I look forward to your response to my query.

Shalom,

Howard

>From epf Wed Feb 4 06:30:28 1998
Return-Path: <epf@igc.apc.org>
Date: Wed, 4 Feb 1998 06:30:26 -0800 (PST)
X-Sender: epf@pop.igc.org
To: mupj@igc.org
From: "Mary H. Miller" <epf@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Sign-on letters

Howard,

Please include us/me on all of the "response to Helms' position" sign-on letters, as follows:

Mary H. Miller, Executive Secretary, Episcopal Peace Fellowship

One typo - in the letter to Lott, the "the" before CTBT is missing.

Thanks for your work! mm

Return-Path: <disarmament@igc.apc.org>
Date: Wed, 04 Feb 1998 11:22:33 -0500
From: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.apc.org>
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse
To: hughes123@aol.com
CC: brodierose@aol.com, mupj@igc.org
Subject: CTBT in WA

Bob - I know that Howard Hallman has been in touch with you about CTBT organizing in Washington state. Your help was vital to winning the CWC, and I hope that you will be involved in the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW campaign too!

Enclosed is an invitation to the Organizing Conference in Bellevue on the 21st of this month (a Saturday). Howard told me that you will not be able to attend - I'm sorry about that. I do hope that you will circulate this invitation to others in Washington state that might come. I will be in the Seattle area from Thursday the 19th through Monday the 23rd. I hope that I might meet with you sometime during that time.

In the meantime, please contact Rosemary Brodie in Seattle (tel) (206) 523 1127, and/or me at the Disarmament Clearinghouse, to let us know how we can work together for a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW.

Thanks!

Kathy Crandall
Disarmament Clearinghouse
1101 14th Street NW #700
Washington, DC 20005
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext.232
FAX: 202 898 0172
<disarmament@igc.org>

**NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY NOW
ACTIVIST TRAINING CONFERENCE**
Join with others in the Northwest to develop a strategy to
win ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty

WHEN: Saturday, February 21st, 1998, 10:00 am - 3:00 pm

WHERE: Bellevue, Washington
American Income Life, 15440 Bellevue-Redmond Rd.

Peace Action of Washington and Northwest Disarmament Coalition invite all nuclear disarmament advocates and concerned citizens in the Pacific Northwest region to join us in a training conference to kick off a grass-roots campaign to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). The CTBT will be considered in the U.S. Senate this year, and

your efforts can ensure that the United States leads the way to the permanent end to nuclear weapons test explosions. After over 2,000 nuclear weapons tests that have had devastating environmental and health effects worldwide, it is time for a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW!

The Pacific Northwest is especially crucial to this campaign. We need your help to secure the leadership of your Senators on this vital disarmament and non-proliferation treaty.

You will receive the information that you will need to become an effective part of this campaign. Issue experts from Washington, DC and local peace organizations will report on the status of the test ban in the Senate and issues surrounding the treaty.

Strategy workshops will include: Lobbying, Media Strategies, Public Outreach and more

The Conference is FREE and open to all who want to work for a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW! Breakfast and Lunch will be provided. As a service to participants coming from distant areas, overnight housing and other assistance will be available.

Please let us know that you will join us. Your advanced registration will help us to plan an effective conference.

Please return the following form to Fred Miller at Peace Action (Seattle, WA address below) or Kathy Crandall at the Disarmament Clearinghouse <disarmament@igc.org>

For more information, or if you cannot attend, but want to participate in the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty Now Campaign, please contact Fred Miller at Peace Action of Washington, (206) 527-8050 or Kathy Crandall at the Disarmament Clearinghouse, Washington DC (202) 898-0150 ext. 232.

Sponsored by Peace Action of Washington, the Northwest Disarmament Coalition & The Disarmament Clearinghouse: a project of Peace Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Plutonium Challenge and Women's Action for New Directions.

NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY NOW ACTIVIST TRAINING CONFERENCE

Join with others in the Northwest to develop a strategy to win ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty

WHEN: Saturday, February 21st, 1998, 10:00 am - 3:00 pm

WHERE: Bellevue, Washington
American Income Life, 15440 Bellevue-Redmond Rd.

Yes, I want to attend the Nuclear Test Ban
Treaty NOW Activist Training Conference!

NAME: _____

ORGANIZATION/AFFILIATION:

ADDRESS_____

TEL: _____ FAX: _____

E-MAIL:

Do you need housing and travel assistance?

RETURN THIS FORM TO: Fred Miller, Peace Action of Washington

TEL: (206) 527-8050 FAX: (205) 527-9985
5828 Roosevelt Way NE
Seattle, WA 98105

or Kathy Crandall, Disarmament Clearinghouse

TEL: 202 898 0150 ext.232 FAX: 202 898 0172
<disarmament@igc.org>
1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington DC 20005

Sponsored by Peace Action of Washington, the Northwest Disarmament Coalition & The Disarmament Clearinghouse: a project of Peace Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Plutonium Challenge and Women's Action for New Directions.

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Wed, 4 Feb 1998 18:31:51 GMT
From: geowcpuk@gn.apc.org (George Farebrother)
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Geneva Protocols Ratification
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
X-Sender: geowcpuk@gn.apc.org

GF/6479

Dear Abolitionists

Following is an information sheet which we have prepared following the UK Ratification of the Additional Protocols to the Geneva Convention last week. I shall send this to the Foreign Office next week asking for comments and then, if there are none (which will probably be the case) to 150 of our supportive Members of Parliament. It is probable that other NATO States have ratified with similar reservations. If so, it might be possible to find out the legislation and to follow it up with the arguments used here. Comments are, as always, welcome. If you would like the Information Sheet in hard copy, please let me know.

George Farebrother

.....

INHUMANE WEAPONS ILLEGAL - UNLESS NUCLEAR

The GENEVA CONVENTION of 1949 supplied rules about the treatment of victims of war and of occupied populations, but not about the protection of civilians in general. To remedy that lack, in 1977 a Diplomatic Conference of UN members states agreed a 'Protocol' or code of international law applicable to armed conflict. This became 'Protocol 1' of 1977 Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 1949.

Part 4 of Protocol 1 says: "In order to ensure respect for and protection of the civilian population and civilian object, the Parties to the conflict shall at all times distinguish between the civilian population and combatants ..."

The Nuclear Weapon states entered reservations stating that nuclear weapons fell outside the scope of the Protocol arguing that the Protocol introduced new prohibitions into the laws of war. However, this was before the landmark ruling on 8 July 1996 of the International Court of Justice (ICJ) on the legal status of the threat or use of nuclear weapons.

GENEVA PROTOCOLS RATIFIED: BUT NUCLEAR WEAPONS EXCLUDED

On 28 January 1998 Foreign and Commonwealth Minister of State Tony Lloyd announced that the United Kingdom had ratified the two Additional Protocols of 1977 to the Geneva Conventions of 1949. Concerning nuclear weapons, he said: "It continues to be the understanding of the United Kingdom that the rules introduced by the Protocol apply exclusively to conventional weapons without prejudice to any other

rules of international law applicable to other types of weapons. In particular, the rules so introduced do not have any effect on, and do not regulate or prohibit the use of nuclear weapons."

HUMANITARIAN LAW APPLIES TO NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Article 19 of the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties states that any reservation must not be incompatible with the "object and purpose of the treaty". The object and purpose of Geneva Protocol I is to protect civilians in armed conflicts. Nuclear weapons are weapons of mass destruction: they cannot discriminate between civilian and military targets and would therefore breach the fundamental objective of Geneva Protocol

I. The reservation entered by the UK is therefore incompatible with object and purpose of Geneva Protocol I and is for that reason invalid. There is an absurdity in the existence of treaty which protects civilians from the horrors of war but allows for the use of weapons of mass destruction. This would mean that Geneva Protocol I would make it unlawful to shoot a civilian but not unlawful to kill civilians with weapons of mass destruction. The entry of reservations to Geneva Protocol I could therefore have the effect of encouraging states to use nuclear weapons rather than conventional weapons because with the former there is less legal regulation. Such a result patently conflicts with the purpose of Geneva Protocol I.

In any event, the reservation is drafted too widely. In its Advisory Opinion of 8 July 1996 on the legal status of the threat or use of nuclear weapons, the International Court of Justice (ICJ) stated in Paragraph 84 that "Additional Protocol I in no way replaced the general customary rules applicable to all means and methods of combat including nuclear weapons. In particular, the Court recalls that all States are bound by those rules ... which when adopted, were merely the expression of the pre-existing customary law" Paragraph 85 went on to say: "In the opinion of the vast majority of States as well as writers there can be no doubt as to the applicability of humanitarian law to nuclear weapons."

Much of the content of Geneva Protocol I is simply a reflection of customary law. This customary law either pre-dates Geneva Protocol I or has developed since the creation of this treaty. Although it is possible in some circumstances to make a reservation to a treaty, it is not possible to make a reservation to customary international law. To the extent that the UK has attempted to enter a reservation to provisions of Geneva Protocol I which reflect customary international law, this reservation is absolutely invalid.

HUMANITARIAN LAW OVERRIDES SELF-DEFENCE

The ICJ concluded that "the threat or use of nuclear weapons would generally be contrary to the rules of international law applicable in armed conflict, and in particular the principles and rules of humanitarian law."

The Court could not "conclude definitively whether the threat or use of nuclear weapons would be lawful or unlawful in an extreme circumstance of self-defence, in which the very survival of a State would be at

stake".

However, Christopher Greenwood, who appeared for the UK before the ICJ, contributing to a series of articles on the Advisory Opinion published by the International Committee of the Red Cross in January 1997, argued: "To allow the necessities of self-defence to override the principles

of humanitarian law would put at risk all the progress in that law which has been made over the last hundred years or so and raise the spectre of a return to theories of 'just war'. Happily, it seems that the Court did not intend to do anything of the kind...". (P6, para 3).

We can conclude that even in self-defence, any threat or use of nuclear weapons must still comply with international humanitarian law. The UK did not dispute this in its evidence to the Court.

UK UNDERSTANDS ITS OBLIGATIONS

The UK Government has shown caution about the consequences of defying the ICJ Opinion by repeating its 1978 reservation about nuclear weapons on ratifying the Additional Protocols. On 21 January 1997, Baroness Chalker, speaking for the Government, stated that ratification of the Additional Protocols had been deferred "in order to resolve some outstanding issues in the context of the requests to the International Court of Justice for an advisory opinion on the legality of nuclear weapons".

NATO FLOUTS LAW

This attempt to detach nuclear weapons from international humanitarian law is also evident in the determination by the UK and other NATO states to exclude use of nuclear weapons - but not chemical or biological weapons - from the jurisdiction of the proposed permanent International Criminal Court (ICC), which could try individuals for war crimes.

NATO thus opposes a New Zealand/Swiss proposal that the ICC Statute should include an unspecific prohibition on "employing weapons...and methods of warfare of such a nature as to cause unnecessary suffering or superfluous injury or are inherently indiscriminate", i.e. which contravene international humanitarian law. Tony Lloyd added: "Statements to similar effect have been made by NATO partners and others when ratifying Protocol I". Thus the whole NATO nuclear alliance is flouting international law, undermining the ICJ and ICC, and encouraging nuclear proliferators.

(THE FOLLOWING IS IN A SEPARATE FRAME)

"One wonders whether in the light of common sense, it can be doubted that to exterminate vast numbers of the enemy population, to poison their atmosphere, to induce in them cancers, keloids and leukemias, to cause congenital defects and mental retardation in large numbers of unborn children, to devastate their territory and render their food supply unfit for human consumption - whether such acts as these can conceivably be compatible with elementary considerations of humanity".

Judge Weeramantry
Opinion given at the International
Court of Justice, July 1996

George Farebrother (geowcpuk@gn.apc.org)

67, Summerheath Rd,
Hailsham
Sussex, BN27 3DR, England
Phone & Fax +44 (0)1323 844 269

The World Court Project is an international citizens' network which is working to publicise and have implemented the 8 July 1996 Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice which could find no lawful circumstance for the threat or use of nuclear weapons.

The World Court Project is part of Abolition 2000, A Global Network to Abolish Nuclear Weapons

Return-Path: <owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org>
Date: Wed, 04 Feb 1998 16:26:06 -0500
From: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.apc.org>
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse
Sender: owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org
Subject: North Carolina for CTBT
To: ctbt-organize@igc.org

The National Security News Service found this editorial, published on January 13th - Proving that Jesse Helms needs to listen more to voices in his own state.

Ban is the Best Defense
January 13, 1998
The News & Observer
Raleigh, NC
Editorial/Opinion

page A 10

Nuclear weapons served the useful purpose during the Cold War of containing the Soviet Union's zeal for expansion. Now, well past the Cold War's end, huge nuclear stockpiles are no longer necessary for America's self-defense.

But despite some progress toward disarmament and a voluntary worldwide moratorium on testing, nuclear weapons still threaten international security and the planet's very future. The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty being considered by the Senate represents an invaluable chance to help put the nuclear weapons genie back in its bottle.

The treaty, which President Clinton signed in December 1996, would drastically reduce the nuclear threat by prohibiting all nuclear explosions, above and below ground. That prohibition would hamper rogue nations from building nuclear arsenals and current nuclear powers from developing new weapons, thus strengthening the 1995 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

But the new treaty can't go into effect until it's ratified by 44 specific countries, including the five major nuclear powers (the United States, Britain, France, Russia and China) and three so-called "threshold" states on the verge of full nuclear capability (India, Pakistan and Israel).

U.S. opponents' main objections are that the treaty would compromise national security, by preventing defense scientists from testing the nuclear arsenal's reliability and safety, and that compliance would be too difficult to verify. A recent administration proposal adequately addresses the first concern, hinging continued U.S. participation on annual assurances from the secretaries of defense and energy that the

arsenal is in good shape. They'll be able to provide that assurance without full-scale testing by relying on computer simulations and by independently testing weapons' non-nuclear components, which are most subject to aging.

As for verification the treaty calls for the creation of an international network of more than 300 monitoring stations that would allow scientists to determine whether suspicious tremors were seismic or military events. That network, along with other provisions, would in fact strengthen U.S. intelligence capabilities.

The Senate should ratify this enforceable worldwide agreement because it would be a large step toward eliminating the threat of nuclear warfare-the ultimate act of defense.

Furthermore, the United States opened the door to the nuclear age and has a special responsibility to provide leadership in closing it. Without the wholesale commitment that ratifying the treaty would represent, U.S. rhetoric on nuclear non-proliferation simply won't hold water, and an international testing moratorium with teeth won't stand a chance.

FROM: Disarmament Clearinghouse

1101 14th Street NW #700

Washington, DC 20005

TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232

FAX: 202 898 0172

<disarmament@igc.org>

Return-Path: <cl-hh.comlink.de!vlberlin.comlink.de!ippnw@popnews.hamburg.pop.de>
From: ippnw@vlberlin.comlink.de (IPPNW)
X-ZC-Post: Koertestrasse 10
Reply-To: ippnw@vlberlin.comlink.de (IPPNW)
Organization: IPPNW Germany
X-Gateway: ZCONNECT UC cl-hh.comlink.de [DUUCP BETA vom 15.08.1997]
Subject: Re: European A2000 Meeting
Date: 04 Feb 1998 00:00:00 +0000
To: mupj@igc.apc.org

DEUTSCHE SEKTION DER INTERNATIONALEN AERZTE
FUER DIE VERHUELTUNG DES ATOMKRIEGES
AERZTE IN SOZIALER VERANTWORTUNG
International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW)

Koertestraße 10, Tel: +49 (0)30 693 0244
D-10967 Berlin 61, Fax: +49 (0)30 693 8166

IPPNW@VLBerlin.comlink.de IPPNW@OLN.comlink.apc.org
<http://www.ippnw.de>

04.02.98

Dear Howard,

I don't see any reason why anyone would object to you taking part in the European meeting. I think it's great if we get a feel for each other's regions and what the main issues are. Alice will also be attending. I presume that English is the language (at least I hope so) because German is very unlikely and my French is terribly rusty. It is usually the French speakers that bring this up, since the other countries usually can speak English.

Looking forward to seeing you,
Yours,

Xanthe Hall
(Co-Director)

IPPNW is a member of Abolition 2000
- a Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons -

CrossPoint v3.11 R

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Thu, 5 Feb 1998 13:49:21 +100
From: International Peace Bureau <ipb@gn.apc.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: NGO Committee seminar programme and registration
To: "Fourth Freedom Forum" <fff@tln.net>,
 "Gensuikin"
 <gensuikin@IGC.APC.ORG>,
 "Schofbanker, Georg"
 <georg.schoefbaenker@jk.uni-linz.ac.at>,
 "Frolich, Maud"
 <greencross@mbox300.swipnet.se>

This information being forwarded on behalf of the Special NGO Committee on Disarmament, Geneva.

Christopher Bross
International Peace Bureau

Geneva, 2 February 1998

Dear friends and colleagues,

Following is the programme for the next meeting of the Special Committee together with the agenda for the morning session on 21 February.

Please confirm your participation by 15 February with the International Peace Bureau, 41 rue de Zurich, 1201 Geneva, Tel: (+41-22) 731-6429; Fax: 738-9419, e-mail: ipb@gn.apc.org

It is of particular importance that we hear from those of you who do not have a regular pass to any of the UN Centres (e.g. Palais des Nations) because we must submit a list of names several days before the opening of the meeting.

Those of you who do not have a regular pass must enter through the route Pregny gate (across from the ICRC building, bus No. 8). Please have the invitation with you and piece of identification.

Please note that the meeting of 20 February will be in Conference Room 9, Palais des Nations, and at the Pariosse de Montbrillant, 14 rue Baulacre, on 21 February.

Sincerely,

Edith Ballantyne,
For the Special NGO Committee for Disarmament

PROGRAMME

FRIDAY 20 FEBRUARY

Conference Room IX, Palais des Nations, Geneva

Morning

10:00- 10:15 Introductions

10:15 - 11:00 Developments in the NPT Review Process (Second Session of the NPT Preparatory Committee) - Mr. Peter Goosen, Minister, Permanent Mission of the Republic of South Africa to the Conference on Disarmament.

11:00 - 11:45 Decisions of the General Assembly concerning disarmament matters - Mr. Abdelkader Bensmail, Chief of Geneva Branch, Centre for Disarmament Affairs.

12:00 - 13:00 Second Session of the NPT Review Conference - Sharing information and strategizing.

Afternoon

14:30 - 16:00 New Weapons in the Making - Mr. Peter Herby, International Committee of the Red Cross

16:30 - 17:30 The work of the UN Disarmament Research Institute (UNIDIR) - Ms. Patricia Lewis, Director, UNIDIR

SATURDAY, 21 FEBRUARY

Paroisse de Montbrillant, 14 rue Baulacre, 1202 Geneva

Morning

09:00 - 13:00 Practical plans for the NPT PrepCom period - briefings/panels, Abolition 2000 and other NGO events, logistics, media work, etc.

Afternoon

14:30 - 18:00 Business meeting of the Special NGO Committee for Disarmament

SUNDAY, 22 FEBRUARY

Paroisse de Montbrillant, 14 rue Baulacre, 1202 Geneva

Morning

Meeting of members of Abolition 2000

AGENDA FOR SATURDAY MORNING, 21 FEBRUARY

NPT PrepCom Strategy Meeting

- * Calendar of NGO events
- * Orientation session, morning briefings, panels
- * Logistics: accommodations and registration
- * NGO presentations
- * Public demonstrations and actions
- * Exhibitions
- * Media

Return-Path: <LWYOLTON@Prodigy.Net>
Date: Thu, 05 Feb 1998 11:23:34 -0800
From: LWYOLTON <LWYOLTON@Prodigy.Net>
Organization: Prodigy Internet
To: Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: endorsement

L. William Yolton, Executive Secretary, Presbyterian Peace Fellowship

To: International Peace Bureau <ipb@gn.apc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: NGO Committee seminar programme and registration
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

At 01:49 PM 2/5/98 +-100, you wrote:

>This information being forwarded on behalf of the Special NGO Committee on
>Disarmament, Geneva.

>

>Christopher Bross
>International Peace Bureau
>

Please confirm my participation in the meetings on February 20 and 21 and arrange for a proper pass for me. Thanks.

Howard W. Hallman, Chair
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036

Return-Path: <network@igc.apc.org>
Date: Thu, 5 Feb 1998 14:03:34 -0800 (PST)
X-Sender: network@pop.igc.org
To: mupj@igc.apc.org
From: Lora Wedge <network@igc.apc.org>
Subject: sign-on

Howard,

Thanks for your work! Please sign on NETWORK: A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby to the letters. We would prefer, however, that you remove the "We notice that" at the beginning of 3 of the letters to make the statement more forceful if that is possible.

Thanks,
Lora Wedge
Associate

=====

NETWORK, A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby
801 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE, Suite 460
Washington, DC 20003-2167
Tel. 202-547-5556
FAX 202-547-5510
network@igc.apc.org
www.igc.apc.org/network

=====

Return-Path: <owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org>
Date: Thu, 05 Feb 1998 16:44:45 -0500
From: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.apc.org>
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse
Sender: owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org
Subject: Senators on CTBT
To: ctbt-organize@igc.org

Round-up of Letters from Senators.

Dear CTBT-Organizers:

Here are excerpts from letters on the CTBT from Senators responding to CTBT advocates.

These are in response to letters sent by 20/20 Vision Subscribers, and the New York letter from D'Amato is in response to letters from Peace Action in New York.

20/20 Vision is collecting letters from Senators, so if you have any letters from your Senator(s), please send them to:

20/20 Vision
1828 Jefferson Place, NW
Washington, DC 20036-2508
TEL: (202) 833-2020
FAX: (202) 833-2507
E-Mail: vision@igc.org

Should you want more information on these letters, contact 20/20 Vision.

ARIZONA, Senator McCain*

Senator McCain is on the Armed Services Committee

Date: January 13, 1998

"... I have long considered international arms control agreements to be an important component of America's national security strategy. To that end, I have supported a number of these agreements in the Senate . . . I believe all these accords have enhanced American security in the post-Cold War period. . .

I am uncertain whether a treaty agreement to ban nuclear testing is in our long-term security interests at this time. . . "Stockpile Stewardship" is an imperfect substitute for actual testing to determine the readiness of the nuclear arsenal . . .

By lowering confidence in our existing nuclear deterrent, a test ban might actually impede our development of safer and smaller nuclear weapons. Furthermore, I do not believe we should make commitments to a comprehensive test ban before we can be sure that China, Russia, India, and other nations will permanently halt their own tests. Finally, we must have high confidence in our ability to verify the compliance of other nations with any ban on nuclear testing — a capability which we do

not currently possess. . . .

KANSAS, Senator Brownback*

Senator Brownback is on the Foreign Relations Committee

Date: October 3, 1997

" . . . I am closely monitoring the developments on this Treaty in the Senate. I agree that the stockpiling of nuclear weapons is an issue that the United States must take a lead on [I am not making this up]. I will take your support into account as the debate over the CTBT progresses.

NEW YORK, Senator D'Amato

Date: January 28, 1998

". . . The Senator's position at this time is that Senator Jesse Helms, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations committee is addressing the issue and trying to work out a document that would then be put forward for a vote in the Senate. Chairman Helms is concerned with the inclusion of a strong verification process that will insure [sic] that rogue states do not use the treaty to their advantage in the proliferation of nuclear weapons and destabilizing actions.

Nuclear testing must be limited in a way that does not allow rogue nations the opportunity to push forward their proliferation agenda at the expense of law abiding, responsible, peaceful nations and our goals of limiting nuclear weapons devices throughout the world. . . "

VIRGINIA, Senator Warner*

Senator Warner is on the Armed Services Committee

Date: January 28, 1998

". . . When the Senate considers the CTBT, it will have to confront some serious and complex issues in deciding whether or not to ratify the treaty. Among these issues are the scope and verifiability of the CTBT, and how the United States would ensure the safety and reliability of its nuclear weapons stockpile under the CTBT.

The magnitude of the Senate's decision on the future security of the United States requires extensive study and evaluation of all aspects of the treaty. The Senate Armed Services Committee, of which I am a senior member, will play a leading role in the Senate's consideration of CTBT. Please be assured that I will keep your views in mind during this ratification process.

WYOMING, Senator Enzi

Date: November 13, 1997

"... I do have some serious reservations about the Test Ban Treaty. I can assure you that I will be listening closely to the debate when it comes before the full Senate for deliberations.

.."

WYOMING, Senator Thomas*
(Senator Thomas is on the Foreign Relations Committee)

Date: November 6, 1997

". . . This treaty would prohibit nuclear tests which have been used to develop nuclear weapons, enhance their safety, check their reliability, determine how nuclear explosion affect military equipment, and study weapons physics. Currently, the CTBT is pending before the Senate Foreign Relations and further action has not yet been scheduled. Rest assured, I will keep your thoughts in mind as this issue develops. . .

Now go out and write your letters, so we can get more responses...

From: Disarmament Clearinghouse
1101 14th Street NW #700
Washington, DC 20005
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232
FAX: 202 898 0172
<disarmament@igc.org>

To: atwood@pop.unicc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Visit to Geneva
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear David:

I'm coming to Geneva in a couple of weeks to participate in the NGO planning meetings for the NPT PrepCom on Friday and Saturday, February 20-21. I'll arrive around midday on Wednesday, February 18. On Thursday I want to make contacts related to the reception for world religious leaders on the opening day of the PrepCom, April 27. I hope to confer with Dwain Epps, though I've had a hard time making contact with him via e-mail recently. I would also like to talk with you to get your advice on some of the details.

Before that, can you offer me some guidance on hotels? Chris Bross of the International Peace Bureau has referred me to Centre Masaryk, where he says some of the NGO folks are staying. I've written for a reservation. By its low price it must be an accommodation with common bathrooms. That may be all right, but I wouldn't mind finding a place with a private bath if something not too expensive is available. Can you offer me any suggestion of such a hotel that is conveniently located.

Shalom,
Howard

Return-Path: <wetekam@juno.com>
To: mupj@igc.apc.org
Date: Thu, 5 Feb 1998 17:07:49 -0500
Subject: CTBT card for NC, at last!
X-Juno-Line-Breaks: 0-4,6-13,15,17-20,22-24,26-29,31-36,38-42,44-45,
47-51,53-54,56,58,60-64,66-67,69,71,73-81,83-85
From: wetekam@juno.com (James R Wetekam)

February 1998
Interfaith Call To Ratify Nuclear Test Ban Treaty
Your Help Needed For Prompt Senate Committee Action

BACKGROUND: As far back as the 1950s, religious bodies in the United States and throughout the world began to press for a Comprehensive Test Ban

Treaty to end all testing of nuclear weapons. It was noted then, and is equally true today, that a ban would greatly reduce the spread of nuclear weaponry, halt the development of new nuclear weapons, and spur a multilateral, verifiable arms control process which could eventually lead to the elimination of nuclear weapons.

After four decades of work, this goal for a permanent end to nuclear weapons testing is now attainable. In September 1996 President Clinton and

149 nations, including the heads of the four other nuclear weapons states,

signed the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). In order to enter into force and become international law, the treaty must be ratified specifically by 44 countries possessing advanced nuclear technology. U.S. ratification requires an affirmative vote by two-thirds of the U.S. Senate.

By ratifying the CTBT, the U.S. will:

* Set an example and ensure rapid implementation of the treaty.

Currently,

only eight countries have ratified the treaty. U.S. ratification of the CTBT will lead the way for the rest of the world.

* Curtail the spread of nuclear weapons. The CTBT's ban on nuclear weapons

will help to prevent the deployment of new, advanced nuclear weaponry. It also makes it more difficult for other nations to obtain advanced nuclear weapons and decreases the need of non-nuclear states to develop nuclear arsenals.

* Help establish a strong arms control verification process. The CTBT will

create a global network of monitoring stations designed to inspect test sites and detect violations.

* Help protect the environment. Nuclear testing, whether above or below ground, spreads dangerous levels of radioactivity into the land and water.

"Enactment of a comprehensive test ban would do more to stem proliferation and reduce the nuclear threat than any other action we could take at this time." - Senator Jim Jeffords (R-VT)

Recent polls have found that over 70 percent of the American public supports this treaty (the Mellman Group, 9/97). Prominent arms control and foreign policy figures have endorsed the treaty, including four chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Crowe and Generals Jones, Powell and Shalikashvili, as well as General Butler, the former Commander-in-Chief of the U.S. Strategic Air Command. Nevertheless, significant obstacles exist.

Some in the U.S. Senate oppose the treaty. This same Senate only narrowly ratified the international Chemical Weapons Convention in 1997.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee must first hold hearings and recommend the treaty to the entire Senate for a vote in order for it to be ratified. Senator Helms is the chairman of this critical Senate Foreign Relations Committee. He opposed passage of the Chemical Weapons Convention and has already indicated that he does not intend to allow the committee to begin consideration of the CTBT until the President submits other treaties for the Senate's consideration.

+ ACTION: Contact Senator Helms and tell him that you oppose any attempts to delay consideration of the CTBT by the full Senate. Urge him to begin holding hearings on the CTBT now and to allow the full Senate to act upon the treaty in an expeditious manner. Remind him that over 70% of the American public supports the CTBT, including four former chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Further inform him that swift ratification is necessary to stop the spread of nuclear weapons worldwide, that the treaty contains a strict verification process, and that U.S. ratification is the catalyst for other countries to do likewise.

You don't need to buy Internet access to use free Internet e-mail.
Get completely free e-mail from Juno at <http://www.juno.com>
Or call Juno at (800) 654-JUNO [654-5866]

Return-Path: <Washofc@aol.com>
From: Washofc@aol.com
Date: Fri, 6 Feb 1998 09:10:49 EST
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: CTBT sign-on

Howard,

The Church of the Brethren would certainly like to sign on to the "CTBT Advocates" letters to Sen. Helms, Sen. Lott, etc. Please sign on over the signature of

Nathan Davis, Legislative Associate
Church of the Brethren Washington Office

Thank you for your CTBT coordination efforts. It seems you've really kept us all on the same page.

Nathan Davis
CoB Washington Office

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Cc: "Abolition Caucus List (E-mail)" <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>
Date: Fri, 6 Feb 1998 08:48:18 -0500
From: Ross Wilcock <rwilcock@execulink.com>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: RE: politicians against nukes
To: "Juergen Hops Hossbach" <J.HOSBACH@LINK-F.rhein-main.de>

The Civil Leader's Statement is available at <http://www.pgs.ca/pages/a2/civledst.htm>

Ross Wilcock
rwilcock@web.net
<http://www.pgs.ca/>

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

From: Juergen Hops Hossbach [SMTP:J.HOSBACH@LINK-F.rhein-main.de]
Sent: Thursday, February 05, 1998 2:27 PM
To: a-days@motherearth.org
Subject: politicians against nukes

Does anybody got the text of there statement who could mail it to me - or perhaps to this list-server? Thank you very much!

Best regards
Hops

Juergen Hops Hossbach, Hundshof 7a, D-35753 Beilstein, Germany
Tel.:+49-2779-225 Fax.: -1645

redaktion _atomwaffenfrei_
informationen der gewaltfreien aktion atomwaffen abschaffen

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Fri, 6 Feb 1998 09:56:36 -0500
From: Dave Robinson <dave@paxchristiusa.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Pax Christi USA on Iraq
To: "'abolition-caucus@igc.org'" <abolition-caucus@igc.org>
X-Envelope-To: <abolition-caucus@igc.org>
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igcb.igc.org id GAA07921

Press Release From Pax Christi USA

For More Information, Call:

Nancy Small-National Coordinator[PARA]814-453-4955 (phone)[PARA]814-452-4784 (fax) For Release 3:00 PM[NL]February 4, 1998

Pax Christi USA Denounces US Plans for Renewed Bombings of Iraq

Pax Christi USA, the national Catholic peace movement, released a statement today opposing the US plans for a "devastating and decisive" bombing campaign against Iraq and called for the lifting of UN sanctions which are killing 4,500 children each month according to UNICEF reports.

Citing Catholic moral teaching, Pax Christi USA's statement was forwarded to some 900 local and regional Pax Christi leaders in the United States and its International Secretariat in Brussels, Belgium. Demonstrations against the planned bombing campaign, which administration officials have admitted will likely entail heavy civilian casualties, are planned in dozens of cities across the US for Fe
bruary 12, the 7th anniversary of the "Smart Bomb" attack on the Baghdad air raid shelter during the Gulf War.

Bishop Thomas Gumbleton, auxiliary Bishop of Detroit and a member of Pax Christi USA's National Council, released a letter to President Clinton on January 20th calling for an end to the economic sanctions on Iraq that have taken the lives of over 1 million Iraqis, more than half of them children. The letter was signed by 54 US Catholic bishops.

Bishop Gumbleton, who initiated a liquid-only fast

January 20th, will participate in the February 12 national demonstration against the bombings in Washington, DC.

-30-

Pax Christi USA Denounces U.S. Plans for Renewed Bombings of Iraq Calls for an End to Sanctions Responsible for Killing 4,500 Children Each Month

Pax Christi USA, the national Catholic peace movement, unequivocally denounces the threatened U.S. bombing campaign against Iraq as an irresponsible disregard for human life and a blatant rejection of moral, ethical and religious principles. U.S. officials have acknowledged that the planned bombing campaign will involve very heavy civilian casualties. As Christians, we interpret these intended actions, which grossly violate the norms of civilized behavior and the rules of international law, as nothing less than a premeditated crime against humanity.

"Any act of war aimed indiscriminately at the destruction of entire cities or of extensive areas along with their population is a crime against God and humanity. It merits unequivocal and unhesitating condemnation."

Vatican II, Pastoral Constitution, #80

We are appalled by the threats of "devastating and decisive" military action that include a U.S. willingness to use nuclear weapons against Iraq's alleged chemical and biological weapons programs. Reports that the newest U.S. nuclear bomb, the B-61 "Bunker Buster," would be useful for incinerating biological agents in Iraq must be rejected outright. Any use of nuclear weapons would violate international law, destroy efforts at international nuclear nonproliferation, and unleash the deadly effects of nuclear fallout.

"The US should commit itself never to use nuclear weapons first, should unequivocally reject proposals to use nuclear weapons to deter any non-nuclear threats...Indeed, we abhor any use of nuclear weapons."

The Harvest of Justice is Sown in Peace, National Conference of Catholic Bishops, 1993

Pax Christi USA calls upon all U.S. policymakers, representatives and government officials to turn away from their threats to bomb the people of Iraq. We support diplomatic efforts at a negotiated settlement of the current impasse which embraces enlightened and compassionate principles of justice and humanity. Pax Christi USA opposes the development and possession of all weapons of mass destruction by all nations, including Iraq and the United States. A posture that threatens the use of weapons of mass destruction as a punishment for the crime of developing weapons of mass destruction is hypocritical and dangerous to the extreme.

"The weak and the innocent cannot pay for mistakes for which they are not responsible."

Pope John Paul II's Address to Vatican Diplomatic Corps, January, 1998

As we prepare for a new round of bombings, we cry out in anguish over seven years of United Nations sanctions against the Iraqi people which can only be understood as biological warfare against a civilian population. During the Gulf War, U.S.-led Coalition forces deliberately targeted Iraq's infrastructure, destroying its ability to provide food, water and sanitation to its civilian population and unleashing disease and starvation on an unimaginable scale. United Nations reports claim that over one million civilians have died as a direct result of the sanctions. UNICEF reports that 4,500 children are dying each month. As people of faith, we are ashamed that the actions of the U.N., whose mission is to foster peace, can be so deliberately directed toward the sustained slaughter of innocent civilians. We join with the 54 U.S. Catholic bishops in denouncing the sanctions and call on the U.S. to use its power on the U.N. Security Council to end this heinous policy.

Pax Christi USA remains steadfast in its mission to "oppose war, preparations for war and every form of violence and domination." We remind all Christians that we are called to follow the nonviolent example of Jesus, who reached out to the victims of oppression and military prowess. We are compelled to place our faith not in gods of metal but in the God of justice, mercy and peace. We invite all people of goodwill to join with us.

Pax Christi USA is a section of Pax Christi International, the Catholic movement for peace.

For more information, contact Pax Christi USA, 532 West 8th Street, Erie, PA 16502, (814) 453-4955 (phone), (814) 452-4784 (fax), www.nonviolence.org/pcusa, info@paxchristiusa.org.

February 4, 1998

\$*\$\$*\$\$*\$\$ 7 LINES REFORMATTED BY POPPER AT igc.apc.org \$*\$\$*\$\$*\$\$

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Fri, 06 Feb 1998 11:07:15 -0500
From: Lachlan Forrow <lforrow@igc.apc.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Abolition 2000 and Olympic Games Opening Ceremony
To: NGO Committee on Disarmament <disarmtimes@igc.apc.org>, abolition-caucus@igc.org, ihelfand@igc.apc.org, hlabrams@leland.Stanford.EDU, lforrow@igc.apc.org, jgeiger@igc.apc.org, rgould@igc.apc.org, dchall@u.washington.edu, harris@open.org, dkerlins@medusa.unm.edu, amilholl@umaryland.edu, wosibin@fix.net, rush@hnrc.tufts.edu, jpwilk@pivot.net, danfine@igc.apc.org, ledwidge@psr.org, bmusil@psr.org, btiller@psr.org
X-Sender: lforrow@pop.igc.org

A highlight of the opening ceremony that will be broadcast tonight in the US is Seiji Ozawa conducting live, simultaneous choruses on five continents singing Beethoven's "Ode to Joy." (For example, the Tanglewood Chorus will be singing from the UN General Assembly Hall.)

This is the second time that Maestro Ozawa (conductor of the Boston Symphony Orchestra) has done something like this, in partnership with Japan's NHK-TV. On January 1, 1995 he led a 3-hour "Symphony for the Earth" that alternated music from leading artists throughout the world [from Yo Yo Ma in Boston to Isaac Stern in Connecticut to a choir in an Italian cathedral to African percussionists on the beach in West Africa] with film from war zones and interviews with world leaders for peace (Nelson Mandela, Mother Theresa, Jimmy Carter, and others). Maestro Ozawa's message was that 50 years after World War

II much remains to be done for peace, that war is not inevitable, and that music provides a universal language that can build a truly global community despite other profound linguistic and cultural barriers.

The culmination involved a live simultaneous performance that included his orchestra in Tokyo, joined live by Yo Yo as the lead cellist, Isaac Stern (from his own living room) as the first violinist, the Africans as the percussion section, and the Italian choir as the choral group. It was stunning. [I had the privilege of participating in the early part of the show with a demonstration in sound (using thousands of brass pellets pouring relentlessly into a resonant metal bowl) of the destructiveness of nuclear arsenals, followed by commentary about Hiroshima from Ozawa's childhood friend, Nobel Laureate Kenzaburo Oe.]

Food for thought: why not approach Maestro Ozawa and NHK-TV in Japan asking if they would do another "Symphony for the Earth" early in the year 2000, with a primary focus on Abolition 2000 and an appeal to the entire world to SIGN THE CONVENTION by 12/31/00?

I'd welcome comments, and would be pleased to take the lead in approaching Maestro Ozawa and NHK-TV.

Lachlan Forrow, MD
President
The Albert Schweitzer Fellowship
Immediate Past Chair
International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War.

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Fri, 06 Feb 1998 11:43:22 -0400
From: John Loretz <jloretz@tiac.net>
Reply-To: jloretz@tiac.net
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: [Fwd: Abolition statement by civilian leaders]
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

Sorry folks...

I was writing from home and forgot my signature info wouldn't be attached. M&GS Website is at <http://www.healthnet.org/MGS>

Received: from mx1.tiac.net (mx1.tiac.net [199.0.65.251]) by mailnfs0.tiac.net (8.8.7/8.8) with ESMTP id LAA23921 for <jloretz@tiac.net>; Fri, 6 Feb 1998 11:33:08 -0500 (EST)
Received: from igc7.igc.org (igc7.igc.apc.org [192.82.108.35]) by mx1.tiac.net (8.8.7/8.6.9) with ESMTP id LAA07370 for <jloretz@tiac.net>; Fri, 6 Feb 1998 11:28:29 -0500 (EST)
Received: (from majordomo@localhost)
 by igc7.igc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) id IAA07383;
 Fri, 6 Feb 1998 08:27:07 -0800 (PST)
Received: from mail-out-0.tiac.net (mail-out-0.tiac.net [199.0.65.247])
 by igc7.igc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id IAA07233
 for <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>; Fri, 6 Feb 1998 08:26:36 -0800 (PST)
Received: from mail-out-4.tiac.net (mail-out-4.tiac.net [199.0.65.16])
 by mail-out-0.tiac.net (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id LAA08180
 for <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>; Fri, 6 Feb 1998 11:26:35 -0500 (EST)
 (envelope-from jloretz@tiac.net)
Received: from tiac.net (medglobe.tiac.net [199.3.130.89])
 by mail-out-4.tiac.net (8.8.7/8.8.7) with ESMTP id QAA27036
 for <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>; Fri, 6 Feb 1998 16:26:34 GMT
 (envelope-from jloretz@tiac.net)
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854"; x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"
Date: Fri, 06 Feb 1998 11:29:41 -0400
From: John Loretz <jloretz@tiac.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Message-ID: <34DB2C64.1D2FFB81@tiac.net>
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: jloretz@tiac.net
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Abolition statement by civilian leaders
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.04 (Macintosh; I; PPC)

M&GS has posted the statement, the list of signatories, and Lee Butler's National Press Club talk on our Website, along with a news article. Follow the News Updates link from the homepage. URL below.

John

Return-Path: <mkamiya@wcrp.org>
From: Masamichi Kamiya <mkamiya@wcrp.org>
To: "Howard Hallman (E-mail)" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Geneva Event in April
Date: Fri, 6 Feb 1998 12:28:10 -0500

Dear Dr. Hallman,

I am so delighted to have talked to you over the telephone. As I indicated to you, there will be a Governing Board meeting in early March in Tokyo Japan. In that meeting, we will discuss quite extensively the establishment of a WCRP Standing Commission on Disarmament and Security.

For the fruitful outcome of the discussion, it would be most grateful if you send me the detailed program on the Geneva event which you are planning in April 1998.

Since I will leave for Nepal and Japan on February 19th, I sincerely hope that your information will reach me before my departure. The fax number of WCRP is 212-983-0566.

I truly thank you for your invitation to the Geneva event, and in the meantime, please keep in touch.

Yours sincerely,

Masamichi Kamiya
WCRP/International

Return-Path: <atwood@pop.unicc.org>
Date: Mon, 9 Feb 1998 11:14:22 +0100
X-Sender: atwood@pop.unicc.org
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
From: atwood@pop.unicc.org (David Atwood)
Subject: Re: Visit to Geneva

Dear Howard:

I'm sorry I haven't been more in touch. You're doing a good job with the organization of this world religious leaders dimension of the NPT PrepCom. Here are a couple of suggestions for hotels (I don't know what your budget limitations are, so here's a range, none of them as cheap as the Masaryk:

Hotel Luserna (av. de Luserna 12--15 minutes walk to the Palais; on a bus line)
Tel: 41-22-345 4676
FAX: 41-22-344 4936

Room with sink (bath and WC on 1st floor)

SF68

Room with shower

78

Room with shower and toilet

115

Room with bath and toilet

120

If you call, mention that you got the information from Emily Miles at QUNO)

John Knox Centre, 27 chemin des Crets de Pregny (UN is walkable--probably 20 minutes; bus possible, after a bit of a walk) (1996 prices: don't know what they are now)

Room with shower/WC: SF85

Room with sink: SF48

Two nights minimum stay

Tel: 41-22-798 9161

FAX: 791 0638

Hotel Mon Repos 131, rue de Lausanne Tel: 732-8010; FAX: 732 8595 Don't have a current price list, but this is a good quality place. Will probably run you 130/night minimum, but call and ask. It's easy walk to the UN

Hotel St. Cervais, 20 Corps Saint, Geneva, 1201 Geneve (Tel: 732 4572)

Small, intimate hotel in heart of Geneva. Single: SF62 (1996 prices). Not sure whether that is for a room with a bath.

If all that proves fruitless, get back to me or Chris (who now has a complete list of possible accommodations in Geneva)

I'm not sure how much of the time you are here I shall actually be here, as I am supposed to be in two places that weekend. I have been put on the restructuring committee of the International Campaign to Ban Landmines and should be in Frankfurt from the 19th. Perhaps we can at least have a phone conversation on the afternoon of the 18th.

All good wishes,

David

>Dear David:

>
>I'm coming to Geneva in a couple of weeks to participate in the NGO planning
>meetings for the NPT PrepCom on Friday and Saturday, February 20-21. I'll
>arrive around midday on Wednesday, February 18. On Thursday I want to make
>contacts related to the reception for world religious leaders on the opening
>day of the PrepCom, April 27. I hope to confer with Dwain Epps, though I've
>had a hard time making contact with him via e-mail recently. I would also
>like to talk with you to get your advice on some of the details.

>
>Before that, can you offer me some guidance on hotels? Chris Bross of the
>International Peace Bureau has referred me to Centre Masaryk, where he says
>some of the NGO folks are staying. I've written for a reservation. By its
>low price it must be an accommodation with common bathrooms. That may be
>all right, but I wouldn't mind finding a place with a private bath if
>something not too expensive is available. Can you offer me any suggestion
>of such a hotel that is conveniently located.

>
>Shalom,
>Howard

>
>
>
>
>
>
>

David C. Atwood
Associate Representative
Disarmament and Peace Programme
Quaker United Nations Office
13, avenue du Mervelet
1209 Geneva
Switzerland
Tel: +41-22-748 4802 or switchboard 748 4800)
FAX: +41-22-748 4819)
E-mail: atwood@pop.unicc.org

Return-Path: <owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org>

Date: Mon, 09 Feb 1998 13:17:32 -0500

From: disarmament@igc.org

Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse

Sender: owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org

Subject: LA Times on CTB

To: ctb-followers@igc.org

Los Angeles Times

page A10

Los Angeles Times

Editorials

Monday, February 9, 1998

Test Ban Treaty Held Hostage

In 1996 President Clinton became the first world leader to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, which prohibits all nuclear weapon tests and other nuclear explosions. But the long-sought pact, which has since been signed by 147 other countries, still awaits U.S. Senate consideration. Responsibility for the holdup falls on Sen. Jesse Helms (R-N.C.), chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, who has yet to schedule hearings on the treaty. His inaction threatens to prevent the United States from having a seat at the table next year when a special conference of nations that have ratified the treaty meets to consider how the accord can be more quickly put into force. The possibility that the world's leading nuclear power will be without a voice at that important meeting is as embarrassing as it is absurd.

Helms in effect is holding the test ban treaty hostage until, as he put it in a recent letter to Clinton, "the Senate has had the opportunity to consider and vote on the Kyoto Protocol and the amendments to the ABM [Anti-Ballistic Missile] Treaty." The Kyoto Protocol deals with global warming and includes a U.S. promise to reduce its emissions of hydrocarbon gases, which some conservatives oppose. Helms and other Republicans want to amend the ABM treaty signed with Moscow to allow a national ballistic missile defense system to be built. The case for such an expensive and dubiously effective system has by no means been made, and the political costs of unilaterally insisting on reinterpreting a major treaty have been all but ignored by its proponents. In any case, both the ballistic missile defense system issue and the global warming problem are utterly unrelated to the aims of the test ban treaty.

Presidents of both parties have always recognized the urgency of limiting access to nuclear weapon technology; the 1970 Non-Proliferation Treaty is among the chief accomplishments of that effort. It makes no sense now to deny the United States and the rest of the world the chance to further control the spread of nuclear arms.

A few weeks ago four former chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who

together have served Presidents Carter, Reagan, Bush and Clinton, endorsed Senate ratification of the test ban treaty. They recognize that its implementation would not diminish national security or the integrity of the U.S. nuclear arsenal. Surely their expertise ought to count for more in the Senate than the transparently ideological agenda of Jesse Helms.

FROM: Disarmament Clearinghouse

1101 14th Street NW #700

Washington, DC 20005

TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232

FAX: 202 898 0172

<disarmament@igc.org>

Return-Path: <owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org>
Date: Mon, 09 Feb 1998 14:50:25 -0500
From: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.apc.org>
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse
Sender: owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org
Subject: CTBT Campaign Update
To: ctbt-organize@igc.org

Dear CTBT-Organizers

Here is a listing of the things that are happening in each key state as we work for a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW!. While this a rather lengthy e-mail, it is organized so that you can read a brief highlighted summary, and then skip to the key states of interest to you- in alphabetical order.

The key states listed below are:

Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, Delaware, Iowa, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New York (upstate), Ohio, Oregon, Eastern & Western Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia, Washington

If you know of activities not listed here, please let us know!

Contact: The Disarmament Clearinghouse

1101 14th Street NW #700
Washington, DC 20005
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232
FAX: 202 898 0172
<disarmament@igc.org>
List E-mail: <ctbt-organize@igc.org>

Highlights for the week ending Feb. 6

COMMUNITIES OF FAITH MOBILIZE ON CTBT

20/20 Vision has produced a postcard that is endorsed by religious bodies as an "Interfaith Call to Ratify Nuclear Test Ban Treaty."

Excerpts from postcard text Background:

"As far back as the 1950's, religious bodies in the United States and throughout the world began to press for a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty to end all testing of nuclear weapons. . . After four decades of work, this goal for a permanent end to nuclear weapons testing is now attainable."

Endorsers of Interfaith Postcard/Action: Church Women United, The Episcopal Church, Episcopal Peace Fellowship, Friends Committee on National Legislation, General Board of Church and Society for the United Methodist Church, Lutheran Office of Governmental Affairs (ELCA),

Mennonite Central Committee, Methodists United for Peace with Justice, Presbyterian Peace Fellowship, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Unitarian Universalist Association, United Church of Christ Office of Church in Society."

7500 of these postcard actions have been distributed to targeted states. Friends Committee on National Legislation (FCNL) is also distributing similar action cards to their own members.

Postcard actions are targeted toward Senators on the Foreign Relations Committee, urging them to support the CTBT & call upon Helms to schedule prompt hearings.

Targeted Senators: Biden (DE), Brownback (KS), Helms (NC), Hagel (NE), Smith(OR), Frist (TN), Thomas(WY)
(FCNL's similar postcards are going to be distributed to additional key CTBT states.)

Many thanks to Jim Wetekam at 20/20 Vision who initiated and produced postcard, and Howard Hallman with Methodists United for Peace with Justice who has been working to bring together religious communities and CTBT organizers. Organizers are also preparing for the Interfaith Legislative Briefing in DC March 29- April 1 where 300-500 participants are expected.

For more information about the postcard contact:

Jim Wetekam at 20/20 Vision:
1828 Jefferson Place, NW, Washington, DC 20036
Tel: (202) 833-2020 Fax: (202) 833-5307
E-mail: vision@igc.org

INDIANA DEVELOPS CTBT NETWORK

In Indiana Karen Jacob at the Fourth Freedom Forum is pulling together a list of contacts and will be launching an Indiana CTB- Network to provide information and coordinated actions for CTBT advocates in Indiana. Sandy Gottlieb will be in Indiana talking about the CTBT March 15-21.

For More information, and to share information about what other activities are happening in Indiana contact Karen at:

Fourth Freedom Forum
803 North Main Street
Goshen, IN 46526-2632
TEL: (800) 233-6786
FAX: (219) 534-4937
E-mail: fff@tln.net

CAMPAIGN TIME-LINE

The President has asked the Senate to ratify the CTBT this year. The Senate's schedule this year is very busy, and Congress & Senators

running for re-election are anxious to get back home to campaign. Therefore, for the CTBT to be considered this year - we must push for a vote before the August recess.

National Membership Organizations have identified a coordinated, phased campaign.

During February and March we will focus on developing strong statewide networks, and putting pressure on key Senators. Many events are planned for the next two months in key states (see state summaries below).

In addition, CTBT organizers are urged to work toward arranging meetings in their home states with Senators during the April 4-19 Spring Recess.

In May we will begin to accelerate activities in the key states, and there will also be opportunities for CTBT advocates to come to DC to meet with Senators.

In June and July, we will hope to be playing an "end-game", accelerating activities with Senate office, focusing on key dates to raise broader public awareness etc.. Of course this schedule will be contingent upon the Senate schedule of hearings and a vote, but we will try to keep the pressure on to ensure that the CTBT is ratified before the next Hiroshima Day.

ACTIVIST CONFERENCE FOR A CTBT IN WASHINGTON STATE
On February 21- An Activist's Conference for a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty
NOW! - All in Washington State and Pacific Northwest Region are urged to attend. For more information, contact:

Kathy Crandall
Disarmament Clearinghouse
1101 14th Street NW #700
Washington DC 20005
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232
FAX: 202 898 0172
<disarmament@igc.org>

For a calendar outlining activities and events month-by-month, contact:
Kathy Crandall at the Disarmament Clearinghouse (contact info. above)

STATE by STATE SUMMARY -

(we have identified DC contacts and state contacts - who are helping to collect information and coordinate activities in these key states. The contact information for these people is available through the Disarmament Clearinghouse. The key states listed below are:
Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, Delaware, Iowa, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New York (upstate), Ohio, Oregon, Eastern & Western Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia, Washington

STATE: Alaska Senators: Murkowski, Stephens
DC Contact: Lisa Ledwidge, Physicians for Social Responsibility
STATE Contact: Cathy Schumaker, (PSR)

We are considering a conference call in March with all Alaska CTBT advocates.

STATE: Arizona Senator : McCain

We have not established a DC or State Contact for AZ.

McCain responded to a constituent letter from a 20/20 subscriber, with a 3 page letter identifying specific concerns about the CTBT - for more information about the letter contact 20/20 Vision.

Kathy Guthrie, FCNL will be travelling to AZ in March.

STATE: Colorado Senators: Allard, Campbell

DC Contact: Lisa Ledwidge, PSR

State Contact: Cathy Schumaker, PSR

The state poll showing 77% approval of the CTBT is a useful to include in letters to Senators & letters to editor. There was also an editorial in the Denver Post on Jan. 22 endorsing the CTBT. There was a Nov.15, Regional Summit in Colorado that helped to pull together a group of CTBT organizers in Colorado. Colorado CTBT organizers are committed to including opposition to the current Stockpile Stewardship program in the CTBT message.

STATE: Delaware Senators: Roth & (Biden)

DC Contact: David Culp, Plutonium Challenge

State Contact: Sally Milubry-Steen, Pacem in Terris

Interfaith postcards are being sent to Biden. 318 postcards have been distributed to religious bodies in DE.

STATE: Iowa Senator: Grassley

DC Contact: Michael P., Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS)

State Contact: Sherry Huthison, Des Moines Valley Friends Meeting

Group of Des Moines CTBT advocates placed a conference call to Grassley's DC staff. Joe Volk in Iowa this weekend. Jim Wetekam, 20/20 Vision will be in Iowa later in Feb. -focusing on organizing in the religious community. STAR-PAC (Stop the Arms Race Pac) may be hiring an organizer to work on CTBT and Code of Conduct issues.

STATE: Indiana Senators: Coats, Lugar

DC Contact: Fran Teplitz, Peace Action

State Contact: Karen Jacob & David Cortright,
Fourth Freedom Forum

Developing Indiana CTBT-Network. Kathy Guthrie will be visiting this weekend with students at Earlham College and Quaker activists in Muncie and Indianapolis. Sandy Gottlieb will be in IN March 15-21. Dave Oprava at 20/20 Vision is coordinating Sandy's trip.

STATE: Kansas Senators: Brownback , Roberts

DC Contact: Kathy Guthrie, FCNL

State Contact: Allan Hanson, FCNL

In the fall Kansas City Peaceworks produced and distributed a postcard action for both Kansas and Missouri. Interfaith postcard targets

Brownback. 696 postcards have been distributed to religious bodies in Kansas.

20/20 Vision activist Robert Rutkowski had a letter to the editor published on Oct. 3, '97

Brownback sent a letter responding to constituent, R.Rutkowski on the CTBT on Oct.3, '97- did not elaborate on Brownback's position, but did say "I will take your support into account as the debate over CTBT progresses."

STATE: Kentucky Senators: McConnell

DC Contact: Fran Teplitz, Peace Action

State Contact: Sr. Pat Kenoyer, Sisters of Loretto

Maine Senators: Collins, Snowe

DC Contact: Fran Teplitz Peace Action, Michael P. UCS

State Contact: WellStaley-Mays (Peace Action/PSR)

P.A./PSR of ME met with Collins' Chief of Staff in January

Peter Wilk, MD with PSR is working on putting together meetings with Senators.

The national office of the League of Women Voters has said that they will work actively for a CTBT in ME

Gordon Clark will go to Maine sometime in March

STATE: Michigan Senator: Abraham

DC Contact: Laura Kriv 20/20 Vision

State Contact: Shana Milkie 20/20 Vision

Throughout the Fall activists tried two times to get a meeting with Abraham. They were told that Abraham would meet with them only when "the issue is being debated."

Several activists attended the Pittsburgh Regional Summit and are now working to find more CTBT organizers in MI.

***** STATE:

Missouri Senator: Bond

DC Contact: Antonia Balasz, Veterans for Peace

State Contact: Lincoln Grahlf, Veterans for Peace

Kansas City Peaceworks put out postcards in the fall (for both KS & MO)

STATE: Nebraska Senator: Hagel

DC Contact: Laura Kriv, 20/20 Vision

State Contact: Jo Peterson, Nebraskans for Peace

Nebraskans for Peace is having a conference Feb 20, Bruce Hall, Peace Action, is going to speak about CTBT and nuclear issues.

STATE: New Hampshire Senator: Gregg

DC Contact: Fran Teplitz

State Contact: Sean Donahue, Peace Action

STATE: New York (upstate) Senator: D'Amato

DC Contact: Kimberly Robson, WAND & Fran Teplitz, Peace Action

State Contact: Judy Metzger, WAND (Buffalo)

Diane Swords, Peace Action (Syracuse)

Letter sent from D'Amato to Diane Swords stated that D'Amato was following Helms' lead.

STATE: Ohio Senator: DeWine

DC Contact: Fran Teplitz

State Contacts: Linda Kimball,

Oxford Citizens for Peace and Justice

Ellen Robinson Peace Action (Youngstown)

Ohio organizers communicate via a state e-mail network.

Over 5,000 20/20 postcards distributed far & wide to Universities, Religious organizations and others. Activists report DeWine is more influenced by folks in the Southwest part of the state (Cincinnati area) rather than Cleveland/ Youngstown.

Have met with DeWine district staff. DeWine's Administrator urged activists to meet with DeWine and DC staff.

STATE: Oregon Senator: Smith

DC Contact: Fran Teplitz, Peace Action

State Contact: Michael Carrigan, OR PeaceWorks

Andy Harris, MD (President of PSR Nat'l Board) is arranging a meeting. Oregon PeaceWorks and others met with E. Furse who reported hat she felt Smith would ultimately vote for the CTBT, and she would help to persuade Smith. Wyden has also promised to help influence Smith.

Marie Rietman is going to Portland on March 10

The regional PSR Board meeting in Seattle, WA is in conjunction with the Bellevue WA CTBT Activists' Conference - so that OR PSR activists will participate

Looking for help from Hatfield

1,535 Interfaith postcards have been distributed in Oregon

STATE: Eastern Pennsylvania Senators: Santorum, Specter

DC Contact: Fran Teplitz, Peace Action

State Contact: Phyllis Gilbert, Peace Action Philadelphia

Bob Musil, PSR will visit PA before March 18

It would be useful to find an additional person who could serve as an E.PA contact, as Phyllis is very busy

Bill Forward from Philly attended the Pittsburgh Summit

***** STATE:

Western Pennsylvania Senators Santorum, Specter

DC Contact: Lisa Ledwidge, PSR
STATE Contacts: Lila Cornell, Rusty Seitzr

Met with Santorum, anxious to focus work on Specter

Activist Training Summit Jan 17 in Pittsburgh hosted approximately 40 activists from PA, OH, IN & MI. Hosted by PSR and Coalition for Abolition

STATE: Tennessee Senators: Frist, Thompson

DC Contact: Fran Teplitz, Peace Action
State Contact: Bill Aiken, Peace Action

Bruce Hall, Peace Action going to TN sometime in Feb./ March
707 Interfaith Postcards (targeting Frist) have been distributed.

STATE: Utah Senators: Bennet, Hatch

DC Contact: David Culp, Plutonium Challenge
State Contact: Deb Sawyers, Utahns United

Kimberly Robson going - Feb./ March

STATE: Virginia Senators: Warner
We need a state & DC contact
Marie Rietman going -Feb./ March

STATE: Washington Senator: Gorton

DC Contact: Kathy Crandall, Disarmament Clearinghouse
State Contact: Rosemary Brodie, Seattle Women Act for Peace
& Northwest Disarmament Coalition

Peace Action and the Northwest Disarmament Coalition are hosting an Activists' Conference in Bellevue, WA (near Seattle) on February 21, 1998. * All Pacific Northwest CTBT advocates are urged to attend.* For more information, contact: Kathy Crandall at the Disarmament Clearinghouse (202) 898 0150 ext. 232 or Fred Miller at Peace Action of Washington (206) 527-8050

FROM: Disarmament Clearinghouse
Coordinator: Kathy Crandall

1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington DC 20005
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232 FAX: 202 898 0172
E-mail: disarmament@igc.org
List E-mail: CTBT-Organize@igc.org

Updates & corrections will be maintained on a rolling basis. You are urged to send information regarding CTBT activities to the Disarmament Clearinghouse and to CTBT-Organize - a list-serve that allows you to

communicate with other CTBT Advocates nationwide.

Return-Path: <owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org>

Received: (from majordomo@localhost)

by igc7.igc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) id KAA06907;

Tue, 10 Feb 1998 10:12:00 -0800 (PST)

Received: from kds5.kivex.com (kds5.kivex.com [204.177.32.2])

by igc7.igc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id HAA16527;

Tue, 10 Feb 1998 07:31:20 -0800 (PST)

Received: from psrcomm1.psr.org (pc38.psrus.org [204.177.54.38])

by kds5.kivex.com (8.8.7/8.8.7) with SMTP id KAA06525;

Tue, 10 Feb 1998 10:32:40 -0500 (EST)

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Date: Tue, 10 Feb 1998 10:26:22 -0500

X-UIDL: 887158741.003

From: Lisa Ledwidge <ledwidge@psr.org>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Message-ID: <34E0719E.4450@psr.org>

Precedence: bulk

References: <199802092251.OAA08167@igc2.igc.apc.org>

Sender: owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org

Subject: Action Alert: Tell your Senators "Ratify the CTBT in 1998"

To: ledwidge@psr.org

X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.0 (Win95; I)

Status: RO

X-Mozilla-Status: 0001

ACTION ALERT ACTION ALERT ACTION ALERT ACTION ALERT

PRIORITY ACTION

Physicians for Social Responsibility

January/February 1998

"What? The Senate hasn't ended nuclear testing yet?"

Ratify the CTBT in 1998!

Ending nuclear testing has been a major goal of PSR since its inception.

After decades of work, the time has come to make the nuclear test ban
U.S. law.

The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) is an international treaty that would permanently ban nuclear testing by prohibiting all explosions which produce a nuclear yield. To enter into force internationally, the treaty must be ratified by the 44 nuclear-capable nations, including the U.S. So far, 148 nations have signed, including all five nuclear-weapon states, and eight have ratified.

The CTBT was transmitted to the U.S. Senate for consideration of ratification in September 1997. The treaty still awaits the Senate's consideration. Like all international treaties, the CTBT requires the support 67 Senators to become U.S. law. Securing that support will be a formidable task and is one of PSR's foremost goals for 1998.

*** WHAT YOU CAN DO ***

* Contact your Senators. Write or call your Senators (U.S. Senate, Washington DC 20510, Capitol Switchboard 202-224-3121). Urge them to support ratification of the CTBT. Republican Senators must hear from their constituents. Contact PSR for talking points.

* Write a letter to the editor of your state newspaper. This is one of the best ways to simultaneously educate the people in your state and raise the issue on your Senators' agendas. Contact PSR for a sample letter.

* Introduce a medical society resolution - Several national and state medical societies have passed resolutions endorsing an end to nuclear testing. Has yours? If not, consider introducing one. To receive how-to information, contact PSR or see the Abolition Action Kit on PSR's website <http://www.psr.org>.

* Host a CTBT Event in Your State - Gather together your friends, colleagues and other CTBT supporters and host a local organizing event in your area to mobilize a state or regional CTBT campaign. For advice or assistance — including help with arrangements and materials, guest speaker suggestions, and names of CTBT-supporters in your area — contact PSR.

* Sign on to the Health Professionals' CTBT Statement of Endorsement - PSR is gathering names of health professionals who support ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. The Health Professionals' CTBT

Statement of Endorsement (attached) and final list of signatories will be announced, possibly with a press event, and transmitted to the Senate in approximately May 1998. To sign on, contact Lisa Ledwidge at PSR, 202-898-0150 x222. You may also view the Statement, visit PSR's website <http://www.psr.org>.

BACKGROUND

Why the CTBT?

Nuclear testing is not necessary to maintain the nation's arsenal. Weapons scientists can maintain the "safety" and "reliability" of nuclear weapons through manual inspections and non-explosive tests, without full-blown nuclear weapons explosions.

(They can also maintain the arsenal without many, if not all, of the facilities proposed in the Dept. of Energy's elaborate "stockpile stewardship" plan, for that matter. See April 1997 PSR Monitor for more information.)

Banning nuclear tests would help protect the environment, curb nuclear weapons proliferation, and help end the nuclear arms race. Moreover, ratification of the CTBT is widely considered to be the next critical step toward the abolition of nuclear weapons.

An end to nuclear tests would also prevent damage to human health. A recent study by the National Cancer Institute found that U.S. nuclear testing in the 1950s and 1960s caused thyroid cancer in 10,000 to 75,000

Americans. (See PSR Health Research Bulletin, Winter 1997-1998.)

Who supports it?

Achieving a nuclear test ban is supported by U.S. leaders, major medical organizations, and a majority of the American public. To name a few: Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Clinton; Generals John Shalikashvili, Colin Powell and David Jones, and Admiral William Crowe, former chairmen of the joint chiefs of staff ; the American Medical Association, the American College of Physicians, the American Public Health Association, the American Medical Student Association, as well as many state and local medical societies; and 70% of U.S. citizens, according to a recent national poll.

Current Status

Hearings on the CTBT are expected to be held in three Senate committees in February or March 1998 — Foreign Relations, Armed Services and Intelligence. A vote is expected this summer or fall. Support from moderate Republican Senators is needed. More Republican Senators voicing support for the CTBT in the next 1-2 months will be important to securing the 67 votes needed for CTBT ratification. We need your help.

Resources

- "Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty: Debate Moves to the Senate," PSR

Monitor April 1997

- Nuclear Test Ban Now! Activist Packet, produced by the Disarmament Clearinghouse
- Physicians for Social Responsibility website <http://www.psr.org>
- Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers website
<http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/index.html>
- U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency website <http://www.acda.gov/>

For more information contact Physicians for Social Responsibility

1101 14th St. NW Suite 700 • Washington DC 20005

tel. 202-898-0150 • fax 202-898-0172 • <http://www.psr.org>

Please take action on this important issue.

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>

Received: from igc3.igc.apc.org (igc3.igc.org [192.82.108.33])

by igc7.igc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id PAA23441;

Tue, 10 Feb 1998 15:30:27 -0800 (PST)

Received: (from majordomo@localhost)

by igc3.igc.apc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) id PAA21611;

Tue, 10 Feb 1998 15:29:02 -0800 (PST)

Received: from ppp13.igc.org (aslater@ppp13.igc.org)

by igc3.igc.apc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id PAA21516;

Tue, 10 Feb 1998 15:27:46 -0800 (PST)

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Date: Tue, 10 Feb 1998 15:27:46 -0800 (PST)

X-UIDL: 887158741.009

From: Alice Slater <aslater@igc.apc.org>

Message-Id: <2.2.16.19980210182805.3f7f1c44@pop.igc.org>

Mime-Version: 1.0

Precedence: bulk

X-Old-Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: NPT/NGO participation

To: abolition-caucus@igc.org, disarm-abolish@igc.org

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.2 (16)

X-Sender: aslater@pop.igc.org

Status: U

X-Mozilla-Status: 0001

To: Abolition-Caucus

From: Alice Slater

Re: NPT Working Group Meeting with Ambassador Eugeniusz Wyzner

Date: Feb. 9, 1998

Present: Alice Slater (GRACE), Felicity Hill(WILPF), Lucy Webster(ECAAR),
Tracy Moavero(Peace Action), Vince Comisky (Pax Christi), John Klotz (Sierra
Club)

We met with Ambassador Eugeniusz Wyzner, Chair of the 1998 NPT PrepCom, at the Polish Mission in New York City where he is stationed as Poland's Ambassador to the UN. Ambassador Wyzner had also invited two members of his Mission as well as Hannelore Hoppe and her assistant, Tamara Malenova to join us. Hoppe and Malenova work at the UN Secretariat in the Centre for Disarmament Affairs and are the liaisons for NGO participation at the PrepCom.

We presented Ambassador Wyzner with our Abolition Statement, the schedule of proposed panels and events, and a copy of the official UN version of the Abolition 2000 draft Nuclear Weapons Convention. (doc.# a/c.1.52/7). He remarked that he had read our letter (originally mailed to Ambassador Strulak and forwarded to him) and was visibly impressed that the Abolition Network now numbers over 900 NGOs and is still growing. We told him how pleased we were to learn that a decision had been made to reserve 3 hours for NGO presentations, instead of the 2 hours we had requested. He said it would occur early in the session, although he had no date for us as yet. These issues are resolved at the beginning of the PrepCom with the members of the PrepCom. He emphasized how important it was that the delegates hear from us early in their deliberations and commented on the unfortunate scheduling of our presentations during the 1997 PrepCom, so late in the

proceedings.

We asked him if the proposed number of 9 presentations which we had heard was agreed to with the NGO Committee on Disarmament was "set in stone" and he told us it was up to the NGOs to decide how to divide our time. He mentioned that we might want time for questions from the delegates during the presentation session and I reminded him of Jonathan Dean's proposal that there might be a separate informal roundtable session for interaction between delegates and NGOs. Hoppe seemed concerned about having too many presentations but commented that our request for 11 was possible.

He brightened at the mention of the 13 million signatures gathered in the Japanese petition campaign, with more to come from other parts of the world.

He agreed to help us present them to the delegates and will think about the best way to do this. It may be a problem presenting all those petitions inside the UN because of security problems, but more thought will be given as to how the presentation of the petitions should be made. He asked us to follow up on this issue with Hoppe and Malenova who are advising him on logistics and NGO participation. Wyzner requested our help to "generate a good atmosphere with public opinion and the media" for the success of the PrepCom.

In a discussion about exchange of documents between delegates and NGOs, it was agreed that Hoppe and Malenova will make at least one copy of every document available to the NGO Committee on Disarmament for copying and distribution to NGOs at the PrepCom and that our documents would be made available to the delegates.

As to access to Main Committee meetings, it was pointed out to us that there are no Main Committee meetings at the PrepCom; those committees only met at the Review Conference. Wyzner indicated that he has little ability to influence which of the plenary sessions will be open to us because the governments will decide by consensus on how open they wish to be. [Ed. note: It may be valuable for abolitionists to contact their governments now, before the PrepCom , and urge greater access for NGOs to the deliberations as well as support for Kirsten Osen's proposal that we ask our governments to support an Abolition 2000 NGO delegation with observer status at the PrepCom, similar to the NGO observer status granted to the International Campaign to Ban Landmines delegation.]

Wyzner was familiar with the Marshall Island proposal, now incorporated in the final report of the 1997 PrepCom, to establish an intersessional Working Group to begin work on a Nuclear Weapons Convention, (NPT/conf.2000/pc.I/11), although he didn't voice an opinion on its chances for success at this PrepCom. He told us of his long and ultimately successful work on several treaties that dealt with the use of outer space and we wished him similar success in fulfilling the Article VI promise of the NPT.

He asked us to rely on Hoppe and Malenova in future communications and follow-up on our meeting. Malenova, a Russian physicist, has been assigned by Hoppe to work with NGOs specifically on the NPT. After the meeting broke up, Malenova told us that she would think about Russian NGOs who might participate with us in Geneva who are engaged in Abolition issues. She also

is working on a website and database of NGOs at the Centre of Disarmament

Affairs that she thought may be helpful to us.

Alice Slater

Global Resource Action Center for the Environment(GRACE)

15 E. 26 St., New York, NY 10010

212-726-9161 (tel)

212-726-9160 (fax)

aslater@igc.apc.org

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>

Received: from igc3.igc.apc.org (igc3.igc.org [192.82.108.33])

by igcb.igc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id QAA27886;

Tue, 10 Feb 1998 16:46:28 -0800 (PST)

Received: (from majordomo@localhost)

by igc3.igc.apc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) id QAA27057;

Tue, 10 Feb 1998 16:45:52 -0800 (PST)

Received: from [198.94.6.45] (marylia@ppp45.igc.org)

by igc3.igc.apc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id QAA26588;

Tue, 10 Feb 1998 16:37:50 -0800 (PST)

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Date: Tue, 10 Feb 1998 16:37:50 -0800 (PST)

X-UIDL: 887197078.002

From: marylia@igc.org (marylia)

Message-Id: <v02140b03b10636104583@[198.94.6.45]>

Mime-Version: 1.0

Precedence: bulk

X-Old-Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: Butler Quotes/partial

To: abolition-caucus@igc.org, nukenet@envirolink.org, sjpc@sjpeace.org,

BHoehn@wajones.org, svaidya@Legato.com

X-Sender: marylia@pop.igc.apc.org (Unverified)

Status: U

X-Mozilla-Status: 0001

General Lee Butler:

On Deterrence and Iraq

quoted from Butler's speech at the Press Club 2/2/98

printed in Tri-Valley CAREs' February newsletter, Citizen's Watch

"Only now are the dimensions, costs and risks of these nuclear nether worlds coming to light. What must now be better-understood are the root causes, the mindsets and the belief systems that brought them into existence. They must be challenged, they must be refuted, but most importantly, they must be let go..."

"Sad to say, the Cold War lives on in the minds of those who cannot let go the fears, the beliefs, the enmities born of the nuclear age. They cling to deterrence, clutch its tattered promise to their breast, shake it wistfully at bygone adversaries and balefully at new or imagined ones..."

"What better illustration of the misplaced faith in nuclear deterrence than the persistent belief that retaliation with nuclear weapons is a legitimate and appropriate response to post-Cold War threats posed by weapons of mass destruction. What could possibly justify our resort to the very means we properly abhor and condemn?...What target would warrant such retaliation?...In a singular act we would martyr our enemy, alienate our friends, give comfort to the non-declared nuclear states and impetus to states who seek such weapons covertly. In short, such a response on the part of the U.S. is inconceivable..."

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>

Received: from igc3.igc.apc.org (igc3.igc.org [192.82.108.33])

by igcb.igc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id JAA28558;

Thu, 12 Feb 1998 09:46:54 -0800 (PST)

Received: (from majordomo@localhost)

by igc3.igc.apc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) id JAA13728;

Thu, 12 Feb 1998 09:45:58 -0800 (PST)

Received: from ppp53.igc.org (disarmtimes@ppp53.igc.org)

by igc3.igc.apc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id JAA12891;

Thu, 12 Feb 1998 09:36:00 -0800 (PST)

CC: abolition-caucus@igc.org

Date: Thu, 12 Feb 1998 13:09:49 +0000

From: "Disarmament Times" <disarmtimes@igc.apc.org>

Message-Id: <199802121736.JAA12891@igc3.igc.apc.org>

Organization: NGO Committee on Disarmament, Inc.

Precedence: bulk

Reply-to: disarmtimes@igc.apc.org

X-Old-Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: NGO participation in NPT PrepCom

To: edibal@iprolink.ch, womensleague@gn.apc.org, atwood@pop.unicc.org,

ipb@gn.apc.org, coalition@clw.org, aslater@igc.apc.org,

danger@stimson.org, acronym@gm.apc.org, warpeace@interport.net,

kcantw9473@aol.com, falvo@nymc.edu, myriamm@aol.com, flick@igc.apc.org,

sfraser@igc.apc.org, jklotz@ibm.net, wrl@igc.apc.org, jem@igc.apc.org,

paintl@igc.apc.org, paprog@igc.apc.org, panukes@igc.apc.org,

metropeace@igc.apc.org, worldfed@igc.apc.org, crramey@igc.apc.org,

wedo@igc.apc.org, psrnyc@igc.apc.org, psrnatl@igc.apc.org,

ippnw@igc.apc.org, ippnw@VLBERLIN.comlink.de,
dave@paxchristiusa.org, ptasso@pipeline.com, lcnp@aol.com,
srfnyusa@igc.apc.org, djroche@maildrop.srv.ualberta.ca,
wagingpeace@napf.org, nan@gn.apc.org, jdean@ucsusa.org,
wslf@igc.apc.org, basicusa@igc.apc.org, jbloomfield@gn.apc.org,
nei.til.atomvapen@sn.no, fredpax@sn.no, miiscres@pandora.sf.ca.us,
cnd@gn.apc.org, scheffran@hrzpub.th-darmstadt.de, pgs@web.apc.org,
takubo@alles.or.jp, antiatom@twics.com, katie@chch.planet.org.nz,
a-days@motherearth.org, salvador@hawaii.edu

X-Enclosure-Info: DOS,"npt98wgv",,,Text

X-Old-Sender: <disarmtimes@pop.igc.apc.org>

X-Total-Enclosures: 1

X-mailer: Pegasus Mail/Windows (v1.22)

X-Mozilla-Status: 0001

----- Enclosure number 1 -----

13 February 1998

Dear NGO:

Preparations are now underway for NGO participation in the

1998 session of the Preparatory Committee for review of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT PrepCom), taking place in Geneva from 27 April-8 May. The meeting of 20-21 February called by the Geneva Special NGO Committee for Disarmament presents an opportunity for coordination of logistical matters and procedures for organizing NGO presentations to the PrepCom.

Any NGO that wishes, whether or not it is able to send representatives to Geneva, will have the opportunity to make a written presentation (limited to 2 pages) to the delegates. The PrepCom Secretariat may not be able to distribute NGO papers, but they should allow representatives of the NGO Committee for Disarmament to distribute a packet to each delegation. You are invited to prepare a two-page paper setting out your substantive views on issues related to the NPT, and send it to the Secretariat of the Special NGO Committee for Disarmament, Case postale 50, 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland. Your NGO will have to bear the costs of duplication; please include either 180 copies of the paper or a small payment (about US\$20) for photocopying. (Please note that the official languages of the PrepCom are English and French.)

A full, informal three-hour session of the PrepCom will be set aside in which NGOs may present their views. This session will most likely take place in the first week of the PrepCom, following the introductory debate. A meeting of the Preparatory Committee agreed to request that nine or so NGO speakers take the floor at this session. Hence, it would be advisable for NGOs to begin immediately to

devise a working process for preparing collective presentations. This preparatory process must be started some time before the conference opens.

We would suggest that the procedures for our selection process follow those employed at last year's PrepCom in most respects. Presentations should be organized around key issues or themes. Once themes are selected, working groups should be established around each theme to prepare and collect ideas and proposals from NGOs concerned and assemble them for coherent presentation. One or two individuals should volunteer to serve as focal point for each theme. The guiding idea behind this process is that each thematic presentation will reflect the range of views most prominent in the NGO community, and include concrete proposals insofar as possible. It would also be desirable to leave some time within the three-hour session for PrepCom delegates to respond substantively to the NGO statements.

The guidelines we use to determine the themes and, at a later date, the spokespeople to present them, should be collectively agreed. We propose that the spokespeople not be ones who spoke in 1997, and that they agree to express the views of various NGOs. As a starting point for discussion, we submit that a possible way of structuring some of the presentations could be by going through the NPT itself. Themes could thus include:

*Articles I and II (non-transfer/non-reception of nuclear

weapons technology)

*Article III (safeguards)

*Article IV (assistance for nuclear energy)

*Article VI (several speakers could present different approaches to fulfilling disarmament commitments, as happened last year -- one on the proposed Nuclear Weapons Convention, one on the rationale for abolition, one on a "Deep Cuts" approach)

Among other topic areas that could be designated for

presentations, we would propose two:

*the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty

*the status of Negative Security Assurances

We hope that these thoughts and suggestions will motivate you to begin preparing your own contributions to this year's NPT PrepCom. If you cannot come to the February meeting, feel free to send us your ideas and concerns in writing. We will update you as planning progresses.

Sincerely,

NGO Committee on Disarmament

New York

777 U.N. Plaza #3B

New York, NY 10017, USA

tel 1.212.687.5340

fax 1.212.687.1643

e-mail disarmtimes@igc.apc.org

Special NGO Committee for Disarmament

Geneva

Case Postale 50

1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland

tel 41.22.731.5019

fax 41.22.740.1063

e-mail womensleague@gn.apc.org

Return-Path: <dfarrell>

Received: (from dfarrell@localhost)

by igc4.igc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) id KAA03340

for mupj; Thu, 12 Feb 1998 10:20:58 -0800 (PST)

Date: Thu, 12 Feb 1998 10:20:58 -0800 (PST)

From: Deborah Farrell <dfarrell@igc.org>

Message-Id: <199802121820.KAA03340@igc4.igc.org>

To: mupj@igc.org

X-Mozilla-Status: 0001

It would be helpful if you could answer as many of the questions below as possible. Sorry about the inconvenience.

Your name:

Your IGC User ID:

Your telephone number- Day: Evening:

Fax number if any:

Your time zone (EST, CST, MST, PST):

1. What version of InterACT are you running?

(Select Help, About on the InterACT menu)

2. What is the brand name and model and speed of your modem? Is it internal or external?

Windows95 instructions: From the Start Menu choose Control Panels then double click the Modems icon. You will see a list of your Com ports. Next to one of

these ports you will see the brand name of your modem. Click on the word 'COM' appearing to the left of your modem. Now click the More Info Button. After a number of seconds you'll see a new window. Copy down ALL of the information in this window and email it to us.

3. What modem did you select when you installed InterACT? (Check this by pulling down InterACT's Options menu and choosing Configure. Go to the Communications tab.)

4. What modem initialization string are you using? (Found at this same screen.)

5. What comm port and speed did you select when you installed InterACT? (Same screen.)

6. Do you have 8250, 16450 or 16550 UART chips installed in your serial ports?

Windows 3.1 instructions: To find out, exit Windows and run the \windows\msd program. Select "Comm Ports" and look at the line "UART chip Used"

Windows95 instructions: (You already reported this information to us in #2.)

7. Are you running InterACT on a network?

8. What type of CPU do you have have? For example, 486 DX-25

9. How much RAM do you have? Start InterACT and then switch back to Program Manager. From Program Manager pull down the Help menu and choose About Program Manager. How much memory is left and what percent of your system resources are available?

10. How much free disk space do you have?

11. Can you connect to the text interface with the same modem using the Windows Terminal program or some other *Windows* (not DOS) communications program using the same computer, modem, and serial port? To run the Windows terminal program, exit InterACT, and from the Windows program manager select File, Run, and then type "terminal" into the "Command Line" box. Please try this before replying.

12. How much virtual memory do you have? (Click on the Windows Control Panel icon, and select 386 Enhanced, Virtual Memory)

13. Are you running any kind of non-Microsoft memory manager like QEMM or 386Max?

14. What version of Windows are you running (3.0, 3.1, 3.11/Windows for Workgroups)? (You can find out by clicking on File, Run, and then typing WINVER in the dialog box.)

Windows95 instructions: Click the Start button, choose Run. In the Open box

just type 'winver'.

15. What version of DOS are you running? (You can find out by

Click on File, Run, and then typing COMMAND in the dialog box.

Type EXIT to return to Windows)

16. Do you have windows installed in c:\windows or is it

installed in the c:\ (root) directory?

17. Please describe the problem you are having in detail, giving

the exact wording of any error messages that are displayed

18. Is InterACT installed on a disk drive that has been

compressed using a utility such as Stacker or DoubleDisk?

19. Are you running InterACT on a laptop? Is the laptop using

any power management software? (You can press Control-Esc to

display a list of software applications that are running.)

20. Which of the following InterACT applications are working

properly:

[] Mail

[] Web

[] Gopher

[] FTP

[] Conference

[] Telnet

21. Please *completely exit* InterACT after you experience a problem, and use another communications program such as Procomm or Windows Terminal to email me your \interact\bin\interact.ini and interact\bin\interact.log files.

Return-Path: <wetekam@juno.com>

Received: from m16.boston.juno.com (m16.boston.juno.com [205.231.101.192])

by igcb.igc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id AAA04258

for <mupj@igc.apc.org>; Thu, 12 Feb 1998 00:46:38 -0800 (PST)

Received: (from wetekam@juno.com)

by m16.boston.juno.com (queueemail) id RVF00443; Wed, 11 Feb 1998 17:33:38 EST

To: mupj@igc.apc.org

Date: Wed, 11 Feb 1998 17:32:19 -0500

Message-ID: <19980211.173220.9334.0.Wetekam@juno.com>

X-Mailer: Juno 1.49

X-Juno-Line-Breaks: 1-9,11,13,15,17,19,21,23,25-33,35,37,39,41,43,45,47,

49,51-52,54,56,58,60-61,63,65-67,69,71-73,75,77-79,81,83-85,87,

89,91-93,95-97,99,101-102,104,106,108,110-120,122-127

X-UIDL: 887286755.005

From: wetekam@juno.com (James R Wetekam)

Status: U

X-Mozilla-Status: 0001

Oh, what the heck, Howard, I got the text completed tonight, so thought I

would e-mail it over. We can talk Thursday afternoon. -- Jim W.

* * * *

February 12, 1998

To: Religious Working Group on the CTBT

From: Jim Wetekam

Re: Yet another draft of something

You may recall that one of the questions we addressed at the last meeting
of this working group

(on January 28) regarded follow-up to the distribution of the CTBT
postcards. I agreed to do a

first draft of a sign-on letter which would be sent by Washington offices
to the bishops,

conference ministers, and key rabbis in each of the eight states on which
we focused. It was our

intent to have each office mail that sign-on letter along with some other
materials on CTBT to

their appropriate leaders in each state. (To avoid confusion, this is
different from the "heads of
faith group" letter which Joe Volk, Kathy Guthrie, and Bridget Moix are
coordinating. That

statement is to be signed by the national heads of religious bodies for
distribution within the
Senate, with press, etc.)

Herewith is a first draft of a sign-on letter:

* * * * *

Dear _____

A long-time goal of many religious organizations has been the worldwide
cessation of nuclear

weapons testing and the implementation of a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty

(CTBT). In

September 1996, the heads of 149 nations, including President Clinton,

signed the CTBT.

However, ratification of the treaty in 1998 by the United States Senate

is far from a sure thing.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee must first act upon the treaty.

This may prove to be

particularly troublesome in the weeks ahead. Senator Jesse Helms,

chairman of the committee,

has already announced his intent to delay committee consideration despite

the President's stated

intent to have the CTBT ratified. All of the faith groups listed below

(as well as several

others) have taken clear positions supporting a Comprehensive Test Ban

Treaty.

After 40 years of advocating for such a ban and nearly 35 years after

President Kennedy called

upon the world to cease nuclear testing, it is critical that we not lose

this important opportunity.

As the first nation to test nuclear weapons and the only nation to use

them thus far, the U.S. can

now lead the world in ending nuclear testing and eventually banishing

these weapons altogether.

Senator _____ sits on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. His

support for a CTBT could
prove to be key in moving its ratification through the Senate.

Currently, he has not indicated a
position on the treaty.

Eleven faith groups recently began distributing the enclosed interfaith
action alert in your state.

With this letter and the enclosed materials, we want to enlist your help
and support. There are

several ways in which you could aid the process of ratification:

1) Write an op/ed for one or more of the significant daily
newspapers in the state. Or co-
author such an op/ed with other heads of faith groups in the state.

Enclosed you will find

a sample;

2) Arrange a meeting for yourself and other religious leaders with
your Senator. You may
wish to include prominent business leaders, scientists, physicians,
educators, etc. who
support the CTBT in such a meeting;

3) Write about the CTBT in one of your regular newsletters or other
communications to
congregations. Encourage people in your synagogues or churches to
write or call the

Senator and express their support for CTBT ratification (see the enclosed interfaith postcard action alert);

4) Write your own letter to Senator _____ encouraging his support for swift ratification

of the CTBT. Urge your ecumenical colleagues to do the same; and/or

5) Draft a single letter for your colleagues' signatures as well.

Hold a press conference to announce its release, and with your colleagues, hand-deliver it to the Senator's office.

Your voice could prove crucial in this effort to ratify the CTBT. We hope that you will join us and other religious people throughout the country in seeking a final end to nuclear weapons testing. Please feel free to contact the office of your own denomination/faith group or any of those listed below for more information. Please let us know of the results of any actions you take on this matter. Thank you.

Shalom,

Enclosures:

Postcard - "Interfaith Call to Ratify Nuclear Test Ban Treaty" (more are available)

Issue Brief: "Ten Reasons for a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty"

Issue Brief: "Ratification in 1998"

Editorials from the Los Angeles Times and the Denver Post

A Letter from former Members of Congress

Quotes on the CTBT

You don't need to buy Internet access to use free Internet e-mail.

Get completely free e-mail from Juno at <http://www.juno.com>

Or call Juno at (800) 654-JUNO [654-5866]

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>

Received: from igc3.igc.apc.org (igc3.igc.org [192.82.108.33])

by igcb.igc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id GAA03271;

Thu, 12 Feb 1998 06:14:56 -0800 (PST)

Received: (from majordomo@localhost)

by igc3.igc.apc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) id GAA28190;

Thu, 12 Feb 1998 06:14:47 -0800 (PST)

Received: from ppp70.igc.org (aslater@ppp70.igc.org)

by igc3.igc.apc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id GAA28142

for <abolition-caucus@igc.org>; Thu, 12 Feb 1998 06:13:50 -0800 (PST)

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Date: Thu, 12 Feb 1998 06:13:50 -0800 (PST)

X-UIDL: 887307242.001

From: Alice Slater <aslater@igc.apc.org>

Message-Id: <2.2.16.19980212091258.0e475816@pop.igc.org>

Mime-Version: 1.0

Precedence: bulk

X-Old-Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: NPT 98 Schedule

To: abolition-caucus@igc.org

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.2 (16)

X-Sender: aslater@pop.igc.org (Unverified)

Status: U

X-Mozilla-Status: 0001

ABOLITION 2000

A Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons

Working Group for the NPT Prep Comm

Schedule of 1998 NPT Prep Comm Events

DAILY throughout the Prep Comm:

8-9am Abolition 2000 Daily Caucus.

9-10am NGO Disarmament Committee daily briefings.

Sunday, April 26

Time TBA: NGO Disarmament Committee Orientation for all NGO's present.

Monday, April 27

Morning: 1998 NPT Prep Comm opens.

Morning/Afternoon: Abolition 2000 Public action/demonstration on the Place

de Nations.

1-3pm Vijali Hamilton - artist presents her work for World Peace.

Evening: Reception and Meeting, Religious Working Group of Abolition 2000,

including leaders of various faith communities. Ecumenical Centre.

Tuesday, April 28

2-4pm: Abolition 2000 with INES/INESAP/IALANA

/IPB/LCNP: Towards a Nuclear Weapons Free World: Joseph Rotblat, David Krieger, Doug Roche, Jodi Williams, Mioko Matsubara, Jayantha Dhanapala,

General Lee Butler, Mikhail Gorbachev, Nelson Mandela (invited).

Wednesday, April 29

Afternoon: Probable time for NGO presentations at the NPT Prep Comm. NOT CONFIRMED.

5-7pm: Abolition 2000 Working Group: Beyond the CTB with Western States Legal Foundation: Laboratory Testing and Article VI Obligation for Disarmament: Jacqueline Cabasso, Vladamir Iakmets, Lysianne Alezard, Ted Taylor, Andrew Lichterman, Andre Gsponer, Greg Mello.

Thursday, April 30

1-2pm: Briefing: Multilateralizing the Nuclear Disarmament Process with Owen Green.

2-4pm INESAP/IALANA -The Nuclear Weapons Convention: Political Strategies and Verification: Alyn Ware, Marav Datan, Martin Kalinowski, Wolfgang Liebert, Juergen Scheffran.

5-7pm (provisionally): IPB to host meeting of landmines and nuclear disarmament activists on sharing of strategies and lessons to be learned from Ottawa process

Friday, May 1

Afternoon: Abolition 2000 annual meeting (part 1).

Saturday, May 2

9-12pm Abolition 2000 annual meeting (part 2).

1-6pm Middle Power Initiative for Nuclear Abolition - Launch and Formation
of International Steering Committee: Doug Roche.

Monday, May 4

1-3pm Abolition 2000 Working Group on Health Effects of Radiation with The
Atomic Mirror, Hiti Tau and WEDO. The Toxic Legacy of the Nuclear Age:
Pamela Meidell, Tricia Pritikin, Pamela Ransom, Janine Allis-Smith and
Gabriel Tetiarahi.

5-7pm: NATO Expansion: Cora Weiss, Moderator.

Tuesday, May 5

1-3pm Abolition 2000 with: International Association of Lawyers Against
Nuclear Arms. Nuclear Strategies and the ICJ Opinion: John Burroughs, Alyn
Ware, Hans Christensen, George Abi Saab, Merav Datan and Peter Weiss (invited).

5-7pm: Abolition 2000 Working Group on Sustainable Energy with: Plutonium
Free Future and GRACE: Nuclear Energy and Environmentally Sustainable
Alternatives. Claire Greensfelder, Alice Slater, Ted Taylor.

Wednesday, May 6th:

5-7pm: Abolition 2000: Women for a Free and Independent Pacific: Nuclear
Waste, Colonialism and Environmental Racism with: Myrla Baldonado, Gabriel
Tetiarahi, Rachel Julian, Michael Simmons.

Friday, May 8th

NPT Prep Com Closes

ADDITIONAL PROPOSED PANEL:

Weapons of Mass Destruction Free Zone in the Middle East: Ayman Kalil,
Praful Bidwai (invited).

PROPOSED ISSUE BRIEFINGS:

Transformation of the current non-proliferation regime to a Nuclear Weapons
Free World regime: IANUS.

NPT amendment to start negotiations on a Nuclear Weapons Convention: Zia
Mian, Merav Datan.

HEU for research reactors, the case of the new FRMII in Garching: Wolfgang
Liebert.

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>

Received: from loas.clark.net (loas.clark.net [168.143.0.13])

by igc7.igc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id MAA19971;

Thu, 12 Feb 1998 12:01:54 -0800 (PST)

Received: from local.clw.org (clw.org [204.245.159.2])

by loas.clark.net (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id PAA26887;

Thu, 12 Feb 1998 15:00:45 -0500 (EST)

Date: Thu, 12 Feb 1998 15:00:45 -0500 (EST)

Received: from CLW/SpoolDir by local.clw.org (Mercury 1.21);

12 Feb 98 15:35:12 -0500

Received: from SpoolDir by CLW (Mercury 1.21); 12 Feb 98 15:34:20 -0500

Received: from clw13.clw.org by local.clw.org (Mercury 1.21);

12 Feb 98 15:34:10 -0500

X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Version 1.4.4

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

To: dkimball@clw.org

X-UIDL: 887328792.004

From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)

Subject: Action on disarm. at CD

Message-ID: <EFF4DE66458@local.clw.org>

Status: U

X-Mozilla-Status: 0001

TO: Coalition members and friends

FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: report from Nicola Butler of BASIC on important developments in the Conference on Disarmament (CD) in Geneva.

I'm fowarding the following report from BASIC on a subject that will be a key element in the Coalition's upcoming messages to the delegates of the NPT PrepCom in April.

DK

Today, in the CD, the South Africans pushed for an early decision on their proposal for an Ad Hoc Committee on nuclear disarmament. Excerpts from their speech are included below. The South Africans also addressed the questions of whether the CD should tackle the issues of Negative Security Assurances and Anti-Personnel Mines. The full text will be on BASICs web site tomorrow at WWW.BASICINT.ORG

INTERVENTION BY THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA, H.E. MR J.S. SELEBI TO THE CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT, GENEVA, 12 FEBRUARY 1998

Mr President,

I addressed this Conference on 20 January at its opening plenary meeting

for the 1998 Session. At that time South Africa made a proposal to the Conference on Disarmament for a decision on the establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee on Nuclear Disarmament. In my statement I also addressed the issue of negative security assurances clarifying my Government's views on and approach to this issue. In my statement today, I again wish to take up the proposal which we have made on nuclear disarmament, address the issue of negative security assurances (NSAs) in the light of recent developments in the informal consultations held under your auspices, and I wish to raise the anti-personnel mines (APM) issue...

On the proposal for a decision for the establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee on Nuclear Disarmament, the text of which has been circulated by the Secretariat as document CD/1483 dated 20 January 1998, I would firstly like to extend my Government's appreciation to those delegations who have welcomed and indicated their support for the proposal.

We are aware Mr President that the motivation of South Africa in making the nuclear disarmament proposal has been questioned. South Africa's motivation on this issue is clear and is demonstrated by the fact that we are the only country which has unilaterally destroyed its own arsenal of nuclear weapons. Rather than seeking to sow confusion by chasing motivational ghosts, members of the Conference on Disarmament should recognise that the Conference is at a cross roads of relevance where we should seek to tackle the real issues which face us and address these in a realistic and achievable manner.

The question which, however, faces this Conference now is how to go

forward on the nuclear disarmament issue. In my statement three weeks ago on 20 January I stated that it was South Africa's intention to push forward with this decision in a plenary meeting of the CD in the near future; and the near future is soon.

Of late, my delegation has been approached on the timing of bringing this proposal to the Plenary for decision by the members of the Conference on Disarmament. Some have wondered whether more time is necessary and whether the opportunity should be given to allow CD members to engage the issue, possibly under your auspices. We have already had three weeks, the informal consultations which you did convene on the nuclear disarmament issue did not appear to use to be close to delivering any conclusive results. We must therefore at this juncture ask if there is anything to gain by allowing further time. Is there a possibility that we will be able to resolve the nuclear disarmament issue in a way which satisfies all the members of the CD? Will the answer be any different from now? If not, is it not better to confront these problems head on, early in the Conference's session, so that we can honestly and openly debate them in the appropriate fora?

I would, however, continue to emphasise that we should not allow this issue, which we are all fully aware lies at the heart of the fundamental problems facing the Conference today, to be submerged in the morass of CD procedural tactics or inaction. The CD will not be able to fulfil the international community's expectations especially as we approach the start of the next millennium, when we all hope for a more secure future than we and our predecessors have faced, by avoiding this issue...

Nicola Butler

BASIC

Carrara House

20 Embankment Place

London, WC2N 6NN

tel: +44-171-925 0862; fax: +44-171-925 0861;

email: nbutler@basicint.org

www.basicint.org

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers

at Council for a Livable World Education Fund

110 Maryland Ave. NE #201

Washington DC 20002

p: (202)546-0795; fax: (202)546-5142

website: <http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/>

>From wsantelmann Thu Feb 12 11:51:17 1998

Return-Path: <wsantelmann@igc.org>

Received: from ppp61.igc.org (wsantelmann@ppp61.igc.org)

by igc3.igc.apc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id LAA24842;

Thu, 12 Feb 1998 11:51:12 -0800 (PST)

Message-ID: <34E37CD4.2525@igc.org>

Date: Thu, 12 Feb 1998 14:51:00 -0800

X-UIDL: 887328792.001

From: wsantelmann <wsantelmann@igc.org>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 2.01 (Win95; I; 16bit)

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: mupj@igc.apc.org

CC: n1au@aol.com

Subject: Speaker needed on Abolition 2000

X-URL: <http://www.wagingpeace.org/a2000back.html#a2000wkg>

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Status: U

X-Mozilla-Status: 0001

I am looking for a speaker on Abolition 2000 for an adult Sunday School class at the Lexington United Methodist Church, Lexington, MA. There are two alternate dates, March 15 and March 29, and the time will be 11:00am to noon.

I hope there is a speaker available in the Boston area!

Many thanks!

Peace!

William F. Santelmann, Jr. wsantelmann@igc.org

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>

Received: (from majordomo@localhost)

by igcb.igc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) id EAA05593;

Fri, 13 Feb 1998 04:17:15 -0800 (PST)

Received: from gn3.gn.apc.org (gn3.gn.apc.org [194.202.158.47])

by igcb.igc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id EAA05507

for <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>; Fri, 13 Feb 1998 04:16:45 -0800 (PST)

Received: from Acronym [193.130.253.41](an041.du.pipex.com [193.130.253.41])

by gn3.gn.apc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8/GN-1.0) with SMTP id MAA27528;

Fri, 13 Feb 1998 12:27:28 GMT

Cc: fiona@alantis.demon.co.uk

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Date: Fri, 13 Feb 1998 12:27:28 GMT

X-UIDL: 887378956.005

From: acronym@gn.apc.org (Rebecca Johnson)

Message-Id: <199802131227.MAA27528@gn3.gn.apc.org>

Mime-Version: 1.0

Precedence: bulk

Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: website for acronym

To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Version 1.4.4

X-Sender: acronym@gn.apc.org

Status: U

X-Mozilla-Status: 0001

Dear friends,

I would like to announce that we have (at long last) set up a website at
www.gn.apc.org/acronym

This means that I will no longer be clogging up the airwaves with long reports on the CD or UN for you (although I have cut down on that for some months now, conscious of the information overload many caucus subscribers are suffering). Instead, I will send brief messages letting you know when there is new information to be found on the website.

The Acronym website is still under construction, but as of Friday, February 13, you should be able to get the text of recent editions of our monthly journal, Disarmament Diplomacy, which include CD updates, document summaries, news reviews and opinion/analysis pieces.

We have chosen a simple format without fancy visuals so that it is more accessible to people without very sophisticated or fast computers or telecommunications systems (a problem in some regions).

So far we have put up the latest three editions of Disarmament Diplomacy and the two major Acronym reports: No 7 on the NPT Review and Extension Conference and No 10 on finalising the CTBT, both of which contain the text of the relevant treaties. We're in the process of translating past Acronym reports and Disarmament Diplomacy editions, and thinking about what else would be useful.

Hope this is helpful,

Rebecca Johnson

The Acronym Institute

24, Colvestone Crescent, London E8 2LH, England.

telephone (UK +44) (0) 171 503 8857

fax (0) 171 503 9153

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>

Received: (from majordomo@localhost)

by igc7.igc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) id QAA20012;

Fri, 13 Feb 1998 16:12:58 -0800 (PST)

Received: from beach.silcom.com (beach.silcom.com [199.201.128.19])

by igc7.igc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id PAA12813;

Fri, 13 Feb 1998 15:38:12 -0800 (PST)

Received: from dial.silcom.com (pm4-34.sba1.avtel.net [207.71.222.34])

by beach.silcom.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id PAA26928;

Fri, 13 Feb 1998 15:34:50 -0800 (PST)

Content-Type: text/enriched; charset="us-ascii"

Date: Fri, 13 Feb 1998 15:26:06 -0800

From: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <wagingpeace@napf.org>

Message-Id: <3.0.32.19980213152604.00839660@silcom.com>

Mime-Version: 1.0

Precedence: bulk

Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: Re: NGO participation in NPT PrepCom

To: Diane Swords <sfcny@igc.apc.org>, Peace through Reason <prop1@prop1.org>,

abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)

X-Sender: napf@silcom.com

X-Mozilla-Status: 0011

General Lee Butler's speech including Q&A session can be found at
http://www.wagingpeace.org/butler_speech_9802.html

At 11:49 AM 2/13/98 -0800, Diane Swords wrote:

>If anyone has this, would you please send a copy my way as well? many thanks.

>Diane Swords

>Peace Action CNY

>658 W. Onondaga St.

>Syracuse, NY 13204

>315-478-7442

>

>At 08:01 AM 2/13/98 -0500, Peace through Reason wrote:

>>Hi, do you happen to have General Butler's latest speech in email or web

>>format?

>>

>>

>>Ellen Thomas

>>Proposition One Committee |

>>Peace Park Antinuclear Vigil

>>PO Box 27217, Washington DC 20038

>>202-462-0757 -- fax 202-265-5389

>>prop1@prop1.org -- <http://prop1.org>

>>

>>

>

>

<bigger> NUCLEAR AGE PEACE FOUNDATION

A founding member of

and global contact point for the

Abolition 2000 Global Network for the

Elimination of Nuclear Weapons

1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 123

Santa Barbara, CA 93108-2794

Phone (805) 965-3443 * Fax (805) 568-0466

E- mailto:wagingpeace@napf.org

[</bigger>](http://www.wagingpeace.org)

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>

Received: (from majordomo@localhost)

by igc7.igc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) id RAA12037;

Fri, 13 Feb 1998 17:57:17 -0800 (PST)

Received: from pooky.myhouse.com (pooky.myhouse.com [204.156.22.2])

by igc7.igc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id RAA10216;

Fri, 13 Feb 1998 17:47:45 -0800 (PST)

Received: from prop1.us.net (prop1.laurel.us.net [198.240.66.227]) by pooky.myhouse.com (8.8.8/8.8.7) with SMTP id UAA09064; Fri, 13 Feb 1998 20:46:14 -0500 (EST)

Cc: nukenet@igc.apc.org

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Date: Fri, 13 Feb 1998 20:22:03 -0500

X-UIDL: 887468173.002

From: Peace through Reason <prop1@prop1.org>

In-Reply-To: <2.2.16.19980213145346.3daf2a0e@pop.igc.org>

Message-Id: <3.0.3.32.19980213202203.0077b5d8@prop1.org>

Mime-Version: 1.0

Precedence: bulk

Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: General Lee Butler speech, February 2, 1998

To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.3 (32)

X-Sender: prop1@prop1.org

Status: U

X-Mozilla-Status: 0001

General Lee Butler

"The Risks of Nuclear Deterrence: From Superpowers to Rogue Leaders"

National Press Club, February 2, 1998

Thank you, and good afternoon ladies and gentlemen. Dorene and I are honored by your presence and gratified by your welcome. Although we are now proud residents of Nebraska -- note the obligatory display of home team colors -- Dorene and I feel very much at home in this city. I see many familiar faces in this audience, which makes the moment all the more special.

I have two roles to serve this afternoon, both very much akin to the events marking my appearance here just over a year ago. As your speaker, I intend to address two matters that go to the heart of the debate over the role of nuclear weapons: why these artifacts of the cold war continue to hold us in thrall; and the severe penalties and risks entailed by policies of deterrence as practiced in the nuclear age.

But first, it is my privilege to announce a compelling addition to the roster of distinguished international figures who have joined their voices in calling publicly for the abolition of nuclear weapons. Last year General Goodpaster and I unveiled a list of some 60 retired generals and admirals from a host of nations who declared their strong conviction that the world would be better served by the total elimination of these weapons. Today, at a press conference following my remarks, Senator Alan Cranston and I will present the names of more than one hundred present and former heads of state and other senior civilian leaders who have signed their names to a

powerful statement of common concern regarding nuclear weapons and who have endorsed a reasoned path toward abolition.

The willingness of this extraordinary assembly to speak so publicly and directly to these issues is very much in keeping with what I have experienced since I became engaged in the abolition debate some two years ago. I have met legions of remarkable men and women from every corner of the earth who have labored long and patiently in this cause. Their ranks have now been swelled by tens of millions of citizens of our planet who reject the prospect of living in perpetuity under a nuclear sword of Damocles.

My purpose in entering the debate was to help legitimize abolition as an alternative worthy of serious and urgent consideration. My premise was that my unique experience in the nuclear weapons arena might help kindle greater antipathy for these horrific devices and the policies which justify their retention by the nuclear weapon states. My purpose this afternoon is to share with you the abiding concern I harbor about the course of the debate. I accepted the press club invitation because I believe this forum is well suited to speak to that concern. In so doing, I intend to render a much more explicit account than I have given to date of the lessons I have drawn from over thirty years of intimate involvement with nuclear weapons.

Permit me, however, to preface my remarks by postulating that with respect to legitimizing the prospect of abolition, there is much to applaud on the positive side of the ledger. Nuclear issues now compete more strongly for the attention of policy makers and the media that often shapes their

interest. Converts are being won on many fronts to the propositions that these issues matter, that nuclear arsenals can and should be sharply reduced, that high alert postures are a dangerous anachronism, that first use policies are an affront to democratic values, and that proliferation of nuclear weapons is a clear and present danger. I am persuaded that in every corner of the planet, the tide of public sentiment is now running strongly in favor of diminishing the role of nuclear weapons. Indeed, I am convinced that most publics are well out in front of their governments in shaking off the grip of the cold war and reaching for opportunities that emerge in its wake.

Conversely, it is distressingly evident that for many people, nuclear weapons retain an aura of utility, of primacy and of legitimacy that justifies their existence well into the future, in some number, however small. The persistence of this view, which is perfectly reflected in the recently announced modification of U. S. nuclear weapons policy, lies at the core of the concern that moves me so deeply. This abiding faith in nuclear weapons was inspired and is sustained by a catechism instilled over many decades by a priesthood who speak with great assurance and authority. I was for many years among the most avid of these keepers of the faith in nuclear weapons, and for that I make no apology. Like my contemporaries, I was moved by fears and fired by beliefs that date back to the earliest days of the atomic era. We lived through a terror-ridden epoch punctuated by crises whose resolution held hostage the saga of humankind. For us, nuclear weapons were the savior that brought an implacable foe to his knees in 1945 and held another at bay for nearly a half-century. We believed

that superior technology brought strategic advantage, that greater numbers meant stronger security, and that the ends of containment justified whatever means were necessary to achieve them.

These are powerful, deeply rooted beliefs. They cannot and should not be lightly dismissed or discounted. Strong arguments can be made on their behalf. Throughout my professional military career, I shared them, I professed them and I put them into operational practice. And now it is my burden to declare with all of the conviction I can muster that in my judgement they served us extremely ill. They account for the most severe risks and most extravagant costs of the U.S.-Soviet confrontation. They intensified and prolonged an already acute ideological animosity. They spawned successive generations of new and more destructive nuclear devices and delivery systems. They gave rise to mammoth bureaucracies with gargantuan appetites and global agendas. They incited primal emotions, spurred zealotry and demagoguery, and set in motion forces of ungovernable scope and power. Most importantly, these enduring beliefs, and the fears that underlie them, perpetuate cold war policies and practices that make no strategic sense. They continue to entail enormous costs and expose all mankind to unconscionable dangers. I find that intolerable. Thus I cannot stay silent. I know too much of these matters, the frailties, the flaws, the failures of policy and practice.

At the same time, I cannot overstate the difficulty this poses for me. No one who ever entered the nuclear arena left it with a fuller understanding of its complexity nor greater respect for those with whom I served its purposes. I struggle constantly with the task of articulating the

evolution of my convictions without denigrating or diminishing the motives and sacrifice of countless colleagues with whom I lived the drama of the cold war. I ask them and you to appreciate that my purpose is not to accuse, but to assess, to understand and to propound the forces that birthed the grotesque excesses and hazards of the nuclear age.

For me, that assessment meant first coming to grips with my experience and then coming to terms with my conclusions.

I knew the moment I entered the nuclear arena I had been thrust into a world beset with tidal forces, towering egos, maddening contradictions, alien constructs and insane risks. Its arcane vocabulary and apocalyptic calculus defied comprehension. Its stage was global and its antagonists locked in a deadly spiral of deepening rivalry. It was in every respect a modern day holy war, a cosmic struggle between the forces of light and darkness. The stakes were national survival, and the weapons of choice were eminently suited to this scale of malevolence.

The opposing forces each created vast enterprises, each giving rise to a culture of messianic believers infused with a sense of historic mission and schooled in unshakable articles of faith. As my own career progressed, I was immersed in the work of all of these cultures, either directly in those of the western world, or through penetrating study of communist organizations, teachings and practices. My responsibilities ranged from the highly subjective, such as assessing the values and motivation of Soviet leadership, to the critically objective,

such as preparing weapons for operational launch. I became steeped in the art of intelligence estimates, the psychology of negotiations, the interplay of bureaucracies and the impulses of industry. I was engaged in the labyrinthian conjecture of the strategist, the exacting routines of the target planner and the demanding skills of the aircrew and the missilier. I have been a party to their history, shared their triumphs and tragedies, witnessed heroic sacrifice and catastrophic failure of both men and machines. And in the end, I came away from it all with profound misgivings.

Ultimately, as I examined the course of this journey, as the lessons of decades of intimate involvement took greater hold on my intellect, I came to a set of deeply unsettling judgements. That from the earliest days of the nuclear era, the risks and consequences of nuclear war have never been properly weighed by those who brandished it. That the stakes of nuclear war engage not just the survival of the antagonists, but the fate of mankind. That the likely consequences of nuclear war have no politically, militarily or morally acceptable justification. And therefore, that the threat to use nuclear weapons is indefensible.

These judgements gave rise to an array of inescapable questions. If this be so, what explained the willingness, no, the zeal, of legions of cold warriors, civilian and military, to not just tolerate but to multiply and to perpetuate such risks? By what authority do succeeding generations of leaders in the nuclear weapons states usurp the power to dictate the odds of continued life on our planet? Most urgently, why does such breathtaking audacity persist at a moment when we should stand trembling in the face of our folly and united in our commitment to abolish its most deadly

manifestation?

These are not questions to be left to historians. The answers matter to us now. They go to the heart of present day policies and motivations. They convey lessons with immediate implications for both contemporary and aspiring nuclear states. As I distill them from the experience of three decades in the nuclear arena, these lessons resolve into two fundamental conclusions.

First, I have no other way to understand the willingness to condone nuclear weapons except to believe they are the natural accomplice of visceral enmity. They thrive in the emotional climate born of utter alienation and isolation. The unbounded wantonness of their effects is a perfect companion to the urge to destroy completely. They play on our deepest fears and pander to our darkest instincts. They corrode our sense of humanity, numb our capacity for moral outrage, and make thinkable the unimaginable. What is anguishingly clear is that these fears and enmities are no respecter of political systems or values. They prey on democracies and totalitarian societies alike, shrinking the norms of civilized behavior and dimming the prospects for escaping the savagery so powerfully imprinted in our genetic code. That should give us great pause as we imagine the task of abolition in a world that gives daily witness to acts of unspeakable barbarism. So should it compound our resolve.

The evidence to support this conclusion is palpable, but as I said at the outset of these remarks for much of my life I saw it differently. That was a product of both my citizenry and my profession. From the early years of

my childhood and through much of my military service I saw the Soviet Union and its allies as a demonic threat, an evil empire bent on global domination. I was commissioned as an officer in the United States Air Force as the cold war was heating to a fever pitch. This was a desperate time that evoked on both sides extreme responses in policy, in technology and in force postures: bloody purges and political inquisitions; covert intelligence schemes that squandered lives and subverted governments; atmospheric testing with little understanding or regard for the long term effects; threats of massive nuclear retaliation to an ill-defined scope of potential provocations; the forced march of inventive genius that ushered in the missile age arm in arm with the capacity for spontaneous, global destruction; reconnaissance aircraft that probed or violated sovereign airspace, producing disastrous encounters; the menacing and perilous practice of airborne alert bombers loaded with nuclear weapons.

By the early 1960's, a superpower nuclear arms race was underway that would lead to a ceaseless amassing of destructive capacity, spilling over into the arsenals of other nations. Central Europe became a powder keg, trembling under the shadow of armageddon, hostage to a bizarre strategy that required the prospect of nuclear devastation as the price of alliance. The entire world became a stage for the U. S. - Soviet rivalry.

International organizations were paralyzed by its grip. East-West confrontation dominated the nation-state system. Every quarrel and conflict was fraught with potential for global war.

This was the world that largely defined our lives as American citizens. For those of us who served in the national security arena, the threat was

omnipresent, it seemed total, it dictated our professional preparation and career progression, and cost the lives of tens of thousands of men and women, in and out of uniform. Like millions of others, I was caught up in the holy war, inured to its costs and consequences, trusting in the wisdom of succeeding generations of military and civilian leaders. The first requirement of unconditional belief in the efficacy of nuclear weapons was early and perfectly met for us: our homeland was the target of a consuming evil, poised to strike without warning and without mercy.

What remained for me, as my career took its particular course, was to master the intellectual underpinning of America's response, the strategic foundation that today still stands as the central precept of the nuclear catechism. Reassessing its pervasive impact on attitudes toward nuclear weapons goes directly to my second conclusion regarding the willingness to tolerate the risks of the nuclear age.

That also brings me to the focal point of my remarks, to my purpose in coming to this forum. For all of my years as a nuclear strategist, operational commander and public spokesman, I explained, justified and sustained America's massive nuclear arsenal as a function, a necessity and a consequence of deterrence. Bound up in this singular term, this familiar touchstone of security dating back to antiquity, was the intellectually comforting and deceptively simple justification for taking the most extreme risks and the expenditure of trillions of dollars. It was our shield and by extension our sword. The nuclear priesthood extolled its virtues, and bowed to its demands. Allies yielded grudgingly to its dictates even while decrying its risks and costs. We brandished it at our enemies and presumed

they embraced its suicidal corollary of mutual assured destruction. We ignored, discounted or dismissed its flaws and cling still to the belief that it obtains in a world whose security architecture has been wholly transformed.

But now, I see it differently. Not in some blinding revelation, but at the end of a journey, in an age of deliverance from the consuming tensions of the cold war. Now, with the evidence more clear, the risks more sharply defined and the costs more fully understood, I see deterrence in a very different light. Appropriated from the lexicon of conventional warfare, this simple prescription for adequate military preparedness became in the nuclear age a formula for unmitigated catastrophe. It was premised on a litany of unwarranted assumptions, unprovable assertions and logical contradictions. It suspended rational thinking about the ultimate aim of national security: to ensure the survival of the nation.

How is it that we subscribed to a strategy that required near perfect understanding of an enemy from whom we were deeply alienated and largely isolated? How could we pretend to understand the motivations and intentions of the Soviet leadership absent any substantive personal association? Why did we imagine a nation that had survived successive invasions and mindnumbing losses would accede to a strategy premised on fear of nuclear war? Deterrence in the cold war setting was fatally flawed at the most fundamental level of human psychology in its projection of western reason through the crazed lens of a paranoid foe. Little wonder that intentions and motives were consistently misread. Little wonder that deterrence was the first victim of a deepening crisis, leaving the antagonists to grope

fearfully in a fog of mutual misperception. While we clung to the notion that nuclear war could be reliably deterred, Soviet leaders derived from their historical experience the conviction that such a war might be thrust upon them and if so, must not be lost. Driven by that fear, they took herculean measures to fight and survive no matter the odds or the costs.

Deterrence was a dialogue of the blind with the deaf. In the final analysis, it was largely a bargain we in the west made with ourselves.

Deterrence was flawed equally in that the consequences of its failure were intolerable. While the price of undeterred aggression in the age of uniquely conventional weaponry could be severe, history teaches that nations can survive and even prosper in the aftermath of unconditional defeat. Not so in the nuclear era. Nuclear weapons give no quarter. Their effects transcend time and place, poisoning the earth and deforming its inhabitants for generation upon generation. They leave us wholly without defense, expunge all hope for meaningful survival. They hold in their sway not just the fate of nations, but the very meaning of civilization.

Deterrence failed completely as a guide in setting rational limits on the size and composition of military forces. To the contrary, its appetite was voracious, its capacity to justify new weapons and larger stocks unrestrained. Deterrence carried the seed, born of an irresolvable internal contradiction, that spurred an insatiable arms race. Nuclear deterrence hinges on the credibility to mount a devastating retaliation under the most extreme conditions of war initiation. Perversely, the redundant and survivable force required to meet this exacting test is readily perceived by a darkly suspicious adversary as capable, even designed, to execute a

disarming first strike. Such advantage can never be conceded between nuclear rivals. It must be answered, reduced, nullified. Fears are fanned, the rivalry intensified. New technology is inspired, new systems roll from production lines. The correlation of force begins to shift, and the bar of deterrence ratchets higher, igniting yet another cycle of trepidation, worst case assumptions and ever mounting levels of destructive capability.

Thus it was that the treacherous axioms of deterrence made seemingly reasonable nuclear weapon stockpiles numbering in the tens of thousands. Despite having witnessed the devastation wrought by two primitive atomic devices, over the ensuing decades the superpowers gorged themselves at the thermonuclear trough. A succession of leaders on both sides of the east-west divide directed a reckless proliferation of nuclear devices, tailored for delivery by a vast array of vehicles to a stupefying array of targets. They nurtured, richly rewarded, even reveled in the industrial base required to support production at such levels.

I was part of all of that. I was present at the creation of many of these systems, directly responsible for prescribing and justifying the requirements and technology that made them possible. I saw the arms race from the inside, watched as intercontinental ballistic missiles ushered in mutual assured destruction and multiple warhead missiles introduced genuine fear of a nuclear first strike. I participated in the elaboration of basing schemes that bordered on the comical and force levels that in retrospect defied reason. I was responsible for war plans with over 12,000 targets, many struck with repeated nuclear blows, some to the point of complete absurdity. I was a veteran participant in an arena where the most

destructive power ever unleashed became the prize in a no holds barred competition among organizations whose principal interest was to enhance rather than constrain its application. And through every corridor, in every impassioned plea, in every fevered debate rang the rallying cry, deterrence, deterrence, deterrence.

As nuclear weapons and actors multiplied, deterrence took on too many names, too many roles, overreaching an already extreme strategic task. Surely nuclear weapons summoned great caution in superpower relationships. But as their numbers swelled, so mounted the stakes of miscalculation, of a crisis spun out of control. The exorbitant price of nuclear war quickly exceeded the rapidly depreciating value of a tenuous mutual wariness. Invoking deterrence became a cheap rhetorical parlor trick, a verbal sleight of hand. Proponents persist in dressing it up to court changing times and temperaments, hemming and re-hemming to fit shrinking or distorted threats.

Deterrence is a slippery conceptual slope. It is not stable, nor is it static, its wiles cannot be contained. It is both master and slave. It seduces the scientist yet bends to his creation. It serves the ends of evil as well as those of noble intent. It holds guilty the innocent as well as the culpable. It gives easy semantic cover to nuclear weapons, masking the horrors of employment with siren veils of infallibility. At best it is a gamble no mortal should pretend to make. At worst it invokes death on a scale rivaling the power of the creator.

Is it any wonder that at the end of my journey I am moved so strongly to

retrace its path, to examine more closely the evidence I would or could not see? I hear now the voices long ignored, the warnings muffled by the still lingering animosities of the cold war. I see with painful clarity that from the very beginnings of the nuclear era, the objective scrutiny and searching debate essential to adequate comprehension and responsible oversight of its vast enterprises were foreshortened or foregone. The cold light of dispassionate scrutiny was shuttered in the name of security, doubts dismissed in the name of an acute and unrelenting threat, objections overruled by the incantations of the nuclear priesthood.

The penalties proved to be severe. Vitally important decisions were routinely taken without adequate understanding, assertions too often prevailed over analysis, requirements took on organizational biases, technological opportunity and corporate profit drove force levels and capability, and political opportunism intruded on calculations of military necessity. Authority and accountability were severed, policy dissociated from planning, and theory invalidated by practice. The narrow concerns of a multitude of powerful interests intruded on the rightful role of key policymakers, constraining their latitude for decision. Many were simply denied access to critical information essential to the proper exercise of their office.

Over time, planning was increasingly distanced and ultimately disconnected from any sense of scientific or military reality. In the end, the nuclear powers, great and small, created astronomically expensive infrastructures, monolithic bureaucracies and complex processes that defied control or comprehension. Only now are the dimensions, costs and risks of these

nuclear nether worlds coming to light. What must now be better-understood are the root causes, the mindsets and the belief systems that brought them into existence. They must be challenged, they must be refuted, but most importantly, they must be let go. The era that gave them credence, accepted their dominion and yielded to their excesses is fast receding.

But it is not yet over. Sad to say, the cold war lives on in the minds of those who cannot let go the fears, the beliefs, and the enmities born of the nuclear age. They cling to deterrence, clutch its tattered promise to their breast, shake it wistfully at bygone adversaries and balefully at new or imagined ones. They are gripped still by its awful willingness not simply to tempt the apocalypse but to prepare its way.

What better illustration of misplaced faith in nuclear deterrence than the persistent belief that retaliation with nuclear weapons is a legitimate and appropriate response to post-cold war threats posed by weapons of mass destruction. What could possibly justify our resort to the very means we properly abhor and condemn? Who can imagine our joining in shattering the precedent of non-use that has held for over fifty years? How could America's irreplaceable role as leader of the campaign against nuclear proliferation ever be re-justified? What target would warrant such retaliation? Would we hold an entire society accountable for the decision of a single demented leader? How would the physical effects of the nuclear explosion be contained, not to mention the political and moral consequences? In a singular act we would martyr our enemy, alienate our friends, give comfort to the non-declared nuclear states and impetus to states who seek such

weapons covertly. In short, such a response on the part of the United States is inconceivable. It would irretrievably diminish our priceless stature as a nation noble in aspiration and responsible in conduct, even in the face of extreme provocation.

And as a nation we have no greater responsibility than to bring the nuclear era to a close. Our present policies, plans and postures governing nuclear weapons make us prisoner still to an age of intolerable danger. We cannot at once keep sacred the miracle of existence and hold sacrosanct the capacity to destroy it. We cannot hold hostage to sovereign gridlock the keys to final deliverance from the nuclear nightmare. We cannot withhold the resources essential to break its grip, to reduce its dangers. We cannot sit in silent acquiescence to the faded homilies of the nuclear priesthood. It is time to reassert the primacy of individual conscience, the voice of reason and the rightful interests of humanity.

Return-Path: <mkamiya@wcrp.org>

Received: from wcrp1.wcrp.org ([38.231.103.71])

by igcb.igc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id GAA25660

for <mupj@igc.org>; Sat, 14 Feb 1998 06:36:03 -0800 (PST)

Received: by WCRP1 with Internet Mail Service (5.0.1457.3)

id <14MCJAT1>; Sat, 14 Feb 1998 09:41:58 -0500

Message-ID: <5164328A8280D111B13E00A0C90377D86669@WCRP1>

X-UIDL: 887468173.006

From: Masamichi Kamiya <mkamiya@wcrp.org>

To: "Howard Hallman (E-mail)" <mupj@igc.org>

Subject: The April event in Geneva

Date: Sat, 14 Feb 1998 09:41:55 -0500

X-Priority: 3

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.0.1457.3)

Content-Type: text/plain

Status: U

X-Mozilla-Status: 0001

Dear Dr. Hallman,

Reminding you of my e-mail sent to you on February 6th, let me
humbly ask you to send me the program of an event organized by the
Abolition 2000, which is scheduled to be convened in Geneva in April
1998.

It would be most grateful if you e-mail me by Wednesday the 18th

because I will be out of the country for about a month from the very
next day of the 19th of February.

The material of the Geneva event will facilitate a meeting of WCRP
Governing Board in considering a possible participation of WCRP
representatives in the Geneva meeting.

I truly appreciate your cooperation for this matter.

Truly yours,

Masamichi Kamiya

WCRP/International

X-Mozilla-Status: 0801

FCC: C:\INTERACT\data\mupj\nsmail\Sent

Message-ID: <34E76853.479@igc.apc.org>

Date: Sun, 15 Feb 1998 14:12:35 -0800

From: mupj <mupj@igc.apc.org>

Organization: Methodists United for Peace with Justice

X-Mailer: Mozilla 2.02 (Win95; I; 16bit)

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: disarmament@igc.org

Subject: New subscriber

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Dear Kathy:

Please subscribe Carol Green, peace with justice coordinator of United Methodist Holston Conference in eastern Tennessee, to CTBT organizers list. Her e-mail is jimvert@postoffice.worldnet.att.net.

Thanks,

Howard

X-Mozilla-Status: 0801

FCC: C:\INTERACT\data\mupj\nsmail\Sent

Message-ID: <34E78449.4072@igc.apc.org>

Date: Sun, 15 Feb 1998 16:11:53 -0800

From: mupj <mupj@igc.apc.org>

Organization: Methodists United for Peace with Justice

X-Mailer: Mozilla 2.02 (Win95; I; 16bit)

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: wsantelmann@igc.org

Subject: Request for speaker

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Dear Friend:

Regarding your request for a speaker, I suggest that you get in touch
with Joseph Gerson at the New England Regional Office, American Friends
Service Committee. Phone: 617-661-6130; fax 617 354-2832; e-mail:
NERO@afsc.org.

If that doesn't work out, please get in touch with me again.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Methodists United for Peace with Justice

Phone/fax: 301 896-0013

X-Mozilla-Status: 0001

Message-ID: <34E8983B.6AFE@igc.apc.org>

Date: Mon, 16 Feb 1998 11:49:15 -0800

From: mupj <mupj@igc.apc.org>

Organization: Methodists United for Peace with Justice

X-Mailer: Mozilla 2.02 (Win95; I; 16bit)

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: 72124.3602@compuserve.com

Subject: Board meeting

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Dear Phil:

I'm responding to your two messages about our board meeting. We will have a low attendance. As far as I know now it will be Sherman, Jim and Char Hipkins, Ben Trammel representing the National Youth Ministry, you, and me. We may still have somebody from the Methodist Youth Movement. I haven't heard from Bruce or Kathy, so I'll call them.

With these numbers I think we should wrap up our business on Friday and not meet on Saturday. We might even go to the Hill on Friday afternoon and do some lobbying for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

So if we could buy some meals from Mel on Friday, that would be great.

Is there anybody else fro

rm Foundry who could join us on Friday and be part of the board?

I'm leaving for Geneva tomorrow, February 17 (my birthday!), and I'll return late Monday afternoon, February 23.

Shalom,

Howard

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>

Received: (from majordomo@localhost)

by igc7.igc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) id NAA22724;

Mon, 16 Feb 1998 13:51:30 -0800 (PST)

Received: from ties.itu.ch (root@ties.itu.ch [156.106.192.33])

by igc7.igc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id NAA17659;

Mon, 16 Feb 1998 13:31:10 -0800 (PST)

Received: from usr0-15.itu.ch (usr0-15.itu.ch [156.106.192.168])

by ties.itu.ch (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id WAA23678;

Mon, 16 Feb 1998 22:31:07 +0100 (MET)

Received: by usr0-15.itu.ch with Microsoft Mail

id <01BD3B2B.274E0920@usr0-15.itu.ch>; Mon, 16 Feb 1998 22:35:16 +-100

Cc: "Atwood, David" <atwood@pop.unicc.org>,

"Ballantyne, Edith"

<edibal@iprolink.ch>,

"WILPF (Emilie)"

<womensleague@gn.apc.org>

Date: Mon, 16 Feb 1998 22:03:03 +-100

X-UIDL: 887673283.002

From: International Peace Bureau <ipb@gn.apc.org>

Message-ID: <01BD3B2B.274E0920@usr0-15.itu.ch>

Precedence: bulk

Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: Hibakusha Exhibition at Red Cross Museum

To: "ABOLITION-CAUCUS" <ABOLITION-CAUCUS@IGC.APC.ORG>,

"Gensuikyo"

<antiatom@twics.com>,

"Gensuikin" <gensuikin@IGC.APC.ORG>

Status: U

X-Mozilla-Status: 0001

The Museum of the Red Cross and Red Crescent in Geneva is now showing a high-quality photo exhibition on victims of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

It is on until 20 April (alas, a week before the NPT), daily from 10am to 5pm, closed on Tuesdays.

Ave de la Paix, 1211 Geneva. (opposite rte de Pregny entrance to the Palais des Nations). Bus 8 from central station.

Those intending to be at the NGO Committee seminar and planning meetings this week (Fri-Sat-Sun) might do well to include it in their programme. The main museum itself is also well worth spending time in.

Best wishes

From: Colin Archer, Secretary-General
International Peace Bureau
41 rue de Zurich, 1201 Geneva, Switzerland.
Tel: +41-22-731-6429, Fax: 738-9419
Email: ipb@gn.apc.org - Web: <http://www.itu.ch/ipb/>

IPB is the oldest and the most comprehensive of the international peace federations - covering issues ranging from nuclear weapons and landmines to conflict resolution and peace education. Our current main programme is the

Hague Appeal for Peace 1999, which features all these themes. Write for details of membership, projects and publications - or consult Website.

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>

Received: (from majordomo@localhost)

by igc7.igc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) id QAA22688;

Mon, 16 Feb 1998 16:11:54 -0800 (PST)

Received: from beach.silcom.com (beach.silcom.com [199.201.128.19])

by igc7.igc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id PAA12150;

Mon, 16 Feb 1998 15:18:16 -0800 (PST)

Received: from dial.silcom.com (pm0-10.sba1.avtel.net [207.71.218.10])

by beach.silcom.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id PAA22106;

Mon, 16 Feb 1998 15:14:32 -0800 (PST)

Content-Type: text/enriched; charset="us-ascii"

Date: Mon, 16 Feb 1998 15:05:45 -0800

X-UIDL: 887720149.001

From: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <wagingpeace@napf.org>

Message-Id: <3.0.32.19980216150524.007ac5c0@silcom.com>

Mime-Version: 1.0

Precedence: bulk

Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: Re: NGO participation in NPT PrepCom

To: Nguyen Hoang Tien <u3914995@au.ac.th>

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)

X-Sender: napf@silcom.com

Status: U

X-Mozilla-Status: 0011

Dear Tien,

I believe the day you hope for will come, but we must work hard to achieve it. As a representative of the Abolition 2000 Global Network for the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons I will be travelling to Hiroshima where on February 21st I will receive more than 13 million signatures that have been collected on Abolition 2000 International Petitions. We have received information that signatures are a

Iso being gathered in Austria, Australia, France, Germany, New Zealand, The Netherlands, Russia, Ukraine, the UK and the US. Abolition 2000 is a fast growing network of citizens and citizens organizations. Currently it has 916 organizational members and 183 municipal endorsers.

Please consider sharing these signs of hope with friends and family and please join millions of other citizens worldwide in their effort to eliminate nuclear weapons. To find out more about Abolition 2000 please check out the following web-site at: <http://www.wagingpeace.org/abolition2000.html> -- you can sign the International Petition electronically by going to <http://www.wagingpeace.org/intlpe>

tition.html .

In a separate mailing I will be sending you Abolition 2000 information in case you do not have access to the web. I will also send you The Sunflower. The Sunflower is a free electronic newsletter which appears once a month and informs about nuclear abolition and other peace related issues.

We are certain that your hopes and dreams for a nuclear-free future will be fulfilled.

With warm regards.

David Krieger

- President -

At 04:37 PM 2/13/98 +0700, you wrote:

>Dear all

>I just hope that one day i can enjoy sleep without knowing that in the

>world there's no more nuclear. This seems so stupid am i?.

>Tien

>

>

<bigger> NUCLEAR AGE PEACE FOUNDATION

A founding member of

and global contact point for the

Abolition 2000 Global Network for the

Elimination of Nuclear Weapons

1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 123

Santa Barbara, CA 93108-2794

Phone (805) 965-3443 * Fax (805) 568-0466

E- mailto:wagingpeace@napf.org

[</bigger>](http://www.wagingpeace.org)

\$*\$\$*\$*\$ 2 LINES REFORMATTED BY POPPER AT igc.apc.org \$*\$\$*\$*\$

>From kimballjames Tue Feb 17 10:45:33 1998

Return-Path: <kimballjames@igc.org>

Received: from [198.94.3.29] (kimballjames@ppp6-29.igc.org)

by igc3.igc.apc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id KAA16213;

Tue, 17 Feb 1998 10:45:26 -0800 (PST)

X-Sender: kimballjames@pop.igc.org (Unverified)

Message-Id: <v02140b00b10f7d7f51e8@[198.94.3.86]>

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Date: Tue, 17 Feb 1998 13:49:46 -0500

To: mupj@igc.org

X-UIDL: 887742499.001

From: kimballjames@igc.org (Daryl Kimball & Sally Murray James)

Subject: NGOs at NPT

Cc: dkimball@clw.org

Status: U

X-Mozilla-Status: 0001

TO: Howard

FR: Daryl (at home)

RE: NGO meeting on NPT PrepCom

Attached below is a copy of the memo that I will be sending tomorrow via facsimile to the NGO Committee on Disarmament in Geneva to alert her that the Coalition's organizations are interested in having one of its representatives address, on behalf of the 17 member groups, the delegates

at the April meeting. Specifically, we are interested in describing our collective recommendations for the utilization of the enhanced NPT review process to advance progress on the fulfillment of the NWS and NNWS obligations under Article VI, and in particular the importance of formal entry into force of the CTBT, the importance of respecting the purposes of the CTBT and opportunities for the initiation of multilateral action on practical steps to achieve nuclear disarmament.

I hope your trip is successful and I thank you for taking the time to be attentive to these words.

DK

February 18, 1998

TO: Edith Ballantyne (edibal@iprolink.ch), NGO Committee on Disarmament, Geneva

FR: Daryl Kimball, Executive Director, Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers

RE: NGO presentations before the NPT PrepCom Meeting in April

On behalf of the organizations of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, I am writing to register our interest in having a representatives address, on behalf of the 17 member groups, the delegates at the April meeting. I understand that arrangements for this session will be discussed at this

weekend's meeting of NGOs in Geneva. I also understand that the process of identifying topics, appropriate speakers, and negotiating a block of time for NGO presentations is complex, so I appreciate your taking the time to consider another candidate for the session.

Three or more member organizations of the Coalition will, on their own, be actively involved in the PrepCom process (British American Security Information Council, the Institute for Science and International Security, and Ambassador Jonathan Dean of the Union of Concerned Scientists), we believe that we could make a useful contribution by conveying the views and recommendations of the entire Coalition. The Coalition consists of 17 U.S.-based NGOs who in late-1995 allied together to address key nuclear disarmament challenges including the test ban, deeper reductions in U.S. and Russian arsenals, nuclear force de-alerting measures, preventing the deployment of national ballistic missile defenses, and moving the NWS toward a multilateral process for nuclear disarmament. The organizations in the Coalition include national grassroots organizations and research and lobbying groups large and small. A major focus of our collective work is the challenge of securing Senate ratification of the CTBT.

Specifically, we are interested in describing our collective recommendations for the utilization of the enhanced NPT review process to advance progress on the fulfillment of the NWS and NNWS obligations under Article VI, and in particular the importance of formal entry into force of the CTBT, the importance of respecting the purposes of the CTBT and opportunities for the initiation of multilateral discussions and negotiations on nuclear disarmament.

I would be happy to provide you with more information about the Coalition,
or you might refer to our web page <<http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/>>
for details on our activities and member groups.

I would also appreciate it if you might keep me informed about developments
concerning the PrepCom and news concerning NGO activities and opportunities
in Geneva. I will be able to forward such information to a wide range of
individuals and organizations that are part of the Coalition.

Sincerely,

Daryl Kimball

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>

Received: from igc3.igc.apc.org (igc3.igc.org [192.82.108.33])

by igcb.igc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id RAA23199;

Wed, 18 Feb 1998 17:22:25 -0800 (PST)

Received: (from majordomo@localhost)

by igc3.igc.apc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) id RAA19416;

Wed, 18 Feb 1998 17:21:56 -0800 (PST)

Received: from [198.94.6.42] (flick@ppp42.igc.org)

by igc3.igc.apc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id RAA19291

for <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>; Wed, 18 Feb 1998 17:20:09 -0800 (PST)

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Date: Thu, 19 Feb 1998 08:30:04 +0100

From: flick@igc.apc.org (flick)

Message-Id: <v02140b03b11184b99d71@[198.94.6.89]>

Mime-Version: 1.0

Precedence: bulk

X-Old-Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: NPT - Just Do It

To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

X-Sender: flick@pop.igc.apc.org

X-Mozilla-Status: 0001

You know what people? Writing letters, lobbying and working on
your governments anticipating the NPT PrepCom would be a VERY beautiful
thing.

Tying it into your work on the Gulf situation is entirely possible. Of

course it is utterly obvious that the NPT failed in the Middle East and elsewhere and should never have been extended. Yet the PrepComs are an opportunity to scream this very loudly and to say that NOW more than ever we need some action on Article 6. Who knows? The horrifying and depressing situation with the Middle East right now might be the kind of kick the NPT needs to produce something. If that is dealerting, thats beautiful. If that is commencing a serious discussion about nuclear weapons in the Middle East, great.

We can be at the NPT PrepComs looking good and saying all the right things, but the positions are being formulated now. The landmines people really knew how to work the system and consistently build pressure. We have a network that is phenomenal. Lets use it to affect one of the VERY FEW places where this issue is multilaterally discussed. Lets lobby governments and share the results of our work on this server as to what the positions and discussion will be in April in Geneva.

love flick

Return-Path: <DCulp@nrdc.org>

Received: from mail1.eni.net (mail1.eni.net [205.214.51.15])

by igcb.igc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id KAA00033;

Thu, 19 Feb 1998 10:06:26 -0800 (PST)

Received: from mail.nrdc.org (mail.nrdc.org [207.168.63.2])

by mail1.eni.net (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id KAA15179;

Thu, 19 Feb 1998 10:06:23 -0800 (PST)

Received: from ccMail by mail.nrdc.org

(IMA Internet Exchange 2.12 Enterprise) id 00062426; Thu, 19 Feb 1998 13:15:02 -0500

Mime-Version: 1.0

Date: Thu, 19 Feb 1998 13:04:09 -0500

Message-ID: <00062426.4085@nrdc.org>

From: DCulp@nrdc.org (David Culp)

Subject: Nuclear Calendar

To: DCulp@nrdc.org (David Culp)

Content-Type: text/basic; name="calendar.txt"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Content-Description: MS-DOS text file

Content-Disposition: inline; filename="calendar.txt"

X-Mozilla-Status: 0001

NUCLEAR CALENDAR

February 18, 1998

Revised the first Monday of each month (and more frequently when
warranted) by David Culp, Plutonium Challenge, (202) 289-2388,

dculp@nrdc.org.

Changes from last month are marked with an asterisk (*).

February 14-22 Congressional Presidents Day recess

*February 16-27 United Nation, session to negotiate a new
treaty, "Convention on the Suppression of Acts
of Nuclear Terrorism," New York

*Feb. 16, 22, 28 Indian parliamentary elections
and March 7

February 20 U.S. District Court for the District of
Colombia, hearing in NRDC et al. v. Pe=A4a,
concerning DOE's stockpile stewardship and
management PEIS, 2 p.m.

February 21 Seattle Regional CTBT Summit

*February 24 Senate Foreign Relations Committee, hearing on
NATO enlargement with Secretary of State
Madeleine Albright, Defense Secretary William
Cohen and JCS Chairman Gen. Henry Shelton
testifying, 10 a.m.

*February 24 Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Technology,
Terrorism and Government Information, hearing
on incidences of foreign terrorists in America
five years after the World Trade Center
bombing, 10:00 a.m., SD-226 Dirksen

*February 24 DOE Defense Programs Office, scoping meeting on

the EIS for tritium production using Tennessee

Valley Authority reactors, Rainsville, Ala.

*February 25 Senate Foreign Relations Committee,

confirmation hearing for Robert Grey to be the

U.S. Representative to the Conference on

Disarmament, Geneva, 2 p.m., SD-419 Dirksen

February 25 South Korean President Kim Dae Jung inaugurated

*February 26 DOE Defense Programs Office, scoping meeting on

the EIS for tritium production using Tennessee

Valley Authority reactors, Evensville, Tenn.

February DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office,

request for proposals (RFP) issued for MOX

disposition of plutonium

February United Kingdom Ministry of Defense, completion

of Strategic Defense Review

*Feb. or March Senate floor action on the nomination of Mary

Anne Sullivan to be DOE General Counsel

*Feb. or March White House announces the appointment of three

assistant secretaries at the State Department

for: (1) arms control, (2) nonproliferation,

and (3) political-military affairs (estimate)

*Feb. or March United Kingdom House of Commons, ratification

of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (estimate)

March 1 DOE Defense Programs Office, selection of

commercial nuclear power plant(s) for tritium

production (Conference Report on the Defense

Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998,

*March 3 Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, hearing on DOE's defense programs and nonproliferation budgets, 9:30 a.m., SD-116 Dirksen

*March 3 Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, markup of S. 8, Superfund reauthorization bill (Smith bill)

*March 3 Senate Foreign Relations Committee, mark up of the resolution of ratification on NATO enlargement

*March 4 House Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee on Water Resources and the Environment, markup of H.R. 2727, Superfund reauthorization bill (Boehlert bill)

*March 4 Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, hearing on the DOE budget with Secretary Federico Peña testifying, 10 a.m., SD-366 Dirksen

*March 5 DOE Environmental Management Office, draft national 2006 cleanup plan released

*March 6 Russian Premier Viktor Chernomyrdin invited to give a report to the Duma on the financial condition of Russia's nuclear weapons complex

*March 9 DOE nonproliferation technology exposition, 9 a.m. - 6 p.m., Cannon Caucus Room (345 Cannon)

*Week of March 9 Senate floor action on NATO enlargement

ratification

*March 10 House Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, hearing on the DOE budget with Secretary Federico Peña testifying, 10 a.m., 2362 Rayburn

March 10 Congressional runoff special election to replace Rep. Walter Capps (D-Calif.-22)

March 10 20th anniversary of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978

*March 9-12 Gore-Chernomyrdin Commission meeting, Washington

*March 11 DOE nonproliferation technology exposition, 9 a.m.-6 p.m., SD-G50 Dirksen

*March 12 House Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, hearing on DOE's environmental management, civilian radioactive waste, and fissile materials disposition programs, 10 a.m., 2362 Rayburn

*March 13-15 Peace Action national conference, Washington

March 15 DOE Defense Programs Office, report to Congress on nuclear weapons stockpile stewardship and management (Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998, Pub.L. 105-85, sec. 3151)

March 15 DOE Environmental Management Office, final land use plans for Hanford Site (Wash.), INEEL (Idaho), Rocky Flats (Colo.), and Savannah

River Site (S.C.) (42 U.S.C. 7274k note,
amended by Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal
Year 1998, Pub.L. 105-85, sec. 3141) [At least
the Hanford Site will not make this deadline.]

March 16 Congressional committees submit budget views
and estimates to the House and Senate Budget
Committees

*March 16-20 Four-party Korean peace talks, second plenary
session, Geneva

March 16-April 3 PrepCom on the establishment of an
International Criminal Court, United Nations,
New York

*March 17 Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy
and Water Development, hearing on DOE's
environmental management program budget,
9:30 a.m., SD-116 Dirksen

*March 17 House Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and
Water Development, hearing on the DOE's Defense
Programs budget, 10 a.m., 2362 Rayburn (closed)

March 17 Illinois primary for the Republican candidate
to challenge Sen. Moseley-Braun (D)

*March 18 Senate Governmental Affairs Subcommittee on
International Security, Proliferation and
Federal Services, hearing on the Comprehensive
Test Ban treaty and nuclear nonproliferation,
2 p.m., SD-342 Dirksen

March 23 15th anniversary of President Reagan's "Star

"Wars" proposal

March 23-26 Exchange/Monitor Publications, Conference on
the Management and Disposition of Nuclear
Weapons Materials, Hyatt Regency, Bethesda, Md.
<<http://exchangemonitor.com/pu03agenda.html>>

March 24 10th anniversary of the conviction of Mordechai
Vanunu by Israel for espionage (Vanunu was
convicted for providing information about the
Israeli nuclear weapons program to the London
Sunday Times in 1986. He is serving an 18-year
sentence.)

March 27 Conference on Disarmament, first session ends,
Geneva

March 31 President reports to Congress on implementation
of the U.S.-Russian Helsinki Joint Statement
issued in March 1997 (Defense Authorization Act
for Fiscal Year 1998, Pub.L. 105-85, sec. 1229)

*March 31 Secretary of Treasury, first government-wide
audited financial statement to Congress (31
U.S.C. 3521(f)) [This will include a statement
of DOE's nuclear waste cleanup liabilities.]

March 31-April 1 G-8 Energy Ministers Conference, Moscow

*Early March Four-party Korean peace talks, working group
meeting, Geneva

March House Commerce Subcommittee on Finance and
Hazardous Materials, markup of Superfund
reauthorization bill, H.R. 3000 (Oxley bill)

(tentative)

*March Senate Foreign Relations Committee, hearing on
the nomination of John Holum to be Under
Secretary of State for Arms Control and
International Security Affairs (tentative)

*March House-Senate conference committee on the
Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1997, H.R. 1270 and
S. 104, begins

*March House-Senate conference committee on the
Foreign Relations Authorization Act for Fiscal
Years 1998 and 1999, H.R. 1757, may resume

*March DOE Nevada Test Site, subcritical test
"Stagecoach"

*March DOE Richland Operations Office, Hanford Site
(Wash.) draft remedial action EIS and land use
plan

*March DOE Environmental Management Office, Rocky
Flats (Colo.) plutonium residues final EIS

March Arctic Military Environmental Cooperation
meeting (United States, Russia and Norway),
Washington

*March-June Senate Foreign Relations Committee, hearing on
the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (estimate)

April 1 Senate Budget Committee reports budget
resolution (target date)

April 2-20 House of Representatives spring recess
April 4-19 Senate spring recess

*April 6-9 Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Organization,
Fifth PrepCom meeting, Vienna, Austria

April 6-28 U.N. Disarmament Commission annual meeting,
New York; agenda items are (1) nuclear-weapon-free zones, (2) U.N. General Assembly Special Session on Disarmament, and (3) guidelines on conventional arms control

*April 7 DOE Openness Advisory Panel meeting, Washington
(tentative)

*April 7 Congressional special elections to replace Rep. Ron Dellums (D-Calif.-9) and Rep. Sonny Bono (R-Calif.-44)

April 10-13 Healing Global Wounds spring gathering, Nevada
Test Site

<<http://www.shundahai.org/HGW/gather.htm>>

*April 14-15 NGO Committee on Disarmament, symposium with sessions on conventional arms control, nuclear free zones, and the Fourth Special Session on Disarmament, United Nations, New York

April 15 Congress completes action on the budget resolution (Target date set by law. Congress will have adjourned earlier for its spring recess.)

April 22 20th anniversary of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which created the Latin American nuclear-free zone, entering into force

April 22 Earth Day

- *April 25 DOE Richland Operations Office, report to
 Congress on whether and how to continue with
 the privatization contract(s) for the Tank
 Waste Remediation System, Hanford Site (Wash.)
- April 26 Chernobyl Commemoration Day
- *April 28 House National Security Subcommittee on
 Military Procurement, markup of its portion of
 the defense authorization bill (including DOE
 programs) (tentative)
- *April 28 Senate Armed Services Subcommittee on Strategic
 Forces, markup of its portion of the defense
 authorization bill (including DOE programs)
 (tentative)
- April 28-May 8 Second PrepCom for the 2000 Non-Proliferation
 Treaty Review Conference, Geneva
- *April 29 House National Security Committee, markup of
 the defense authorization bill (tentative)
- *April 29 Senate Armed Services Committee, markup of the
 defense authorization bill (tentative)
- April 29 First anniversary of the Chemical Weapons
 Convention entering into force
- *April Senate Governmental Affairs Subcommittee on
 International Security, Proliferation and
 Federal Services, hearing on the DOE's
 stockpile stewardship program and the nuclear
 weapons manufacturing complex (estimate)
- April DOE Arms Control and Nonproliferation Office,

draft study on the nonproliferation impact of
reprocessing research reactor fuel at the
Savannah River Site (S.C.)

April DOE Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
(Calif.), National Ignition Facility
supplemental EIS notice of intent

April DOE Savannah River Operations Office, Savannah
River Site (S.C.), spent nuclear fuel
management draft EIS

April DOE Albuquerque Operations Offices, Los Alamos
National Laboratory (N.M.) site-wide draft EIS

*April DOE Environmental Management Office, Rocky
Flats (Colo.) plutonium residues EIS record of
decision

*April India's new Foreign Minister visits Washington

May 1 Defense Department, report to Congress on
counterproliferation programs (22 U.S.C. 2751
note)

May 1-4 Physicians for Social Responsibility national
meeting and lobby day, Crystal City Marriott,
Arlington, Va. <<http://www.psr.org>>

May 3-6 Alliance for Nuclear Accountability (formerly
Military Production Network), D.C. Days,
Washington

May 11 Conference on Disarmament, second session
begins, Geneva

May 15 House Appropriations Committee, markup of

annual appropriation bills may begin (Markups
may occur earlier if the budget resolution has
been adopted.)

May 15 DOE Environmental Management Office, report to
 Congress on land use plans for Hanford Site
 (Wash.), INEEL (Idaho), Rocky Flats (Colo.),
 and Savannah River Site (S.C.) (42 U.S.C. 7274k
 note, amended by Defense Authorization Act for
 Fiscal Year 1998, Pub.L. 105-85, sec. 3141) [At
 least the Hanford Site will not make this
 deadline.]

May 15-17 G-8 Summit, Birmingham, United Kingdom

*Week of May 18 House of Representatives floor action on the
 defense authorization bill (tentative)

*Week of May 18 Senate floor action on the defense
 authorization bill (tentative)

*May 18 U.S.-European Union Summit, United Kingdom

May 19 Congressional special election to replace Rep.
 Tom Foglietta (D-Pa.-1)

May 19 Arkansas primary election for the Democrat and
 Republican candidates to replace retiring
 Sen. Dale Bumpers (D)

May 22 U.S. District Court for the District of
 Columbia, summary judgment hearing in NRDC
 et al. v. Pe=A4a, concerning DOE's stockpile
 stewardship and management PEIS, 10 a.m.

May 23-May 31 Congressional Memorial Day recess

*May 25 DOE Richland Operations Office, decision

whether and how to continue with the
privatization contract(s) for the Tank Waste
Remediation System, Hanford Site (Wash.)
(tentative)

May 26 Kentucky primary election for the Democrat and
Republican candidates to replace retiring Sen.
Wendell Ford (D)

*May 28-29 NATO foreign ministers meeting, Luxembourg

May 29 NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council foreign
ministers meeting, Luxembourg (estimate)

May 29 DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office,
proposals due for MOX disposition for plutonium

*May House Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and
Water Development, markup of the energy and
water development appropriations bill
(estimate)

May DOE Arms Control and Nonproliferation Office,
meetings on the draft nonproliferation study on
reprocessing research reactor fuel at the
Savannah River Site (S.C.), Washington and near
Aiken, S.C.

May EPA approval of WIPP (N.M.) opening

May DOE WIPP (N.M.), target date for opening the
facility

May DOE Defense Programs Office, commercial reactor
for tritium draft EIS

*May DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office,
surplus plutonium disposition draft EIS (The
preferred site for the Pit Disassembly and
Conversion Facility will be announced.)

May DOE Richland Operations Office, Hanford Site
(Wash.) solid (radioactive and hazardous) waste
program draft EIS

May Institute of Medicine, review and
recommendations of the National Cancer
Institute's studies on radioactive fallout from
nuclear testing

May or June President Clinton visits Moscow (estimate)

*May-July Senate Armed Services Committee, hearing on the
Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (estimate)

*Spring Russian Duma, possible ratification of START II

June 1 10th anniversary of the Intermediate-Range
Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, which eliminated
all U.S. and Soviet intermediate- and shorter-
range missiles, entering into force at Moscow

*Week of June 1 House-Senate conference committee on the
defense authorization bill begins (tentative)

June 2 California primary for the Republican candidate
to challenge Sen. Barbara Boxer (D);
Congressional special runoff elections (if
necessary) to replace Rep. Ron Dellums
(D-Calif.-9) and Rep. Sonny Bono (R-Calif.-44)

*June 8-11 Defense Special Weapons Agency, 7th Annual

International Conference on Controlling Arms,
Philadelphia

<<http://www.dsaw.mil/dsawconf/control.htm>>

*June 9 DOE Openness Advisory Panel meeting, Washington
(tentative)

June 10 House Appropriations Committee reports last
annual appropriation bill (target date)

June 10 35th anniversary of President Kennedy's nuclear
testing speech at American University

*June 10-12 First International Conference on Addressing
Environmental Consequences of War: Legal,
Scientific and Economic Perspectives, hosted by
the Environmental Law Institute and the
Smithsonian Institution, S. Dillon Ripley
Center, Washington <<http://www.eli.org/ecw/>>

June 15 Congress completes action on reconciliation
legislation (target date)

*June 15-July 17 U.N. diplomatic conference to establish an
International Criminal Court, Rome

June 20 35th anniversary of the signing of the "hot
line" agreement between the United States and
the Soviet Union at Geneva

*Week of June 22 House and Senate floor action on the conference
report on the defense authorization bill
(tentative)

June 26 Conference on Disarmament, second session ends,
Geneva

June 26-July 13 House of Representatives July 4th recess

June 27-July 5 Senate July 4th recess

June 30 House of Representatives completes floor action
on annual appropriation bills (Target date set
by law. The House of Representatives will have
adjourned earlier for its July 4th recess.)

*June DOE Environmental Management Office, receipt of
the first shipment of foreign research reactor
spent nuclear fuel at the Concord Naval Weapons
Station (northeast of San Francisco), to be
shipped to INEEL (Idaho)

June DOE Idaho Operations Office, INEEL (Idaho)
advanced mixed waste treatment project draft
EIS

June DOE Environmental Management Office, records of
decision from the waste management PEIS on the
treatment sites and storage sites for mixed
radioactive waste and low-level radioactive
waste

June NATO defense ministers meeting, Brussels,
Belgium

*June Russian Duma adjourns for its summer recess
(The exact date will be set in late May or
early June.)

*Late June DOE Environmental Management Office, final
national 2006 cleanup plan

*June or July Senate floor action possible on the

Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (estimate)

- July 1 30th anniversary of the signing of the Non-Proliferation Treaty at Washington, Moscow and London
- July 16 53rd anniversary of the first nuclear test, "Trinity," at Alamogordo, N.M.
- *July 25 Senate Select Intelligence Committee, hearing on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (closed) (tentative)
- July 27 Conference on Disarmament, third session begins, Geneva
- July 29 Second anniversary of the last nuclear test, Lop Nor, China
- July DOE Arms Control and Nonproliferation Office, final study on the nonproliferation impact of reprocessing research reactor fuel at the Savannah River Site (S.C.)
- July DOE Richland Operations Office, Hanford Site (Wash.) final remedial action EIS and land use plan (estimate)
- July DOE Savannah River Operations Office, accelerator for the production of tritium at the Savannah River Site (S.C.) final EIS
- Summer DOE Nevada Test Site, subcritical test "Bagpipe" [The name may be changed.]
- Summer European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, International Chernobyl

Sarcophagus Financing Conference, United
Kingdom (estimate)

- *August 1 Senate summer recess begins
- August 5 35th anniversary of the signing of the Limited Test Ban Treaty by the United States, Soviet Union and United Kingdom at Moscow
- August 6 Hiroshima Day
- August 8 House of Representatives summer recess begins
- August 9 Nagasaki Day
- August 11 Colorado primary for the Democratic candidate to challenge Sen. Ben Campbell (R)
- *August 17-21 Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Organization, Sixth PrepCom meeting, Vienna, Austria
- August 30 35th anniversary of the "hot line" between Washington and Moscow going into operation
- *August 31 Senate returns from summer recess
- August DOE Fissile Materials Office, shipment of MOX nuclear fuel from the Los Alamos National Laboratory (N.M.) to the Chalk River Nuclear Laboratory (northwest of Ottawa) for the "Parallax Project" test burn, using U.S. and Russian plutonium (estimate)
- August DOE Savannah River Operations Office, Savannah River Site (S.C.) spent nuclear fuel management final EIS (estimate)
- August DOE Richland Operations Office, Hanford Site (Wash.) remedial action EIS and land use plan

record of decision (estimate)

August DOE Savannah River Site (S.C.), accelerator for
the production of tritium EIS record of
decision

*September 5-7 Senate Labor Day recess

September 9 House of Representatives returns from summer
recess

September 9 Conference on Disarmament, third session ends,
Geneva

September 15 New York primary for the Democratic candidate
to challenge Sen. Alfonse D'Amato (R);
Washington primary for the Republican candidate
to challenge Sen. Patty Murray (D)

September 15 U.N. General Assembly, 53rd session convenes,
New York

September 21 Congressional Rosh Hashanah recess

September 21 U.N. General Assembly, general debate begins
and the President addresses the General
Assembly, New York

September 24 Second anniversary of the signing of the
Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty at New York

September 27 German Federal Assembly (Bundestag) elections

September 29-30 Congressional Yom Kippur recess

September 30 DOE Civilian Radioactive Waste Management
Office, report to the President and Congress on
a viability assessment of the Yucca Mountain
nuclear waste repository (42 U.S.C. 10134 note)

September DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office,
 contract award for MOX disposition for
 plutonium

September DOE Albuquerque Operations Office, Sandia
 National Laboratory (N.M.) site-wide draft EIS

September DOE Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
 (Calif.), National Ignition Facility draft
 supplemental EIS

September DOE Albuquerque Operations Office, Los Alamos
 National Laboratory (N.M.) site-wide final EIS

*September President Clinton visits Bangladesh, India and
 Pakistan (estimate)

*September Gore-Chernomyrdin Commission meeting, Moscow
 (estimate)

*September Russian Duma reconvenes from its summer recess
 (The exact date will be set in early
 September.)

October 1 U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency,
 completion of merger into the State Department
 (tentative)

October 1 Federal budget year begins

October 7 15th anniversary of the DOE Office of Civilian
 Radioactive Waste Management

October 9 Congressional adjournment target date

October 9 Nobel Peace Prize announced, Oslo, Norway
 (estimate)

October 20-22 NGO Committee on Disarmament, Disarmament Week

symposium, United Nations, New York (tentative)

October 26 15th anniversary of the termination of the

Clinch River Breeder Reactor (Tenn.) by

Congress

October DOE Albuquerque Operations Office, Los Alamos

National Laboratory (N.M.) site-wide EIS record

of decision

October DOE Idaho Operations Office, INEEL (Idaho)

advanced mixed waste treatment project final

EIS

October DOE Savannah River Operations Office, Savannah

River Site (S.C.) spent nuclear fuel management

EIS record of decision

November 3 U.S. congressional elections

*November 9-13 Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Organization,

Seventh PrepCom meeting, Vienna, Austria

November DOE Defense Programs Office, commercial reactor

for tritium final EIS

November DOE Idaho Operations Office, INEEL (Idaho),

advanced mixed waste treatment project EIS

record of decision

November President Clinton visits China (estimate)

December 7 5th anniversary of former Energy Secretary

Hazel O'Leary announcing her "Openness

Initiative" and releasing previously classified

records on human radiation experiments

December 10 Nobel Peace Prize awarded, Oslo, Norway

December 31 DOE Defense Programs Office, report to Congress
on the technology to be used for tritium
production (Defense Authorization Act for
Fiscal Year 1998, Pub.L. 105-85, sec. 3135(a))

December DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office,
surplus plutonium disposition final EIS

December DOE Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
(Calif.), National Ignition Facility final
supplemental EIS

December DOE Richland Operations Office, Hanford Site
(Wash.) solid (radioactive and hazardous) waste
program final EIS

December DOE Defense Programs Office, commercial reactor
for tritium EIS record of decision

*December Energy Secretary decision of whether to use the
Fast Flux Test Facility at the Hanford Site
(Wash.) for tritium production

*December NATO foreign ministers meeting

*December NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council foreign
ministers meetings

*December NATO defense ministers meeting, Brussels,
Belgium

Winter DOE Environmental Management Office, record of
decision from the waste management PEIS on the
storage sites for high-level nuclear waste now
at Hanford Site (Wash.), INEEL (Idaho),
Savannah River Site (S.C.) and West Valley

Demonstration Project (N.Y.) (estimate)

1999

January DOE Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
(Calif.), National Ignition Facility
supplemental EIS record of decision

January DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office,
surplus plutonium disposition EIS record of
decision

February DOE Idaho Operations Office, INEEL (Idaho)
high-level waste and facilities disposition
draft EIS

February DOE Hanford Site (Wash.), solid (radioactive
and hazardous) waste program EIS record of
decision

Copyright (c) 1998 by Plutonium Challenge. Permission (and
encouragement) is given to citizens groups to reproduce or use
this calendar. Proper credit is appreciated.

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>

Received: from igc3.igc.apc.org (igc3.igc.org [192.82.108.33])

by igcb.igc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id UAA27324;

Thu, 19 Feb 1998 20:01:40 -0800 (PST)

Received: (from majordomo@localhost)

by igc3.igc.apc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) id UAA03293;

Thu, 19 Feb 1998 20:01:29 -0800 (PST)

Received: from ppp4-4.igc.org (wslf@ppp4-4.igc.org)

by igc3.igc.apc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id TAA03046;

Thu, 19 Feb 1998 19:55:15 -0800 (PST)

Cc: lasg@igc.org

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Date: Thu, 19 Feb 1998 19:55:15 -0800 (PST)

From: Jackie Cabasso <wslf@igc.apc.org>

Message-Id: <2.2.16.19980219195759.77efa3c8@pop.igc.org>

Mime-Version: 1.0

Precedence: bulk

X-Old-Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: CTBT Yes! "Stockpile Stewardship" NO! #3

To: abolition-caucus@igc.org

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.2 (16)

X-Sender: wslf@pop.igc.org

X-Mozilla-Status: 0001

Western States Legal Foundation - 1440 Broadway, Suite 500 - Oakland, CA

94612 -Tel: (510)839-5877 - Fax: (510)839-5397 - E-mail: wslf@igc.apc.org

*****LAWRENCE BERKELEY LAB SUPPORTS NEW NUCLEAR WEAPONS RESEARCH*****

Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL) has agreed to design key parts, including an electron accelerator, for the Dual Axis Radiographic Hydrotest (DARHT) facility, now under construction at the Los Alamos National Laboratory in New Mexico. The DARHT is a central component of the Department of Energy's vast new "Science-Based" Stockpile Stewardship and Management (SS&M) Program to maintain and expand U.S. nuclear weapons capabilities under the recently signed Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT).

The SS&M Program involves dozens of existing, upgraded, and entirely new state-of-the-art experimental facilities and the world's fastest supercomputers, and is located primarily at the Lawrence Livermore and Los Alamos National Laboratories (managed by the University of California), Sandia National Laboratory, and the Nevada Test Site. The Clinton Administration has pledged \$4.5 billion a year to support this program -- in constant dollars, an amount well above the Cold War annual spending average for directly comparable activities including research, development, testing, production, and disassembly.

DARHT will be used to conduct hydrodynamic experiments in which weapons materials are subjected to intense pressures and heat. (The behavior of weapons materials under these extreme conditions is termed "hydrodynamic" because they seem to flow like liquids.) DARHT experiments will entail "photographing," with two x-ray machines at right angles to each other, large explosions involving radioactive materials (including depleted uranium

and non-fissile isotopes of plutonium), as well as beryllium and other hazardous materials. The electron accelerator being developed at LBNL is an important component of DARHT. It will generate the x-rays that are used to produce images of simulated nuclear weapons "pits" (the primary components of nuclear weapons) as they explode. The total construction cost of DARHT is more than \$250 million; LBNL's portion is about \$40 million.

Hydrodynamic experiments using the DARHT and other facilities at Los Alamos, Lawrence Livermore and the Nevada Test Site are being justified on the grounds that they are needed to maintain the "safety" and "reliability" of nuclear weapons as they age. DARHT is not needed for these purposes. However, there is little question that hydrodynamic tests provide information valuable for designing actual nuclear weapons. For this reason, detailed technical information remains highly classified. If completed, DARHT will be the most advanced experimental facility in the world for the design of nuclear weapons.

WHAT'S WRONG WITH THIS PICTURE? The current SS&M Program is grossly excessive, and may serve in the long term to stimulate the proliferation of nuclear weapons. This could happen directly, through the development and spread of technology and information, and indirectly, by legitimizing the continued possession and threat of use of nuclear weapons. Advanced lab testing facilities, such as DARHT, that are intended to provide nuclear scientists with the capability to design nuclear weapons without underground test explosions, violate the purpose and spirit of the CTBT and undermine prospects for its global entry into force. Moreover, they contravene the U.S. obligation to eliminate nuclear weapons enshrined in the Nuclear

Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). In July 1996, the International Court of Justice issued an authoritative interpretation of the NPT's Article VI commitment: "There exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control." Building and operating the DARHT fundamentally contradicts this obligation.

LBNL's Charter prohibits classified work and the Lab claims that it does not engage in weapons research. LBNL's participation in the DARHT project clearly violates the intent of this policy. It also violates the spirit and intent of Berkeley's Nuclear Free Zone Act, which states: "No person, corporation, university, lab, institution or other entity...engaged in work for nuclear weapons, shall, within the city of Berkeley, commence any such activities..." LBNL should refuse to take any part in the DARHT project or any other part of the dangerous and destabilizing SS&M program.

- Prepared by Jacqueline Cabasso, revised December 7, 1997

WESTERN STATES LEGAL FOUNDATION

1440 Broadway, Suite 500

Oakland, CA USA 94612

Tel: (510)839-5877

Fax: (510)839-5397

wslf@igc.apc.org

***** Part of ABOLITION 2000 *****

Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>

Received: from igc3.igc.apc.org (igc3.igc.org [192.82.108.33])

by igcb.igc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id UAA27340;

Thu, 19 Feb 1998 20:01:42 -0800 (PST)

Received: (from majordomo@localhost)

by igc3.igc.apc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) id UAA03292;

Thu, 19 Feb 1998 20:01:29 -0800 (PST)

Received: from ppp4-4.igc.org (wslf@ppp4-4.igc.org)

by igc3.igc.apc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id TAA03040;

Thu, 19 Feb 1998 19:55:12 -0800 (PST)

Cc: lasg@igc.org

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Date: Thu, 19 Feb 1998 19:55:12 -0800 (PST)

From: Jackie Cabasso <wslf@igc.apc.org>

Message-Id: <2.2.16.19980219195755.6bcff534@pop.igc.org>

Mime-Version: 1.0

Precedence: bulk

X-Old-Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: CTBT Yes! "Stockpile Stewardship" NO! #2

To: abolition-caucus@igc.org

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.2 (16)

X-Sender: wslf@pop.igc.org

X-Mozilla-Status: 0001

Western States Legal Foundation - 1440 Broadway, Suite 500 - Oakland, CA

94612 -Tel: (510)839-5877 - Fax: (510)839-5397 - E-mail: wslf@igc.apc.org

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES ON THE COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN TREATY & NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT

"The preamble gives the considerations that delegations had when they decided to conclude the this test ban." - Ambassador Jaap Ramaker, the Netherlands, Chair, CTBT Working Group on Legal and Institutional Issues, briefing for Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), United Nations (UN), New York, October 26, 1995

"...[T]he cessation of all nuclear weapon test explosions and all other nuclear explosions, by constraining the development and qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons and ending the development of advanced new types of nuclear weapons, constitutes an effective measure of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation in all its aspects..." Preamble to the CTBT

"It is important to recognize that the motivation of the 38 countries that joined together in this [CTBT] negotiation is not the same. The majority believes, as I understand it, that the banning forever of all nuclear tests in all environments will bring about, and bring about rapidly, the deterioration and the decay of all existing nuclear weapon stockpiles. As I understand it, all five nuclear weapon states believe that without testing we can nevertheless maintain for the foreseeable future the viability, the safety and the reliability of our nuclear stockpiles. So many participants are working on this endeavor from somewhat different premises... All five, as I understand it, believe that this is not only a classic disarmament negotiation, but that it is also a nonproliferation exercise... [N]one of

the five of us wishes any of the other five to be left with a privileged position with regard to the reliability of their nuclear weapon stockpiles."

- U.S. Ambassador to the CTBT negotiations, Stephen Ledogar, briefing for NGO's, UN, New York, October 26, 1995

"We have always believed that the objective of a CTBT was to bring about an end to nuclear weapons development. We are all aware that nuclear explosion technology is only one of the technologies available to the nuclear-weapon States. Technologies relating to subcritical testing, advanced computer simulation using extensive data relating to previous explosive testing, and weapon-related applications of laser ignition will lead to fourth-generation nuclear weapons even with a ban on explosive testing. It is a fact that weapons-related research and development in these technologies is being promoted. Our objective therefore was a truly comprehensive test-ban treaty, rather than merely a nuclear-test-explosion-ban-treaty. For many years, we had been told that a CTBT was not possible because testing was required for the safety and reliability of existing weapons. We questioned it then and now we know that we were right. Today, underground explosion technology has the same relevance to halting development of new nuclear weapons by the nuclear-weapon States as banning atmospheric tests did in 1963. A truly comprehensive treaty should have fossilized the technology of nuclear weapons." - Indian Ambassador Arundhati Ghose, to the Conference on Disarmament, UN, Geneva, August 20, 1996

"Now that the Test Ban Treaty has been concluded, it is the view of my government that all nuclear weapons states should destroy their facilities for nuclear testing, a logical consequence of this comprehensive agreement.

The French Government has undertaken to close down the testing site on the Mururoa atoll in the Pacific. We welcome that decision. Similar measures should also be implemented by the other nuclear powers." - Norwegian Ambassador Finn K. Fostervoll, statement to the First Committee, United Nations General Assembly, October 17, 1996

"Despite the conclusion of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, the nuclear weapon states continue nuclear testing through advanced non-explosive means and use these tests to refine their arsenals.... Recent experience has shown us that some countries will be reluctant to join limited agreements such as the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty...unless the nuclear weapon States undertake... commitments [to negotiate a program for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons]. Malaysia understands the concerns expressed by these countries that such limited steps place little constraint on the nuclear weapon States while requiring the non-nuclear States to forgo much more. The CTBT, for example, prohibits testing which involves nuclear explosions, but does not prohibit other forms of testing such as advanced computer simulations and high energy experiments, which the nuclear weapon States have the technology to conduct." - Malaysian Ambassador Dato' Abdullah Ahmad, address to NGOs, UN, New York, April 7, 1997

"In order to retain a technological edge in the military system, one major nuclear-weapon State has embarked upon a more sophisticated program to further refine its nuclear weapons design by using techniques such as above ground experiments, hydronuclear experiments, inertial confinement fusion and computer simulations which is a conspicuous violation to the spirit of Article VI [of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty]. We are very much

concerned over this discouraging development, for it could also trigger a renewed nuclear arms race among the nuclear-weapon States." - Indonesian representative Iwan Wiranataatmadja, statement in Main Committee I, NPT Review and Extension Conference, May 5, 1995

"...[T]he overall impression that they [nuclear-weapon States] give is that of business as usual. The Cold War may be over and, yes, the strategic competition between the United States shows signs of abating, but the relationship of nuclear weapons States to their own nuclear weapons has not registered the kind of basic change one might expect. They continue to rely on nuclear weapons and do not seem prepared to give them up in the foreseeable future. Quite the contrary, they are looking for ways to freeze the Non-Proliferation Treaty's dichotomy between the nuclear haves and the nuclear have-nots. This does not bode well for the NPT of nuclear non-proliferation in general."

- Mexican Ambassador Miguel Marin-Bosch during exchange of views at the Fourth Session of the Preparatory Committee of the NPT Review and Extension Conference, January 23, 1995

"It is illegal not only to use or threaten use of nuclear weapons, but to acquire, develop, test, or possess them. The right of States to self-defence cannot be invoked to justify such actions....States which possess nuclear weapons must be subject to an obligation to eliminate their existing weapons. They must within a reasonable time frame take systematic action to eliminate completely all nuclear weapons in a manner which is safe, and does not harm the environment.... [D]uring this transitional phase...[nuclear weapon states] cannot introduce new nuclear weapons. They cannot refine

their existing stockpiles. They cannot engage in action intended to ensure maintenance of their nuclear arsenals indefinitely into the future." -

Australian Minister for Foreign Affairs Gareth Evans, Oral Statement to the International Court of Justice, October 30, 1995

"There exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control."

- International Court of Justice (unanimous opinion), July 8, 1996

"Nuclear weapons are held by a handful of states which insist that these weapons provide unique security benefits, and yet reserve uniquely to themselves the right to own them. This situation is highly discriminatory and thus unstable; it cannot be sustained. The possession of nuclear weapons by any state is a constant stimulus to other states to acquire them." -

Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons, August 1996

- Prepared by Jacqueline Cabasso, November 14, 1997

WESTERN STATES LEGAL FOUNDATION

1440 Broadway, Suite 500

Oakland, CA USA 94612

Tel: (510)839-5877

Fax: (510)839-5397

wslf@igc.apc.org

***** Part of ABOLITION 2000 *****

Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>

Received: from igc3.igc.apc.org (igc3.igc.org [192.82.108.33])

by igcb.igc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id UAA27342;

Thu, 19 Feb 1998 20:01:44 -0800 (PST)

Received: (from majordomo@localhost)

by igc3.igc.apc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) id UAA03304;

Thu, 19 Feb 1998 20:01:35 -0800 (PST)

Received: from ppp4-4.igc.org (wslf@ppp4-4.igc.org)

by igc3.igc.apc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id TAA03031;

Thu, 19 Feb 1998 19:55:08 -0800 (PST)

Cc: lasg@igc.org

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Date: Thu, 19 Feb 1998 19:55:08 -0800 (PST)

From: Jackie Cabasso <wslf@igc.apc.org>

Message-Id: <2.2.16.19980219195752.77ef0910@pop.igc.org>

Mime-Version: 1.0

Precedence: bulk

X-Old-Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: CTBT Yes! "Stockpile Stewardship" NO! #1

To: abolition-caucus@igc.org

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.2 (16)

X-Sender: wslf@pop.igc.org

X-Mozilla-Status: 0001

Western States Legal Foundation - 1440 Broadway, Suite 500 - Oakland, CA

94612 -Tel: (510)839-5877 - Fax: (510)839-5397 - E-mail: wslf@igc.apc.org

***** LEGAL ASPECTS OF THE COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN TREATY *****

Current status: The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) was adopted in September 1996 by the United Nations General Assembly and has now been signed by about 150 countries. Under a generally accepted rule of international law, set forth in article 18 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, signatories to a treaty are bound to refrain from acts which would defeat the object and purpose of a treaty. The U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has stated that this rule bars CTBT signatories from carrying out nuclear test explosions. President Clinton has also stated that the adoption of the CTBT established an "international norm" against such explosions. (In addition, the U.S. is prohibited by federal statute from carrying out nuclear test explosions unless another country tests.) Further testing would also be inconsistent with the nuclear weapon states' (NWS) obligation under Article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), as authoritatively interpreted by the International Court of Justice, to "bring to a conclusion negotiations on nuclear disarmament in all its aspects". Indeed, the NWS (except China) have already jointly declared at the Conference on Disarmament that they have ceased the arms race in compliance with one element of that obligation.

The CTBT regime will be fully established when the treaty "enters into force". This requires ratification (in addition to signature) of the treaty by the 44 states in the world which have commercial or research nuclear reactors (a recognition that nuclear power is the foundation for a nuclear

weapons program). Of those states, India and Pakistan, both undeclared nuclear weapon states, as well as North Korea, have not signed the treaty. Reflecting the concerns of many countries, India objects to the NWS' laboratory testing programs as an evasion of the CTBT, and has declared its intention not to sign or ratify the treaty absent an unequivocal commitment by the NWS to a process of global nuclear disarmament. Pakistan has stated that it will not endorse the CTBT unless India does so.

Article XIV of the CTBT provides that a conference of states that have ratified may be held at the request of a majority of those states three years or later after the treaty was opened for signature, i.e. in September 1999 or later. This conference would "decide by consensus what measures consistent with international law may be undertaken to accelerate the ratification process in order to facilitate the early entry into force of this Treaty". Additional such conferences could be held on an annual basis.

Paths to establishing the CTBT regime: The CTBT Organization Preparatory Commission is now creating the treaty's elaborate verification system. According to the Commission's executive secretary, Wolfgang Hoffman, it will be operational in two to three years whether or not the treaty has entered into force. In September, he was in Washington seeking \$20 million in funding for the system owed by the US. Though it is less than one-half of one percent of the \$4.5 billion annual budget for the Stockpile Stewardship and Management Program, Congress so far has refused to meet this obligation. Other possible steps towards establishment of the CTBT regime include the following:

1) The NWS could make a joint declaration at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva or a Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) review proceeding (the next one is in April 1998) that they will respect the prohibition on nuclear test explosions pending the CTBT's entry into force, thus reinforcing their existing obligation as signatories to abide by the treaty's terms.

2) The NWS could agree to the commencement of multilateral negotiations on global nuclear disarmament in the Conference on Disarmament and curtail or eliminate their laboratory testing programs, thus substantially meeting India's objections.

3) The NWS could ratify the CTBT and then seek to persuade/coerce India to endorse the treaty, or at least not test in conjunction with provisional application of the treaty (see (4) below). This appears to be present US strategy. Assistance with India's nuclear power program could be one element of this approach.

4) The NWS and other states could agree to provisional application of the CTBT to consenting states pending its entry into force, as authorized by Article 25 of the Vienna Convention. Such a step could be taken at a conference on facilitation of early entry into force held in the fall of 1999 or later or by some other means. This procedure has been employed with other multilateral treaties. Notably, the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT) was made binding for decades by the Protocol of Provisional Application. The US became a party to the Protocol and GATT simply by signing the Protocol, without Senate approval. However, the Senate would likely strongly resist formal US adherence to the CTBT absent its approval,

and also only ratifying states can participate in CTBT conferences on early entry into force.

Scope of the prohibition: Article I of the CTBT prohibits "any nuclear weapon test explosion or any other nuclear explosion" (emphasis added). The preamble "recogniz[es]" that the prohibition will "constrain[] the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons and end[] the development of advanced new types of nuclear weapons". Exactly what "nuclear explosions" are prohibited will be determined by parties to the CTBT, and possibly the International Court of Justice, on the basis of the treaty text, the (sparse) negotiating record, and the future practice of all states parties, including their statements at review conferences. A strict construction of the prohibition as banning all kinds of experimental nuclear explosions would advance the treaty's disarmament objectives, help attract India's adherence to the treaty, and promote the long-term viability of the non-proliferation regime.

The NWS have stated that the treaty bars explosions involving a self-sustaining chain reaction. Accordingly, they claim, "subcritical" tests are permitted. However, such tests involve the production of neutrons by fissile materials and a nuclear "explosion" though a chain reaction does not occur. For example, it remains to be determined whether the CTBT bars tests of possible "fourth-generation" weapons in which fissile material is "burned", without a chain reaction, at a rapid rate resulting in yields of tens or 100s of tons.

Another area of concern is devices that would cause "pure fusion" explosions

that destroy the initiating device. Research into such devices, for example using chemical explosive driven pulsed power, is underway, including in joint US-Russian experiments. Especially since such devices could have large yields and are potentially compact enough to be "weaponizable", there is already expert opinion that CTBT parties should determine their testing to be banned.

Still another area of concern is large laser facilities like the US National Ignition Facility and the French Megajoule Laser that are designed to produce, on a repeated basis in containment vessels, sizable fusion explosions (on the order of 100 pounds of yield, enough to partially destroy a building). The NWS, as well as such advanced non-nuclear weapon states as Germany, contend that such explosions are not banned by the CTBT. They cite the CTBT negotiating record, as well as an asserted understanding under the NPT that such explosions conducted for civilian purposes by non-nuclear weapon states are permissible. However, the CTBT on its face bars any "nuclear explosion", whether "civilian" or military. Further, such experiments conducted by NWS in support of nuclear weapons maintenance and development seem to violate both the letter and the intent of the CTBT. Thus whether the prohibition applies in this area also remains open to determination by all CTBT parties.

- Prepared by John Burroughs, revised December 5, 1997

WESTERN STATES LEGAL FOUNDATION

1440 Broadway, Suite 500

Oakland, CA USA 94612

Tel: (510)839-5877

Fax: (510)839-5397

wslf@igc.apc.org

***** Part of ABOLITION 2000 *****

Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons

To: International Peace Bureau <ipb@gn.apc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: NGO Committee seminar programme and registration
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

At 01:49 PM 2/5/98 +-100, you wrote:

>This information being forwarded on behalf of the Special NGO Committee on
>Disarmament, Geneva.

>

>Christopher Bross
>International Peace Bureau
>

Please confirm my participation in the meetings on February 20 and 21 and arrange for a proper pass for me. Thanks.

Howard W. Hallman, Chair
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036